



2020 Special Committee on Foster Care Oversight

September 22, 2020

Crossover Youth Working Group Final Report Key Findings

Presented by:

Tanya Keys

Deputy Secretary

Kansas Department for Children and Families

Ethan Belshe, Government Relations Manager
DCF Administration Building, 6th Floor
(785) 296-8378 ethan.belshe@ks.gov
www.dcf.ks.gov

Testimony of:

Tanya Keys, Deputy Secretary

Kansas Department for Children and Families

Chair Concannon, Vice Chair Baumgardner, and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to share key findings from the final report of the Crossover Youth Working Group. We appreciate the dedicated participation across disciplines in the working group and data task group in 2019 and were grateful for the facilitation and report preparation provided by Hina Shah and colleagues at the Kansas Health Institute (KHI.) My remarks focus on key takeaways and findings from data analysis of the workgroup regarding sixteen (16) specific data elements set forth in the 2019 legislative budget proviso.

Background and Data Methods

In 2019, House Substitute for SB 25 included a budget proviso legislatively mandating DCF to convene two working groups to study the impact of SB 367 on "crossover" youth. Youth involved in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems are referred to as "crossover" youth. The involvement of youth in each system might vary widely. The first working group, the Crossover Youth Services Working Group, met in fiscal year (FY) 2019 and identified themes, challenges and needed services. The second working group, the Crossover Youth Working Group met July 2019 to January 2020 to gather and study 16 specific data elements.

The working group collected data only from FY 2019 and designed a retrospective, cross-sectional study to assess crossover youth and comparison group demographics and variables of interest. Data sources included DCF, KDOC, KBI, KDADS, KDHE, and OJA. The group focused on the "in foster care" group, and DCF foster care contractors, KVC Kansas and Saint Francis Ministries identified 691 crossover youth to include in a case review for data elements. Crossover youth were identified at a single point in time, July 31, 2019, based upon behaviors and involvement that may have occurred years before.

The crossover case review cohort was identified as youth age 10 and older in custody of the Secretary of DCF, who:

- Have had law enforcement calls for behaviors which could result in juvenile offender charges; or,

- Have had law enforcement calls due to repeated runaway behaviors; or,
- Were referred to foster care following juvenile justice system involvement; or,
- Were referred as a result of parents' inability or unwillingness to manage the child's behaviors; or,
- Are involved in the juvenile justice system through diversion or immediate intervention services or programs (IIP); or,
- Have an open juvenile justice case.

Key Takeaways and Challenges

As the workgroup reflected on data points of comparisons for cross over youth in the review and general populations of either children in foster care or various status of juvenile services contact, a few discoveries emerged to consider or inform future practice in assessment, bridge to appropriate level or service delivery and placement stability.

- While they make up only a small segment of the broader foster care or juvenile offender populations, crossover youth often have significantly higher needs and require highly coordinated cross-system collaboration and greater placement stability for services to be effective.
- Contact with law enforcement is an important entry point for crossover youth. Passage of SB 367 limited authority of law enforcement officers to place youth in detention and replaced it with a detention risk assessment with grounds to override. The detention risk assessment is utilized and informs decisions. Statewide policy does not guide data collection on the utilization of services recommended to youth and their families by juvenile intake and assessment services.
- Identifying earlier intervention needs and using services through community mental health centers (CMHCs) is needed and acute care is needed for youth who are actively a danger to themselves such as runaways. A significant barrier to services is placement instability. Children in the child welfare prevention or foster care are not consistently assessed for the serious emotional disturbance (SED) waiver.

A central challenge for the working group is that crossover youth are not captured in data collection systems. There is a lack of integrated data systems across state agencies and other entities and a lack of centralized law enforcement data. A concurrent challenge in the effort was an inability to define or identify individuals "at-risk" of becoming crossover youth and a lack of existing mechanisms for information sharing between agencies. Although these short-term challenges limited the 2019 data

analysis, the working group recognizes future efforts at a Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System (CCWIS) and implementation of the Georgetown Crossover Youth Practice Model will inform and provide long term relief or remedy to help define, track and impact Kansas outcomes for crossover youth.

Data collection involved demographics, nature and type of contacts, juvenile intake and assessment, services and placements. As we review data analysis of the sixteen (16) proviso point elements, key findings are noted and current activity underway related to the data findings is highlighted.

Proviso Point 1: Numbers and **demographics** of crossover youth compared to the broader juvenile offender population. This review identified 691 crossover youth and 2,446 youth in the broader juvenile offender population.

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

- a) 42.7% crossover youth in this review were female compared 22.3% of youth in broader juvenile offender population.
- b) Half (45.7%) of the crossover youth in this review were age 16-17 and another one-third (32.1 percent) were age 14-15 which is generally like the broader juvenile offender population.
- c) 70.3 % crossover youth in this review and 63.7% the broader juvenile offender population were non-Hispanic Whites.

Related Program or Practice Activity

- a) The ages of youth who crossover services and proportion of females parallels demographics of youth who experience absences or run experiences in foster care.
- b) DCF has increased training and practice model development for workforce on youth engagement and implemented a 12-member special response team across the state to increase placement stability for youth and prevent run behavior. [practice approaches include Motivational Interviewing, Let's Talk: Runaway Prevention curriculum for the National runaway Safeline®, Mental Health First Aid for Adolescents, Family Finding, Cognitive Interaction Skills]

Proviso Point 2: Types and nature of calls to law enforcement related to crossover youth compared to the broader juvenile offender population. There were 222 crossover youth in the review that had arrests with criminal charges in FY 2019

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

- a) 38.7% were charged with felonies and 60% charged with misdemeanors.
- b) 37.8% crossover youth in the review were adjudicated as juvenile offenders with property crimes in FY 2019 compared to 27.1% of the youth in the broader juvenile offender population.

Proviso Point 3: Numbers and nature of alleged offender behaviors of **crossover youth taken into custody by law enforcement** could not be conducted as Law enforcement does not have a consistent, centralized data collection system and reliable data on criminal charges for youth returned home.

Proviso Point 4: Numbers and nature of alleged offender behaviors of **crossover youth taken for intake and assessment.** In FY 2019, 100 crossover youth in this review had at least one criminal damage to property charge recorded at intake by a JIAS worker.

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

- a) Law enforcement officers detained crossover youth (in this review cohort) for transport to JIAS 18 times in FY 2019 for exhibiting assaultive/destructive behavior.

Proviso Point 5: Release and referral determinations, including rates of detention, from intake and assessment process for crossover youth alleged to have engaged in behavior that may cause injury to self or others or damage to property and youth who pose a risk to public safety.

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

Of the 1,194 placement outcomes following juvenile intake for the crossover youth in the review:

- a) 24.7% resulted in a detention placement
- b) 20.9% resulted in a crossover youth being sent back to a parent or guardian.

Proviso Point 6: Use of **detention risk assessment override for crossover youth**

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

- a) Crossover youth in this review had 2.1 KDAI completions and other youth had 1.4 KDAI completions. Average score on the KDAI for crossover youth was 5 (low risk).
- b) 65.5% of overrides resulted in detention (high risk)
- c) The main override reasons in FY 2019 included no appropriate alternative available (37.2%)

Proviso Point 7 and 8: Services; Number of crossover youth received EB services and nature of services.

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

- a) Acute Mental Health – Inpatient
- b) Aggression Replacement Therapy(ART)
- c) Cognitive Behavior Therapy (CBT)
- d) Functional Family Therapy (FFT) – thirteen (13) crossover youth in the review were referred to FFT in FY2019.
- e) Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT)
- f) Multisystemic Therapy (MST)
- g) Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility
- h) Community Mental Health Center
- i) Parent mgmt. Training-Oregon PMTO
- j) Substance Use Disorder
- k) Youth Advocate Program YAP
- l) DCF implemented well supported evidence based FFT in the Kansas City Region and MST in several jurisdictions statewide 10/1/2020 through Family First Act implementation.

Related Future Program or Practice Activity

DCF issued a Request for Proposal through the Department of Administration bid solicitation process for Kansas Family Crisis Response and Support. This service amplifies the continuum of crisis care services for any child in Kansas and adults who are foster care alum up to age 21. The scope of work includes managing a 24/7 crisis call center operation and triage assessment for families or caregivers who have a child experience an emotional crisis. Based on the situation and needs of the child, there may be mobile response to the family or child's location for assessment and coordination of supportive services or connection to appropriate screening for treatment.

Proviso Point 9: Any other juvenile offender information routinely captured by the DOC.

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

The Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument – Second Version (MAYSI-2) screens and scores across six domains, and youth might receive a “caution” or “warning” designation. “Warning” represents a higher level of need or concern in that domain.

- a) 23% of MAYSI-2 assessments completed indicated a caution for somatic complaint, such as anxiety or depression, in FY 2019.
- b) 17.6% MAYSI-2 assessments completed indicated a warning for suicide ideation

Proviso Point 10: Information on the **types and classifications of placements** used by crossover youth placed in foster care

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

- a) Crossover youth were more than twice as likely to be placed in group residential homes than were other foster care youth in FY 2019 (36.1% compared to 14.7 percent).
- b) 10.1% crossover youth were placed with a relative compared to 28.7% other foster care youth.
- c) No crossover youth received a pre-adoptive placement in FY 2019; however, one in twelve (8.5 percent) other foster care youth received a pre-adoptive placement that year.

Related Program or Practice Activity

- a) Implemented 10/1/19, Family First Act requires youth placed in Qualified Residential Treatment Program (QRTP) receive independent evaluation within 30 days of placement. That evaluation is provided to court to approve or disapprove continued placement in group care. The goal is to increase family-based placement settings.
- b) 7/1/20, Foster Care Case Management grant outcomes will increase the goal for relative placement from 29% to 50%.
- c) Youth engagement, support to relatives and licensed family homes and family finding are being amplified to increase family-based placements.
- d) A treatment transition level of care (rate) was created January 2020 to support relative and foster caregivers to support active engagement and discharge

planning task coordination for youth after acute or psychiatric residential treatment stays.

Proviso Point 11: Information on **placement stability** of crossover youth placed in foster care

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

- a) In FY 2019, the placement stability rate for crossover youth in this review was 26.1 compared to a rate of 9.7 for all Kansas foster care youth (including crossover youth).
- b) The average number of placements was eight placements for crossover youth compared to three placements for other foster care youth.
- c) Data for June 2020 reflects an improved placement stability for all Kansas foster care youth of 5.9; however, recent data is not available for current crossover youth.

Proviso Point 12: Use of PRTF by crossover youth including waitlist data

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

- a) In FY 2019, there were 282 beds available for youth at the eight PRTFs across the state.
- b) In FY 2019, 93 (14.2%) crossover youth in this review were admitted to a PRTF.
- c) The average stay for crossover youth at a PRTF was four ½ months (137 days).
- d) As of 9/7/2020, there were 18 youth in foster care on the waitlist for PRTF with a capacity of 336 beds across the state. It is not known how many of these 18 experienced a circumstance to meet the definition of crossover youth.

Proviso Point 13: Any other reportable event information routinely captured by the department of corrections

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

- a) The average age at first intake and assessment for a crossover youth in this review was 12.2 compared to 13.8 for other youth who completed an intake.
- b) 25.3% of the crossover youth in this review already had services in place compared to 10.4% of other youth who completed an intake.

Proviso Point 14: Gaps in available corrections interventions for crossover youth placed at home. The working group did not study crossover youth placed at home because this population group could not be identified

Proviso Point 15: Gaps in available corrections interventions for crossover youth placed in foster care.

Proviso Data Analysis Key Findings

- a) Referral to prevention services offered by DCF might be underutilized by juvenile intake and assessment worker and law enforcement.
- b) A service referral form for locally available services is not readily available for law enforcement.
- c) The totality of crossover youth and its family needs might not be fully assessed.

Proviso Point 16: Other matters relating to the impact of 2016 Senate Bill No. 367 on youth at risk of being placed or placed foster care. The working group considered but did not ultimately study the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide highlights of the final report and key information on practice efforts to impact forwarding action and positive outcomes for youth whose service interaction crosses over multiple systems. I am happy to answer any questions the committee may have.