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BACKGROUND

- Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) has been an acknowledged issue in juvenile justice for decades

- Justice agency records show race/ethnic disparities at multiple contact points in juvenile justice process, but less clear about explanation and effective response
  - Differential Offending vs. Differential Treatment?

- In 2012, Ohio Department of Youth Services funded UC to investigate these disparities
  - Will talk today about data that we collected and show a sampling of results
EXAMPLE OF PROBLEM:
RECENT TRENDS IN JUVENILE RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT

Placement Rate per 1000 Youths

Non-White youth are still overrepresented in secure placement across most states (see Leiber, 2002)

- Primed to disproportionately experience negative consequences of placement
  - Including developmental impacts
  - Also not as likely to benefit from recent declines in residential placement

^Data from “National DMChttps://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/dmcdb/index.html Data Book,” Available at: https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/dmcdb/index.html
PURPOSE

1. Determine whether there is a problem with disproportionate contact at various points in police and court decision-making processes
   - Statewide and locally
   - Beyond what can be inferred from Relative Rates

2. Develop explanations where it is identified
## DMC Assessment Methods/Data Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sample(s) Size</th>
<th>Key Measures/Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest Records</td>
<td>19 Police Agencies, Electronic or Paper Files (2010-2011)</td>
<td>20,344</td>
<td>Race, Offense Type, Offense Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Records</td>
<td>13 Juvenile Courts, Electronic or Paper Files, Direct Data Collection (2010-2011)</td>
<td>75,946</td>
<td>Race, Offense Type, Offense Level, Number of Charges, Six Decision Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Facility Records</td>
<td>Data for randomly-selected cases provided electronically by state facilities (2010 to 2014)</td>
<td>1,514 (Full), 666 (OYAS), 435 (Txt Info)</td>
<td>Race, Committing Offense, Four “Experiences” Limited Assessment/Treatment Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Focus Groups</td>
<td>17 sessions and two interviews facilitated by UC personnel</td>
<td>130 Officers of various ranks, roles</td>
<td>Explanations for delinquency, DMC Decision-making factors, Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Interviews, Observations</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with UC personnel, Observations</td>
<td>131 Court actors with varying roles; 32 Days</td>
<td>Explanations for delinquency, DMC Decision-making factors, Solutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDY GOALS

- Account for legally-relevant factors
- Integrate multiple sources of evidence
- Observe and hear from those working in system
- Consider variation across state and decision points
- Offer suggestions for policy and practice

- Collect and synthesize relevant information
  - Then analyze, contextualize, and report
POLICE RECORD RESULTS
WEAPON INVOLVED? AND TYPE

Note: Sample for “Weapon Involved?” is 6,840 records, 539 had some “weapon involved”
POLICE RECORD RESULTS
SOURCE OF COMPLAINT (N=1,193)

% of Arrests

- Parent/Guardian: 21.6% Non-White, 28.1% White
- Citizen/Neighbor: 7.1%, 7.3%
- School Official: 14.4%, 9.0%
- Police: 48.4%, 44.7%
- Other: 8.4%, 10.9%

Red = Non-White  Gray = White
Race had a statistically significant, and moderate-sized effect on the odds of detention in all models.

Previous research found that detention can have a cascading effect where decisions made at earlier stages in process may affect those at later stages (e.g., Rodriguez, 2010).

Included as an explanatory variable in supplementary analyses for adjudication and secure confinement.

- Fairly sizeable effects for youth who were detained relative to not.

Note: All results account for legally-relevant factors (e.g., prior offenses, seriousness of current offense), youth age, and sex.
Effect at adjudication stage suggests that Non-White youth are less likely to be adjudicated delinquent
  - "Dismissal" follows similar pattern, but is not as precise a measure

Not unprecedented
  - Some suggest that there may be a “correction” that enters process with more formality and facts (see, e.g., Bishop & Leiber, 2012)

Due to cross-site variation in pattern of relationships

Diminished when using alternate methods, but still statistically significant

Note: Results account for legally-relevant factors (e.g., prior offenses, seriousness of current offense), youth age, and sex; Only counties with statistically significant effects are shown; May not include all diverted cases
STATE FACILITY RESULTS
RACE, DISCIPLINARY INFRACTIONS, AND SECLUSION TIME

Non-White Youth
(n=991)

White Youth
(n=524)

Number of Disciplinary Infractions

Number of Days in Seclusion
## Key Findings: Official Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Barriers/Limitations</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest Records</td>
<td>“Selected” on Arrests</td>
<td>Proportionally more Non-White youth included in sample (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some agencies did not provide data</td>
<td>Comparison of arrests across groups identified statistically significant differences, but typically small in size. A few, like weapon-involvement and its type, are worth emphasizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measures and data coverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Records</td>
<td>One selected court did not participates</td>
<td>Although smaller, generally were race relationships after controlling for other factors—varied in size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some subgroups of cases excluded in certain counties</td>
<td>Not all led to worse outcomes for Non-White youth—depended on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measures and data coverage</td>
<td>Detention had an impact on later decision points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Barriers/Limitations</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYS Facility Records</td>
<td>Some measures not available for full sample</td>
<td>Some disproportion in referrals—more in some counties than others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One of four outcome measures had relationship with race after controlling for relevant baseline factors: Number of Disciplinary Infractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In turn, it had a relationship with the Seclusion Time and Length of Stay measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

While a significant amount of literature has emphasized the identification and explanation of disproportionate minority contact (DMC) in the juvenile justice system, less research has examined racial disparities in postdisposition outcomes. This study seeks to address this gap through its examination of the experiences of youths in custody. Specifically, using a stratified, random subsample of 1514 youths confined in secure confinement facilities between 2010 and 2014 in one Midwestern state, this article explores whether youths’ race impacts in-facility outcomes, such as number of disciplinary infractions, time spent in seclusion, length of stay, and access to educational services, when race-level predictors are accounted for. Findings suggest that race has an inconsistent relationship with the outcomes experienced by youths in custody. However, significant mediating effects of disciplinary infractions on relationships between race and other outcomes appear to have significant implications for non-White youths in custody. Considering these findings, policy recommendations are discussed.
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ABSTRACT

Research on the targeted enforcement of weapons and drug offenses suggests that policies and street-level decisions around those offenses may play a role in disproportionate minority involvement with the justice system. Little research has directly examined the relative influence of these types of offenses on juvenile justice decisions. The analyses were completed using official case records from police agencies (n = 11) and juvenile courts (n = 6) as well as data from focus groups (n = 8) and key informant interviews (n = 56) conducted with personnel in those agencies. The quantitative data used here comprise records from 87,983 cases with measures of youth socio-demographics, case characteristics, offense type, and key juvenile court outcomes. The findings suggest that, although the effects of race as well as weapons and drug offenses vary across outcome decisions and with the introduction of controls for other relevant factors, race-based disparities often persist in multivariate models. Qualitative data analysis finds that system actors tend to see the weapons and drug offense-based disparities emerging from structural conditions that are often mediated by culture and differential offending. Together, these findings offer important points of departure for further research and discussion of practical responses to disproportionate minority contact for the benefit of youth, communities, and the system itself.
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