



Colorado Commission on Criminal & Juvenile Justice

FY2017 RECOMMENDATION/FY17-JCC01 Create a Plan to Formally Recognize and Address the Needs of Crossover Youth

Status: Implementation Complete

Actions/Updates

2018 FINAL UPDATE

This recommendation was included as part of Senate Bill 2018-154 (Sponsor: Sen. Fields). With the passage and signing of HB18-154 (Concerning a Requirement for a Local Juvenile Services Planning Committee to Devise a Plan to Manage Dually Identified Crossover Youth) the work on this recommendation is complete.

No further action required.

2017 UPDATE

This recommendation requires statutory change.

Description

Define crossover youth and crossover plan in statute and require each local Juvenile Services Planning Committee, established in C.R.S. 19-2-211, to devise a crossover plan for the identification and notification of cases involving crossover youth.

I. Add crossover youth definitions to 19-1-103 C.R.S.

II. Add a new section to 19-2-211 C.R.S. numbered 19-2-211.5 C.R.S.

Require the Juvenile Service Planning Committee in each judicial district to adopt a plan for identifying and notifying the human/social services representatives, probation representatives, S.B. 94 coordinators, juvenile court representatives, public defenders, district attorneys, parents and guardians ad litem of a youth's crossover status.

III. Add language to 24-1.9-102 (1)(e) C.R.S. (Collaborative Management Statute)

Explicitly include and permit local Collaborative Management Programs to establish memorandum of understanding with the local Juvenile Services Planning Committees for the coordination of services for crossover youth.

IV. Add a new section to Title 19 Article 2 C.R.S.

Require the court to consider a youth's crossover status at all stages of the proceedings (i.e., pre and post adjudication) and not be used against the youth in a manner contrary to the principles informing the crossover youth practice model.

Agencies Responsible

General Assembly Juvenile Service Planning Committees Collaborative Management Programs

Discussion

Colorado law does not explicitly define crossover youth nor does it require the identification, notification and coordinated case management of crossover youth.(Footnote 1) This recommendation is a first step to better serving crossover youth in a more effective and efficient manner and in a way that serves the best interests of the youth and the community. The purposes of this recommendation are to:

- Formalize collaboration specific to crossover youth;
- Facilitate early identification and information sharing between agencies;
- Ensure communication and collaboration with existing initiatives including the Collaborative Management Program;
- Facilitate consideration of least restrictive placement based on individual needs and protection of the public;
- Facilitate the successful discharge from the juvenile justice system as early as possible;
- Reduce recidivism or re-entry;
- Encourage a coordinated plan with engagement from the youth and family or natural supports;
- Contribute the maximum use of community resources; and
- National studies have shown that dual status youth, or those who have come into contact with both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, have higher rates of complex trauma histories than the general youth population resulting in behavior problems which lead to juvenile justice system involvement. They are also more likely to be detained, detained for longer periods of time, and have histories of out-of-home placements with the child welfare system. The level of services required to address their complex trauma needs as well as the behavior which has led to juvenile justice system involvement is costly and disruptive and results in further traumatic experiences due to multiple changes in educational settings, placements and services. In Colorado, it has been estimated that upwards of 80% of the youth committed to the Division of Youth Services have a prior history of child welfare involvement. It is further estimated that 60% have experienced prior out-of-home care placement through the child welfare system.

In order to address the complex needs of dual status youth, national experts identified four key components which must be in place for effective reform: 1) Routine identification of Dual Status Youth; 2) Using validated screening and assessment tools; 3) Coordination in case planning and management; and 4) Engaging youth and families in decision-making processes that impact them. (Footnote 2)

See the complete text of the recommendation and the "Proposed Statutory Language" at the link to the "Recommendation Text."

Footnotes

(1) Crossover youth, sometimes referred to as “dually involved” or “multisystem” youth, are youth who are involved in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. In Colorado, it is estimated that upwards of 80% of the youth committed to the Division of Youth Services have a prior history of child welfare involvement. It is further estimated that 60% have experienced prior out-of-home care placement through the child welfare system. Research has found these youth to be at higher risk for poor developmental outcomes (see Haight, et.al. (2016) for a

review) and to have higher recidivism rates compared to those involved only in the juvenile justice system (Huang, et al. (2015). Crossover youth are described as higher risk by juvenile justice decision-makers and receive harsher dispositions than their non-crossover counterparts (Ryan, Hertz, Hernandez, & Marshall, 2017; Morris & Freundlich, 2005; Conger & Ross, 2001; Jonson-Reid & Barth, 2000). Research reflects importance of designing comprehensive, integrated approaches for improving the outcomes of crossover youth (e.g., Cusick, Goerge, & Bell, 2009; Munson & Freundlich, 2005). Such approaches typically involve multisystem collaborations, minimally between child welfare and juvenile justice professionals, but also law enforcement, education, behavioral health, and court personnel (Wiig & Tuell, 2004; Siegel & Lord, 2004; Halemba & Lord 2005; American Bar Association, 2008; Herz & Ryan, 2008; Nash & Bilchik, 2009). Without integrated and comprehensive efforts—including coordinated case assignment, joint assessment processes, coordinated case plans and coordinated supervision--crossover youth are less likely to receive the appropriate services and placements they need to improve their outcomes in both the short- and long-term (Widom & Maxfield, 2001; Cusick, Goerge, & Bell, 2009).

(2) See the report at the Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps; rfknrcjj.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Dual-Status-Youth-Initiative-Report-First-Edition-Early-Gains-and-Lessons-Learned.pdf.