The mission of Youth Impact! of Douglas County:
Engaging, guiding and empowering Douglas County youth and families to achieve positive outcomes within the child welfare and juvenile justice systems through community partnerships designed to offer unique and innovative opportunities to decrease further system involvement.

The vision of Youth Impact!:
Youth Impact! provides a unique and innovative way to give families a greater voice in decisions affecting their lives and to decrease further involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Values key to Youth Impact!:
Ensure greater youth and family involvement
Collaborate with community partners
  Focus on family strengths
  Improve system accountability
Engage and collaborate with youth, family and stakeholders
  Identify system gaps and barriers
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT AS A RISK FACTOR FOR DELINQUENCY

- Increased likelihood of arrest as a juvenile by 55% and for a violent crime as a juvenile by 96%
- Increased likelihood of arrest as an adult by 28% and for a violent crime as an adult by 30%
- Increased the odds of future delinquency and adult criminality overall by 29%
WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT DUAL STATUS or CROSSOVER YOUTH

• They are often in the child welfare system for long periods of time.
• They are more likely to be female as compared to the general delinquency population.
• Minorities, particularly African Americans, appear to be over represented.
• Most are placed out of the home and often experience multiple placements.
• They are often truant and/or performing poorly in school.
• Over half are detained prior to adjudication.

Herz & Ryan, 2008b; Halemba, Siegel, Lord, & Zawacki, 2004; Kelley, Thornberry, & Smith, 1997; Saetern & Swain, 2009
PREVALENCE

• Studies estimate that between 9-29% of youth involved in the child welfare system come into contact with the juvenile justice system
  – Most maltreated youth do not have official records and do not self report delinquency.
• Higher proportion of crossover youth as penetration in the juvenile justice system deepens:

  1% Diversion Cases
  7% Probation Cases
  42% Placement Cases

Sources: Smith, Thornberry, Ireland, & Elwyn, 2008; Johnson, Ereth, & Wagner 2004; Dennison & Waterson, 2002; Halemba 2004.
## CYPM GOALS

### Practice Goals

- Reduction of use of pre-adjudication detention
- Increase use of diversion
- Reduction of number of youth reentering child welfare from juvenile justice placements
- Improvement in pro-social bonds
- Reduction in recidivism

### Process Goals

- Increase use of interagency information-sharing
- Increase use of “joint” assessment
- Increase inclusion of youth and family voice in decision-making
# IMPROVED OUTCOMES FOR DOUGLAS COUNTY YOUTH

## Juvenile Justice Outcomes
- Penetration of juvenile justice by foster youth
- Pre-adjudication detention
- Rate of recidivism

## Child Welfare Outcomes
- Number/percentage of youth who received independent living services after identification
- Number of child welfare placements
- Time to permanency
- Additional referrals to the CWS
- Stable contact with family

## Child Well-Being Outcomes
- Involvement in prosocial programming
- Youth enrolled in school or educational program
- Improvement in youth’s academic performance or behavior at school
- Indication that youth’s mental health had changed
- Indication that youth’s use of alcohol and/or drugs had changed
How it Began

• January 2012
• Agreement between Nebraska Supreme Court, Department of Health and Human Services and Douglas County
• Crossover Youth Practice Model is currently situated within the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative to utilize existing resources and infrastructure
PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP
Douglas County CYPM Target Population

A youth;

1.) Referred to the County Attorney’s office for a delinquency, truancy, or status offense  **AND**

2.) Has a Child Welfare case that is open or closed, within the last 12 months. The case can be voluntary or court involved.
Fundamental Paradigm Shift

• All youth Team Eligible (eligible for diversionary options) – unless already Court involved for delinquency
• Youth progressing due to need for formal Court supervision offered Coordinated Case Planning
• County attorney allows joint review by team and accepts recommendations as part of decision to be made at meeting
• Youth (& family) present – central to solution oriented Team Meeting
Who Are Cross Over Youth?

Gender Of CYPM Team Eligible 2015

- Female: 66
- Male: 68
Who Are Cross Over Youth?

2015 CYPM Team Eligible by Race

- African American: 70, 52%
- Hispanic or Latino: 41, 30%
- Mixed: 17, 13%
- Native American or Alaska Native: 5, 4%
- White/Caucasian: 1, 1%
Who Are Cross Over Youth?

2015 CYPM Team Eligible Age

- 7: 1
- 8: 1
- 10: 6
- 11: 4
- 12: 15
- 13: 21
- 14: 24
- 15: 25
- 16: 26
- 17: 11

Total
Who Are Cross Over Youth?

Placement Status For YI! Team Eligible Youth 2015

- Adoptive Placement: 1
- Congregate Care: 7
- Foster Care: 20
- Home: 79
- Other: 8
- Relative Placement: 12
- Hospital/PRTF: 3
- Shelter: 4
Data Snapshot
This past year-2015

• 180 youth were identified as meeting Youth Impact! criterion
• 134 of those youth met criteria to be eligible for team meetings.
• Team meetings can yield four potential outcomes for the youth and family:
  – Nolle Pros (no further action on law violation or status referral)
  – Enhanced Child Welfare Coordinated Case Plan (No further action on law violation or status referral)
  – Diversion
  – Court filing

• 46 Youth were ineligible for team meetings in 2015.
  Youth who were not eligible for team meetings were already court involved for a delinquency or status and/or were being held in detention at the time of identification.
Data Snapshot

2015 YI! Team Meeting Decisions/Initial Outcomes

- 37, 50%
- 18, 24%
- 13, 17%
- 7, 9%

- Nolle Pros
- Nolle Pros Enhanced
- Diversion
- File
Quality Assurance

- Team meeting script
- Team meeting QA tool
  - Feedback after each team meeting
- Coordinated case planning process measures
- Feedback from judges
- Satisfaction survey
- Overarching CYPM structure
  - Steering Committee (quarterly)
  - Subcommittee (quarterly)
  - Working Group (monthly)
Youth Impact! Evaluation

- Dr. Wright & Dr. Spohn secured external funding
- Purpose of project is to evaluate CYPM in Douglas County, NE (Youth Impact!)
- Four evaluation components:
  - Process evaluation
  - Outcome evaluation
  - Cost-benefit analysis
  - Systems analysis
Evaluation Progress

• **Outcome evaluation**: Is the process better now than in the past?
  – data collection on 9-month & 18-month outcomes for program participants and control group

• **Cost-benefit & Systems analysis**: Is YI! cost-effective?
  – data collection stage

• **Process Evaluation**: How do YI! agency professionals and the youth/families who are involved feel about it?
  – professional interviews completed & begun data collection on youth and families
Qualitative Themes

- Agency collaboration vs. silos
- Implications for CWS/JJS services and workload
- Better decision-making for youth & youth/family engagement
- Individual buy-in/trust & communication
- Sustainability: turnover
- Sustainability: maintaining focus on mission

- Making data useful to the process
- Limitations of participants (time, etc.)
- Outcomes: recidivism & CW involvement vs. broader measures
- Youth & family barriers (transportation, availability, etc.)
Opportunity for Sustainable Reform

- National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
- Dual Status Youth Practice Network (RFK National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice)
- CYPM expansion to new sites in Nebraska
- Operation Youth Success – collective impact in Douglas County
- Youth Impact! work informing larger system reform efforts
Focus Areas for 2016

- Strengthen coordinated case planning process for youth who “crossover”
- Increase voice and choice of youth and families participating in the program
- Utilize research findings to improve practice and improve youth and family outcomes
- Facilitate quarterly “Brown Baggers” to educate Youth Impact! team and community stakeholders
- Strengthen public private partnership and leverage unique agency contributions to initiative