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Session Roadmap

- California’s Approach to Dual Status Youth
- Case Example
- Research, Data, and Best Practices from around the Nation
- On the Horizon for California (AB1911)
- San Diego’s Example of Dual Status, CYPM
- Group Discussion of Challenges and Strategies

History of Dual Status in CA

- Prior to 2005, a child could not be both a dependent and ward of the court
  - What did that mean for children?
- In 2005, AB129 amended WIC to allow dual status youth
  - 18 counties, representing 67% of California’s population, developed dual status protocols
  - There are several dual status models being used in the counties.
- 2015 audit by the state revealed flaws
  - Lack of standardized terms
  - Lack of defined outcomes
  - The legislature responded with AB1911
Case in Point

- First CWS encounter at 5 months
- In delinquency at 13; terminated at 14
- Referred himself to CWS at 16; placed in several GHs over following year
- Incident at GH lead to disrupted placement and detention
- Jurisdictional foodfight ensues

Jurisdictional Foodfight Jeopardizes Future Support

- Clerical error left jurisdiction in question
- "Non-dual" county
- With multiple GH placements, difficulty in securing new placement following detention
- Result was 4 months in detention
- Recommendation from BOTH systems was detention until 18th birthday...
- Which would have rendered him ineligible for extended foster care
What could have been done differently

- Individual needs vs. family history
- Exploration of home-based care as a first option
- Continuum of Care Reform:
  - GH → Short Term Residential Treatment Program
  - Probation now required to develop home-based care as first placement option

Why Focus on Dual Status Youth?

- Coordination between systems leads to access to more treatment resources
- Poor communication and cultural differences lead to cross purposes
What do we know about dual status youth?

- Maltreated youth have increased risk for arrest as a juvenile and as adult (Wisdom and Maxfield, 2001)

- Prevalence
  - 67% of JJ youth had some form of CW involvement (King County, WA 2011); 83% of the cohort studied by the CDN had been referred to CPS at least once (Los Angeles, CA 2017)
  - 9%-29% of CW youth become involved with JJ (multi-city)

- Risk factors among youth in foster care (Cutuli, 2014)
  - Older age at first foster care placement
  - Experiencing a high number of placements
  - Placement in congregate care
  - Males and African-American youth in foster care are at greater risk of later juvenile justice involvement

What do we know about dual status youth?

- Outcomes and Experiences
  - Youth in foster care begin offending earlier, spend more time incarcerated, and commit a greater number of offenses than youth not in foster care. (Yang, 2017)
  - Dual status youth have higher rates of recidivism (Lee & Villagran, 2015)
  - Dual status youth are detained more often; and for longer periods of time. (Ganger & Ross, 2001; Halemba & Siegel, 2011)
  - Dual status youth experience negative outcomes related to permanency, with significant numbers of placement changes and AWOL episodes. (Halemba & Siegel 2011)
  - Dual status youth are more likely than youth in just one system to experience a jail stay, lack of education and employment in young adulthood. (Center for Innovation through Data Intelligence, 2015)

- Protective Factors
  - Staying engaged with school
  - Having positive attachments/relationships
  - Engagement with non-delinquent peers
Recommended Practices

- Routine identification of dual status youth (San Diego)
- Individualized outcomes (El Dorado)
- Validated screening and assessment instruments
- Alternatives to formal processing at earliest opportunity and key decision points
- Engagement of families
- Joint assessment process across systems
- Coordinated:
  - case planning
  - court processes
  - case management (Santa Clara)
- Focus on family stability, placement stability, and community connections

AB1911

- Required Judicial Council to convene stakeholders
- Report approved by JC submitted to legislature
- Outcome tracking
  - Recidivism
  - Health
  - Pregnancy
  - Homelessness
  - Employment
  - Education

ADDITIONAL AREAS RECOMMENDED TRACKING:

- Substance abuse
- Placement stability
- Extended foster care participation
- Commercially sexual exploitation
Recommendations for Dual Status Youth (AB1911)

- Challenges related to tracking outcomes
  - No common definition of terms
  - No single way to identify same youth in various systems
  - No consistent data sharing and interface of networks
  - No consistent data collection
  - Systems needing updating
  - No consistent way to track youth, families who move to other counties

Identifying Terms

- Dual Status Youth
  - Youth simultaneously declared a dependent and a ward
- Child Welfare Crossover Youth
  - Youth whose child welfare case terminated in favor of wardship
- Juvenile Justice Crossover Youth
  - Youth whose juvenile justice case terminated in favor of child welfare finding
- Dually Involved Youth
  - Youth who is currently a child welfare or juvenile justice youth and has formal or informal action (pending or active) through child welfare, probation and/or the court
- Dually-Identified Youth
  - Youth with historical contact in one system and current contact with the other
Identifying Priority Outcomes to Track

- Runaway
- AWOL
- Voluntary Services
- Informal Services
- Informal Probation
- Child Welfare History

- Recidivism
- Child welfare re-entry
- Child welfare re-detention
- Permanency
- Diversion
- Homelessness

Recommendations for Dual Status Youth (AB1911)

- What’s the take away?
  - The purpose of AB1911 was to consider how we gather information about DSY and we share that information.
  - It represents a shift – a growing concern – with gathering the right information so we can better serve this population.
Dual Jurisdiction in California

- 18 Courts have dual protocols
  - [http://www.courts.ca.gov/7989.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/7989.htm)
- Protocols vary
- Varies-lead, dual, on hold, combination of both
- Not all one judge, one court
- Eligibility varies
- Report, supervision duties vary
- Switching agency varies
- As AB1911 noted, no common tracking of data

Dual Jurisdiction in San Diego

- Began with dual protocol 1998, now CYPM 2012
  - Identify youth in one system touching another
  - Identify early on how to best handle, include CWS, Probation, Def Atty
  - Term probation at earliest possible time
  - Challenges with WIC707(b), camp
- One judge, one court
- Lead agency, court
- Dual unit in CWS and Probation
- Stakeholders meet monthly
  - On going work in progress, discuss issues
  - Original pushback on dual, concern over duplication service
Goals/Objectives

- Provide better and more coordinated services to crossover youth.
- Reduce number of youth in out-of-home placement.
- Reduce amount of arrests for assault in group homes.
- Reduce number of youth crossing over and becoming dually involved.
- Reduce length of detention

Goal/Objectives

- Develop stronger case plans earlier in the process; specifically at the first referral.
- Strengthen family.
- Improve case assessment, planning and management protocols.
- Create a cross system value around permanency, well-being and child and community safety.
Tracking Information

- Youth remain single/300, or dual, not single/602
  - 2016/17—78 youth had meet and confer
    - 54 remained single status dependents, 22 dual, 2 wards
  - Fewer youth AWOL
  - Fewer changes in placement
  - Fewer re-offending
  - Youth diverted from probation
    - 25% diverted, 25% not charged
  - How many youth initially detained
    - If arrested, 50% detained initially

San Diego Data
2013-2016

- Total Youth 442
- Pre-Adjudication
  - Detained: 227
  - Not Detained: 207
- Juvenile Justice Outcome
  - Diverted 91
  - Not charged 124

- Average age: 15
- Gender
  - Male 249
  - Female 184
- Race
  - Asian 8
  - African American 151
  - Caucasian 96
  - Latino 168
Challenges with DSY

- Communication with DSY stakeholders
  - Family, attorneys, education rights holder, CASA
- Access to information by CWS and Probation
  - Between the agencies
- Placement challenges
- Longer in detention facility pending placement?
- Cross county challenges
  - When one county is dual status, other county is single status
  - Last jurisdiction with petition usually isn’t the county most familiar with the youth
- Meet and confer process WIC 241.1
  - Recent cases-reversals for not complying with WIC, CRC

DSY in Your Jurisdiction

- What challenges are you facing?
Thank you

- Hon. Carolyn M. Caietti, Presiding Judge of Juvenile Court, San Diego
  carolyn.Caietti@sdcourt.ca.gov

- Kevin Gaines, California Department of Social Services

- Jessica Heldman, Associate Executive Director, Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice
  jheldman@rfkchildren.org