September 11, 2018

To: Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, Chair
    Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
    Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
    Supervisor Janice Hahn
    Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Judge Michael Nash (Ret.)
      Executive Director, Office of Child Protection

OCP RESPONSE TO DUAL-STATUS YOUTH MOTION

On March 20, 2018, the Board of Supervisors instructed the Director of the Office of Child Protection (OCP), in collaboration with the Juvenile Courts, the directors of Children and Family Services (DCFS), Mental Health (DMH), and Office of Diversion and Re-Entry, the Chief Probation Officer, County Counsel, Interim Public Defender, Alternate Public Defender, District Attorney, Superintendent of Schools, the Acting Executive Director of the Office of Immigrant Affairs, and others to report back to the Board in 180 days on a countywide plan for dual-status youth that includes, among other things:

- An understanding of the population and the funding streams available to them
- Addressing ongoing cross-sector coordination and consistency
- Best practices from other jurisdictions
- Building on efforts of the County and the Juvenile Courts
- Addressing gaps and recommendations on:
  - Prevention
  - Improving the treatment of dual-status youth
  - Strengthening data-tracking and evaluation
  - Consideration of LGBTQ youth
  - Steps to provide juvenile criminal record expungement
- Any necessary policy changes, supports, and funding to achieve the Countywide plan

The following is an update on the ongoing efforts to meet the Board’s directives.

Initially, the OCP had separate meetings with DCFS Director Bobby Cagle, Chief Probation Officer Terri McDonald, and Juvenile Court Presiding Judge Michael
Levanas. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss Los Angeles County’s historical efforts and current practices with regard to dual-status youth.

Following those meetings, the OCP exercised its delegated contracting authority authorized by the Board to contract with Dr. Denise Herz, a professor at the California State University Los Angeles (CSULA) School of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics. Since 2005, Dr. Herz has worked extensively with the Juvenile Court, DCFS, Probation, DMH, and others on Los Angeles County’s dual-status protocols. She was the primary architect of the current Welfare and Institutions Code section 241.1 joint assessment and has done extensive evaluation and research in this field. In addition, Dr. Herz has worked in this area on a national level, primarily with Georgetown University’s Center for Juvenile Justice Reform. Given her extensive experience with dual-status issues on both the local and national levels, she is the ideal consultant to assist the OCP with this ongoing collaborative effort.

On June 11, 2018, the first meeting of the workgroup for the Countywide Plan for Dual-Status Youth was convened. It consisted of representatives from the Juvenile Court, DCFS, Probation, DMH, the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), the Office of Diversion and Re-entry, County Counsel, the Public Defender, Alternate Public Defender, the OCP, the Commission for Children and Families, Children’s Law Center, the Center for Strategic Public-Private Partnerships, Children’s Data Network, CSULA, the Probation Commission, Court-Appointed Special Advocates of Los Angeles (CASA–LA), the University of California Los Angeles School of Law, Loyola Law School, the Alliance for Children’s Rights, the Association of Community Human Services Agencies (ACHSA), Hathaway-Sycamores Child and Family Services, private foundations, and others.

At the June 11 meeting, Judge Michael Nash (ret.) provided an overview of the Board’s March 20 motion and a historical perspective on Los Angeles County’s previous dual-status efforts. In addition, Dr. Herz gave an overview of national crossover efforts (Attachment 1) and Dr. Jacquelyn McCroskey from the University of Southern California’s Dworak-Peck School of Social Work and the Children’s Data Network provided an overview of the data and research on Los Angeles County crossover youth (Attachment 2). Following those presentations, the first in a series of listening sessions on the topic occurred.

At the June 25, 2018, meeting, Dr. Herz presented overviews of the Welfare and Institutions Code section 241.1 multi-disciplinary team (MDT) process and the MDT data-collection process, as well as data collected through 2017 (Attachment 3).

On July 27, 2018, a comprehensive plan for the workgroup was presented (Attachment 4). The plan contemplates dividing the workgroup into two main subcommittees.

- The Delinquency Prevention Subcommittee will focus on four levels of prevention—preventing entry into the child-welfare system, preventing delinquency by youth in child welfare, preventing youth in child welfare from entering the juvenile-justice system, and preventing greater penetration into the juvenile-justice system by youth with child welfare cases. This subcommittee will coordinate with the OCP’s preven-
tion work and with the Youth Diversion and Development Steering Committee to prevent child-welfare youth from entering the juvenile-justice system.

- The second subcommittee is the 241.1 MDT Subcommittee, which will focus on the process and protocols that occur when youth do, in fact, become involved with both systems. This includes the 241.1 joint assessment process, the court process, the joint supervision process by DCFS and Probation, and more. As part of this subcommittee, Dr. Herz will also work closely with the agencies to formulate a plan to ensure consistent and comprehensive data collection to inform our ongoing work in this area.

In addition to leading the work in these subcommittees, we will coordinate efforts (where appropriate) with the OCP prevention plan (Paving the Road to Safety for Our Children) and with the Youth Diversion and Development Foster Care Youth Identification and Inclusion Workgroup.

It is anticipated that coordination with other existing related efforts plus the work of the two subcommittees described above will generate recommendations to improve existing processes and protocols in these areas, recommendations to enhance training, and, to the extent necessary, recommendations for additional resources.

Through its quarterly updates to the Board, the OCP will keep the Board informed of the progress of these workgroups in developing recommendations in the areas outlined by the motion, and will also issue a comprehensive report every six months until a plan is complete and fully implemented.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 893-1152 or by email at mnash@ocp.lacounty.gov, or your staff may contact Carrie Miller at (213) 893-0862 or by email at cmiller@ocp.lacounty.gov.
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c: Chief Executive Office
   Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
   Alternate Public Defender
   Children and Family Services
   County Counsel
   District Attorney
   Juvenile Court
   Los Angeles County Office of Education
   Mental Health
   Office of Diversion and Re-Entry, Department of Health Services
   Office of Immigrant Affairs, Department of Consumer and Business Affairs
   Probation
   Public Defender
The OJJDP Dual Systems Study

Crossover Youth Motion Workgroup Presentation

June 11, 2018

Principal Investigators:
Denise Herz, Ph.D., Professor
Carly B. Dierkhising, Ph.D., Assistant Professor

California State University, Los Angeles
School of Criminal Justice & Criminalistics
Study Overview

- OJJDP initiated Dual Systems Design Study in October 2015*

- Goals
  - To propose a method to generate a national estimate of dual system youth, their trajectories leading to multiple system involvement, and the key characteristics/trajectories of this population.
    - *Led by Linked Administrative Data Subcommittee*
  - To identify the successes and challenges associated with cross-system collaboration and data integration in jurisdictions and design a method by which to collect and report such information in a consistent and representative way nationwide.
    - *Led by Jurisdictional Case Studies Subcommittee*

*This project was supported by Grant #2015-CV-BX-0001 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication/program/exhibition are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.*
Core Study Partners

**Linked Administrative Data Subcommittee**

Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development

**Jurisdiction Case Study Subcommittee**

Children's Law Center of Los Angeles
Chief Probation Officer, State of Florida
Los Angeles County Juvenile Court Judge
Juvenile Court Judge, Broward County Florida
Magistrate, Mahoning County, Ohio
Director, Maricopa County Education Service Agency

Center for Innovation through Data Intelligence

Center for Juvenile Justice Reform
Categories of Crossover Youth

Non-Concurrent System Involvement:
- Dually Contact Youth

Concurrent System Involvement:
- Dually-Involved Youth
- Dual Adjudicated Youth
- Dually Adjudicated Youth

Maltreated youth who engage in criminal activity and may or may not touch both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems

Maltreated youth who engage in criminal activity and do touch the child welfare and the juvenile justice systems
Pathways to Dual System Involvement

Historical Child Welfare Case (Previously Open and Closed Prior to Concurrent System Involvement)

Child Welfare Contact Precedes Juvenile Justice Contact

Juvenile Justice Contact Precedes Child Welfare Contact
Linking the Administrative Data Using a 1st JJ Petition Cohort

Cook County, IL
(N=14,170)

Cuyahoga County, OH
(N=11,441)

New York City, NY
(N=1,272)

COHORT OF YOUTH WITH 1st DELINQUENCY COURT PETITION

CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE DATA FROM 2010-2014 USED

CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE DATA FROM 2013-2014 USED
Incidence of Dual System Youth across Sites

Of all dual system youth, approximately **one half** were dual contact youth.

Approximately **two-thirds** of all youth in the petition cohort touched both systems.

Of all dual system youth, approximately **one-third** were dually-involved.
A Deeper Look at Dually-Involved Youth

- Nearly all DI youth on JJ Pathway had a previous, but closed, CW case.
- Almost all of DI youth on CW Pathway had a previous, but closed, CW case.
Brief Overview of Characteristics:
Dual Contact Youth v. Dually-Involved

Male
African-American
Average of 2 CW referrals
First investigation at 7; last at 9
Involved with CW on average for 14-24 mos.
Up to 22% placed out of home—average of 3 placements
About 1/3 detained after charge

Male but females=30-50%
African-American
Average of 2-3 CW referrals
First investigation at 4; last at 16
Involved with CW on average for 1-12 years
16-91% placement out of home—average of 5-9 placements
28-57% detained after charge

Dual Contact Youth

Dually-Involved Youth
Brief Overview of Characteristics: Dually-Involved Youth with a Previous CW Case v. Dually-Involved with No Previous Case

Dually-Involved Youth With A Previous CW Case
- Male but females=30-50%
- African-American
- Average of 3 CW referrals
- First investigation at 4; last at 9
- Involved with CW on average for 4-12 years
- 48-91% placement out of home—average of 5-9 placements
- 28-57% detained after charge

Dually-Involved Youth With No Previous CW Case
- Male but females=30%
- African-American
- Average of 2 CW referrals
- First investigation at 15; last at 16
- Involved with CW on average for 1-12 years
- 16-52% placement out of home—average of 4-5 placements
- 41-63% detained after charge
Jurisdictional Case Studies
Subcommittee

Development of the Best Practices Rubric
Best Practices Rubric for Dual System Youth

JCS developed the Best Practices Rubric to capture the level of cross systems work on 11 key domains

1. Interagency collaboration
2. Judicial leadership
3. Information sharing
4. Data collection
5. Training
6. Identification of dual system youth
7. Assessment process
8. Case planning and management
9. Permanency, and transition plans
10. Placement planning
11. Service provision and tracking
## Judicial Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judicial Leadership</th>
<th>Practice Not in Place</th>
<th>Initial Efforts in Place</th>
<th>Emerging Practice</th>
<th>Developed Practice</th>
<th>Highly Developed Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No judicial support or leadership. Or, there is active judicial opposition.</td>
<td>No active opposition. Some judicial support but not very involved nor leadership in the work.</td>
<td>Active judicial support for collaboration. Attends meetings but may not take a leadership role</td>
<td>Active judicial support. Regularly attends cross-system meetings and trainings; provides leadership but in a limited capacity</td>
<td>Active judicial support and leadership. Convenes and leads cross-system meetings, drives the work, and provides accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Interagency Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interagency Collaboration</th>
<th>Practice Not in Place</th>
<th>Initial Efforts in Place</th>
<th>Emerging Practice</th>
<th>Developed Practice</th>
<th>Highly Developed Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-system teams/committees have not been established and key stakeholders have not been engaged.</td>
<td>Potential cross-system teams/committees and key stakeholders have been identified but not engaged.</td>
<td>Cross-system teams/committees and key stakeholders have been engaged in the work but do not meet regularly.</td>
<td>Cross-system teams/committees are established and meet regularly. Key stakeholders are engaged but not in a consistent manner.</td>
<td>Cross-system teams/committees are established and meet regularly. Key stakeholders are consistently engaged and participate in ongoing review of the work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sharing</td>
<td>Practice Not in Place</td>
<td>Initial Efforts in Place</td>
<td>Emerging Practice</td>
<td>Developed Practice</td>
<td>Highly Developed Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is not a protocol in place and/or an MOU/MOA that supports or allows information sharing between CW and JJ systems.</td>
<td>An MOU/MOA or a protocol is in the process of being developed that allows information sharing between JJ and CW systems.</td>
<td>An MOU/MOA or a protocol is in place that allows information sharing between JJ and CW systems, but information is never exchanged or only shared under special circumstances (e.g., challenging case, emergencies, etc.).</td>
<td>An MOU/MOA or a protocol is in place that allows information sharing between JJ and CW systems, but information is not consistently shared.</td>
<td>An MOU/MOA or a protocol is in place that allows information sharing between JJ and CW systems and information is regularly shared between systems in a structured and collaborative manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Practice Implications of the Rubric

1. Apply to Random Sample of Jurisdictions
2. Rankings Used to Produce a Continuum
3. Identify Practices in High Performing Areas and Evaluate
4. Empirically Identify Best Practices and Diffuse Nationwide
Access to Los Angeles 241 and Probation Reports:

www.juvenilejusticeresearch.com/projects

241.1 MDT Evaluation Reports

Probation Outcomes Study, Part I & Part II
Contact Us

Denise Herz
dherz@calstatela.edu

Carly B. Dierkhising
cdierkh@calstatela.edu
Los Angeles County Probation Youth with Previous Referrals to Child Protective Services
“THE CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM HAS LONG OVERLAPPED WITH THE JUSTICE SYSTEM, BUT THIS TOPIC HAS YET TO RECEIVE THE ATTENTION IT DESERVES.”

—JOHN LAUB, FUTURE OF CHILDREN, SPRING 2018
What share of youth with [intensive] probation involvement had earlier come to the attention of child protective services?

**Universe**

387 Los Angeles County Probation youth exiting suitable placement or camp in 2015 [a subset of the 806 youth in the Probation Outcomes Study]

**Analysis**

A retrospective study of the timing and degree of previous involvement with child protective services.

What are the implications for serving youth in probation placements?

Are there touch points when prevention-oriented family support and strengthening could have been delivered?
Probation records extracted, encrypted, and transmitted

Records standardized and prepared for linkage

Records linked using probabilistic matching algorithms

Clerical review of record pairs, final assignment of matches, and removal of identifying information

Analysis of restricted research dataset on secure server
How many children reported for maltreatment and/or in foster care later become involved with LA County Probation?

How many probation youth exiting suitable placement or camp in 2015 have a history of child protection involvement?

Statewide / California Child Welfare Records

LA County Probation Records
4 out of 5 referred

70% before age 10
5.6 referrals
43% before age 5
6.7 years of age

OF THE 387 YOUTH IN THE 2015 SUITABLE PLACEMENT AND CAMP COHORTS WHO HAD EXITED:

- **83%** (n=322) had been referred to child protective services at least once for maltreatment
- **38%** (n=148) had a substantiated report of maltreatment
- **35%** (n=135) had cases opened for services by the child protection system, either in-home or through out-of-home foster care
- **20%** (n=76) had been removed from their home due to abuse or neglect
1 out of 3 substantiated before age 5

7.7 years
91% of those substantiated

1 out of 3 case opened

45% before age 5

OF THE 387 YOUTH IN THE 2015 SUITABLE PLACEMENT AND CAMP COHORTS WHO HAD EXITED:

- 83% (n=322) had been referred to child protective services at least once for maltreatment
- 38% (n=148) had a substantiated report of maltreatment
- 35% (n=135) had cases opened for services by the child protection system, either in-home or through out-of-home foster care
- 20% (n=76) had been removed from their home due to abuse or neglect
43% before age 5

1 out of 5 placed

OF THE 387 YOUTH IN THE 2015 SUITABLE PLACEMENT AND CAMP COHORTS WHO HAD EXITED:

- **83% (n=322)** had been referred to child protective services at least once for maltreatment.
- **38% (n=148)** had a substantiated report of maltreatment.
- **35% (n=135)** had cases opened for services by the child protection system, either in-home or through out-of-home foster care.
- **20% (n=76)** had been removed from their home due to abuse or neglect.
**findings**

**Significant differences (p<.05)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>race / ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(m vs. f)</td>
<td>(black vs. Hispanic vs. white)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prevalence of past involvement was higher among female probation youth (at all levels)

Prevalence of past involvement was higher among black youth than Hispanic and white youth (at all levels)
EVIDENCE

What family strengthening, support, and service interventions are most effective in decreasing longer-term involvement with the child protection and delinquency systems?

CONNECTIONS

How can we ensure families referred to the child protection system are properly connected and engaged in community-based services when cases are not opened?

ACTION

Are there regions or communities where gaps between community needs and service capacity are especially challenging? How do we ensure service slots map to family needs?
Questions?

ehornste@usc.edu
Los Angeles County

241.1 MDT Data

Denise C. Herz, Ph.D.

School of Criminal Justice & Criminalistics
dherz@calstatela.edu
Youth in child welfare charged with criminal offense and petitioned to juvenile court

241.1 referral made to Probation and DCFS 241.1 Units

All MDT partners collect information for joint assessment

241.1 MDT meets to discuss case

Probation produces 241.1 MDT report and submits it to court with recommendations for disposition and services

241.1 hearing held and youth receives disposition

Post-disposition MDT meeting held to review court orders

Youth is supervised by DCFS case carrying social worker and assigned a probation officer

DCFS social worker and probation officer execute MDT recommendations and case plan

241.1 MDT Process
Data Collection Launches

Oct. 2013

**Initial Data**

All 241.1 Referrals “Initial Data” = Characteristics at Time of Arrest & 241.1 Referral

**Initial Data Entered By:**
- 241.1 DCFS Unit
- 241.1 Probation Unit
- DCFS Education Section & Consultants
- DMH

**Tracking Data**

Up to 30 241.1 youth who received a disposition each month starting in October “Tracking Data”

**Tracking Data Entered By:**
- 241.1 DCFS Unit
- 241.1 Probation Unit
- DMH (Service data only)

NOTE: 2014 Data is presented in the Overview slides. The 2015 MDT data shows similar patterns and can be accessed at www.juvenilejusticeresearch.com/projects

241.1 CWS/CMS
Web-Based Application
Who were the 241.1 referrals?

Limited to Unique Individuals with a Declared 300 Case & a Pending Delinquency Petition (N=402)

- **37%** FEMALE
- **63%** MALE

- **45%** African-American
- **43%** Latino
- **8%** Caucasian
- **4%** Other

**Average Age**
16 Years Old

**At Time of Their Arrest**
- Family had been referred to DCFS **10 times** (on average).
- Youth had spent **5 years** in DCFS care (on average) consecutive and non-consecutive.
- **32%** were living in group homes
  - 17% at Home
  - 17% with Relative

Dependency Representation
*Children's Law Center*
- 33% Unit 1
- 23% Unit 2
- 21% Unit 3
School Status & Academic Performance

- 40% Did not have an identifiable Education Rights Holder
- 70% were Enrolled in School
- 21% Attended Regularly
- 18% Doing Well/Average
- 49% Credit Deficient
- 31% were receiving Special Education Services
- 16% needed an Assessment for Special Education

Behavioral Health Status

- 74% had Mental Health Diagnosis
- 59% had Pattern of Drug Use or Abuse/Dependency Diagnosis
- 23% Experienced Suicidal Ideation
- 27% Were Prescribed Medication
What were their offenses & how did they move through the juvenile justice system?

- 76% of these offenses were assault-related.
- 40% of charges were related to violent offense.
- 35% of charges were related to property offense.
- 28% of charges were related to other offense.
- 29% of charges were related to living situation.
- 15% of charges were related to school.
- 35% were detained at time of arrest.
- 23% had prior criminal charges.
- 18% had prior referrals for status offenses.
A Summary of MDT 241.1 Referrals for 2016 & 2017  
Presented by Denise Herz, Ph.D  
Crossover Workgroup--June 25, 2018

Table 1: Summary of WIC 241.1 Referrals for 2016 and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Referrals</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Accepted Referrals</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Total Accepted Referrals...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Youth with a Pending 602 Petition</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending 602 Petition with pending DCFS case, VFM</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassessment--New Arrest</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassessment--Probation Violation</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassessment--Court Request</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Declared 602 Youth with an Open ER Referral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse 241.1 (AB 212)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary of Characteristics for WIC 241.1 Referrals with Open 300 Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Adjudication Detention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detained Post Arrest</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: MDT Recommendations and Delinquency Court Dispositions for Open 300 Cases ONLY by Year Including Missing Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Disposition</th>
<th>2016 MDT Recommendations</th>
<th></th>
<th>Court Dispositions</th>
<th></th>
<th>2017 MDT Recommendations</th>
<th></th>
<th>Court Dispositions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 654.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 725(A)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 790</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 300/602 Home on Probation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 300/602 Suitable Placement</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 300/602 Camp Placement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 602 (HOP, SP, CCP)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Disposition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: MDT Recommendations and Delinquency Court Dispositions for Open 300 Cases ONLY by Year Excluding Missing Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Disposition</th>
<th>2016 MDT Recommendations</th>
<th></th>
<th>Court Dispositions</th>
<th></th>
<th>2017 MDT Recommendations</th>
<th></th>
<th>Court Dispositions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 654.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 725(A)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 790</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 300/602 Home on Probation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 300/602 Suitable Placement</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 300/602 Camp Placement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 602 (HOP, SP, CCP)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5: MDT Recommendations and Delinquency Court Dispositions by Year in Collapsed Categories (Missing Data Excluded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MDT Rec</td>
<td>Dispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Diversion Combined (654.2,725,790)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Status Combined (300/602)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 602 (HOP, SP, CCP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6: Delinquency Court Dispositions by Year in Collapsed Categories (Missing Data Excluded in 2016 & 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Diversion Combined (654.2,725,790)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Status Combined (300/602)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 602 (HOP, SP, CCP)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: Delinquency Court Dispositions by Year in Collapsed Categories (Missing Data Included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Diversion Combined (654.2,725,790)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Status Combined (300/602)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC 602 (HOP, SP, CCP)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different Levels of Prevention

- Preventing Entry into Child Welfare
- Preventing Delinquency by Youth in Child Welfare
- Preventing Youth in Child Welfare from Entering the Juvenile Justice System
- Preventing Further Penetration of the JJS for Youth with Child Welfare Cases
Preventing Entry into Child Welfare

Target:
• Reducing risk for abuse/neglect before it begins and/or escalates
• Increasing resources for families prior to formally entering the child welfare system

Data:
• In development as part of Countywide Prevention Strategy

Lead:
• Office of Child Protection is focused on this level of prevention
Preventing Delinquency by Youth in Child Welfare

**Target:**
- Identifying and reducing risk for delinquency before it occurs
- Addressing the system-based factors that contribute to delinquency (e.g., use of placements)
- Matching youth and families to appropriate services to address underlying issues related to delinquency (e.g., poor school performance, unmet educational needs)

**Data:**
- Limited but insightful data from the Delinquency Prevention Project piloted by DCFS
- Results from larger literature
- Needs to be developed by tracking information currently collected by agencies in LA County

**Lead:**
- Crossover Workgroup
Preventing Youth in Child Welfare from Entering the Juvenile Justice System

Target:
• Identifying youth with child welfare cases when contacted by law enforcement
• Ensuring access to diversionary program that will prevent youth in child welfare from entering the juvenile justice system
• Coordinating programming across the family, DCFS, and the diversion program to address underlying issues related to delinquency

Data:
• Under consideration as part of larger work being completed by Youth Diversion and Development Workgroup
• Raises question of the role of Court data to identify these youth
• Raises question of the role of Probation data as part of their intake decisions related to diversion

Lead:
• Coordinated effort between Crossover Workgroup & Youth Diversion and Development (YDD) Steering Committee
Preventing Further Penetration of the JJS for Youth with Child Welfare Cases

Target:
• Improving and augmenting (where appropriate) 241.1 MDT processes and procedures
• Improving access to appropriate referrals for services
• Improving the implementation of a coordinated supervision plan across DCFS and Probation

Data:
• 241.1 MDT database

Lead:
• Crossover Workgroup
Plan to Move Forward

Crossover Workgroup

Delinquency Prevention Subcommittee

Prevention of Abuse/Neglect: Coordination with OCP

241.1 MDT Subcommittee

Preventing JJS Entry: Coordination with YDD
Pre-Adjudication Data Collection
Data Collected Pre-Adjudication

241.1 Referral Received=DCFS 241.1 Unit Completes Intake Form
- Identifying information
- Demographics
- Referral Date
- Pre-adjudication detention status
- Court location (both dependency and delinquency)
- Type of referral
- Reason for WIC 300 case
- Charge code and type of charge
- Whether case was continued
- Disposition date
- MDT recommendation
- Lead agency
- Court disposition
- Probation and DCFS worker names

DCFS completes Child Welfare Background Information Form
- # of family referrals
- Type of services (court vs. VFM)
- Length of time in the child welfare system
- # of placements during stay in child welfare
- Previous 241.1 referrals and if so, # of referrals
- Living situation
- AWOL at time of referral
- Permanency plan at time of arrest
- Type of dependency counsel

Probation completes referral information, and background information, and disposition
- Current charges
- Place where current offense occurred (home or school)
- Any prior arrests (and #)
- Status offenses (and #)
- New arrests between original arrest and pre-pleas report
- New referrals between original arrest and pre-plea report STAR Court referral
- Delinquency court #
- Interviewed by probation office
- Type of delinquency representation
- MDT Recommendation
- MDT Disposition
DMH completes Mental Health History Form

- Was DMH interviewed authorized?
- History of psychiatric hospitalization
- Receiving MH services when arrested?
- History of suicide ideation
- History of suicide attempts
- Family history of mental illness
- Family history of substance abuse
- Did youth have mental health diagnoses at time of referral?
- If so, what were the current diagnoses?
- Did youth have history of substance use/abuse?
- If so, what drugs?
- What services was youth receiving at time of the referral (limited list)
- Was youth prescribed psychotropic medication?
- Was youth taking medication
- Was youth a regional center client?

DCFS Education Liaison completes Education Information Form

- Educational rights holder
- # of school placements in past four years
- # of school placements in past nine months
- Was youth enrolled at time of assessment?
- Type of school attending
- Youth’s attendance in past nine months
- Credit deficiency
- Status of current grades, on average
- Behavioral issues in the past nine months
- Behavioral issues at the time of the referral
- Types of general education services receiving at time of referral (limited list)
- Receiving special education services at time of assessment
- Reason for eligibility
- Type of special education services receiving

DCFS Unit records attendance at MDT Assessment Meeting

- The Youth
- The Youth’s Parents/Caregivers
- 241 Unit CSW
- Youth’s Case Carrying Social Worker (CSW)
- 241 Unit DPO
- DMH PSW
- DCFS Ed Consultant
- Alliance for Children’s Rights
- Public Counsel
- CLC Attorney
- Panel Attorney for Dependency
- Youth Advocate (Name)
- Other Representative (Name)
Post-Disposition Data Collection
Data Collected Post-Adjudication

- Date of the Post-Disposition Meeting
- Attendance at Post-Disposition Meeting
  - The Youth
  - The Youth’s Parents/Caregivers
  - 241 Unit CSW
  - Youth’s Case Carrying Social Worker (CSW)
  - 241 Unit DPO
  - Supervising DPO
  - DMH PSW
  - Mental Health Provider Agency: (Name)
  - DCFS Ed Consultant
  - Alliance for Children’s Rights
  - Public Counsel
  - CLC Attorney
  - Panel Attorney for Dependency
  - Panel Attorney for Delinquency
  - Public Defender Youth Advocate: (Name)
  - Private Attorney for Delinquency
  - DPH Representative
  - Substance Abuse Treatment Provider Agency: (Name)
  - Group Home Staff Agency: (Name)
  - Youth Advocate(s) Who: (Name)
  - Other Representative: (Name)
Capturing the Relationship between MDT Plan & Court Orders

The following is coded for all assessments (as appropriate) listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDT Plan</th>
<th>Court Ordered</th>
<th>Agency(s) Responsible for This Referral/Service If in the MDT Plan and/or Court Ordered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ No ☑ Ref. ☑ In Progress</td>
<td>❑ No ☑ Yes</td>
<td>☑ Prob ☑ DCFS ☑ DMH ☑ DPH ☑ School ☑ Attorney ☑ Caretaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FURTHER ASSESSMENTS

- ☐ 730 WIC Evaluation
- ☐ Contact CSAT
- ☐ Voluntary CRAFFT
- ☐ Alcohol/Drug Assessment
- ☐ Assistive Tech Assessment
- ☐ Medical Evaluation
- ☐ Neurological Assess/Testing
- ☐ Out Patient M/H Assessment
- ☐ Psych Consult for Meds
- ☐ Psycho-Educational Assess
- ☐ Psych Testing
- ☐ Speech & Lang Assess
- ☐ Other: _________________
The following is coded for all services listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDT Plan</th>
<th>Court Ordered</th>
<th>Agency(s) Responsible for This Referral/Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ N/A</td>
<td>☐ Continue</td>
<td>☐ Ref In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Ref Needed</td>
<td>☐ No</td>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**
- □ Cognitive Behavior Therapy
- □ Eating Disorder Tx
- □ Family Tx
- □ Full Service Partnership
- □ Functional Family Therapy
- □ Group Tx
- □ Individual Tx
- □ Medication Monitoring
- □ Strengthening Family Prog
- □ Trauma Informed Care
- □ Therapeutic Behavioral Svcs
- □ Wrap Around Services
- □ STAR Court/CSEC
- □ Other:

**YOUTH DEVELOPMENT**
- □ Anger Management (Not ART)
- □ Anger Replacement Therapy
- □ Community Service
- □ Community Detention Program
- □ Gang Prevention/Intervention
- □ Independent Living
- □ JAWS
- □ Life Skills/Social Skills
- □ Mentoring
- □ Pro-Social Comm Activities
- □ Transitional Housing
- □ Vocational Programming
- □ Other: ___________________

**EDUCATION**
- □ Appt. w/ School Counseling
- □ 317(e) Referral
- □ AB 167 Appropriate
- □ Behavioral Support Services
- □ Career Survey
- □ CAHSEE Prep
- □ Credit Recovery Program
- □ Daily Attendance Monitoring
- □ Weekly Attendance Mon.
- □ Enroll Youth in School
- □ ERMHS
- □ FAA/FBA
- □ Graduation Check
- □ IEP Team Meeting
- □ One-to-One Aide
- □ Regional Center Referral
- □ Responsible Adult for Ed Rgts
- □ Section 504 Plan
- □ SST
- □ Tutoring
- □ Other: ___________________
Tracking Data Collection
6 months after disposition, DCFS provides tracking data

- Was dependency case still open or terminated?
- Was youth re-referred to DCFS during this period
- Permanency Plan at the beginning and end of this period
- # of contacts between supervising social worker and youth (by type)
- Living situation—beginning and end of this period
- Did youth’s placement change? If so, where was youth living at end of this period?
- Enrolled in school at end of this period
- Type of school attending
- Attendance level at the end of this period
- Current grades at the end of this period
- School discipline issues during this period
- Behavioral issues during this period

6 months after disposition, Probation provides tracking data

- Was delinquency still open or terminated?
- # of contacts between supervising DPO and youth (by type)
- New citations during this period
- Court ordered violations during this period
- Violations (WIC 777) during this period
- New arrests during this period
- Sustained petitions during this period
- Did youth receive a reassessment
- Did youth’s disposition change
- Living situation—beginning and end of this period
- Did youth’s placement change? If so, where was youth living at end of this period?
- Enrolled in school at end of this period
- Type of school attending
- Attendance level at the end of this period
- Current grades at the end of this period
- School discipline issues during this period
- Behavioral issues during this period
DCFS, Probation, and DMH complete the Service GRID to capture the status of referrals/services during this period.

The following is answered for all Probation Conditions ordered by the Court:

- No Longer Applies
- Adhered
- Violated
- Completed

The following is answered for all assessments and services listed earlier (most recent status for any particular assessment/service is coded):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Referral/Service</th>
<th>Agency(s) Responsible for This Referral/Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ Referral In Prog ☐ Referral Needed ☐ Youth Refused ☐ Completed</td>
<td>☐ Prob ☐ DCFS ☐ DMH ☐ DPH ☐ School ☐ Attorney ☐ Caretaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Identify members for subcommittees
• Work with OCP Prevention Workgroup and YDD Steering Committee to identify how to coordinate efforts
• Schedule meetings for subcommittees