



County of Los Angeles
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

425 Shatto Place, Los Angeles, California 90020
(213) 351-5602

PHILIP L. BROWNING
Director

BRANDON NICHOLS
Chief Deputy Director

Board of Supervisors

HILDA L. SOLIS
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District

SHEILA KUEHL
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

September 16, 2016

To: Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, Chair
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: Philip L. Browning, Director
Department of Children and Family Services

RESPONSE TO THE MARCH 12, 2013 BOARD MOTION (ITEM NO. 4) ON ENHANCING SERVICES TO STRENGTHEN THE 241.1 PROJECT FOR CROSSOVER YOUTH ANNUAL REPORT

Executive Summary

Per a motion on March 12, 2013 by Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) was instructed, in conjunction with the Directors of the Departments of Mental Health (DMH), Public Health (DPH), Probation, and Children and Family Services (DCFS), to implement the 241.1 Crossover Youth Project recommendations and report annually on the evaluation measures identified in the CEO's November 2012 report.

Per the Board's request, attached is the annual report prepared by Denise Herz, Ph.D., Director and Professor at the School of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics at the California State University, Los Angeles.

If you have any questions or need additional information, you may call me or your staff may contact Aldo Marin, Board Liaison, at (213) 351-5530.

PLB: BN:KR:VS:lj

Enclosure

c: Chief Executive Officer
County Counsel
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Probation Department
Department of Public Health
Department of Mental Health

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

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



Report to the
Los Angeles
County
Board of
Supervisors



CAL STATE LA
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

Denise C. Herz, Ph.D.

School of Criminal Justice & Criminalistics
California State University—Los Angeles

September 2016

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 a Crossover Committee (an interdisciplinary committee tasked with improving the 241.1 process in Los Angeles County) convened and led by Judge Michael Nash. The 241.1 MDT approach evolved from the 241.1 Protocol developed by Judge Nash and the Crossover Committee in 1998 and was implemented countywide in 2012. Below is a brief timeline of the events related to the development and expansion of the 241.1 MDT approach in Los Angeles County.

Timeline for the Development of the 241.1 Multidisciplinary Team Approach in Los Angeles County	
1998	Judge Nash convenes an interagency Crossover Committee and establishes the Los Angeles County 241.1 Protocol.
2005-2006	California passes AB 129 allowing dual jurisdiction in counties that chose to pursue this approach (Note: WIC 241.1 specifically dictates separate jurisdiction between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems). The Crossover Committee begins planning to adopt dual jurisdiction using a multidisciplinary approach.
May 2007	The 241.1 MDT Pilot Program launches in Pasadena Delinquency Courts. The MDT includes one dedicated representative from the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) 241.1 Unit, the Probation 241.1 Unit, and the Department of Mental Health (DMH) Juvenile Court Services Clinician. Additionally, educational reviews were conducted by attorneys from the Learning Rights Center.
October 2011	241.1 MDT expands to Eastlake Delinquency Court—Commissioner Totten’s courtroom and staff in all respective units begin rotating all staff into MDTs. DCFS Educational Consultants replace the education advocacy attorneys when grant money is exhausted.
January 2012	One court at each delinquency court location is dedicated as a 241.1 Court and the 241.1 MDT process is expanded countywide.
September 2012	The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors pass a motion to hire additional psychiatric social workers to ensure countywide coverage for the 241.1 MDTs (funded from Proposition 63-the Mental Health Services Act).

Although some level of data has been collected for the 241.1 MDT since 2007, an institutionalized, web-based system was not in place until 2013 following the passage of the Board Motion to support the addition of DMH psychiatric social workers for the 241.1 MDT. The current data collection effort on which this report is based was led by a 241.1 Data Subcommittee composed of the following representatives (NOTE: a few of the original members listed below were promoted and moved into different assignments):

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

The database used for this effort is an application built onto the DCFS information system (Child Welfare Services/Case Management System-CWS/CMS) by Marcelino Ramos from DCFS-BIS. Access to the database is provided to the DCFS 241.1 Unit, Probation and DMH, making it an interagency-based data collection system. No additional resources were provided to DCFS, Probation, DMH or California State University—Los Angeles; thus, all efforts related to building/maintaining the database, entering data into the database, and cleaning/analyzing the data are either subsumed in current workloads or provided through in-kind services.

A testament to the innovativeness of the 241.1 MDT Database built by Marcelino Ramos is the selection of the database as a recipient of the 2016 Excellence in Technology - Outstanding IT Project Award at the Los Angeles Digital Government Summit.

OVERVIEW OF KEY WIC CODES AND THE DATA METHODS USED FOR THE CURRENT REPORT

Key Welfare and Institutions Codes Related to 241.1

Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) Section 241.1: Requires, in part, that whenever a youth appears to come within the description of both Section 300 and Section 602, DCFS and Probation must initially determine the status that will serve the best interests of the youth and the protection of society. Also defines and addresses "dual status" youth, allows these youth to be simultaneously dependent youth and a ward of the court, and outlines the requirements that DCFS and Probation must meet. It also addresses and defines a "lead court/lead agency" system.

WIC Section 300: States, in part, that children who meet the specified criteria will be considered within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and that the court may adjudge these children to be dependents of the court.

WIC Section 602: States that any individual under the age of eighteen (18) who commits a specified crime is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and may be adjudged by the court to be a ward of the court

NOTE: See Appendix A for a description of delinquency court dispositions descriptions.

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 for 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 can learn more about this particular law by going to <http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/PG2902.htm>).

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 were 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.

Type of Data Collected

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, 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. 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 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.

The cases used for this report include all 241.1 referrals received and accepted for processing between October 1, 2013 and March 31, 2016; however, the data are analyzed by year when appropriate. Given limited resources, tracked cases were limited to youth who received dispositions between October 1, 2013 and July 31, 2014. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the total number of cases available for analysis based on the type of referral examined.

Table 1: Summary of 241.1 Cases Used for Analysis

Type of Case	Number
All 241.1 Referrals Received and Approved for Processing	2,438
All “New” 241.1 Referrals	1,281
“300 youth with a pending delinquency petition”—All Referrals	763
“300 youth with a pending delinquency petition”—Unique Youth	718
Youth Tracked for 6 Months After Disposition (“Tracked Cases”)	152

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The current report presents a summary of (1) 241.1 referrals from 2013 and 2014, and (2) dispositions received by “300 youth with pending delinquency petitions” in 2013, 2014, and 2015. Additionally, the characteristics of all “300 youth with a pending delinquency petition” processed to date are presented as well as 6-month outcomes for tracked youth.

RESULTS FOR 241.1 REFERRAL TYPES AND DISPOSITIONS

241.1 Referrals Received by Type of Referral and by Year (*Table 2*)

- Overall, the number of 241.1 referrals has decreased 13% over time. This decrease was predominately due to lower numbers of youth in the “new” referral category.
- Slightly more than half of all 241.1 referrals were for “new” referrals and the remaining half were associated with “reassessments.”
- Of the “new” referrals, 300 youth with a pending delinquency petition comprised approximately one-third of all referrals and 59% of all “new” referrals.
- The predominant reason for “reassessments” was a court order to see the youth followed by a new arrest and probation violations.

**Table 2: Total Number of 241.1 Referrals Received
by Type of Referral and by Year***

Type of Referral	2013 Referrals (N=1,058)		2014 Referrals (N=1,021)		2015 Referrals (N=920)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
“New” 241.1 Referrals						
<i>New Referrals-All Types Combined*</i>	592	56.0	537	52.6	459	50.0
300 pending delinquency petition	---	---	311	30.5	271	29.5
ER, VFM, or LG pending delinquency petition	---	---	105	10.3	90	9.8
Pending 300 case & pending delinquency petition	---	---	77	7.5	76	8.3
Declared 602 with ER, VFM, or LG	---	---	23	2.2	12	1.3
Declared 602 with pending 300	---	---	21	2.1	10	1.1
Reassessments—Follow-Up Hearings for 241.1 Cases Already Processed						
<i>Reassessment-All Types Combined</i>	413	39.0	484	47.4	454	49.3
Reassessment-Court Order	---	---	236	23.1	211	22.9
Reassessment-New Arrest	---	---	177	17.3	176	19.1
Reassessment-Violation (WIC 777)	---	---	59	5.8	65	7.1
Reverse 241.1	42	4.0	12	1.2	2	.2
AB 12	11	1.0	---	---	---	---
<i>Missing Type of Referral</i>	53	5.0	---	---	7	.8

**Data are limited to cases accepted for processing. In 2013, the type of new referral was not distinguished; thus, these referrals are only presented in the combined category.*

**Dispositions Received by “300 Youth with a
Pending Delinquency Petition” by Year (Table 3)**

- Between 2013 and 2015, case dismissals increased slightly, informal probation dispositions remained relatively constant, dual jurisdiction dispositions more than doubled, and delinquency wardship (alone) dispositions decreased by half.
- “300 youth with a pending delinquency petition” were most likely to receive an informal probation disposition regardless of year. Just under half of these youth received a disposition of either WIC 654.2, 725(a) or 790. In 2015, youth in this category were more likely to receive a WIC 790 or 725(a) disposition than a WIC 654.2 disposition (see Appendix A for definitions of each code).
- For youth who received a dual jurisdiction disposition, the most likely type was placement in a suitable placement.

- For youth who had their dependency cases closed and were made a delinquency ward, the disposition was most likely for Home on Probation in 2015; however, it was most likely for suitable placement in 2013.
- *NOTE: Dispositions were missing in a number of cases in 2013 and 2014, which could impact the accuracy of the distributions in those years.*

Table 3: Type of Disposition Received by “300 Youth with a Pending Delinquency Petition” by Year

	2013 Referrals (N=588)		2014 Referrals (N=311)		2015 Referrals (N=271)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Case Dismissed	20	3.4	13	4.2	19	7.0
Informal Probation (Dependency Case Remains Open)						
<i>All Categories Combined</i>	277	47.2	131	42.2	130	47.9
WIC 654.2	88	15.0	51	16.4	31	11.4
WIC 725(a)	81	13.8	44	14.2	48	17.7
WIC 790	108	18.4	36	11.6	51	18.8
Dual Jurisdiction (Dependency Case Open and Delinquency Court Wardship)						
<i>All Categories Combined</i>	84	14.3	104	33.4	88	32.4
300/602 Home on Probation	19	3.2	29	9.3	13	4.8
300/602 Suitable Placement	60	10.2	65	20.9	57	21.0
300/602 Camp	5	.9	10	3.2	18	6.6
602 Wardship (Delinquency Court Wardship and 300/Dependency Case Closed)						
<i>All Categories Combined</i>	51	8.7	9	2.9	11	4.0
602 Home on Probation	17	2.9	1	.3	6	2.2
602 Suitable Placement	27	4.6	4	1.3	2	.7
602 Camp	6	1.0	4	1.3	2	.7
602 DJJ	1	.2	---	---	1	.4
Other/Missing/Pending	156	26.5	54	17.4	23	8.4

**NOTES: Data reflect all referrals rather than unique youth—i.e., one youth may have multiple referrals within one timeframe.*

CHARACTERISTICS OF 241.1 REFERRALS

The data presented in this section are taken from the Initial Forms completed by all agencies for “300 youth with a pending delinquency petition” between October 2013 and March 31, 2016 (N=718) and for Tracked Youth who received delinquency court petitions between October 1, 2013 and July 31, 2014 (N=152). Although the distributions for both groups are presented throughout these sections, the narrative is limited to presenting the results for the “300 youth with a pending delinquency petition” because (1) the results are nearly identical for the Tracked Youth group, and (2) presentation of the results is easier to understand.

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 763 referrals in the “300 youth with a pending delinquency petition” category, which yielded a total of 718 unique youth. As shown in Table 4, the majority of youth (94.2%) only had one “new” 241.1 referral during this time, but 5.8% had two or more.

**Table 4: Number of “New” 241.1 Referrals for
“300 Youth with Pending Delinquency Petition” (N=763 Referrals)**

	N	%
1 Referral	676	94.2
2 Referrals	40	5.6
3 Referrals	1	.1
4 Referrals	1	.1

**Demographic Characteristics of 241.1 Referrals
“300 Youth” Only (Table 5)**

- Approximately two-thirds of these 241.1 referrals were male, and a third of referrals 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 was 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 15.82 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 a fifth of these youth were AWOL (absent without leave) from their living situation at the time of their arrest.

Table 5: Demographic Characteristics of 241.1 Referrals

	All 300 Youth with Pending Delinquency (N=718)	Tracked Youth (N=152)
	%	%
Gender		
Female	39.6	37.5
Male	60.4	62.5
Race/Ethnicity		
African-American	42.8	44.7
Latino	45.8	41.4
Caucasian	9.5	9.2
Rounded Average Age at Time of 241.1 Referral	15.82 years old	15.82 years old
Living Situation at Time of Referral		
Group Home	38.2	39.5
Home	23.7	23.0
Relative (Includes Legal Guardian)	19.0	23.6
Foster Care or Legal Guardian	15.4	12.5
Other /Missing	3.8	1.3
AWOL at Time of Arrest	19.6	15.8

Involvement with the Child Welfare System (Table 6)

- 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 10.8.
- The average number of years 241.1 tracked youth spent in the child welfare system was 5.3 years, and this time was consecutive for slightly more than half of these youth.
- The permanency plan for just under half 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 majority of youth assigned to Unit 1.

Table 6: Involvement in Child Welfare System for 241.1 Referrals

	All 300 Youth with Pending Delinquency (N=718)	Tracked Youth (N=152)
	%	%
Average # of Referrals for Youth's Family	10.8 Referrals (SD=7.8 Referrals)	9.9 Referrals (SD=8.4 Referrals)
Average Length in the System	5.3 Years (SD=4.6 Years)	5.4 Years (SD=6.4 Years)
Time is Consecutive	57.1	59.2
Has Prior 241.1 Referral	14.8	11.2
Permanency Goal at Time of Referral		
Permanent Planned Living Arrangements	41.1	35.5
Reunification	25.6	28.9
Remain at Home	22.4	21.1
Guardianship	6.8	9.9
Other	2.7	3.3
Missing	1.4	---
Dependency Counsel		
Children's Law Center Unit 1	41.2	39.5
Children's Law Center Unit 2	25.1	28.9
Children's Law Center Unit 3	25.3	25.7
Panel Attorney	2.9	2.0
Other	4.3	3.9
Missing	1.1	---

Involvement with the Juvenile Justice System (Table 7)

- Just over a third of these 241.1 referrals were detained at juvenile hall at the time of their arrest.
- 241.1 referrals were most likely to be charged with a violent charge in the current arrest followed by property offenses, and other offenses. Two-thirds 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 youths' living situations and just under a fifth occurred at school.
- One-third of youth had a prior criminal charge and one-quarter had a prior status offense at the time of their 241.1 referral.
- The majority (over three-quarters) of these 241.1 referrals were represented by the Public Defender's Office.

Table 7: Involvement in Juvenile Justice System for 241.1 Referrals

	All 300 Youth with Pending Delinquency (N=718)	Tracked Youth (N=152)
	%	%
Detained at Time of Arrest	38.3	27.0
Most Serious Current Charge		
Violent Offense	42.2	44.7
Violent Offenses Involving an Assault	66.7	70.6
Property Offense	27.2	29.6
Other Offense	30.1	25.7
Type of Charge		
Felony	51.9	47.4
707b Offense	9.1	8.6
Misdemeanor	38.7	44.1
Was Offense Related to...?		
Living Situation	27.7	30.9
School	17.7	19.1
Missing	5.3	4.6
Recommendation to STAR Court	3.9	---

Table 7: Involvement in Juvenile Justice System for 241.1 Referrals—Continued

	All 300 Youth with Pending Delinquency (N=718)	Tracked Youth (N=152)
Prior Offenses		
Criminal Charges	32.9	27.0
Status Offenses	25.2	20.4
Missing Data	5.3	---
Delinquency Counsel		
Public Defender	81.5	86.2
Alternate Public Defender	4.2	1.3
Panel Attorney	5.7	7.2
Other	3.2	5.3
Missing	5.3	---

*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 8)

- One-quarter to one-third of 241.1 referrals had a history of hospitalization for mental illness, were prescribed medication, and/or experienced suicidal 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 8: The Prevalence of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Problems for 241.1 Referrals

	All 300 Youth with Pending Delinquency (N=718)	Tracked Youth (N=152)
	%	%
Mental Health History		
Ever Placed in Psychiatric Hospital	30.9%	31.0%
Experienced Suicidal Ideation	21.7%	24.4%
Ever Attempted Suicide	9.2%	12.5%
Prescribed Psychotropic Medication	26.3%	27.0%

**Table 8: The Prevalence of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Problems
for 241.1 Referrals—Continued**

	All 300 Youth with Pending Delinquency (N=718)	Tracked Youth (N=152)
	%	%
Mental Health Diagnoses		
No	12.4%	21.0%
Yes	74.5%	78.9%
Unknown/Missing	13.5%	---
Substance Use/Abuse		
No Substance Abuse Problem	21.9%	30.9%
Misuse/Pattern of Use	24.3%	27.0%
Abuse/Dependency	34.4%	35.5%
Unknown/Missing	13.5%	6.6%

*13.5% of the cases included for this analysis had missing data for all DMH Initial information.

Educational Status and Characteristics (Table 9)

- Complete school records were rarely available for these youth, but partial records were available for slightly more than half of the youth.
- Just under half 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 some of these youth were enrolled during their detention in juvenile hall.
- Less than one-fifth of these youth were attending school regularly, and one-third were attending sporadically or not at all.
- Less than one-quarter of these youth were doing well academically and a quarter was doing poorly. Just under half of these youth were credit deficient at the time of the 241.1 referral.
- About one-third of these youth were either special education eligible or needed to be assessed for eligibility.

Table 9: Educational Status and Characteristics for 241.1 Referrals

	All 300 Youth with Pending Delinquency (N=718)	Tracked Youth (N=152)
	%	%
School Records Available		
Yes-Complete Records	1.5	5.2
Yes-Partial Records	55.4	48.0
Records were Not Available	6.6	4.6
Missing/Unknown	36.5	42.1
Youth Does Not Have an Active Educational Rights Holder	48.6	41.4
Enrolled in School at Time of 241.1 Assessment		
In the Community	40.7	44.7
In Juvenile Hall	14.9	7.9
Missing/Unknown	38.3	42.1
Attendance at School within Past Year (Top 3)		
Regular Attendance	14.8	14.8
Sporadic Attendance	19.4	17.8
Poor Attendance	17.6	14.4
Academic Performance at Time of 241.1 Assessment		
Doing Poorly	23.7	26.3
Doing Well or Average	13.5	13.8
Credit Deficient at Time of 241.1 Assessment	40.9	36.2
Special Education		
Receiving Services	15.0	12.5
Assessment Needed or In Process	21.5	17.9
No Behavior Problems at School	7.0	10.5

*A substantial amount of educational data is missing so results should be interpreted carefully. For the full sample, missing data is 36.5% and for the tracked sample it increases to 42.1%.

RESULTS FOR TRACKED CASES 6 MONTHS AFTER RECEIVING DISPOSITION

This section presents results related to youths' situations six months after they received a disposition from the delinquency court (i.e., they were found responsible for the criminal charges and given some level of supervision through the juvenile court and Department of Probation). As indicated above, the total number of youth tracked during this time is 152, which represents all dispositions given to 241.1 referrals who were 300 youth with a pending delinquency petition between October 1, 2013 and July 31, 2014. Three critical areas were examined over time: Changes in permanency plans and living situations, educational characteristics/performance, and on-going behavior problems as measured through reassessment hearings and new charges (i.e., recidivism). NOTE: Recidivism is measured using any new citation (e.g., a municipal offense) or new criminal charge—whether the charge was sustained or not in delinquency court.

Case Status, Permanency Plans, Living Situations, and Placement Changes over Time (Table 10)

- Six months after disposition, two-thirds of tracked youth still had open child welfare and juvenile justice cases. Approximately a fifth of cases had their probation cases terminated, and fewer had their child welfare cases closed.
- There was little change in permanency plans and living situations for tracked youth. The predominant goal for permanency was Permanent Planned Living Arrangements at the time of the 241.1 assessment and six months after disposition followed by reunification and remain at home.
- Consistent with the findings for permanency plan, there was little change in youths' living situations over time. Slightly more than a third were living in group homes/residential treatment centers followed by living with relatives or at home. At the end of tracking, however, several youth were in juvenile hall or in a Probation camp.
- A third of youth had at least one placement change during the tracking period, and the average number of placement changes experienced was between 1-2 placements.
- With regard to face-to-face contacts with case carrying social workers and assigned deputy probation officers, youth, on average, saw their social workers seven times during this period and they saw their probation officers approximately six times during the tracking period.

Table 10: Case Status, Permanency Plans, Living Situations, and Placement Changes over Time (N=152)

	Beginning of the Tracking Period	End of the Tracking Period
Status of Child Welfare (CW) and Juvenile Justice Cases (JJ)		
Child Welfare & Juvenile Justice Cases Open	---	67.1
Child Welfare Case Closed	---	11.2
Juvenile Justice Case Terminated	---	17.1
Child Welfare & Juvenile Justice Cases Closed	---	4.6
Permanency Plan		
Remain at Home	21.1	19.7
Reunification	28.9	28.9
Guardian/Adoption	9.9	11.9
Permanent Planned Living Arrangements	35.5	36.8
Other	1.3	.7
Living Situation		
Group Home/RTC	39.5	36.8
Home	23.0	17.1
Relative (Includes Legal Guardian)	23.6	21.7
Foster Care or Legal Guardian	12.5	13.8
Juvenile Hall	---	2.6
Camp	---	2.6
Other	1.3	5.3
Placement Changes		
Youth had at Least One Placement Change	n/a	33.6
Average Number of Placement Changes	---	Range: 1-4 Mean: 1.53 SD: .76
Contacts with Social Workers and Probation Officers		
Face-to-Face Contacts with Social Worker	---	Range: 0-23 Mean: 7.2 SD: 4.4
Face-to-Face Contacts with Probation Officer	---	Range: 1-46 Mean: 5.7 SD: 7.0

**Educational Characteristics and Outcomes over Time
(Table 11)**

- Between the 241.1 assessment and the end of tracking period 1, enrollment in school increased dramatically (+35.7 percentage points). NOTE: There is a great deal of missing data at the time of the 241.1 assessment so results should be interpreted cautiously.
- Regular attendance increased (+48.1%) while sporadic attendance decreased slightly. There was also a slight increase in poor attendance.
- Doing poorly at school dropped 2 percentage points while doing average (mostly C's) or doing well increased 36.2 percentage points.
- Behavior problems at school decreased by 35.6 percentage points by the end of the tracking period.
- Overall, six of the eight measures for educational performance showed change in the positive direction.

**Table 11: Educational Outcomes for Tracked Youth
at the End of Tracking Period 1 (N=152)**

	Beginning of the Tracking Period	End of the Tracking Period	Change Over Time	Type of Change
School Enrollment				
Graduated/GED	---	3.2	n/a	+
Enrolled in School	52.6	88.3	35.7	+
Missing/Unknown	43.4	---	---	---
School Attendance				
Attends Regularly	14.8	62.9	48.1	+
Attends Sporadically	17.8	14.5	-3.3	+
Poor Attendance	14.4	19.4	5.0	-
Missing/Unknown	42.1	---	---	---
Academic Performance				
Doing Well or Average	13.8	50.0	36.2	+
Doing Poorly	26.3	24.3	-2.0	-
Missing/Unknown	42.8	---	---	---
No Behavior Problems at School	89.5	53.9	-35.6	+

*Percentages do not add up to 100% because some categories within a variable were not included.

Recidivism at the End of Tracking Period 1 (Table 12)

- 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 quarter of tracked youth had a court violation (e.g. a bench warrant) during the tracking period, and approximately one-fifth had a WIC 777 probation violation filed.
- 18.4% of 241.1 tracked youth had a new citation, and 17.8% were re-arrested for a new criminal offense within six months of their disposition. For comparison, Table 12 shows new arrest rates for 1 year after disposition from two studies. In these studies, the arrest rate for Non-MDT cases is 30-36%, which is nearly double the rate of MDT youth during this period.

Table 12: Reassessments and Recidivism for Tracked 241.1 Youth (N=152)

	Herz, 2010 MDT Evaluation	Hui et al., 2011 Study	2016 Report (N=152)
	Non-MDT	Non-MDT	MDT
Referred for a 241.1 Reassessment Hearing	---	---	21.7
Violations			
Court Violations During this Period	---	---	28.3
WIC 777 Violations During this Period	---	---	23.3
New Charges			
New Citations During this Period	---	---	18.4
New Arrests During this Period	36.0 (1 Year)	30.0 (1 Year)	17.8

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 group homes, at home, 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.

Outcomes for 241.1 Tracked youth

- ❖ Overall, 241.1 tracked youth appeared to improve their attendance, academic performance, and behavior over time.
- ❖ Recidivism, as measured by new arrests, at the end of tracking was only 17.8%, which is lower than the rates produced for Non-MDT samples (30%-36%). However, the time frame for tracking is slightly different (i.e., 6 months compared to 1 year), making the comparisons not entirely equivalent.
- ❖ Approximately one-quarter of tracked youth continue to receive a reassessment and be charged with a probation violation, indicating that youth service plans may not meet the needs and risk levels for youth.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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. 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. 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.

One final and critical note is related to resources to support a data infrastructure for the 241.1 process. 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. 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.

While Dr. Herz will continue with the project in an advisory capacity, she will no longer be able to produce the annual report. Thus, it is critically important to identify sufficient resources to (1) ensure data is entered accurately, completely, and consistently and (2) one or more researchers are able to assist in the monitoring of data quality and produce regular reports for the agencies. Commitment of such resources will align with the State Auditor's report on dual-system youth and their call for one database that accurately captures data on youth who cross into both systems. Specifically, resources to support the following recommendation are strongly encouraged:

- A full-time data entry/quality control staff person for each agency—these staff would also work collaboratively to develop and provide regular trainings for all staff related to the 241.1 MDT process;
- Full-time or part-time assistant to BIS programmer for the 241.1 application to build and run reports for both quality assurance and regular data updates to agencies
- Research support internally or through a contract with university researchers to assist in overall development, monitoring, and analysis of the data on a regular basis
- Create an interface between 241.1 application and all individual agencies (i.e., Probation and DMH information systems).

The 241.1 MDT process and application is unique in Los Angeles County. It represents a historical effort to build collaboration across agencies lasting over 18 years and has been recognized by national models for its interdisciplinary focus and commitment to data. The 241.1 data application is one of a kind in the state as noted by the recent State Auditor's Report. With some investment, the application will be sustainable and allow for on-going evaluation of the MDT process, creating a valuable feedback loop between research and practice. Such a process provides valuable insight into how systems can work together to better serve youth and families, particularly those who penetrate deeply into multiple systems and have poorer outcomes than those who touch no systems or only one system. Without an investment of resources and a commitment to the process, however, it is unlikely the application or the process will be sustainable. Unfortunately, an absence of resources, training, and on-going oversight will slowly erode the foundation built over many years of dedication across collaborative partners.

Appendix A: Delinquency Disposition Options
(From Least Restrictive, to Most Restrictive)

1. Dismissal

- No Probation/Delinquency Court Intervention

INFORMAL PROBATION: AKA - Dual Supervision

2. 654.2 WIC

- Youth remains a 300 WIC Dependent (DCFS Lead Agency)
- Will be supervised by the Probation Dept. for 6 months – 1 yr.
- Does NOT require admission of charges in Court
- If at SCHOOL = there are exclusions
- 654.2 WIC fails = PROCEED TO ADJUDICATION

3. 725(a) WIC

- Youth remains a 300 WIC Dependent (DCFS Lead Agency)
- Will be supervised informally by the Probation Dept. for 6 months only.
- Requires an admission of the offense in court.
- Should be considered for any youth who has failed or is unlikely to succeed at 654.2 WIC.
- 725A WIC fails = PROCEED TO DISPOSITION = 602 WIC HOP, S/P, CCP, OR DJJ

4. 790 WIC - Deferred Entry of Judgment

- Youth remains a 300 WIC Dependent (DCFS Lead Agency)
- Will be supervised by the Probation Dept. for a minimum of 1yr and up to 3 yrs.
- Requires an admission of the offense in court
- Cannot be considered in certain extremely serious offenses (707b WIC)
- 790 WIC fails = JUDGMENT ENTERED = DISPOSITION 602 WIC HOP, S/P, CCP, OR DJJ

FORMAL PROBATION: AKA - DUAL STATUS

5. 300/602 WIC - Home on Probation / Home of Parent

- Minor is declared a Ward of Delinquency Court, but retains their 300 WIC status in Dependency Court
- All department guidelines regarding supervision remain in place.
- Must designate a Lead Agency (DCFS or Probation)

6. 300/602 WIC - Suitable Placement - (DCFS I Probation Lead)
 - Minor is declared a Ward of Delinquency Court, but retains their 300 WIC status in Dependency Court
 - All Department guidelines regarding supervision remain in place
 - Must designate a Lead Agency
 - Lead Agency responsible for physical placement and most treatment services
7. 300/602 WIC - Camp Community Placement - (Probation Lead)
 - Minor declared a Ward of the Delinquency Court, but retains their 300 WIC status in Dependency Court
 - All Department guidelines regarding supervision remain in place
8. 602 WIC - D.J.J. (Department of Juvenile Justice)
 - Minor declared a Ward of the Delinquency Court: Dependency Court terminates jurisdiction
 - Can only be considered if the youth is charged with a 707b offense and must be approved by Probation Department Screening Committee and Director.