

Crossover Youth Practice Model: Past, Present & Future

May 19, 2021
Virginia Commission on Youth
Crossover Youth Workgroup Meeting

Presenters:

Shay Bilchik, Georgetown University
Alexandra Miller, Georgetown University
Macon Stewart, Georgetown University



CENTER FOR JUVENILE
JUSTICE REFORM
working across systems of care
georgetown university



Overview

- **Development** of the CYPM
- Implementation of the **CYPM**
- **Accomplishments** & Lessons Learned
- Moving **Forward**



Development of the **CYPM**

- Who we are at the **C**enter for **J**uvenile **J**ustice **R**eform

OUR MISSION



The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform supports leadership development and advances a balanced, multi-systems approach to reducing juvenile delinquency that promotes positive child and youth development, while also holding youth accountable.



For more information:

<http://cjjr.georgetown.edu>



Development of the **CYPM**

- **Wingspread Conference 2008**

- Policy Guidance for youth involved in the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems
- Partnership with American Public Human Services Association & Casey Family Programs

- **Breakthrough Series Collaborative (BSC) 2009-2010**

- Co-sponsored by Casey Family Programs
- Engaged seven jurisdictions

- **Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM) 2010**

- Created based on research and lessons learned from the BSC
- Engaged 13 jurisdictions during the first year



Drivers Behind the Development of the **CYPM**

Prevention

- Youth crossing over based on systemic regulations
- Failure to identify needs and risk
- Adequate supports not being offered

Information Sharing

- Lack of clarity on what is allowable
- Various interpretations of the law
- Inadequate data systems and case management processes to promote sharing

Interagency Collaboration

- Inability to identify youth at the point of intake
- Overlapping assessment processes
- Lack of understanding regarding other systems

Phases of the **CYPM**

Phase I

- Arrest, Identification, and Detention
- Decision-Making Regarding Charges

Phase II

- Joint Assessment and Planning

Phase III

- Coordinated Case Management and Ongoing Assessment
- Planning for Youth Permanency, Transition, and Case Closure

Systemic processes that are enhanced or developed to support youth who move between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems



Implementation of the **CYPM**

- CYPM launched in 2010 in 13 jurisdictions
- To date, the CYPM has been introduced in:
 - **23 states**
 - **123 jurisdictions**
- State level initiatives:
 - **Arizona**
 - **Florida**
 - **Idaho**
 - **Kansas**
 - **Maryland**
 - **Missouri**
 - **Nebraska**



CYPM in the USA: 23 States, 123 Jurisdictions

Arizona

Apache Co.
Cochise Co.
Coconino Co.
Gila Co.
Graham Co.
Greenlee Co.
La Paz Co.
Maricopa Co.
Mohave Co.
Navajo Co.
Pima Co.
Pinal Co.
Santa Cruz Co.
Yavapai Co.
Yuma Co

California

Alameda Co.
Los Angeles Co.
Orange Co.
Sacramento Co.
San Diego Co

Connecticut

New London Co.

Colorado

Alamosa Co.
Broomfield Co.
Conejos Co.
Costilla Co.
Denver Co.
Douglas Co.
Gunnison Co.
Jefferson Co.
Larimer Co.

Colorado (cont.)

Mesa Co.
Mineral Co.
Morgan Co.
Rio Grande Co.
Saguache Co.

Florida

Brevard Co.
Broward Co.
Duval Co.
Miami-Dade Co.
Marion Co.
Polk Co.
Seminole Co.
Volusia Co.

Idaho

Bannock Co.
Oneida Co.
Power Co.

Iowa

Woodbury Co.

Kansas

Sedgwick Co.
Montgomery Co.
Shawnee Co.

Maryland

Allegany Co.
Baltimore City
Baltimore Co.
Carroll Co.
Frederick Co.
Harford Co.
Howard Co.
Prince George's Co.
Montgomery Co.
Washington Co.

Michigan

Berrien Co.
Genesee Co.
Oakland Co.
Wayne Co.

Minnesota

Carver Co.
Hennepin Co.
Kandiyohi Co.
Olmsted Co.
Stearns Co.

Missouri

Camden Co.
Cass Co.
Greene Co.
Jefferson Co.
Johnson Co.
Laclede Co.
Miller Co.
Moniteau Co.
Morgan Co

Nebraska

Dodge Co.
Douglas Co.
Gage Co.
Lancaster Co.
Sarpy Co.

Nevada

Washoe Co.

New York

Bronx Co.
Kings Co.
Monroe Co.
New York Co.
Queens Co.
Richmond Co.

Ohio

Carroll Co.
Clarke Co.
Cuyahoga Co.
Franklin Co.
Hamilton Co.
Lucas Co.
Mahoning Co.
Montgomery Co.
Ross Co.
Stark Co.
Summit Co.
Trumbull Co.

Oregon

Clackamas Co.
Douglas Co.
Jackson Co.
Lane Co.
Marion Co.
Multnomah Co.
Washington Co.

Pennsylvania

Allegheny Co.
Philadelphia Co.
South Carolina
Berkeley Co.
Charleston Co.
Georgetown Co

Texas

Bexar Co.
Dallas Co.
El Paso Co.
Harris Co.
McLennan Co.
Tarrant Co.
Travis Co.

Virginia

City of
Alexandria

Washington

King Co.

Wyoming

Laramie Co.



CENTER FOR JUVENILE
JUSTICE REFORM
working across systems of care
georgetown university

Implementation of the **CYPM**

- CJJR provides technical assistance for an average of 18 mo.
- Jurisdiction teams are typically lead by Judicial, CW, and JJ leadership
 - Frontline staff, behavioral health, prosecution and defense attorneys, CASA, law enforcement, education personnel, individuals with lived experience, and others design and support the work
- Monthly full-team and workgroup meetings
 - Workgroups commonly focus on protocols, information sharing, court structure, prevention, training, and data collection/analysis
- Quarterly site visits



Accomplishments & Lessons Learned

Reductions In:

- ✓ Recidivism in justice system
- ✓ New sustained juvenile justice petitions
- ✓ Use of pre-adjudication detention
- ✓ Use of APPLA as a permanency goal

Increases In:

- ✓ Improved educational outcomes
- ✓ Pro-social activities
- ✓ Positive behavioral health outcomes
- ✓ Diversion/dismissal
- ✓ Home placement/reunification
- ✓ Social supports

Haight et al. (2016); Herz et al. (2018); Wright et al. (2017)

Accomplishments & Lessons Learned

National Institute of Justice (2020)

- CYPM received an evidence rating as promising
- Program Type identified as Diversion, Vocational/Job Training, Wraparound/Case Management, Children Exposed to Violence, Court Processing

California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse (2018)

- CYPM was designated as having “Promising Research Evidence” with a rating of 3 out of 5 based on external studies
- Relevance to Child and Family Well-Being was deemed High for CYPM

Lessons Learned

- Youth and Family Voice Matters
- Leadership Commitment and Engagement is Essential
- Accountability is Required
- Data is Necessary



Moving Forward

- Expand focus on upstream and downstream prevention in jurisdictions implementing the CYPM
- Encourage the use of data to further target efforts and assess short/long-term impact of the CYPM
- Introduce the CYPM to other regions of the U.S.
- Expand research and practical application of the CYPM on subpopulations of crossover youth that present greater vulnerabilities (i.e. tribal youth, victims of commercial sexual exploitation and youth that identify as LGBTQ-GNCT)
- Increase our study on girls and how the systems can enhance their supports for girls at risk of or who have crossed over





For more information, log onto:
<https://cjjr.georgetown.edu>

Contact:

Shay Bilchik at scb45@georgetown.edu

Alex Miller at am4020@georgetown.edu

Macon Stewart at macon.stewart@georgetown.edu



CENTER FOR JUVENILE
JUSTICE REFORM
working across systems of care
georgetown university

