

# **A Summary of Findings for the Los Angeles County 241.1 Multidisciplinary Team**

## **Report to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors—May 2015**

**Denise C. Herz, Ph.D.**  
**School of Criminal Justice & Criminalistics**  
**California State University—Los Angeles**

### **Overview of the 241.1 MDT Research Project**

The 241.1 Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) began as a pilot program in the Pasadena delinquency courts in May 2007 under the direction of Judge Michael Nash and the Crossover Committee (an interdisciplinary committee tasked with improving the 241.1 process in Los Angeles County). Since that time, all participating agencies have contributed to data collection efforts. The amount and type of data have varied over time because no resources were dedicated to data collection, and the task added to an already long list of responsibilities for these agencies. Nonetheless, the agencies were committed to driving practice with data and worked with Dr. Denise Herz to capture the evolution of the MDT program with as much data as possible.

With the passage of the Board Motion to provide funds to support the addition of DMH psychiatric social workers for the 241.1 MDT, the need for data grew to include the tracking of outcomes for youth who received a 241.1 MDT assessment and plan. To support this requirement, the agencies and Dr. Herz devoted their time to develop data collection tools, and DCFS committed resources through their Bureau of Information Systems to build a 241.1 web-based application to collect data from all agencies at the time of the referral, following the assessment, and following disposition. Their work is a testament to their commitment to the 241.1 MDT Program and youth impacted by it especially since no additional resources were provided to support the data collection requirement.

The 241.1 Data Subcommittee members include the following individuals (NOTE: a few of the original members listed below were promoted and moved into different assignments):

- Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS): Wilhelmina Bradley (241.1 Unit), and several representatives from the DCFS Education Unit including Patricia Armani, Denise Prybylla, Gerardo Beltran, and Marcelino Ramos
- Probation: Michael Verner, Mirsha Gomez, Suzanne Lyles, and Delores Bryant-White
- Department of Mental Health (DMH): Nancy Gilbert
- California State University—Los Angeles: Denise Herz

While designed by this committee, the 241.1 Application was programmed by Marcelino Ramos from DCFS-BIS. Without the commitment of all these individuals the 241.1 Application, the data it captures, or this report would not have been possible.

The data system previously in place to record 241.1 referrals was a stand-alone ACCESS database that simply captured the referrals and limited information related to those referrals. All data presented in previous reports have required additional data collection above and beyond the ACCESS database due to limited information contained within it. The Data Subcommittee merged all previous research efforts with the information required by the Board Motion to create a comprehensive data collection tool. Marcelino Ramos, DCFS/BIS, was then tasked with building a 241.1 application to capture all of this information and give Probation and DMH access to limited screens for data entry. Additionally, Patty Armani, Education Consultant Services Program, was working with BIS to create the On-Line Education Consultant Services System. To avoid duplication of systems, BIS worked to connect the 241.1 Application to this system for efficient and effective data collection. The 241.1 Application was finished in two phases—the first phase was completed in January 2014 (Referral and Initial Form information) and the second phase was completed in February 2014 (Tracking Information).

### Overview of Data and Methods Used for the Current Report

The use of the 241.1 Application to capture all 241.1 referrals made to the DCFS and Probation 241.1 Units began on October 1, 2013. The database was used to collect three types of data: Referral Information, Initial Data and Tracking Data.

*Referral Information:* Basic information is captured in the 241.1 Application for all 241.1 referrals received. In addition to demographic and type of 241.1 referral administrative, it also captures administrative information needed by the DCFS 241.1 Unit to process the referrals.

*Initial Data:* For all cases except reassessments, additional characteristics are captured in the 241.1 Application by each agency participating on the Team. For example, DCFS enters information on the youth's history in the agency, Probation enters information about the current offense and prior contact with the juvenile justice system, DMH enters general information on the youth's behavioral health needs (if applicable), and Education Consultants/contracted agencies provide information on the youth's educational status/background. These data reflect the youth's status at the time of the referral, and it is important to note that the information entered by the agencies reflects that contained in the 241.1 Joint Assessment and submitted to the delinquency court in preparation for the 241.1 hearings (i.e., no additional information is collected).

*Tracking Data:* The collection of "Tracking Data" is more limited in scope (i.e., it is only collected for a subsample of referred youth). The subsample of youth is identified each month (beginning in October 2013) from all youth who have an open 300 case prior to receiving a disposition from the delinquency court. Specifically, up to 30 of these youth in any particular month are selected as tracking cases. If this list is less than 30, all youth are selected for tracking, but when the number of youth exceeds 30, a random sample of 30 is selected. Both DCFS and Probation are responsible for reporting data on the educational status, placement status, and

services status for tracked youth at two points in time: 6 months after their disposition and 1 year after their disposition or until both the dependency and delinquency cases close—whichever comes first. DMH is also responsible for reporting the services youth received from DMH during these two timeframes.

### **Types of 241.1 Referrals**

There are several types of referrals made to the 241.1 Units. Youth who had an open 300 case and had a pending delinquency petition were the original target population for data collection and the development of the 241.1 MDT; however, the 241.1 Application collects data on all types of referrals.

The target group for this report is still youth with an open 300 case and a pending delinquency petition, but for the first time since data collection began on crossover youth in Los Angeles, we now can report the distribution of all types of referrals. For clarity, a brief description of the different types of referrals is provided below:

- *300 youth with a pending delinquency petition:* These youth have an open DCFS court-involved case, are charged with criminal charges, and are awaiting a delinquency court hearing (hereafter referred to as “300 youth”).
- *Emergency Referral (ER), Voluntary Family Maintenance (VFM), Legal Guardian (LG) with a pending delinquency petition:* These youth do not have substantiated cases in dependency court, but they were involved with DCFS in some way when they were charged with a criminal offense and, consequently, face a delinquency court hearing.
- *Declared 602 youth with a pending dependency decision:* These youth are wards of the delinquency court at the time of their referral and subsequently, a case is opened on them in DCFS.
- *Reassessments:* Youth with reassessments were previously 241.1 referrals who received a delinquency disposition and are now returning to court because (1) the court has requested to see them; (2) they committed a new charge; and/or (3) they are being charged with a Probation violation.
- *Reverse 241.1 and AB 12 Referrals:* These are referrals for wards of the delinquency court who are requesting a return to dependency because their delinquency dispositions are coming to an end (NOTE: AB 12 is a bit more complicated than this description—readers are referenced to the protocols for AB 12 youth for more specific information).

It should be noted that except for reassessment referrals, all referrals are “new”—in other words, even though the youth referred may have been on Probation in the past, they are not under Probation supervision at the time of the referral. Additionally, some youth

receive multiple 241.1 referrals within the same timeframe; thus, unless the narrative in a particular section indicates otherwise, the unit of analysis is referrals not individuals. In the case of referrals, one youth may be represented several times due to multiple referrals.

### **Purpose of this Report**

The current report presents a summary of 241.1 referrals in 2013 and 2014 and the dispositions received by “300 youth” in 2012, 2013, and 2014. Additionally, the characteristics of “300 youth” and tracked cases as well as the 6-month outcomes for tracked youths are presented.

### **Results for 241.1 Referral Types and Dispositions**

#### **Types of 241.1 Referrals (*Table 1*)**

- The overall number of 241.1 referrals received in 2013 and 2014 was similar across years.
- When comparing the general categories of referrals, the distribution of referrals was similar across years—with about half of the cases falling into “new” cases with a pending delinquency petition, and more than a third of cases falling into “reassessment.” One difference was noticeable, though: the percentage of “new” referrals was slightly higher than reassessments in 2013, but in 2014, the percentage of reassessments was slightly higher than “new” cases.
- The data in 2014 allow for a deeper understanding of the general categories of referrals discussed above. Based on more detailed information, “300 youth” account for the largest proportion of “new” cases, but they do not represent the majority of all 241.1 referrals. For reassessments, “reassessment because of court request/order” is the slightly more prevalent than other types of reassessments.

**Table 1: Type of 241.1 Referrals Received in 2013 and 2014\***

Type of Referral	2013 Referrals (N=1,058)		2014 Referrals (N=1,021)	
	N	%	N	%
<b>“New” 241.1 Referrals</b>				
300 w/pending delinquency hearing	592	56.0	311	30.5
ER, VFM, or LG w/pending delinquency	---	---	105	10.3
300 pending w/pending delinquency hearing	---	---	77	7.5
Declared 602 with ER, VFM, or LG	---	---	23	2.2
Declared 602 with pending 300	---	---	21	2.1
<b>Reassessments—Hearings for 241.1 Cases Already Processed</b>				
Reassessment-Any Type Combined	413	39.0	---	---
Reassessment-Court Request/Order	---	---	236	23.1
Reassessment-New Arrest	---	---	177	17.3
Reassessment-Violation (WIC 777)	---	---	59	5.8
Reverse 241.1	42	4.0	12	1.2
AB 12	11	1.0	---	---

\* Data collected in 2012 was limited to “300 Youth with a Pending Delinquency Petition.” <sup>1</sup>In 2013, there were a total of 1,133 referrals; however, 112 (9.9%) were rejected for processing (i.e., they did not meet the criteria to be processed and were excluded from analysis in this report.

**Types of Dispositions for “300 Youth” 241.1 Referrals (Table 2)**

- Even though the majority of youth received an informal probation disposition, type of informal probation varied by year. In 2012 and 2013, youth were most likely to receive WIC 790, and in 2014, youth were most likely to receive a WIC 654.2 disposition.
- When youth received dual jurisdiction, they were most likely to receive 300/602 Suitable Placement in 2013 and 2014. Although the pattern was similar in 2012, youth received a similar percentage 300/602 Home on Probation and 300/602 Suitable Placement dispositions.
- Youth were almost twice as likely to receive an informal probation disposition in 2012 as in 2013 and 2014. Conversely, 241.1 youth were nearly twice as likely to receive a dual jurisdiction disposition in 2014 compared to 2012 and 2013; and in 2013, youth were approximately twice as likely to become a 602 ward (300 case terminated) in 2012 and 2014.

**Table 2: Dispositions for “300 Youth” 241.1 Referrals in 2012, 2013, and 2014\***

	2012 Referrals (N=255) <sup>1</sup>		2013 Referrals (N=588)		2014 Referrals (N=311)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Case Dismissed</b>	17	6.7	20	3.4	13	4.2
<b>Informal Probation</b>						
WIC 654.2	54	21.2	88	15.0	51	16.4
WIC 725(a)	56	22.0	81	13.8	44	14.2
WIC 790	69	27.1	108	18.4	36	11.6
<b>Dual Jurisdiction</b>						
300/602 Home on Probation	19	7.5	19	3.2	29	9.3
300/602 Suitable Placement	18	7.1	60	10.2	65	20.9
300/602 Camp	7	2.8	5	.9	10	3.2
<b>602 Wardship (300 Closed)</b>						
602 Home on Probation	2	.8	17	2.9	1	.3
602 Suitable Placement	5	2.0	27	4.6	4	1.3
602 Camp	---	---	6	1.0	4	1.3
602 DJJ	---	---	1	.2	---	---
<b>Other/Missing/Pending</b>	8	3.1	156	26.5	54	17.4

*\*NOTES: Data reflect all referrals rather than unique youth—i.e., one youth may have multiple referrals within one timeframe. <sup>1</sup>In contrast to 2013 and 2014 which contain a year’s worth of data, the data in 2012 were only available for the months of January through June, but there is no reason to suspect that the second half of the year would alter the findings of the first half. Finally, the data for 2012 include the beginning of the 241.1 MDT expansion across all delinquency courts.*

### **Characteristics of 241.1 Referrals**

The data presented in this section are taken from the Initial Forms completed by all agencies for “300 youth” between October 2013 and December 2014. No other 241.1 referral types are included in this analysis. The unit of analysis for this section is the individual youth rather than referrals; thus, no youth is represented more than once in the findings presented. During this timeframe, there were 427 241.1 referrals for “300 Youth,” which yielded a total of 402 unique youth. The table on the next page shows the number of referrals across these youth. As shown in Table 3, the majority (68.9%) only had one “new” 241.1 referral during this time, but 19.4% had two, 8.7% had three, and 3.0% had four or five referrals.

**Table 3: Distribution of Multiple “New” 241.1 Referrals for “300 Youth” (N=402)**

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
1 Referral	277	68.9
2 Referrals	78	19.4
3 Referrals	35	8.7
4 Referrals	9	2.2
5 Referrals	3	.8

Finally, it is important to note that 10% and 20% of Initial Data was missing across agencies. Even though missing data is always a concern, we do not believe the missing data, if completed, would change the results dramatically if at all. Moreover, missing data will be corrected in future reports.

**Demographic Characteristics of 241.1 Referrals  
“300 Youth” Only (Table 4)**

- Approximately two-thirds of these 241.1 referrals were male, and a third were female. The proportion of females in this population is higher than in the general juvenile justice system population (typically 20%).
- Just under half of these 241.1 referrals were African-American and a similar percentage were Latino. African-American youth were over-represented at much higher rates in this population compared to the general population as well as the child welfare or juvenile justice systems individually.
- These 241.1 referrals were 16 years old (on average) at the time of their current arrests.
- These youth were most likely to live in group homes at the time of their referral followed by home and with relatives, and just under a fifth of these youth were AWOL from their living situation at the time of their arrest.
- Just under half of these referrals were from only five DCFS Offices: South County, Wateridge, Vermont Corridor, Compton, and Belvedere.

**Table 4: Demographic Characteristics of 241.1 Referrals—“300 Youth” Only (N=402)**

	%
<b>Demographics</b>	
Female	36.6%
Male	63.4%
African-American	44.5%
Latino	43.3%
Caucasian	8.2%
<b>Rounded Average Age at Time of 241.1 Referral</b>	16 years old
<b>Living Situation at Time of Referral</b>	
Group Home	32.3%
Home	17.2%
Relative (Legal Guardian and Not)	16.6%
Foster Care or Legal Guardian	9.9%
Other	20.0%
Missing	16.7%
<b>AWOL at Time of Arrest</b>	15.2%
<b>DCFS Office</b>	
South County	10.7%
Wateridge	10.4%
Vermont Corridor	9.7%
Compton	6.7%
Belvedere	6.2%
Lancaster	5.5%
Pasadena	5.5%
Glendora	5.2%
Torrance	5.0%
San Fernando Valley	4.7%
Santa Clarita	4.7%
Metro North	4.5%
Pomona	4.5%
Palmdale	4.2%
All Other Offices	12.4%



***Involvement with the Child Welfare System (Table 5)***

- At the time of their 241.1 referral, the average number of previous referrals to DCFS for 241.1 tracked youth and/or their families was 10.3.
- The average number of years 241.1 tracked youth spent in the child welfare system was 5 years, and this time was consecutive for half of these youth.
- The permanency plan for a third of these youth at the time of their 241.1 referral was permanent planned living arrangements followed by reunification, remain at home, and guardianship.
- The Children’s Law Center provided counsel for almost all these youth, with more youth in Unit 1.

**Table 5: Involvement in Child Welfare System for 241.1 Referrals  
“300 Youth” Only (N=402)**

	%
<b>Average # of Referrals for Youth’s Family</b>	10.3 Referrals (SD=7.4 Ref.)
<b>Average Length in the System</b>	5.4 Years (SD=4.70 Years)
Time is Consecutive	50.5%
<b>Has Prior 241.1 Referral</b>	12.4%
<b>Permanency Goal at Time of Referral</b>	
Permanent Planned Living Arrangements	32.8%
Reunification	23.6%
Remain at Home	18.9%
Guardianship	6.5%
Other	2.1%
Missing	16.2%
<b>Dependency Counsel</b>	
Children’s Law Center Unit 1	33.3%
Children’s Law Center Unit 2	22.6%
Children’s Law Center Unit 3	20.9%
Panel Attorney	4.2%
Other	2.7%
Missing	16.2%

***Involvement with the Juvenile Justice System (Table 6)***

- Just over a third of these 241.1 referrals were detained at juvenile hall at the time of their arrest.
- These youth were most likely to be charged with a violent charge in the current arrest followed by property offenses, and other offenses. Three-quarters of the violent charges involved an assault of some sort, and over half of the charges were felonies.
- Slightly more than one-quarter of the charges occurred at the youths’ living situations and just under a fifth occurred at school.
- Less than 10% of female 241.1 referrals were recommended for the STAR Court—a program specifically designed for sexually exploited youth.
- One-quarter of youth had a prior criminal charge, and just under a fifth had a prior status offense at the time of their 241.1 referral.
- The majority (three-quarters) of these 241.1 referrals were represented by the Public Defender’s Office.

**Table 6: Involvement in Juvenile Justice System for 241.1 Referrals  
“300 Youth” Only (N=402)**

	%
<b>Detained at Time of Arrest</b>	35.1%
<b>Most Serious Current Charge</b>	
Violent Offense	40.2%
% Violent Offenses Involving an Assault	76.2%
Property Offense	35.3%
Other Offense	28.1%
<b>Type of Charge</b>	
Felony	51.7%
707b Offense	7.5%
Misdemeanor	43.5%
<b>Was Offense Related to...?</b>	
Living Situation	28.6%
School	15.4%
Missing	9.7%
<b>Recommendation to STAR Court (% of Female Youth)</b>	6.1%

<b>Prior Offenses</b>	
Criminal Charges	23.4%
Status Offenses	17.7%
Missing Data	9.7%
<b>Delinquency Counsel</b>	
Public Defender	74.4%
Alternate Public Defender	9.7%
Panel Attorney	5.2%
Other	4.7%
Missing	9.7%

\*Youth may have multiple charges across offense categories; thus, the offense categories do not add up to 100%.

***Mental Health and Substance Abuse Problems (Table 7)***

- One-quarter to one-third of 241.1 referrals had a history of hospitalization for mental illness, were prescribed medication, and/or experienced suicide ideation. Just about one-tenth of these youth had attempted suicide at some point in the past.
- Three-quarters of these 241.1 referrals had a mental health diagnosis, and slightly more than half had a pattern of alcohol/drug use and/or diagnosed abuse or dependency.

**Table 7: The Prevalence of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Problems for 241.1 Referrals “300 Youth” Only (N=402)**

	%
<b>Mental Health History</b>	
Ever Placed in Psychiatric Hospital	31.6%
Experienced Suicidal Ideation	22.7%
Ever Attempted Suicide	9.9%
Prescribed Psychotropic Medication	26.6%
<b>Mental Health Diagnoses</b>	
No	1.7%
Yes	73.9%
Unknown/Missing	24.4%
<b>Current Mental Health and/or Substance Abuse Problems</b>	
No Substance Abuse Problem	21.4%
Misuse/Pattern of Use	23.1%
Abuse/Dependency	35.6%

Unknown/Missing	19.9%
-----------------	-------

***Educational Status and Characteristics (Table 8)***

- Partial school records were available for 241.1 referrals more often than complete school records.
- More than a third of these youth did not have an active educational rights holder at the time of the 241.1 assessment.
- Only two-thirds were enrolled in school at the time of the 241.1 assessment, and a few of these youth were enrolled during their detention in juvenile hall.
- Only one-fifth of these youth were attending school regularly; fewer were doing well or doing average academically, half were credit deficient, and a third were either special education eligible or needed to be assessed for eligibility.

**Table 8: Educational Status and Characteristics for 241.1 Referrals  
“300 Youth” Only (N=402)**

	%
<b>School Records Available</b>	
Yes-Partial Records	66.9%
Yes-Complete Records	3.7%
Missing	19.4%
<b>Youth Does Not Have an Active Educational Rights Holder</b>	40.1%
<b>Enrolled in School at Time of 241.1 Assessment</b>	
In the Community	53.7%
In Juvenile Hall	16.1%
Missing	20.9%
<b>Regular Attendance at School within Past Year</b>	20.9%
<b>Doing Well or Average at Time of 241.1 Assessment</b>	17.5%
<b>Credit Deficient at Time of 241.1 Assessment</b>	49.0%
<b>Special Education</b>	
Receiving	31.1%
Needs/Assessment Recommended by MDT	16.3%

**241.1 MDT Meetings: Assessment and Post-Disposition  
“300 Youth” Only (N=402)**

***MDT Meetings for “300 Youth” (Tables 9 and 10)***

- According to the 241.1 Application data available, fewer than three-quarters of these 241.1 youth received an Assessment 241.1 MDT meeting.
- Assessment meetings were attended by a 241.1 DCFS social worker, a 241.1 Deputy Probation Officer, a DMH representative/psychiatric social worker, and an educational consultant (DCFS or contracted agency) nearly all the time. Advocates and program representatives were in attendance much less, and parents/caregivers as well as youth rarely, if ever, attended this meeting.
- Slightly less than one-third of these youth received a Post-241.1 MDT meeting.
- Post-241.1 MDT meetings were most likely to be attended by the 241.1 DCFS social worker, the case carrying social worker, a DMH representative/psychiatric social worker, the parents/caregivers/family, and the youth. Also in attendance, albeit less often, were Probation representatives, educational consultants, and advocates (e.g., CLC) and program representatives (NOTE: Probation may have attended most if not all the meetings but the Probation representatives covered meetings individually rather than together).

**Table 9: Assessment 241.1 MDT Meetings and Who Attended for 241.1 Referrals  
“300 Youth” Only (N=402)**

	%
<b>Received an Assessment 241.1 MDT Meeting</b>	71.9%
<b>Who Attended the Assessment 241.1 MDT Meeting</b>	
241.1 Unit DCFS CSW	99.6%
241.1 Unit Probation Officer	99.0%
DMH/Psychiatric Social Worker	96.5%
Education Consultant	92.0%
Other DCFS Social Worker (e.g., case-carrying CSW)	99.6%
Children’s Law Center	10.3%
Other Program Representative/Advocate	10.3%
Parents/Caregivers	1.0%
Youth	.7%

**Table 10: Post-241.1 MDT Meetings and Who Attended for 241.1 Referrals  
“300 Youth” Only (N=402)**

<b>Received a Post 241.1 MDT Meeting</b>	36.8%
<b>Who Attended the Post 241.1 MDT Meeting</b>	
241.1 Unit DCFS CSW	99.1%
241.1 Unit Probation Officer	49.3%
DMH/Psychiatric Social Worker	91.4%
Education Consultant	28.4%
Other DCFS Social Worker (e.g., case-carrying CSW)	91.4%
Supervising Deputy Probation Officer	55.2%
Children’s Law Center	16.4%
Other Program Representative/Advocate	29.3%
Parents/Caregivers/Other Family	81.2%
Youth	92.2%

**Results for Services Received by Tracked Youth**

Tracking data collected in the first period provided insight into which services youth received and the extent to which they were participating in those services as well as which Probation conditions tracked youth received. Specifically, this section identifies the services tracked 241.1 youth received and their status in those services at the end of tracking period 1 (i.e., 6 months after disposition).

**Mental Health Services Received During Tracking Period 1 (Tables 11 and 12)**

- Based on the prevalence of diagnoses and history of mental health problems, it would appear that at least three-quarters of 241.1 tracked youth need mental health services. According to the service data provided, nearly all youth received some type of mental health service (NOTE: The data currently available do not allow for testing the “appropriateness” of services).
- The top four mental health services received by 241.1 tracked youth were: (1) individual counseling, (2) group counseling, (3) medication monitoring, and (4) family counseling.
- Half or more of these youth were participating in services at the end of the tracking period, but between a quarter and a third of youth were not participating in these services.

**Table 11: Prevalence of Mental Health Problems for 241.1 Tracked Youth (N=62)**

	%
<b>Does Youth have a Mental Health Diagnoses</b>	75.8%
Unknown/Missing	12.6%
<b>Mental Health History</b>	
Ever Placed in Psychiatric Hospital	33.9%
Experienced Suicidal Ideation	27.4%
Ever Attempted Suicide	12.9%
Prescribed Psychotropic Medication	27.4%
<b>241.1 Tracked Youth Receiving Mental Health Services in Tracking Period 1</b>	55 (88.7%)

**Table 12: Top Four Mental Health Services Received and Youth Status in Those Services at the End of Tracking Period 1 (N=55)**

Type of Service Received	N (%)	Status in Services at End of Tracking Period				
		Refer	Part	Not Attending	Comp	Term
Individual Treatment	55 (100%)	---	71.2%	25.4%	5.4%	---
Group Treatment	29 (52.7%)	6.8%	65.5%	31.0%	3.4%	---
Medication Monitoring	24 (43.6%)	---	66.7%	16.0%	---	---
Family Treatment	18 (32.7%)	16.7%	55.5%	27.8%	5.5%	---

NOTE: “---” denotes “Not Applicable.” Percentages across the types of services do not necessarily add to 100% because the status could be missing for a particular service. Additionally, percentages may add to more than 100% if a particular service was entered more than once.

**Substance Abuse Services Received During Tracking Period 1 (Tables 13 and 14)**

- Based on the prevalence of substance abuse problems for 241.1 tracked youth, it would appear that at least one-half of youth need substance abuse services, with a third needing services more intensive than alcohol and drug education. According to the service data provided, just over half of the tracked youth received some type of substance abuse service (NOTE: The data currently available do not allow for testing “appropriateness” of services).
- Over half of youth receiving substance abuse services received drug and alcohol education, one quarter received outpatient treatment, and less than one-fifth were placed in inpatient treatment.
- Half or more of these youth were participating in services at the end of the tracking period, but between a quarter and a third of youth were not participating in these services.

**Table 13: Prevalence of Substance Abuse for 241.1 Tracked Youth (N=62)**

	%
<b>Current Mental Health and/or Substance Abuse Problems</b>	
No Substance Abuse Problem	40.3%
Misuse/Pattern of Use	21.0%
Abuse/Dependency	33.8%
Unknown/Missing	4.8%
<b>241.1 Tracked Youth Receiving Substance Abuse Services in Tracking Period 1</b>	34 (54.8%)



**Table 14: Substance Abuse Treatment Services Received and Youth Status in Those Services at the End of Tracking Period 1 (N=34)**

Type of Service Received	N (%)	Status in Services at End of Tracking Period				
		Refer	Part	Not Attending	Comp	Term
Drug/Alcohol Education	18 (52.9%)	22.2%	50.0%	---	27.8%	---
Drug/Alcohol Outpatient	9 (26.5%)	---	44.4%	55.6%	---	---
Drug/Alcohol Inpatient	6 (17.6%)	---	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%	---

NOTE: “---“ denotes “Not Applicable.” Percentages across the types of services do not necessarily add to 100% because the status could be missing for a particular service. Additionally, percentages may add to more than 100% if a particular service was entered more than once.

**Behavioral/Social Services During Tracking Period 1 (Table 15)**

- Of all 241.1 tracked youth, over three-quarters received at least one behavioral/social service.
- The top four behavioral/social services were (1) anger management (Not ART); (2) independent living programs; (3) life skill programs; and (4) mentoring programs.
- Participation rates were highest for 241.1 tracked youth placed in life skills training and anger management (Not ART). Participation was lowest for independent living programs and for mentoring programs—in both situations, a high percentage of youth were referred only and had not been able to access those services yet.

**Table 15: Behavioral/Social Programs Received and Youth Status in Those Programs at the End of Tracking Period 1 (N=52)**

*NOTE: 52 out of the 62 (83.9%) Tracked Youth Received a Behavioral/Social Service*

Type of Service Received	N (%)	Status in Services at End of Tracking Period				
		Refer	Part	Not Attending	Comp	Term
Anger Management	33 (63.4%)	18.1%	60.1%	9.0%	6.0%	3.0%
Independent Living Program	13 (25.0%)	53.8%	23.1%	23.1%	---	---
Life Skills Program	11 (21.2%)	27.2%	63.6%	9.0%	---	---
Mentoring Program	8 (15.4%)	37.5%	37.5%	12.5%	12.5%	---

NOTE: “---“ denotes “Not Applicable.” Percentages across the types of services do not necessarily add to 100% because the status could be missing for a particular service. Additionally, percentages may add to more than 100% if a particular service was entered more than once.

**Educational Services During Tracking Period 1 (Table 16)**

- Of all 241.1 tracked youth, over three-quarters received at least one educational service.
- The top three educational services received by 241.1 tracked youth were (1) tutoring; (2) attendance monitoring; and (3) referrals for AB 167 and 317E (combined in this analysis).
- “Referral only” rates were highest for scheduling an individualized education plan meeting, making an AB 126/317E referral, and accessing assistance for the CAHSEE. Participation rates were highest for tutoring and attendance monitoring but non-attendance was highest among tutoring services as well. Non-attendance was also high for credit recovery and CAHSEE assistance programs.

**Table 16: Educational/School-Based Services Received and Youth Status in Those Services at the End of Tracking Period 1 (N=53)**

*NOTE: 53 out of the 62 (85.5%) Tracked Youth Received an Educational Service*

Type of Service Received	N (%)	Status in Services at End of Tracking Period				
		Refer	Part	Not Attending	Comp	Term
Tutoring Services	35 (66.0%)	17.1%	48.6%	31.4%	2.8%	---
Attendance Monitoring	32 (60.4%)	9.4%	56.2%	15.6%	9.4%	6.3%
AB 126 & 317E Combined	24 (45.3%)	25.0%	12.5%	12.5%	16.7%	16.7%
Credit Recovery	22 (41.5%)	27.2%	36.4%	22.7%	9.1%	---
Individual Educ. Plan Meeting	21 (39.6%)	38.1%	23.8%	14.3%	19.0	---
CAHSEE Assistance	16 (30.2%)	43.7%	6.2%	31.2%	18.8%	---

NOTE: “---“ denotes “Not Applicable.” Percentages across the types of services do not necessarily add to 100% because the status could be missing for a particular service. Additionally, percentages may add to more than 100% if a particular service was entered more than once.

**Probation Conditions (Table 17)**

- Based on the data provided in the 241.1 Application, all but two of the 241.1 tracked youth received probation conditions.
- The top four Probation conditions received by 241.1 tracked youth were: (1) attend school and maintain grades; (2) participate in family counseling; (3) perform community service; and (4) do not drink alcoholic beverages.
- *NOTE: Due to time constraints, youth status on each of the conditions is not reported but will be included in the next report.*

**Table 17: Probation Conditions Received by Type (N=58)**

*NOTE: 58 out of the 62 (93.5%) Tracked Youth had Probation Conditions from the Court.*

<b>Probation Condition Received</b>	<b>N (%)</b>
9-Attend School and Maintain Grades	55 (94.8%)
30-Participate in Family Counseling	46 (79.3%)
8-Perform Community Service	41 (70.7%)
17-Not Drink Alcoholic Beverages	36 (62.1%)
9a-Participate in HS Grad/GED/WIN Program	29 (50.0%)
19-Must Submit to Drug Testing	22 (37.9%)
10-Participate in Afterschool/Tutoring Program	22 (37.9%)
18-Not Be Around Using or Selling Drugs	20 (34.5%)
13b-Do Not Participate in Gang Activity	18 (31.0%)
20-Random Testing for Drugs/Alcohol	17 (29.3%)

**Findings for 241.1 Tracked Youth Outcomes**

Using data collected from the first tracking period, this section explores how youth are doing on the following measures: school performance, reassessments, and new violations and/or arrests.

**Educational Outcomes at the End of Tracking Period 1  
(Table 18)**

- Between the 241.1 assessment and the end of tracking period 1, enrollment in school dropped slightly (-2%).
- The percentage of credit deficient youth dropped slightly (-3%).
- Regular attendance increased dramatically (+39%) while sporadic attendance and poor attendance dropped (-24% and -3%, respectively).
- Doing poorly at school dropped 23 percentage points while doing average (mostly C's) increased 24 percentage points.

**Table 18: Educational Outcomes for Tracked Youth  
at the End of Tracking Period 1 (N=62)**

	<b>At the Beginning of Period 1</b>	<b>At the End of Period 1</b>
<b>Enrolled in School</b>	90.4%	88.3%
<i>Graduated/GED</i>	---	3.2%
<b>Credit Deficient</b>	61.3%	58.1%
<b>School Attendance</b>		
Attends Regularly	24.2%	62.9%
Attends Sporadically	38.7%	14.5%
Poor Attendance	22.6%	19.4%
<b>Academic Performance at the End of Period 1*</b>		
Doing Well	12.9%	11.3%
Doing Average	8.1%	32.3%
Doing Poorly	64.5%	42.0%
Unknown	15.5%	15.5%

**Recidivism at the End of Tracking Period 1 (Table 19)**

- Between the 241.1 assessment and the end of tracking period 1, one-fifth of 241.1 tracked youth were referred for a 241.1 reassessment.
- One third of these youth had a court violation (e.g. a bench warrant) during the tracking period, and slightly less than one-fifth had a WIC 777 probation violation filed.
- 14.5% of 241.1 tracked youth had a new citation and 16.1% were re-arrested for a new criminal offense within 6 months of their disposition.

**Table 19: Reassessments and Recidivism for Tracked 241.1 Youth (N=62)**

	<b>At the End of Period 1</b>
<b>Referred for a 241.1 Reassessment Hearing</b>	19.4%
<b>Violations During Period 1</b>	
Court Violations During this Period	30.6%
WIC 777 Violations During this Period	17.7%
<b>New Charges During Period 1</b>	
New Citations During this Period	14.5%
New Arrests During this Period	16.1%

### **Summary of Findings**

The findings from the 241.1 data collected by DCFS, Probation, and the Department of Mental Health provide unprecedented insight into “who” 241.1 youth are, the challenges they face, the services and conditions they receive, their participation/adherence to those services and conditions, and their outcomes. Although the numbers for tracked cases was still relatively small, the findings are consistent with last year’s report and previous research completed in Los Angeles County and nationwide on crossover youth. Confidence in these findings and increased insight into these youths’ experiences will continue to grow as the number of 241.1 youth included in analysis for future reports increases over time. In sum, this is what the current findings tell us:

#### Characteristics

- ❖ Females are more likely to be in the crossover population (i.e., WIC 241.1/involved in both child welfare and juvenile justice systems) than in the general juvenile justice population.
- ❖ The overrepresentation of African-American youth is greater within the crossover population than in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems individually.
- ❖ These youth and their families have multiple contacts with child welfare and the youth have long lengths of stay in the child welfare system.
- ❖ By the time they reach the 241.1 referral stage, many of these youth have had previous contact with the juvenile justice system by way of a criminal charge and/or a status offense.
- ❖ They are most likely to live in a group homes or with relatives; and at least a third of their arrests are related to their living situations.

- ❖ These youth are struggling at school and engaged in behavioral problems that often lead to their current arrest (i.e., the charge occurred at school).
- ❖ Almost all of these youth have an indication of a mental health problem and/or an alcohol/drug problem.

### System Responses

- ❖ Almost all of the 241.1 tracked youth received mental health services and most were participating in those services during Tracking Period 1, non-attendance rates were highest for group treatment and family treatment. Slightly less than a fifth were referred but hadn't accessed services yet.
- ❖ Only half of 241.1 tracked youth received alcohol/drug services, but half these services were alcohol/drug education. Non-attendance rates exceed participation rates for outpatient treatment and the two rates were equivalent for inpatient services.
- ❖ More than three-quarters of 241.1 tracked youth received behavioral/social interventions. Participation rates were highest for anger management and life skills programming, and non-attendance rates were highest for independent living programs. "Referral only" rates were also very high for independent living and mentoring.
- ❖ Over three-quarters of 241.1 tracked youth received educational services related to tutoring, enrollment or credit recovery. Most youth were participating in these services.
- ❖ Over three-quarters of 241.1 tracked youth also received one or more educational services. Tutoring and attendance monitoring had the highest rates of participation but tutoring also had one of the highest non-attendance rates. Non-attendance was also high for credit recovery programs. "Referral only" rates were high for all educational services except tutoring and attendance monitoring.
- ❖ The top four Probation conditions received by 241.1 tracked youth were: (1) attend school and maintain grades; (2) participate in family counseling; (3) perform community service; and (4) do not drink alcoholic beverages.

### Outcomes for 241.1 Tracked youth

- ❖ 241.1 tracked youth appeared to improve their attendance and their academic performance over time; however, the change, while positive, was modest and greater

with youth on the margins of poor performance.

- ❖ Recidivism, as measured by new arrests, at the end of tracking was only 16.1%. *NOTE: Once recidivism rates are measured at 1 year after disposition, the performance of these youth can be compared to the recidivism rates of 241.1 youth not served by the MDT (collected from a previous study).*
- ❖ It should be noted, though, that a significant number had received bench warrants and/or were referred for a 241.1 reassessment.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

Similar to last year's report, these findings indicate that youth are receiving services related to the challenges they face. However, it appears that substance abuse continues to be an issue for some youth. Such problems can, in turn affect their placement, education, and recidivism outcomes. The results presented in this report raise questions about the appropriateness of treatment as well as the ability of agencies to connect youth and families to appropriate services.

The literature on effective programming and outcomes for youth with complex needs and risk factors is clear: Effective services require (1) matching youth needs and risks to appropriate levels of service, (2) using multi-modal treatments to address different risks and needs (often related) simultaneously, and (3) meaningfully engaging youth and their families in services. The findings presented in the current report lay the foundation for looking at these issues more directly for dually-involved youth in Los Angeles County, and as the data continue to grow, it will be possible to track trends for these youth and determine what characteristics and services are related to more positive outcomes and how strategies can be built to address the characteristics of youth with more challenging outcomes.

One final note is on the need to provide appropriate resources for data collection mandates is necessary. As mentioned earlier in this report, the design and implementation of the 241.1 Application is a major accomplishment and "labor of love" for a number of agency staff who work with dually-involved youth on a daily basis. Despite the Board's mandate to collect data, no resources were provided to support this work. Consequently, staff workloads continuously impact the timeliness and accuracy of data entered into the database (e.g., in theory, this report should have contained information on tracked youth for six to eight months rather than three months). If resourced appropriately (i.e., each agency would have daily access to a staff person who is knowledgeable in data information systems and data collection), the data produced in the 241.1 Application could be used for



real-time analysis and case management of all 241.1 cases. Until that time, however, 241.1 Application data will continue to need substantial cleaning prior to analysis, which will delay report writing, and unfortunately, will result in the Application being underutilized and undervalued by all of its participating agencies.