

Nebraska Center for Justice Research

Evaluation of the Crossover Youth Practice Model (Youth Impact!): Appendices 2017



UNIVERSITY OF
Nebraska
Omaha

Appendices

Appendix A. Background Characteristics, All Groups

Summary: Differences of means tests demonstrate that the CYPM-Full treatment youth were significantly younger, consisted of more Hispanic youth, were less likely to have been arrested for criminal and for status-related charges, and were less likely to have been sexually abused than youth in the CYPM-Eligible group. Relative to the Comparison group, the CYPM-Full treatment group consisted of fewer males and more females, fewer Caucasian youth, more African American youth, and they were less likely to have been arrested for criminal or status-related offenses. Additionally, youth in the CYPM-Full treatment group were less likely to have several types of abuse/maltreatment (physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse/neglect) cited as the reason for their CWS involvement. More CYPM-Full treatment youth experienced “other” types of abuse/neglect compared to the Comparison group, while more Comparison youth had experienced “no” abuse or maltreatment prior to CWS involvement. Relative to the Comparison group, the CYPM-Eligible group consisted of fewer males and more females, fewer Caucasian and Hispanic youth, and were significantly older. Further, CYPM-Eligible youth were less likely than Comparison youth to have several types of abuse/maltreatment (physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse/neglect) cited as the reason for their CWS involvement. More CYPM-Eligible youth experienced “other” types of abuse/neglect compared to the Comparison group, while more Comparison youth had experienced “no” abuse or maltreatment prior to CWS involvement. All youth in each group were “Pathway 1.”

Table 1. Background Characteristics: Sample Means and Standard Deviations

	CYPM-Full Treatment Group (n=215)		CYPM-Eligible Treatment Group (n=127)		Comparison Group (n=562)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Gender ^{2,3}						
Male	114	53.0	67	52.8	348	61.9
Female	101	47.0	60	47.2	210	37.4
Age ^{1,2,3}	Mean = 14.20 Standard Dev. = 1.92 Min-Max = 8-17		Mean = 15.17 Standard Dev. = 1.63 Min-Max = 10-18		Mean = 14.86 Standard Dev. = 2.40 Min-Max = 5-18	
Race/Ethnicity						
Caucasian ^{2,3}	80	37.2	44	34.6	226	40.2
African American ²	94	43.7	64	50.4	228	40.6
Hispanic ^{1,2,3}	28	13.0	6	4.7	56	10.0
Native American or Alaska Native	9	4.2	12	9.4	NA	NA
Asian or Pacific Islander	2	0.9	0	0.0	NA	NA



Other (incl. Asian, Native American, Other in Comparison Group)	1	0.5	1	0.8	37	6.6
Mixed	1	0.5	0	0.0	NA	NA
Unknown	NA	NA	NA	NA	10	1.8
Offense at Identification						
Felony	3	1.4	3	2.4	67	11.9
Misdemeanor	103	47.9	50	39.4	267	47.5
Status Offense	105	48.8	60	47.2	116	20.6
Prior Arrest						
For Criminal Charges ^{1 2}	53	24.7	73	57.5	305	54.3
For Status Offenses ^{1 2}	69	32.1	72	56.7	303	53.9
Types of Maltreatment for CWS Involvement ^{a 2 3}		Mean = 1.13 Standard Deviation = 0.39 Min-Max = 1-3		Mean = 1.15 Standard Deviation = 0.40 Min-Max = 0-3		Mean = 1.66 Standard Deviation = 1.15 Min-Max = 0-4
Physical Neglect	174	80.9	100	78.7	439	78.5
Physical Abuse ^{2 3}	40	18.6	19	15.0	238	42.3
Sexual Abuse ^{1 2 3}	6	2.8	11	8.7	162	28.8
Emotional Abuse/Neglect ^{2 3}	5	2.3	2	1.6	91	16.2
Other Abuse/Neglect ^{2 3}	18	8.4	14	11.0	5	0.9
No Abuse/Maltreatment ^{2 3}	0	0.0	1	0.8	92	16.4
Pathway 1 (open child welfare case)	215	100.0	127	100.0	562	100.0

^aNot mutually exclusive

¹ = Significant difference (p<.10) between CYPM-Full vs. CYPM-Eligible group

² = Significant difference (p<.10) between CYPM-Full vs. Comparison group

³ = Significant difference (p<.10) between CYPM-Eligible vs. Comparison group



UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

NEBRASKA CENTER FOR JUSTICE RESEARCH

Appendix B. Youth Impact! Team Processing Outcomes

Summary: Having the “full” treatment (the team meeting and related case-planning meetings) differentiated CYPM-Full treatment group from the CYPM-Eligible group; the YI! program was not available when the Comparison group youth were system-involved and therefore they did not receive the treatment. Difference of means tests show that compared to the CYPM-Eligible youth, CYPM-Full treatment youth were significantly more likely to have a team meeting, experience a “staffing” meeting, have a unified case plan, be present in at least one decision meeting, and have an interagency planning and multidisciplinary team meeting. CYPM-Eligible youth were more likely to not have an appointment scheduled for the team meeting and be considered “data-only” youth.

Table 2. Youth Impact! Team- Processing Outcomes

	CYPM-Full Treatment Group (n=215)		CYPM-Eligible Treatment Group (n=127)		Comparison Group (n=562)	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Team Meeting ¹	215	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.00
Team Decision ¹						
Team Meeting ¹	163	75.8	0	0.0	NA	NA
Appointment Not Scheduled ¹	7	3.3	53	41.7	NA	NA
Staffing ¹	43	20.0	1	0.8	NA	NA
Data Only ¹	2	0.9	69	54.3	NA	NA
Else	0	0.0	3	3.2	NA	NA
Unified Case Plan Developed for Youth ¹	96 ^a	98.9	0	0.0	NA	NA
Youth Present in at least One Decision Meeting ¹	165	76.7	0	0.0	NA	NA
Interagency Planning Meeting ¹	212	98.6	0	0.0	NA	NA
Multidisciplinary Team Meeting ¹	207	96.3	0	0.0	NA	NA

NA = Data unavailable/not tracked for comparison group

^a = Out of 97 youth whose cases were not dismissed.

¹ = Significant difference ($p < .10$) between CYPM-Full vs. CYPM-Eligible group

Appendix C. Case-Processing Outcomes

Summary: Difference of means tests demonstrated that CYPM-Full treatment youth were significantly more likely to have their cases dismissed or not charged, receive informal diversion, and were less likely to be placed on probation, sent to congregate care/group home, or sent to a juvenile or adult correctional institution than CYPM-Eligible youth. CYPM-Full treatment youth were also less likely to receive a new sustained juvenile justice petition within 9 months after being identified as a crossover youth compared to the CYPM-Eligible youth. The CYPM-Full treatment youth also spent significantly less time in the CWS (in terms of months) between being identified as a crossover youth and their case closure than did the CYPM-Eligible youth. Relative to the Comparison youth, CYPM-Full treatment youth were more likely to have their cases dismissed or not charged and to receive informal diversion. They were also more likely to have their delinquency case closed within 9 months of being identified as a crossover youth and have their dependency case closed within that timeframe than Comparison youth. CYPM-Full treatment youth also spent significantly less time in the CWS between being identified as a crossover youth to case closure compared to the Comparison group youth. Relative to Comparison youth, CYPM-Eligible youth were less likely to have their cases diverted and were more likely to be placed on probation for their crime. CYPM-Eligible youth were more likely to have their delinquency and dependency cases closed within 9 months of being identified as a crossover youth relative to the Comparison youth. Finally, CYPM-Eligible youth also spent less time in the CWS between their date of identification and their case closure than Comparison youth.

Table 3. Case-Processing Outcomes (9 Months after Identification)

	CYPM-Full Treatment Group (n=215)		CYPM-Eligible Treatment Group (n=127)		Comparison Group (n=562)	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Disposition for Arrest/Referral						
Dismissed/Not Charged ^{1 2}	118	54.9	48	37.8	172	30.6
Informal Diversion ^{1 2 3}	57	26.5	0	0.0	18	3.2
Home/Probation ^{1 3}	35	16.3	41	32.3	119	21.2
Congregate Care/Group Home ^{1 2}	0	0.0	3	2.4	2	0.4
Juvenile Correctional Institution ^{1 2}	0	0.0	3	2.4	13	2.3
Adult Correctional Institution ^{1 2}	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	1.1
Other	5	2.3	28	22.0	113	20.1
Missing	0	0.0	4	3.1	119	21.2
Delinquency Case Closed ^{2 3}						
Yes	110	51.2	70	55.1	225	40.0
No	22	10.2	23	18.1	205	36.5
Missing/Unknown	22	10.2	34	26.8	132	23.5
Dependency Case Closed ^{2 3}						
Yes	59	27.4	32	25.2	40	7.1

No	138	64.2	65	51.2	2	0.4
Missing/Unknown	18	8.4	30	23.6	520	92.5
New Sustained Juvenile Justice Petition ¹						
Yes	30	14.0	34	26.8	0	0.0
No	185	86.0	93	73.2	4	0.7
Missing	0	0.0	0	0.0	558	99.3
Length of Time in CWS (Months) from Date of Identification ^{1 2 3}	Mean = 23.04 Standard Dev. = 25.81 Min-Max = 0-148		Mean = 28.54 Standard Dev. = 31.45 Min-Max = 0-123		Mean = 41.86 Standard Dev. = 48.23 Min-Max = 0-195	

NA = Data unavailable/not tracked

¹ = Significant difference (p<.10) between CYPM-Full vs. CYPM-Eligible group

² = Significant difference (p<.10) between CYPM-Full vs. Comparison group

³ = Significant difference (p<.10) between CYPM-Eligible vs. Comparison group

Appendix D. Recidivism Outcomes

Summary: Difference of means tests indicate that CYPM-Full treatment youth were significantly less likely to be re-arrested within 9 months of being identified as a crossover youth than CYPM-Eligible youth. Note that approximately 150 CYPM (Full or Eligible) youth were excluded from these analyses because they had not reached their 18-month follow-up date by the time of this report. Therefore, we suspect that low statistical power may be impacting the 18-month recidivism outcomes, resulting in the inability to uncover significant differences. Nonetheless, general patterns indicate that the CYPM-Full treatment youth generally engaged in fewer new arrests than CYPM-Eligible youth (non-significant), and took longer to recidivate than youth in the other groups, for both 9 and 18-month follow-up periods (non-significant). Finally, the most-often cited charge for arrest among CYPM-Full treatment youth was “theft” (at 9 and 18-month follow-up periods), compared to “assault” for CYPM-Eligible youth.

Table 4. Recidivism Outcomes (9 and 18 Months after Identification)

	CYPM-Full Treatment Group (n=215)		CYPM-Eligible Treatment Group (n=127)		Comparison Group (n=562)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Any New Arrest at 9 or 18 months						
Yes	84	39.1	59	46.5	235	41.8
No	131	60.9	68	53.5	327	58.2
Any New Arrest at 9 months ¹						
Yes	52	24.2	45	35.4	161	28.6
No	163	75.8	82	64.6	401	71.4
Any New Arrest at 18 months						
Yes	50	23.3	29	22.8	124	22.1
No	165	76.7	98	77.2	438	77.9
Number of New Arrests at 9 months	Mean = 0.40 Standard Deviation = 0.97 Min-Max = 0-9		Mean = 0.56 Standard Deviation = 0.89 Min-Max = 0-4		Mean = 0.42 Standard Deviation = 0.79 Min-Max = 0-5	
Number of New Arrests at 18 months	Mean = 0.37 Standard Deviation = 0.77 Min-Max = 0-4		Mean = 0.32 Standard Deviation = 0.65 Min-Max = 0-3		Mean = 0.36 Standard Deviation = 0.82 Min-Max = 0-6	

Number of Total Arrests (9-18 months)	Mean = 0.77 Standard Deviation = 1.30 Min-Max=0-9	Mean = 0.86 Standard Deviation = 1.14 Min-Max = 0-4	Mean = 0.78 Standard Deviation = 1.23 Min-Max = 0-10
Time to Recidivism (in Days) Time to 1 st Arrest (9 months)	Mean= 115.21 Standard Deviation =75.51 Min-Max=1-273	Mean = 96.25 Standard Deviation = 86.46 Min-Max = 1-261	Mean = 104.99 Standard Deviation = 83.03 Min-Max =0-274
Time to 1 st Arrest (18 months)	Mean = 383.56 Standard Deviation= 90.81 Min-Max = 275-548	Mean = 377.69 Standard Deviation = 74.81 Min-Max = 274-543	Mean = 368.41 Standard Deviation = 104.93 Min-Max = 272-1097
Average Arrest Charges At 9 months At 18 months	Theft Theft	Assault Assault	Disorderly Conduct Theft

¹ = Significant difference (p<.10) between CYPM-Full vs. CYPM-Eligible group

² = Significant difference (p<.10) between CYPM-Full vs. Comparison group

³ = Significant difference (p<.10) between CYPM-Eligible vs. Comparison group



Appendix E. Social and Behavioral Outcomes

Summary: Comparison group data were matched retrospectively to CYPM data as best as possible. This involved collecting data from CW case files. NAs represent that such information was not readily available in these case files. We did not conduct significance tests for groups with variables with more than 50% missing. Difference of means tests indicate that 9 months after being identified as a crossover youth, CYPM-Full treatment youth were more likely to be living at home with a parent or caregiver and less likely to be in congregate care/group home or a correctional facility or detention facility than the CYPM-Eligible youth. CYPM-Full treatment youth had improved overall performance in behavior and academics compared to CYPM-Eligible youth, as well as improved mental health 9 months after identification. More CYPM-Eligible youth had no contact with family members than CYPM-Full treatment youth during this time period. More CYPM-Full treatment youth had received mentoring services than CYPM-Eligible youth, but more CYPM-Eligible youth were involved in independent living programming, substance use services or assessments, and vocational services or assessments than CYPM-Full treatment youth at the 9-month follow-up period. More CYPM-Full treatment youth were placed at home with a parent or caregiver 9 months after identification as a crossover youth than Comparison youth, and more CYPM-Eligible youth experienced improved overall behavior/academic performance during this period than Comparison youth.

Table 5. Social and Behavioral Outcomes (9 Months after Identification)

	CYPM-Full Treatment Group (n=215)		CYPM-Eligible Treatment Group (n=129)		Comparison Group (n=562)	
	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Living Situation/Placement at 9 months						
Home with Parent/Caregiver ^{1 2 3}	124	57.7	37	29.1	261	46.4
Relative or Kinship Placement	18	8.4	5	3.9	NA	NA
Non-Relative Caregiver	1	0.5	3	2.4	NA	NA
Foster Care	23	10.7	11	8.7	NA	NA
Adoptive Placement	7	3.3	4	3.1	NA	NA
Shelter	1	0.5	1	0.8	NA	NA
Congregate Care/Group Home ¹	8	3.7	20	15.7	NA	NA
Residential Treatment Center	9	4.2	5	3.9	NA	NA
Correctional Facility or Detention ¹	2	0.9	5	3.9	NA	NA
Other	4	1.9	6	4.7	262	46.7
Missing	18	8.4	30	23.6	39	6.9
Engaged in Prosocial behavior						
Yes	120	55.8	62	48.8	165	29.4
No	76	35.3	31	24.4	69	12.3



Missing	19	8.8	34	26.8	328	58.4
Behavior/Academic Performance ^{1 3}						
Improved Behavior	21	9.8	2	1.6	35	6.2
Improved Academic Performance	19	8.8	15	11.8	70	12.5
Improved Overall Performance	45	20.9	17	13.4	7	1.2
No	11	51.6	62	48.8	211	37.5
Improved Mental Health ¹						
Yes	40	18.6	18	14.2	26	4.6
No	67	31.2	46	36.2	59	10.5
NA (no MH problems)	84	39.1	29	22.8	NA	NA
Missing	18	8.4	31	24.4	475	84.5
Improved Substance Use/Abuse						
Yes	19	8.8	19	15.0	37	6.6
No	33	15.3	27	21.3	22	3.9
NA (no SU problem)	135	62.8	45	35.4	NA	NA
Missing	20	9.3	32	25.2	497	88.4
No Contact ¹						
Yes	5	2.3	8	6.3	32	5.7
No	193	89.9	88	69.3	170	30.2
Missing	17	7.9	31	24.4	360	64.1
After School Program						
Yes	17	7.9	5	3.9	1	0.2
No	178	82.8	88	69.3	236	42.0
Missing	20	9.3	34	26.8	325	57.8
Mentoring ¹						
Yes	18	8.4	4	3.1	4	0.7
No	176	81.9	89	70.1	233	41.5
Missing	21	9.8	34	26.8	325	57.8
Sports/Athletics						
Yes	23	10.7	12	9.4	36	6.4



No	172	80.0	81	63.8	201	35.8
Missing	20	9.3	34	26.8	325	57.8
Church Program						
Yes	16	7.4	4	3.1	10	1.8
No	179	83.3	89	70.1	227	40.4
Missing	20	9.3	34	26.8	325	57.8
Arts Program						
Yes	7	3.3	1	0.8	5	0.9
No	189	87.9	92	72.4	232	41.3
Missing	19	8.8	34	26.8	325	57.8
Extra-Curricular Activities						
Yes	20	9.3	10	7.9	9	1.6
No	176	81.9	83	65.4	228	40.6
Missing	19	8.8	34	26.8	325	57.8
Independent Living Program ¹						
Yes	36	16.7	29	22.8	1	0.2
No	162	75.3	67	52.8	139	24.7
Missing	17	7.9	31	24.4	422	75.1
Educational Services or Assessments						
Yes	19	8.8	10	7.9	2	0.4
No	157	73.0	79	62.2	195	34.7
Missing	39	18.1	38	29.9	365	64.9
Substance Abuse Services and/or Assessments ¹						
Yes	14	6.5	18	14.2	30	5.3
No	162	75.3	71	55.9	167	29.7
Missing	39	18.1	38	29.9	365	64.9
Behavior and/or Social Intervention						
Yes	60	27.9	35	27.6	73	13.0
No	116	54.0	54	42.5	124	22.1



Missing	39	18.1	38	29.9	365	64.9
Vocational Assessment and/or Services ¹						
Yes	18	8.4	21	16.5	49	8.7
No	179	83.3	75	59.1	89	15.8
Missing	18	8.4	31	24.4	424	75.4
College and/or Educational Assistance						
Yes	21	9.8	13	10.2	9	1.6
No	177	82.3	83	65.4	130	23.1
Missing	17	7.9	31	24.4	423	75.3

¹ = Significant difference ($p < .10$) between CYPM-Full vs. CYPM-Eligible group

² = Significant difference ($p < .10$) between CYPM-Full vs. Comparison group

³ = Significant difference ($p < .10$) between CYPM-Eligible vs. Comparison group

Note = Significance tests were not conducted for groups with variables with more than 50% missing.

Appendix F. Qualitative Findings: Publically-Available Reports

Douglas County Youth Impact! Views of Successes from the Professionals Involved

Douglas County Youth Impact! is a practice model designed to prevent “crossover” youth from moving further into the child welfare or juvenile justice systems. The target population for this initiative is youth that meet the following criteria: 1) the youth must have been referred to the County Attorney’s office for: a) a status offense, or b) a law violation; and 2) the youth has a child welfare case which is: a) open, b) closed within the last 12 months, c) voluntary, or d) court-involved.

The initiative began in Douglas County in February 2012 and was fully implemented by November 2012. The initiative brings together county attorneys, child welfare workers, juvenile justice agents, and youth and family advocates in a “team meeting” to discuss crossover cases with each other, and the youth and their families. This process informs the decision of the county attorney regarding whether to file the case, dismiss it, divert, or require enhanced child welfare services. At each meeting, the crossover youth and their family members are given the opportunity to tell their story and give their perspective on the incident(s) that brought them into the juvenile justice system.

In 2014, researchers from the University of Nebraska, Omaha, with support from the Sherwood Foundation, began an evaluation of the Youth Impact! (YI!) initiative in Douglas County. Among other things, the evaluation is intended to a) understand the processes, successes, and challenges that the team has gone through in order to implement YI! and b) use these “lessons learned” to inform similar and larger initiatives which are designed to enhance the system response to at-risk youth. The following is a brief synopsis of the YI! professionals’ views on successes that the initiative has yielded.

Success #1: Better decision-making for crossover youth because decision-makers get a more complete picture of the youth and his or her family situation.

Prosecutors indicated that they gained more insight about the youth’s case and surrounding circumstances by participating in the weekly “team meetings,” and this often went beyond the information they would be able to get from the police report. They noted that hearing from social workers, youth advocates, and the youth and family themselves provided a deeper understanding of the situations that may have precipitated the youth’s misbehavior. Other team members reiterated the value of obtaining information and professional expertise from multiple sources. Additionally, gaining a better “whole picture” of what was going on in the youth’s life also made the attorney feel more confident about their decision regarding the case.

Success #2: Increased interagency collaboration and reduction in information silos may reduce costs to the system.

Professionals routinely indicated that their relationships with other professionals in other agencies involved in YI! have become stronger over time, and this has improved the flow of information across agencies, as well as increased their understanding of what other agencies can (and can't) do for crossover youth. The increased flow of information between agencies has also likely reduced the duplication of services that are offered to the youth, which may in turn lead to reductions in costs for each case.

Success #3: Increased trust between professionals and their agencies leads to continued support for the initiative, and fosters energy for continued improvement.

Agency professionals suggested that getting to know others from other agencies has benefited them in personal and professional ways. For instance, child welfare professionals often work very closely with probation officers in YI!, which has led to increased trust between the personnel. Subsequently, this had led to some cross-agency trainings on the topics of crossover youth, trauma, and related topics. Such initiatives likely would not have been created if it weren't for their collaboration through YI! Further, seeing the same people "at the table" each week not only increased trust and collaborations between the team members, but this also effectively led to sustained inertia among the members to continue the collaboration.

Success #4: Improved responsiveness to crossover youth and families leads to positive outcomes for them, and benefits the juvenile justice system.

Professionals involved in YI! saw the initiative as doing something different from the status quo in juvenile justice, particularly by allowing the youth to have "a voice" in which they could describe to the YI! team the events that brought them to the attention of the juvenile justice system. This information helped the team identify and better respond to the youth's needs by "getting to the root of the problem," as one team member said. This, in turn, led to reductions in duplications of services across systems, and more often resulted in outcomes such as diversion, or enhanced services for those youth who "don't belong" in the juvenile system (but instead required services). Additionally, the team identified positive outcomes for the youth, which they believe will become increasingly evident over time, such as increased time to recidivate, reduced severity of offenses, and less trauma and stigma experienced by the youth. They also noted that such positive benefits for the youth would likely translate into benefits for the juvenile justice system, such as lower caseloads for system personnel, lower associated costs with case filing and processing, fewer court fees, and related expenses.



Douglas County Youth Impact!

Views of Challenges from the Professionals Involved

Douglas County Youth Impact! is a practice model designed to prevent “crossover” youth from moving further into the child welfare or juvenile justice systems. The target population for this initiative is youth that meet the following criteria: 1) the youth must have been referred to the County Attorney’s office for: a) a status offense, or b) a law violation; and 2) the youth has a child welfare case which is: a) open, b) closed within the last 12 months, c) voluntary, or d) court-involved.

The initiative began in Douglas County in February 2012 and was fully implemented by November 2012. The initiative brings together county attorneys, child welfare workers, juvenile justice agents, and youth and family advocates in a “team meeting” to discuss crossover cases with each other, and the youth and their families. This process informs the decision of the county attorney regarding whether to file the case, dismiss it, divert, or require enhanced child welfare services. At each meeting, the crossover youth and their family members are given the opportunity to tell their story and give their perspective on the incident(s) that brought them into the juvenile justice system.

In 2014, researchers from the University of Nebraska, Omaha, with support from the Sherwood Foundation, began an evaluation of the Youth Impact! (YI!) initiative in Douglas County. Among other things, the evaluation is intended to a) understand the processes, successes, and challenges that the team has gone through in order to implement YI! and b) use these “lessons learned” to inform similar and larger initiatives which are designed to enhance the system response to at-risk youth. The following is a brief synopsis the YI! professionals’ views on challenges that the initiative has faced.

Challenge #1: Differing Philosophies about Crossover Youth.

The systems in which the crossover youth is embedded – the child welfare and juvenile justice systems – have differing views and philosophies about the youth: the child welfare system typically views the child as primarily a victim who is in need of services, while the juvenile justice system typically views the youth as an offender in need of rehabilitation and accountability. These different philosophies sometimes resulted in different views about what the best course of action was for the youth. Finding the right balance between providing service and empowerment to crossover youth and their families while holding them accountable for wrongdoing requires “finesse” among the team members, and continues to be a “balancing act.” To keep the initiative on-track, leaders often remind members of the broader goal of YI!, which is to better serve youth in Douglas County; the mantra of “we’re in this together for the same reasons” often helps to get team members back on the same page.

Challenge #2: Implementing change when faced with the realities of “system” work.

There are some realities of working in “the system” that the professionals recognized might influence Youth Impact! over time – including turnover amongst team members due to promotions, disinterest, or “burnout.” They also noted that across-agency collaborations were at times difficult, given the “institutional histories” between various agencies that have not always been collaborative. Others cited problems relating to resources, particularly when collaborating agencies could not agree on who was to pay for services to crossover youth. Finally, some YI! professionals acknowledged that the system is still not very “family friendly,” meaning that problems presenting to crossover youth and their families do not necessarily only happen between the hours of 9am-5pm.

Challenge #3: Limited resources and no formal or institutionalized structure raises concerns about sustainability over time.

Youth Impact! is not institutionalized in Douglas County – it has no formal financial backing, no “central hub of management,” and is currently relying on relationships between team members to keep the initiative moving forward; this concerns many team members the most. For instance, “mission drift” is a serious concern for this initiative because of the lack of a formal “leader:” when disagreements or factions arise, it can be more disruptive because the team does not have a “boss” to keep everyone in line. Team members suggested that “succession planning” in key positions (e.g., the chair and co-chair) is needed for long-term sustainability, so that if (and when) turnover in these positions occurs, mission drift is minimized and the momentum of the initiative is not seriously impacted.

Challenge #4: Personal and professional challenges of agency professionals and crossover youth.

Agency professionals involved in YI! cited issues in time, effort/energy, and resources as major challenges they faced in working on the initiative. For the most part, the team members acknowledged that their work on YI! was meaningful and worth it, but nonetheless time consuming and (at times) draining. Some professionals also noted the difficulty of getting a deep understanding of the youth’s circumstances in just one hour. Others suggested that the setting of the meeting, with 8 or more professionals at the table with the youth, can be intimidating and awkward. Meeting the accessibility needs (e.g., timing of meeting, transportation, etc.) of the youth and his or her family can also be difficult. Team members also noted the difficulties of engaging youth and their families who don’t seem to want to be there or don’t want help: despite the group’s best intentions, YI! professionals are nonetheless representatives of the juvenile justice and child welfare systems – systems which most youth and families want to avoid. Finally, there may be long-standing negative views of “the system” from citizens that are difficult to change.

Douglas County Youth Impact! Recommendations from the Professionals Involved

***Douglas County Youth Impact!** is a practice model designed to prevent “crossover” youth from moving further into the child welfare or juvenile justice systems. The target population for this initiative is youth that meet the following criteria: 1) the youth must have been referred to the County Attorney’s office for: a) a status offense, or b) a law violation; and 2) the youth has a child welfare case which is: a) open, b) closed within the last 12 months, c) voluntary, or d) court-involved.*

The initiative began in Douglas County in February 2012 and was fully implemented (spanning decision points from identification as a crossover youth, to making detention and charging decisions, to case assignment and case planning, to case management and finally, to case closure) by November 2012. The initiative brings together county attorneys, child welfare workers, juvenile justice agents, and youth and family advocates in a “team meeting” to discuss crossover cases with each other, and the youth and their families. This process informs the decision of the county attorney regarding whether to file the case, dismiss it, divert, or require enhanced child welfare services. At each meeting, the crossover youth and their family members are given the opportunity to tell their story and give their perspective on the incident(s) that brought them into the juvenile justice system.

In 2014, researchers from the University of Nebraska, Omaha, with support from the Sherwood Foundation, began an evaluation of the Youth Impact! (YI!) program in Douglas County. Among other things, the evaluation is intended to a) understand the processes, successes, and challenges that the team has gone through in order to implement YI! and b) use these “lessons learned” to inform similar and larger initiatives which are designed to enhance the system response to at-risk youth. As part of that evaluation, professionals involved in the initiative were interviewed to provide their recommendations for improvement of YI!. Their recommendations are briefly summarized below.

Recommendation #1: Formalize the Initiative in Douglas County.

Youth Impact! is not institutionalized in Douglas County – it has no formal financial backing, no “central hub of management,” and is currently relying on relationships between team members to keep the initiative moving forward. This is the primary concern of many team members. For instance, “mission drift” is a serious concern for this initiative because of the lack of a formal “leader” when disagreements or factions arise, it can be more disruptive because the team does not have a “boss” to keep everyone in line. Team members suggested that “succession planning” in key positions (e.g., the chair and co-chair) is needed for long-term sustainability, so that if (and when) turnover in these positions occurs, mission drift is minimized and the momentum of the initiative is not seriously impacted. Team members suggested three specific recommendations for formalizing YI!:

1. Attach YI! to an existing entity or agency that is integral to YI!. Most professionals suggested making the Juvenile Assessment Center (JAC) the “host agency” where YI! would reside.
2. Provide the initiative with adequate resources and a budget to function properly. Professionals suggested that “dedicated staff” were needed to manage the cases up-front *and* to work with families throughout the engagement process for services. It was suggested that each participating agency could allocate a portion of its budget in order to staff YI!. Team members saw dedicated staff as essential for sustainability.
3. Formalize the structure of YI! and dedicate a manager and management team. The lack of such leadership within the team is essential to avoid mission drift and keep the initiative running smoothly. Team members worried that having no “hub of management” might lead to aimlessness among members and recommended that such management is essential for keeping everyone on the same page and moving in the same direction.

Recommendation #2: Scale the Initiative Up to a Higher or Broader Level.

Team members believe that YI! presents a “good way” to work with high-risk youth in Nebraska. However, the initiative is “maxed” at this point: it is doing the most it can with the resources it currently has. In order to reach a larger audience in Nebraska, the team feels that more resources are needed in order to maintain YI! best practices and achieve the desired outcomes. As noted above, the team members believe that having dedicated staff to work on crossover youth cases will help in this regard. Some team members also suggested to expand the team members of YI!, primarily by adding representatives from the elementary and high schools that crossover youth attend, as well as adding one or two licensed mental health professionals to aide in case management and case planning efforts. Finally, some team members suggested adding a new team member whose job would be solely dedicated to the family engagement process – to keep the crossover youth and family engaged in services throughout the duration of their crossover case. Team members believed doing these things could better sustain the initiative in Douglas County, and the Douglas County framework potentially could be expanded elsewhere in Nebraska.

Recommendation #3: Continue to Improve Day-to-Day Aspects of the Initiative.

Team members provided several suggestions for continuing to improve the day-to-day aspects of YI!. They typically recommended that the team continue to work together to improve the “back end” of the initiative, which is providing coordinated case management between social service agencies and juvenile justice. Specific suggestions included:

1. Continue to improve coordinated case management
2. Continue to improve family engagement and follow-up with families
3. Continue specialized or cross-trainings between agencies
4. Increase participation of community partnerships – for instance, these partnerships could be involved in providing scholarships for services to youth and their families
5. Improve school representation and their “voice” within YI!
6. Continue to utilize the voice of youth and families as team members

Appendix G. Cost-Benefit Analysis

Youth Impact! Implementation Cost Estimate

1. Staffing Cost

Some of the intangibles that are not included in simple salary estimates are elaborated further in the Notes section of this document. As one rule-of-thumb, a Harvard Business Review (HBR) meeting cost calculator (<https://hbr.org/2016/01/estimate-the-cost-of-a-meeting-with-this-calculator>) uses a multiplier of 1.4 to include some of these intangibles such as the cost of prep time and employee benefits. Applying this multiplier, for example, increases the estimated cost of one of YII's \$525 meetings to \$735. These HBR multiplier estimates are included in our table and adopted as the best cost estimate for our purposes.

Date	Type of Meeting	Approx. Hours	Approx. Attendance	Salary Cost	HBR estimate
03.06.2012	CYPM Working Group Meeting	1	15	525	735
03.20.2012	Stakeholder Meeting	3	25	2,625	3675
03.20.2012	On site with Georgetown	3	25	2,625	3675
04.11.2012	CYPM Working Group Meeting	1	15	525	735
04.12.2012	Gap Analysis	2	8	560	784
05.12.2012	webinar and data call	2	4	280	392
05.22.2012	Subcommittee	1	15	525	735
06.11.2012	CYPM Working Group Meeting	1	15	525	735
06.21.2012	On site with Georgetown	3	25	2,625	3675
06.26.2012	Subcommittee	1	15	525	735
07.11.2012	Steering Committee	1	8	280	392
07.23.2012	Steering Committee	1	8	280	392
07.24.2012	Subcommittee	1	15	525	735
07.26.2012	Webinar Multi Systems Youth	2	4	280	392
07.31.2012	CYPM Presentation	2	4	280	392
07.31.2012	Implementation Call	2	4	280	392
08.31.2012	Mapping Meeting	2	15	525	735
09.12.2012	On site with Georgetown	3	25	2,625	3675
10.04.2012	CYPM Training	2	15	525	735
10.17.2012	Provider Meeting	2	15	525	735
10.19.2012	Team Meeting	2	15	525	735
10.23.2012	Subcommittee	1	15	525	735
10.24.2012	CYPM Working Group Meeting	1	15	525	735



11.05.2012	Webinar Cross System	2	4	280	392
11.08.2012	On Site with Georgetown	3	25	2,625	3675
11.15.2012	CYPM Training	2	15	525	735
Total		47	364	\$22,470	\$31,458

Note: Assumes an average of \$35 (2012 dollars) per hour for staff time.

2. Data System Costs

Data collection was not only required to be an official site for the Crossover Youth Practice Model initiative of Georgetown University's Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, but was also prioritized by Douglas County as a "best practice" for tracking the initiative. Costs associated with data collection at the implementation stage were absorbed by the Douglas County Juvenile Assessment Center and included data system enhancements for a stand-alone data system and to meet the requirements of the state Community-Based Juvenile Services AID (CBA) program.

Juvenile Assessment Center (JAC), data system enhancements:	\$20,000
Juvenile Assessment Center, CBA reporting requirements enhancement:	\$5,500
Total:	\$25,500

Total Estimated Implementation Costs: \$31,458 + 25,500 = \$56,958 in 2012 dollars or **\$59,752 in 2016 dollars.**

Notes:

We suggest that the cost estimate using the 1.4 multiplier adopted by the Harvard Business Review's meeting cost calculator is a more accurate estimate of YI implementation costs. These notes provide some justifications for this suggestion.

- Not all aspects of the efforts that went into the implementation of Youth Impact! can be monetized. Consequently, this estimate should be considered to be a conservative estimate, or under-estimate of the overall efforts of agency professionals.
- There is no accurate way to estimate the "prep time" of meeting attendees, so those costs are not included in this estimate. Although some attendees simply attended the meetings, some participants, and the persons leading the meetings in particular, had significant responsibilities for prepping for meetings. Some of this prep time might be considered "voluntary time" rather than paid time by one's employer. The estimated value of volunteer time in Nebraska is \$21.51 per hour in 2015 dollars (https://www.independentsector.org/volunteer_time) or \$21.86 in 2016 dollars. In sum, not including prep time also suggests that our implementation cost estimate is conservative.
- A variety of leadership and staff from a variety of public and private agencies attended these meetings. An overall average of \$35 per hour (in 2012 dollars) may or may not be a good approximation of the mean or modal salary cost for these attendees.
- Travel costs and travel time to meetings are not included in these estimates, again indicating that this is a conservative cost estimate.

Youth Impact! Annual Administration Cost Estimate

The following cost and benefit estimate focuses on the annual cost of administering the Youth Impact! crossover youth program in Douglas County. These estimates represent “systems” costs and benefits which, as we describe below, are just the tip of the iceberg regarding the true costs of serious delinquency to society.

Our annual cost and benefit analysis includes cost/benefit estimates from the primary agencies that regularly participate in the Youth Impact! initiative. **Cost-savings stem from two primary sources: 1) savings to Probation due to youth that are diverted from the system and do not require probation supervision and, 2) savings in court costs due to youth who are diverted from the system and do not go to Juvenile Court.**

- It is estimated that the need for four full-time probation officers for high-risk youth are avoided as a result of the Youth Impact! initiative.
- We reached an estimate of \$1,475 in court costs per youth in Douglas County, so 100 youth diverted from the system on average per youth results in a savings estimate of \$147,500 annually.

Most agencies experienced costs of some kind associated with their participation in Youth Impact! The bulk of these costs are salary and benefits.

Total annual cost of administering YI! = \$212,264

Total estimated annual benefits = \$385,425

Annual Net Benefit = \$173,161

Given estimated implementation costs of less than \$60,000, our cost/benefit analysis suggests that **the CYPM as implemented as Youth Impact! in Douglas County, NE, paid for itself in the first year of implementation as a result of reduced probation costs and reduced costs of processing youth in court.**

The cost/benefit analysis contained in this report includes only costs and benefits associated with systems: the Douglas County juvenile justice system and child welfare system. It does not include minor expenses, such as travel to meetings, because similar expenses would occur in the absence of the crossover youth initiative. In addition to these system costs, existing literature provides estimates of **at least three other types of costs of crime, which we do not include in the current cost-benefit analysis: 1) victim costs, 2) crime career costs, and 3) intangible costs.** We provide some information regarding these other types of costs to highlight the fact that our analysis of system costs, *although clearly indicating that Youth Impact! is cost effective, is a very conservative estimate* of the cost-savings provided by Youth Impact!

Annual Benefits and Costs of the Youth Impact! of Douglas County Program										
	County Attorney	Juvenile Assessment Center	Probation	DHHS	Boys Town	Court Costs	NFSN	Project Harmony	NCFF	TOTAL
COSTS										
Salaries/ Benefits	\$20,982	\$80,133 ¹	\$39,000 ²	\$31,733 ³	\$21,582 ⁴	0	\$10,850 ⁵	\$1496 ⁶	\$2,480	\$208,166
Supplies/ Services	0	\$1,000	0	0	\$300.00 ⁷	0	0	0	0	\$1300
Other Costs	0	\$2,200 ⁸	0	0	\$598.00 ⁹	0	0	0	0	\$2798
BENEFITS										
Salaries/ Benefits	0	0	\$237,925 ¹⁰	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$237,925
Supplies/ Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Costs	0	0	0	0	0	\$147,500 ¹¹	0	0	0	\$147,500
Total Benefit	0	0	\$237,925	0	0	\$147,500	0	0	0	\$385,425
Total Cost	\$20,892	\$83,333	\$39,000	\$31,733	\$22,480	0	\$10,850	\$1,496	\$2,480	\$212,264
NET BENEFIT	(\$20,892)	(\$83,333)	\$198,925	(\$31,733)	(\$22,480)	\$147,500	(\$10,850)	(\$1,496)	(\$2,480)	\$173,161

¹ Salary costs reflect an Assessment Specialist (1.0 FTE), a Pre-adjudication Coordinator (0.25 FTE), and an Administrative Assistant (0.15 FTE). Benefits are calculated as 33% of salary.

² Although a position has not been filled, the increased data entry justifies a data entry/clerical position estimated at \$31,200 + \$7,800 (25% benefits) = \$39,000.

³ Salary costs include .31 FTE for a Staff Assistant I, .12 FTE for a Child and Family Services Supervisor, and .09 for a CFS Service Delivery Administrator I. Benefits are calculated as 35% of salary.

⁴ Includes hourly time for the Sr. Director of Community Impact, Director of Contracts, and an Administrative Assistant. Benefits are calculated as 36% of salary.

⁵ 0.175 staff FTE per week.

⁶ \$48,000 salary + 24.65% for benefits for .025 FTE.

⁷ Printing and supply costs.

⁸ Annual cost of the percent of the CMS data system dedicated to Youth Impact! data.

⁹ \$398 for mileage @ \$.45475 per mile and \$200 for food costs for annual partner meeting.

¹⁰ 296 youth over 3 years did not enter the Probation system, for an average of about 100 youth per year. Due to child welfare involvement, these youth would likely fall into a high supervision range, requiring probation officers with a low caseload, assumed here to be 25 youth per officer (or 4 officers total in savings). Starting pay for these staff is \$47,585 per year plus 25% benefits (\$11,896.25) = \$59,481.25 X 4 = \$237,925.

¹¹ Court costs are based on a NYC estimate of \$1,890 per youth in 2007 dollars ([http://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us/iboreports/\[\[path.pdf\]\]](http://www.ibo.nyc.ny.us/iboreports/[[path.pdf]])). This is \$2,200 in 2016 dollars. The CNN cost-of-living calculator suggests that, with the exception of housing, most costs in NYC are about 1/3 higher than in Omaha. So if we multiple that number by 67% to bring costs in-line with Omaha, we get an estimate of \$1,475 per youth. The probation estimate is that about 100 crossover youth per year are diverted from court processing, resulting in a savings of \$147,500 per year in court costs.

Cost to victims is another significant cost of delinquency. McCollister, French and Fang (2010) provide some estimates of tangible victim costs per crime type. Listed here are some of their estimates, translated into 2016 dollars.

<u>Type of Crime</u>	<u>Crime Victim Costs (2016 dollars)</u>
<i>Murder</i>	\$822,140
<i>Aggravated assault</i>	\$9,698
<i>Robbery</i>	\$3,678
<i>Motor vehicle theft</i>	\$6,816
<i>Household burglary</i>	\$1,518
<i>Larceny/ theft</i>	\$535

Although many of the crime listed above are more serious than the average crime or crimes committed by Douglas County crossover youth, they are crimes that become more likely if a crossover youth develops into a career criminal. The Youth Impact! initiative is specifically targeted at preventing further such penetration into either the juvenile delinquency or child welfare systems.

Crime career costs. Youth who become adults who engage in illegal activities do not contribute to the economy in the same fashion as adults who engage in legal, productive activities. For example, they pay no (or fewer) legal taxes and contribute less to the legal Gross Domestic Product (GDP). McCollister et al. (2010) estimated productivity losses associated with delinquents and criminals by calculating person-years served in prison as 2,080 hours that were not worked at the 2008 federal minimum wage rate of \$6.55. Although this wage rate is applicable for some individuals, others would have earned more than minimum wage, making these also conservatively low estimates. In the table below, these 2008 estimates are transformed into 2016 dollars.

<u>Type of Crime</u>	<u>Crime Career Costs (2016 dollars)</u>
<i>Murder</i>	\$165,600
<i>Aggravated assault</i>	\$2,370
<i>Robbery</i>	\$4,762
<i>Motor vehicle theft</i>	\$616
<i>Household burglary</i>	\$759
<i>Larceny/ theft</i>	\$182

As high as these cost estimates are, crime produces many additional costs to society as well. As Kleiman, Caulkins, and Gehred state, “Victimization costs are to crime costs as the tip is to the iceberg. These estimates keep invisible a whole mass of residual fear, avoidance behaviors, and social hostility,” (2014:15). They describe at least five other categories by which crime imposes costs on society. First, there are direct crime-avoidance costs (e.g. buying security cameras for a home or business). Next, there are second-order avoidance costs (e.g. a business moves out of a high-crime area, resulting in loss of jobs). Third, there is the cost of the fear of crime, such as undesired changes in behavior or reduced physical or psychological health. An entire literature has emerged in an attempt to capture these costs (for example, see Dolan and Peasgood 2007). Fourth, there is the cost of social hostility of citizens towards groups associated with crime and delinquency (e.g. young people, minorities, the indigent, the mentally ill) as well as the corresponding hostility of these groups if they feel ignored by the police or targeted by the police. Finally, there are the indirect and

direct costs of law enforcement (Kleiman, Caulkins, and Gehred 2014). These costs are not included in the current analysis, but again suggest that the current estimates are extremely conservative.

Other cost/benefit research accepts that juvenile detention centers tend to serve as “schools of crime” where youth increase their “criminal capital” and become better delinquents and/or expand their delinquent networks (Nguyen et al. Forthcoming). This empirical research suggests that for every additional 30 days of incarceration, youth earn an additional \$172 in illegal wages per month upon release. In other words, youth detention has a real, explicit cost to society, in addition to the social, emotional, and health costs to the youth themselves.

Finally, research has estimated the cost-savings to society of keeping youth from engaging in a life of crime. For example, Mark Cohen and Alex Piquero conducted a cost analysis that produced estimates of saving a 14-year old high-risk juvenile from a life of crime range from \$2.6 to \$5.3 million dollars. Translated into 2016 dollars produces estimates of \$2.9 to \$5.9 million dollars in savings.

In conclusion, our estimate of over \$173,000 annually in system-savings is a conservative estimate because it does not include the expense of collateral costs of involvement in the justice system and the child welfare system. However, we argue that these broader estimates that can reach into the millions of dollars per individual should be considered with caution, as such high estimates of benefits can justify nearly any justice intervention if the “goodness” of the intervention is judged only from an economic or cost/benefit standpoint. For this reason, we stand by the more conservative estimate as a useful metric for assessing the worth of YI! in Douglas County. Moreover, this economic worth is matched by the communication channels and collaboration that is enhanced as a result of this initiative. **Consequently, we strongly endorse the Crossover Youth Practice Model as implemented in the Douglas County Youth Impact! initiative.**

Cost/Benefit References

- Cohen, Mark and Alex R. Piquero. 2009. “New Evidence on the Monetary Value of Saving a High Risk Youth.” *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. 25(1):25-49.
- Dolan, Paul and Tessa Peagood. 2007. “Estimating the Economic and Social Costs of the Fear of Crime.” *The British Journal of Criminology*. 47(1):121-132.
- Kleiman, Mark A. R., Janathan P. Caulkins, and Peter Gehred. 2014. “Measuring the Costs of Crime.” U.S. Department of Justice: Washington DC.
- McCollister, Kathryn e., Michael t. French, and Hai Fang. 2010. “The Cost of Crime to Society: New Crime-Specific Estimates for Policy and Program Evaluation.” *Drug and Alcohol Dependency* 108(1-2):98-109.
- Nguyen, Holly, Thomas A. Loughran, Ray Paternoster, Jeffrey Fagan, and Alex R. Piquero. Forthcoming. “Institutional Placement and Illegal Earnings: Examining the Crime School Hypothesis”. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*.

Appendix H. System Impact Analysis

Youth Impact! System Impact Analysis

Overview. As one part of a larger evaluation of the Youth Impact! initiative in Douglas County, Nebraska, leaders and staff members from public and private agencies participating in the initiatives were surveyed to determine their assessment of how the implementation of Youth Impact! has influenced the larger juvenile justice system. The survey was distributed electronically on October 10, 2016 and remained open for seventeen days. One reminder email was delivered on October 25th to increase the response rate. Overall, 12 of 16 individuals completed the survey, for a final response rate of 75%.

Sample Characteristics. The resulting sample exhibited the following characteristics:

- *Role in the Douglas County juvenile justice system:*
 - Public agency leadership (e.g. state/county): 54.55%
 - Private agency leadership: 36.36%
 - Public agency staff: 9.09%
- *Years experience with the Youth Impact! initiative:*
 - 5 years (since planning stages): 58.33%
 - 3-4 years: 33.33%
 - 0-2 years: 8.33%

Analysis. A thematic analysis was applied to the qualitative responses gathered by the online survey. Responses were aligned around three key questions focusing on system impact. Responses to these questions are presented in turn.

1. *How has Youth Impact! impacted Douglas County's juvenile justice system? Describe what you see as the most significant change that would not exist if YI! had not been implemented.*

Theme	# of professionals mentioning
Improved cooperation, communication, and/or collaboration	6
Better case coordination	2
Providing a voice to youth/parents/caregivers	2
Reduction in filings of youth	2
Allows for enhanced child welfare services for youth with minor delinquent charges	1
Paradigm shift to a holistic, multidisciplinary, strength-based lens	1
System mapping	1

Overwhelming, the most common system impact reported by survey respondents was the improved cooperation, communication, and collaboration among professionals in the juvenile justice system and also with child welfare professionals. Better case coordination, which is highly related and likely

a result of this collaboration, was mentioned by two YI! professionals. Systematically including the voice of youth, parents, and caregivers was also mentioned by two professionals. One respondent indicated:

“I definitely see youths getting a chance to explain themselves so their unique circumstances are taken into consideration before just being filed on.”

A reduction in filings of youth was described as the most important impact of the YI! initiative. Related to this reduction in filings was the possibility that youth would receive enhanced child welfare services as an alternative to juvenile justice involvement:

“It has allowed youth with developmental disability who receive minor delinquency charges to be addressed with enhanced child welfare services rather than a juvenile court delinquency filing.”

One agency professional described a paradigm shift to a more holistic multidisciplinary, strength-based lens as the most significant change brought on by the YI! initiative. Finally, the system-mapping that has occurred as part of this initiative was mentioned as significant by one respondent. Overall, these impacts largely reflect the stated goals of the Youth Impact initiative.

2. Please identify the one most positive impact of YI! on the juvenile justice system.

Theme	# of professionals mentioning
Few filings; more diversion; less probation	4
Better service provision and support for youth	2
True team approach and collaboration	2
Providing a voice to youth/parents/caregivers	2
Youth outcomes improved	1
Public/private funding collaboration	1

The second question instructed respondents to identify the one most positive impact of the Youth Impact! initiative. The most common response, indicated by four professionals, was a reduction in filings, using diversion more, and relying less on probation. Two respondents highlighted the better service provision and support for youth:

“Getting the kids and families the support they need to be successful.”

Another two individuals described the “true” team approach and collaboration:

“Our committed volunteers in steering and work committees have gotten a lot accomplished. Smoothest and best outcome project I’ve worked on here.”

Two positive things that were not mentioned in reference to the first question were improved outcomes for youth (one mention) and the success of the public/private funding collaboration (one mention) that can serve as a model for other initiatives, such as Operation Youth Success.

3. Please identify the one most negative impact of YI! on the juvenile justice system.

Theme	# of professionals mentioning
Nothing	3
Required time and cost	3
Erosion of public trust/naysayers	2
Absence of youth buy-in	1
Disruption in youth placements	1
Association with philosophy of being “soft” on delinquency	1
Persisting communication deficits	1

As one major goal of the larger evaluation is to assist in improving the process of Youth Impact! in Douglas County, our final question asked respondents to identify the most negative impact of YI! on the juvenile justice system. Three individuals could not identify a negative impact. Another three respondents mentioned the time and cost of the initiative to participating agencies. Because many of these costs are not directly reimbursed, our larger evaluation has made recommendations that efforts need to be made to institutionalize the funding and leadership of Youth Impact!

“The amount of time spent gathering and inputting data without additional resources.”

Another negative impact mentioned was an erosion of public trust in some instances and the persistence of “naysayers” of the initiative. One respondent mentioned a disruption in youth placements, while another respondent indicated that communication in some areas still needed improvement. Finally, one agency professional stated that Youth Impact! was viewed negatively as being soft on delinquency:

“YI! is perceived as ‘soft’ by some of the other county attorneys not part of the staffing.”

Conclusion. Overall, participating professionals indicate that the Youth Impact! initiative is having many positive, anticipated impacts on the Douglas County juvenile justice system. The most highlighted impacts are **1) increased collaboration, cooperation, and communication within the juvenile justice system and across the JJ and CW systems and 2) a reduction in filings of youth. A significant negative impact to be addressed is the costs and personnel time required for the YI! to run efficiently**, while these costs are not always offset by the provision of additional resources. Another issues to be addressed is the **perceptions by naysayers that the initiative is only temporary or is too soft on delinquency and does not hold youth accountable.**



Appendix I. Data Recommendations

The purpose of this report is to concisely discuss the data collection efforts for Youth Impact! We hope that our study helps the team understand the most important data pieces to collect in order to provide continued feedback for YI! Our recommendations below follow from the results presented above. The YI! team is being asked to collect an extraordinary amount of data on youth: they collect “initial” and “9-month” data on every crossover youth that comes to their attention. This is both beneficial and cumbersome at the same time. On the one hand, the YI! initiative is founded on evidence-based principles, and data collection is an essential part of this. However, many data points are difficult to get, or must be collected by multiple team members, and as such, is very burdensome to complete in a timely fashion. **Our overall recommendation regarding data collection is that the team scale down the amount of data being collected.** We have identified the most important data points for the team to continue to collect, and present them below. **Based on the findings from this evaluation, as well as the data points that are of interest to the team (i.e., they provide meaningful feedback to the team for continued improvement, and may be helpful to determine continued effectiveness), we suggest that YI! continues to collect the data points provided below:**

Continue Collecting these Data Points	Survey Question
Team Decision	No survey question, this was created by the JAC to help streamline the data collection process
<p data-bbox="203 304 617 336">Team Meeting</p> <p data-bbox="203 378 617 661">There was no survey question that specifically asked the question about team meeting but question 4 on the 9-month survey covered different types of team meetings – the bolded responses to the right were used to create the variables below:</p> <ul data-bbox="251 724 609 1018" style="list-style-type: none"> • Interagency Meeting • Youth Received Coordinated Joint Assessment • Youth Present in at least One Decision Meeting • Unified Case Plan • Wraparound Services <p data-bbox="203 1081 600 1186"><i>We recommend that the bolded questions continue to be collected by the JAC</i></p>	<p data-bbox="646 304 1031 336">Question 4 on 9-Month Survey</p> <p data-bbox="646 378 1396 483">4. In the past 9 months, were any of the following promising practices used during the processing of this youth? <i>Check all that apply.</i></p> <ul data-bbox="646 514 1421 1617" style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An interagency planning meeting (formal communication to facilitate the exchange of pertinent information) was held between CW and JJ workers regarding this youth. ○ A Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) Meeting (involving CW, JJ, Behavioral Health, and Education, at a minimum) was held and a joint assessment was completed regarding this youth. ○ The youth was present in at least one multi-disciplinary or interagency meeting regarding decision-making. ○ The youth was present in at least one multi-disciplinary or interagency meeting regarding case management. ○ The youth’s family/caregiver/committed adult was present in at least one multi-disciplinary meeting regarding decision-making. ○ The youth’s family/caregiver/committed adult was present in at least one multi-disciplinary meeting regarding case management. ○ The youth’s case was referred to a case management and/or supervision team designated for the supervision of dually-involved youth in the community. ○ Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice developed a unified case plan for this youth. ○ Permanency was specifically discussed while creating and reviewing this youth’s case plan. ○ This youth was provided with wraparound services specifically for dually involved youths. ○ Other Special Handling: _____ ○ None
Prior Arrests (Criminal)	<p data-bbox="646 1627 1055 1659">Question 25 on the Initial Survey</p> <p data-bbox="646 1711 1396 1774">25. At the time of this offense, did this youth have any prior arrests for criminal charges?</p>



Prior Arrests (Status)	<p>Question 26 on the Initial Survey</p> <p>26. At the time of this offense, did this youth have any prior arrests/contacts for status offenses (i.e., running away, incorrigibility, truancy, etc.) or municipal charges?</p>
<p>Prior Number of CW Placements</p> <p>This information is not gathered in the Initial or 9-month survey, but was collected for the Control group.</p> <p><i>We recommend that the JAC begin to collect this data if possible.</i></p>	<p>Not collected on Initial or 9-Month Surveys</p> <p>At the time this youth was identified as a dually-involved youth, how many placements did he/she have while in the care of child welfare?</p> <p>_____ # relative placements, foster care placements, congregate care placements, residential treatment center placements, hospitalizations, other</p> <p>_____ Not applicable (i.e., no child welfare case or history at the time identified)</p>
Case Closure (Delinquency)	<p>Question 2 on 9-Month Survey</p> <p>2. Was youth's delinquency case closed within the last 9 months? (Closed=diversion/disposition successfully terminated from court supervision) Answer <i>regardless</i> of 3A-Court involvement</p>
Case Closure (Dependency)	<p>Question 1 on 9-Month Survey</p> <p>1. Was youth's dependency case closed within the last 9 months?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider the youth's AFTERCARE CASE as an "open" case. ○ Answer "yes" to the right for the date of the "active" case closure ONLY if the family does NOT pursue Aftercare Services. <p>Answer "yes" to the right with the date of the Aftercare Case closure.</p>
New JJ Sustained Petition	<p>Question 12 on 9-Month Survey</p> <p>12. Did this youth have any new sustained petitions (i.e., found responsible/guilty for charges) in the juvenile justice system within 9 months of being identified as a dually-involved youth?</p> <p>MUST BE AT 9 MONTH MARK NOT WHEN CASE(S) WAS CLOSED.</p>



Living Situation/Placement 9-months Post-ID	Question 5 on 9-Month Survey 5. What was the youth's living situation 9 months after he/she was identified as a dually-involved youth?
<p>JJS Assessment</p> <p>The bolded responses to the right were used to create the variables below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CWS Assessment • Mental Health Assessment • Educational Assessment • Medical Assessment <p><i>We recommend that the bolded questions continue to be collected by the JAC</i></p>	<p>Question 22 on 9-Month Survey</p> <p>22. What types of assessments/services did youth received after he/she was identified as a dually-involved youth? <i>Check all that apply.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Further Mental Health Assessment ○ Further Educational Assessment ○ Juvenile Justice Assessment (Risk/Needs) ○ CW Comprehensive Assessment ○ Medication Assessment/Maintenance ○ Mental Health Treatment ○ Sex Offender Treatment ○ Substance Abuse Treatment ○ Behavioral/Social Interventions ○ Educational
Recidivism (9 and 18 month)	Not a survey question



Appendix J. Future Recommendations

Given the results of this evaluation, we provide the following recommendations for continued evaluation and data collection, as well as team-oriented activities in what we term “phase 4” of YI!:

1. **Data collection and evaluation:** Consider continuing the evaluation of Youth Impact! by following the rest of the CYPM-full group up to 18 months post-identification. Additionally, consider following all youth in each group for longer periods, such as 3 years post-identification. Following-up the youth from all groups to adulthood (21 or 25 years old) would make a significant contribution to our understanding of the long-term effects of early crossover intervention. Finally, consider collecting additional child welfare outcomes that were not collected in this evaluation.
2. **Team-oriented activities for “Phase 4” of YI!:** The “CYPM-Eligible” youth were unable to get the “full” intervention – for various reasons, they missed the joint team meeting (e.g., they may have had a more serious violation that made them ineligible for diversion). However, these youth may be in need of enhanced services that can be identified and offered by the Youth Impact! initiative. Our recommendation is to consider offering a team meeting for these “ineligible youth.” These youth may benefit the most by integrated case management and follow-up meetings with JJ supervisors and CW case workers. We also recommend additional data analyses on these youth in order to determine how they differ from the CYPM youth (in terms of offense severity and needs) so that the team can determine whether (and how) to respond to these youth within the purview of YI!



Appendix K. Project Limitations

This evaluation was limited by the relatively small numbers of youth in the three groups (“full,” “eligible,” and “comparison” groups), and this may have limited our statistical power to uncover significant results. This problem was amplified by the fact that not all of the CYPM youth reached their 18-month follow-up date, and were therefore excluded from our analysis – this resulted in a loss of approximately 150 CYPM (full or eligible) youth. We believe that many of the findings regarding 18-month recidivism suffered from the loss of these cases, and we expect that more significant differences will be uncovered once 18-month recidivism outcomes are assessed for these additional youth. At the time of the writing of this final report, the research team is continuing to collect data on the 18-month recidivism outcomes for these 150 youth. Finally, it is possible that a limited number of “high rate” CYPM-Full treatment youth impacted the significance tests because they are outliers and thus influence regression lines.

Appendix L. Summary of Deliverables

Quarterly Reports

A total of 8 quarterly reports were provided throughout the project period.

Technical/Brief Reports

2016

Wright, E.M. & Spohn, R. *Douglas County Youth Impact! Views of challenges from the professionals involved*. Brief report submitted to the Douglas County Youth Impact! Working Group.

Wright, E.M. & Spohn, R. *Douglas County Youth Impact! Views of successes from the professionals involved*. Brief report submitted to the Douglas County Youth Impact! Working Group.

Wright, E.M. & Spohn, R. *Douglas County Youth Impact! Recommendations from the professionals involved*. Brief report submitted to the Douglas County Youth Impact! Working Group.

Presentations

2017

Wright, E.M., Spohn, R., Chenane, J. Crossover youth in the justice system: An outcome and cost-benefit analysis of the crossover youth practice model. Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Kansas City, MO.

Wright, E.M., Spohn, R., Chenane, J., Juliano, N., Johnson, D. Crossover youth in Douglas County. Nebraska Juvenile Justice Association (proposed – not accepted).

2016

Wright, E.M., Spohn, R., Chenane, J. Enhancing services for crossover youth: Challenges and recommendations. American Society of Criminology, New Orleans, LA.

Chenane, J., Wright, E.M., Spohn, R. When helping crossover youth helps the juvenile justice system: Reports from agency professionals. American Society of Criminology, New Orleans, LA.

Wright, E.M., Spohn, R., & Chenane, J. NCJR Research Findings. Youth Impact! Annual Partner Meeting.

2015

Spohn, R. & Wright, E.M. Evaluation of Douglas County Youth Impact! Presented at the 2015 Nebraska Juvenile Justice Association. Kearney, NE.

Coonfare, S.J., Juliano, N., Spohn, R., & Wright, E.M. Implementation of the Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM) in Douglas County: A unique public-private partnership to improve the lives of youth. Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities (CUMU) 2015 Conference. Omaha, NE.

Spohn, R. & Wright, E.M. NCJR Evaluation. Youth Impact! Annual Partner Meeting.

Articles

Wright, E.M., Spohn, R., Chenane, J., & Juliano, N. Interagency collaboration: The case for crossover youth. Forthcoming at the *Journal of Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*.



For more information on the contents of this report, please contact:

Emily M. Wright, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, School of Criminology & Criminal Justice
Associate Director, Nebraska Center for Justice Research
University of Nebraska at Omaha
Phone: 402.554.3898
emwright@unomaha.edu

Ryan Spohn, Ph.D.
Director, Nebraska Center for Justice Research
University of Nebraska at Omaha
6001 Dodge Street
Omaha, NE 68182-0310
Phone (402) 554-3794

Joselyn L. Chenane, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate, School of Criminology & Criminal Justice
Research Assistant, Nebraska Center for Justice Research
University of Nebraska at Omaha

www.justiceresearch.unomaha.edu