

**The Minnesota
Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee's
Annual Report and Recommendations**

**to Governor Tim Pawlenty and
the Minnesota Legislature
for the State of Minnesota**

October, 2008

Table of Contents

Recommendations	ii
The Minnesota Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee	1
Juveniles in Minnesota	3
Today's Snapshot: Juvenile Justice in Minnesota	3
A Profile of Today's Juvenile Offenders	4
Priorities: Where We Need Action	9
1. Disproportionate Minority Contact.....	9
2009 Recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature on DMC:.....	13
2. Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI)	13
2009 Recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature on JDAI:	15
3. Coordination of Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Services	15
2009 Recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature on Coordination of Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Services:	16
4. De-institutionalization of Status Offenders	16
2009 Recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature on DSO:	18
5. Use of Jails and Other Secure Detention Facilities.....	18
6. Prevention, Diversion, Aftercare, Family Engagement and Community-based Services.....	19
7. Impact and improvement of school/juvenile justice interface	20
8. The Adam Walsh Act: Juvenile Sex Offender Registration.....	21
Appendix A: 2008 JJAC Membership Roster	23
Appendix B: 2008 JJAC Membership Profile.....	26
Appendix C: Minnesota JDAI Results Report 2008.....	27
Appendix D: Relevant Youth Data.....	45
Appendix E: OJJDP Allocations	53
Appendix F: Report on Mini Youth Summits.....	55

Summary of Recommendations:

On DMC:

Establish a statewide policy regarding DMC. As an example, “It is the policy of the state of Minnesota to identify and eliminate barriers to racial, ethnic, and gender fairness within the Criminal Justice, Juvenile Justice, Corrections and Judicial systems, in support of the fundamental principle of fair and equitable treatment under law.

Further, that all state agencies will collaborate with and provide available data on DMC within these systems to the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) so that JJAC, as the lead organization on this issue may gather research, pertinent statistical information and other documentation in support of the state wide DMC policy and Minnesota’s continued compliance with the four core protections of the JJDP Act.

Finally, JJAC will work to explore ways so that counties and local jurisdictions are able to collect and report DMC data.

On Juvenile Detention Reform:

Support and expand Juvenile Detention Reform in all 87 Minnesota counties.

On Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Initiative:

Support the recommendations from the Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Initiative convened in 2007 by the Commissioner of Corrections in partnership with the Department of Human Services along with multiple state and local partners.

On De-institutionalization:

Promote evidence-based strategies and non secure programs that address status offense behaviors to prevent further involvement in the juvenile justice system and promote safe and healthy outcomes for youth.

Reduce repeat offender rates by focusing on treatment and family oriented approaches in non secure facilities.

Invest funding in non secure community-based programs to serve as alternatives to juvenile detention.

On Use of Jails and Other Secure Detention Facilities:

The Office of Justice Programs in the Department of Public Safety and the Department of Corrections should work together to strengthen inspection of jails and lockups to monitor compliance with JJDP Act regulations regarding juveniles in adult jails and lockups.

On Community Based Services:

JJAC joins with the organizations mentioned above for the expansion of community based programs providing prevention, intervention, treatment and aftercare/re-entry services to keep youth out of the justice system and speed their return to successful lives in their communities.

On Improvement of School and Juvenile Justice Interface:

The Department of Education and the Department of Public Safety should explore strategies that address behavior and keep youth in school.

The two departments should work together to prepare and provide training to school administrators, teachers and law enforcement on how they can best work together to control behavior while keeping individual youth in school.

On the Adam Walsh Act on Juvenile Sex Offender Registration:

Minnesota should take no further action towards implementing the Adam Walsh Act as it relates to juveniles at this time.

Minnesota should request a one year extension to July, 2010 without penalty on the Adam Walsh Act as provided in the federal rules.

The relevant state departments should come together to engage all parties in an ongoing discussion on the Adam Walsh Act and its relevance to good public policy in Minnesota.

Minnesota Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee Annual Report to the Governor and the Legislature

October, 2008

The Minnesota Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee

Minnesota's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) is appointed by the Governor to advise and make recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature about issues, trends and practices relating to the state's juvenile justice system. JJAC serves as Minnesota's state advisory group to meet the requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJJPA Act) as re-authorized in 2002 by Congress.

The Governor's eighteen JJAC appointees come from all backgrounds and places to truly represent Minnesota. Each member brings a particular interest and expertise rooted in professional and personal experience. Geographically one third of its membership is from rural Minnesota, one third from suburban MN and one third from the metropolitan Twin Cities. People of color representing major racial origins comprise forty four percent of the committee. JJAC brings together juvenile justice policymakers, juvenile justice experts including judges, prosecutors and defenders, private sector service providers, researchers and youth representatives with current experience of Minnesota's youth culture. (The JJAC Membership Roster and a JJAC Membership Profile are provided in Appendices A and B.)

JJAC meets monthly to fulfill its federal and state responsibilities. Its primary responsibilities are:

1. To develop an ongoing Comprehensive Three Year Plan for Juvenile Justice;
2. To advise the Governor and Legislature on Minnesota's compliance with the four core requirements of the JJDP Act;
3. To annually advise the Governor and Legislature on recommendations for the juvenile justice system, which is the purpose of this report; and

4. To review, award and monitor federal juvenile justice funds appropriated by Congress in Title II, Title V and in the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG).¹

All of JJAC's work is based on the Four Core Requirements or Protections contained in the JJDP Act:

1. ***De-institutionalization of status offenders (DSO)***. States must ensure that juveniles who are charged with status offenses are not placed in secure detention or correctional facilities. Status offenses are those offenses that would not be an offense if committed by someone over the age of eighteen: truancy, curfew, runaway, and tobacco or alcohol in possession or use.
2. ***Sight and sound separation of juvenile from adult offenders***. States must ensure that a juvenile charged with a delinquent offense who is detained or confined in an adult jail or lockup will not have verbal or visual contact with adult offenders.
3. ***Removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups***. States must ensure that no juvenile shall be detained or confined in a jail or lockup that is intended for adult offenders beyond proscribed time limits: six hours in a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) county and twenty-four hours in non-MSA counties.
4. ***Disproportionate minority contact (DMC)***. States must make efforts to reduce the proportion of minority youth at all points along the juvenile justice system when that proportion exceeds the minority's representation in the general population.

The four core Requirements/Protections have evolved beginning with the first iteration of the JJDP Act in 1974 to today with the next iteration of the act in process currently in Congress.² JJAC's overarching goal is to balance the protection of youth while also instilling in them the basic foundation premise of accountability. While research has shown that a juvenile needs the JJDP Act protections in order to continue on a healthy path to maturation,³ accountability and execution of the justice system should be designed in ways that promote public safety and the safety of the involved individual. Statistics show

¹ Title II provides for Prevention, Intervention and Aftercare Programs. Title V provides for Community Delinquency Prevention Programs. JABG provides support for the state's juvenile justice system.

² See the JJDP Act at <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/about/ojjjact.txt>

³ See the Congressional Record transcript on the JJDP Act.

conclusively that once a youth has been involved in the juvenile justice system, the possibility of recurring visits and involvement in the juvenile justice system increases.⁴ Prevention and community based alternatives remain important tools for Minnesota's Juvenile Justice System.

Juveniles in Minnesota

Minnesota's juvenile population has held steady in recent years at twenty-four percent of the state's total population, or about 1.25 million children and youth under the age of eighteen according to the latest census figures. Between 575,000 and 580,000 Minnesotans are ages 10 to 17, making them eligible to become involved in the juvenile justice system, and 297,000 are between the highest risk ages of 14 to 17.⁵

Minnesota's youth are more diverse than their elders: Racial and ethnic minorities are a greater percentage of the youth population than of the entire population as a whole. Minnesota's youth population is estimated in 2006 to be 79 percent Caucasian (compared to 88 percent for the population as a whole), 6 percent African American, 6 percent Hispanic, 5 percent Asian, 3 percent comprising two or more races, and 1 percent Native American.⁶

Today's Snapshot: Juvenile Justice in Minnesota

Overall juvenile arrests have been declining since they peaked in 2000 at 754,751. Recent youth arrests are down significantly from 2000, at 44,615 in 2007 following 54,384 in 2006 and 50,942 in 2005. (The largest decline in

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Source: Estimates of the Population by Selected Age Groups for the United States, States, and Puerto Rico: July 1, 2007. US Census Bureau. Available at <http://www.census.gov/popest/states/asrh/tables/SC-EST2007-01.xls>

⁶ Source: "From "Getting By" to "Getting Ahead," Kids County Data Book 2008. Children's Defense Fund Minnesota.

arrests, a drop of nearly 30 percent, took place in 2001 and may be due, at least in part, to changes in the way law enforcement deals with juveniles.)⁷

The number of youth on probation in 2007 was 14,181, down somewhat from 14,742 in 2006 and 14,312 in 2005.⁸ The relative impact of juvenile offenses and offenders as compared to adult offenses and offenders in the overall justice system is that while juveniles comprised 10 percent of the state's probation population⁹ they accounted for 21 percent of arrests.¹⁰

Offenses committed by juveniles which bring them into the system include (in 2007) 24 percent were PART I offenses, 64 percent were PART II, and 12 percent were STATUS. This offense distribution has remained fairly constant for the past three years. STATUS arrests are down from 17 percent in 2006 to 12 percent in 2007. Consequently, the percentage of total arrests for PART I and PART II offenses has increased slightly in 2007.¹¹

A Profile of Today's Juvenile Offenders

Data from the Minnesota Crime Information Reports of 2005, 2006, and 2007 (see Appendix D for a Compilation of Relevant Youth Data) presents this profile of our juvenile offenders:

By Gender:

- Between 2005 and 2007, males have consistently accounted for 2/3rds (67%) of all juvenile arrests.

⁷ Sources: *2007 Minnesota Crime Information, 2006 Minnesota Crime Information, and 2005 Minnesota Crime Information*. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Criminal Justice Information Systems: Uniform Crime Report.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ 2007 Probation Survey. Minnesota Department of Corrections.

¹⁰ Sources: *2007 Minnesota Crime Information*. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Criminal Justice Information Systems: Uniform Crime Report.

¹¹ Arrests are divided into three categories for juveniles: Part I (typically serious, violent or person offenses); PART II (typically less serious, property related offenses); and "status" related offenses of curfew/ loitering and runaway. PART I offenses reflect the greatest public safety risk. Sources: *2007 Minnesota Crime Information. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Criminal Justice Information Systems: Uniform Crime Report*.

- Over the past three years, on average, males have accounted for 64 percent of PART I arrests, 71 percent of PART II arrests and 53 percent of status offenses. These distributions have remained fairly constant.
- The only offenses where juvenile females have higher arrest rates than juvenile males are Prostitution (12 v. 7), Family/Children (7 v. 4) and Runaway (1,404 v. 946).

By Race:

	2000	2001	2005	2006	2007
Total Juvenile Arrests	74,751	52,452	50,942	54,384	44,615
Caucasians	55,715	39,564	32,707	32,228	28,678
African Americans	12,356	8,691	14,224	17,644	12,822
Indian/Native Alaskans	3,249	2,433	1,999	2,333	1,895
Asians	3,431	1,764	2,012	2,179	1,220

CAUCASIAN YOUTH:

- Caucasians, who are the majority of the population, commit the majority of the crime. Caucasian juveniles accounted in 2007 for 64.3 percent of juvenile arrests. Caucasians are 79 percent of the youth population under 18.
- Caucasians accounted in 2007 for 63% of PART I arrests; 70% of PART II arrests; but only 34% of STATUS arrests.

AFRICAN AMERICAN YOUTH:

- In 2007, African American youth accounted for 28.7 percent of youth arrests. African American youth are 6% of the juvenile population.
- African American youth accounted for 30% of PART I arrests; 24% of PART II arrests; and 54% of STATUS arrests. These disparities are significant when related to use of Curfew/ Loitering as arrest for African American youth as this is often the first contact with the justice system.

AMERICAN INDIAN YOUTH:

- In 2007 American Indian youth accounted for 4.2 percent of arrests. American Indian youth are 1% of the juvenile population.
- American Indian youth accounted for 3% of PART I arrests; 4% of PART II arrests; and 5% of STATUS arrests.

ASIAN YOUTH:

- Asian youth in 2007 accounted for 4% of juvenile arrests. Asians are 3% of the total youth population.
- Asians accounted for 4% of PART I arrests; 2% of PART II arrests; 4% of status arrests.

In addition to reviewing the statistics, JJAC has conferred with a wide range of youth-serving agencies, experts, researchers, policy makers and practitioners across the state. Today, according to these experts, Minnesota's youthful offenders come from a wide variety of races and cultures, have greater diversity in GLBT identification, and present an extremely high incidence of mental health diagnoses in addition to their illegal behavior.¹²

JJAC recognizes there are Issues related to juvenile justice system data collection. The following are overarching data collection concerns:

Standardization:

There is no standardized or uniform way for the different points in the juvenile justice system to collect race and ethnicity.

- Most use the primary categories of Caucasian, African American, American Indian/Native Alaskan and Asian/Pacific Islander. Some use the categories "other" or "two or more races". Lack of standardization confounds analysis between the different system points.
- Some report the Hispanic ethnicity separately from race; some have Hispanic as its own racial category. Differences here make it difficult to compare populations for Hispanics. A more uniform method of recording ethnicity would be beneficial.
- In addition, there is little opportunity to pull out other ethnic subgroups that may have distinct juvenile justice related trends such as the Hmong and Somali communities.

Arrest:

- There is no Hispanic ethnicity breakout in the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) for juvenile arrests. Thus, there cannot be any analytical comments on juvenile Hispanics arrested in Minnesota based on the UCR.

¹² *Minnesota Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Initiative, Findings and Recommendations, Final Report, August, 2008.*

- Since the UCR is a report and not a database, one cannot go in and create any additional analysis on arrest data that might be relevant to juveniles.
- Minnesota has no incident based reporting system. This would create an arrest database with all the information about police calls. Statewide crime analysis cannot be accomplished in a meaningful way without incident level data. Minnesota is working towards NIBRS (National Incident Based Reporting System) but it has been a very long process. According to the BCA website, there are no current established timelines for this project.

Diversion and County Attorney Referral:

- There is little data on pre-court diversion programs in terms of the number of juveniles served and the race of juveniles served. Some of this data could be available through the county attorneys' offices if they were required to report it.
- County attorney data is maintained at the county level. There is no central statewide repository for this data.
- Many county attorneys' offices reported they do not, are not able to, or do not wish to track the race of youth petitioned to court or diverted. This is a key decision point for which no race data is available. It is essential that data collection at this step be implemented to thoroughly understand DMC at the juncture between police contact and court processes.

Petition/ Adjudication/ Certification:

- The State Court Administrator's Office (SCAO) was, until 2005, legislatively mandated to create a report on juvenile petitions and dispositions. This was a key report that illustrated the outcomes of sentencing including data on adult certifications. The SCAO is no longer required to create this report which leaves a large gap in published and easily accessible juvenile data.
- Over 20 percent of SCAO race data report has the race as "unknown". The system for identifying race at this level results in a large enough unknown category to make race data at this decision point largely irrelevant.

Detention and Placement:

- The Department of Corrections (DOC) collects juvenile corrections placement data and also juvenile probation data.
- The DOC does not publish an annual report on juvenile placements in terms of frequency, race, gender, length of placement, or type of placement (pre or post adjudication). If the DOC had an annual report this information would be available in the public domain.
- The DOC does collect some juvenile probation data and includes this data in a report that includes all probationers (adult and juvenile) throughout the state. The DOC may have additional data on juvenile probationers, monitoring and probation revocations that could enhance this section of the current report.
- The DOC or the SCAO could also report on certified youth in terms of length of adult sentence and offense for which they were certified.

Data across systems:

- Different data systems across state agencies use different individual identifiers such that one cannot match populations across databases. This makes it difficult to answer questions such as: “How many youth in the juvenile justice system were also in the child protection system?” Or, “How many youth with serious disciplinary incidents in the education system become involved in the juvenile justice system?” These types of research questions could move agencies out of their individual silos but are difficult and costly to implement.

Data Recommendations:

1. Move towards uniform race and ethnicity reporting practices within state agencies-- specifically a system that matches the categories used by the U.S. Census Bureau.
2. Work closely with county attorneys' offices to collect and report race data on cases petitioned, declined and diverted. This will help to improve DMC calculations.
3. Encourage the SCAO to create the Juvenile Delinquency Petitions report annually; and the DOC to publish a comprehensive annual report on youth in correctional placements. No other branch of government or agency is able to provide these data.
4. Expedite completion of the NIBRS system to allow thorough crime analysis statewide.

Priorities: Where We Need Action

JJAC studied the juvenile justice statistics, conferred with juvenile system and treatment experts as the recommendations for action in 2009 were developed.¹³ JJAC staff attended ten youth summits comprised of youth, parents and teachers to provide out reach to youth across Minnesota. Juvenile Justice experts recommend a multi-faceted approach to improving the juvenile justice system in Minnesota, ranging from public policy reform to systems reform to further investment in community-based programs that address the developmental needs of the juvenile offender while maintaining accountability for their actions in the community and reducing recidivism.

JJAC found common vision, interests and a willingness to collaborate among organizations and citizens. JJAC, in ongoing communication with interested stakeholders, has identified a short list of critical issues for attention.

Funding will not be the only issue at stake in 2009; there must be a new focus on changing the way the juvenile justice system operates. JJAC presents their priority issues below, along with a request for action from Minnesota's policymakers.

1. Disproportionate Minority Contact

Reducing disproportionate minority contact (DMC) is one of the four core requirements of the JJDP Act, and a key charge to the JJAC. JJAC's vision regarding DMC is:

Rational, fair and equitable treatment for all youth across youth-centered institutions/agencies through culturally responsive and community-partnered practices.¹⁴

Minnesota's performance in meeting the goal of the JJDP Act and the vision of JJAC is far from satisfactory. Examination of the Minnesota's below national DMC rates (for 2005 data) show that Minnesota has significant issues with DMC at all points in the juvenile justice system as compared to the national average.

The issue is a critical one for Minnesota. Minority youth are much more likely than Caucasian youth to be in contact with the juvenile justice system and to receive stronger sanctions at each point along the juvenile justice continuum. In

¹³ See Appendix F for a description of the Youth Summits.

¹⁴ This vision was developed by the JJAC's DMC Subcommittee on July 25, 2008

counties where there is comprehensive data, it is easy to see that juveniles of color are overrepresented from arrest through disposition and detention. Here are two examples:

- In Hennepin County, African American youth are confined at a rate much higher than Caucasian youth at every point along the juvenile justice continuum.¹⁵
- While African American youth make up only three percent of the youth in Dakota County, they represent one-fifth of youth in corrections.¹⁶

The following chart presents a more comprehensive view of Minnesota's statistics on DMC in comparison to the national averages.¹⁷ In particular, note:

Caucasian youth, who are the overwhelming majority of Minnesota's youth population at 79 percent, comprise 64.3 percent of juvenile arrests. In 2007 Caucasian youth accounted for 63 percent of Part I Arrests, 70 percent of Part II arrests but only 34 percent of Status arrests.

African American youth who are 6 percent of the total juvenile population accounted for 28.7 percent of youth arrests, specifically 30 percent of Part I arrests, 24 percent of Part II arrests and 54 percent of Status arrests.

American Indian youth at 1 percent of the juvenile population accounted for 4.2 percent of arrests with 3 percent for Part I arrests, 4 percent for Part II arrests and 5 percent of Status arrests. American Indians are the group most likely to be referred to adult court.

Asian youth at 3 percent of the total youth population accounted for 4 percent of juvenile arrests with 4 percent of Part I arrests, 2 percent of Part II arrests and 4 percent of Status arrests.

¹⁵ Council on Crime and Justice. *An analysis of Racial Disproportionality in Juvenile Confinement: An Analysis of Disproportionate Minority Confinement in the Hennepin County Juvenile Detention Center.*

¹⁶ Wilder Foundation Research. *(2007) Minority Youth Corrections Placements in Dakota County: Conclusions and Recommendations [web page].*

¹⁷ *Minnesota 2007 Disproportionate Minority Contact Report*, Department of Public Safety, Office of Justice Programs.

Minnesota and National DMC Relative Rate Index Calculations

Interpreting the RRI: An RRI of 1.0 means white youth and minority youth have equal representation at that point in the system. For example, an RRI of 2.0 indicates that the minority group is twice as likely to appear at the point in the system than white youth.

Juvenile Justice System Points of Contact	*State of Minnesota RRI: Calendar Year 2006 ¹					*National RRI: Calendar Year 2005 ²			
	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	**All Minorities	Black	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	***All Minorities
Juvenile Arrests: "Arrest Rate"	4.84	2.76	0.63	3.16	3.03	2.1	1.1	0.3	1.7
Cases Referred to Court: "Referral Rate"	--	--	--	--	--	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2
Cases Diverted: "Diversion Rate"	--	--	--	--	--	0.7	0.9	0.8	0.7
Cases Involving Secure Detention: Detention Rate"	2.66	1.45	4.24	3.44	2.54	1.4	1.1	1.1	1.4
Cases Petitioned; "Petitioned Rate"	1.38	0.97	2.15	2.02	1.52	1.2	1.0	1.1	1.2
Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings: "Adjudicated Rate"	--	--	--	--	--	0.9	1.1	1.0	0.9
Cases Resulting in Probation Placement: "Probation Rate"	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.9	1.0	1.1	0.9
Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Correctional Facilities: "Placement Rate"	1.4	1.66	2.28	1.53	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.2
Cases Transferred to Adult Court: "Waiver Rate"	2.32	**	**	2.99	1.94	1.1	1.9	0.6	1.1

*Please note that Minnesota data is from calendar year 2006 and National data is from calendar year 2005, preventing direct comparisons.

**Minnesota data on the racial groups "Native or other Pacific Islander" and "Other/Mixed" have been excluded because data for these groups does not meet the 1% minimum population at that point in the system to be able to use the Relative Rate calculation.

***National data does not include information on the "Hispanic/Latino" ethnicity.

1. *Minnesota 2007 Disproportionate Minority Contact Report. Department of Public Safety, Office of Justice Programs*

2. *Puzzanchera, C. and Adams, B. (2008). National Disproportionate Minority Contact Databook. Developed by the National Center for Juvenile Justice for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Online. Available: <http://ojdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/dmcdcb/>.*

In response to the critical need to address the disproportionate involvement of minority youth at all points in Minnesota's juvenile justice system, JJAC has set these goals:¹⁸

1. A uniform statewide data collection and analysis of action and outcomes at all decision points from arrest through disposition (including detention), correlated with information on race, ethnicity, geography, gender, and offense.
2. Prescribe objective detention standards statewide, including a defined purpose for detention and a standardized objective risk assessment instrument.
3. Engage community partnerships to address Disproportionate Minority Contact (target populations, professional, governmental and community agencies) and to develop increased alternatives to detention.
4. Fewer youth of color in institutions/detention.
5. Increase funding for community-based systems/programs.
6. Promote implementation of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) statewide, as it has shown to have a beneficial effect on racial equity issues.

JJAC has taken note of all the different statutes and/or state department policies that relate to the DMC issue but in a piecemeal fashion. For instance, the Judicial Council's policy states:

It is the policy of the Minnesota Judicial Branch to identify and eliminate barriers to racial, ethnic and gender fairness within the judicial system, in support of the fundamental principle of fair and equitable treatment under law.

Although every relevant department has some policies that relate to DMC, yet Minnesota does not have an over-arching DMC policy for all agencies to follow.

This recommendation for an overarching policy is important because (1) it demonstrates the visibility of meaningful leadership in changing attitudes and subsequently actions; (2) it recognizes the intersections of state agencies which deal with youth; and (3) it provides an opportunity for state agencies to coordinate activities with communities such as Public Safety when intersecting with local law enforcement, Corrections with the three correctional systems in Minnesota's counties and Human Services in the interface with those youth with co-occurring disorders and who also happen to be within the juvenile justice system.

¹⁸ DMC Goals are the work of the JJAC DMC Subcommittee, written July 25, 2008

2009 Recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature on DMC:

Establish a statewide policy regarding DMC. As an example, “it is the policy of the state of Minnesota to identify and eliminate barriers to racial, ethnic, and gender fairness within the Criminal Justice, Juvenile Justice, Corrections and Judicial systems, in support of the fundamental principle of fair and equitable treatment under law.

Further, that all state agencies will collaborate with and provide available data on DMC within these systems to the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee(JJAC) so that JJAC, as the lead organization on this issue may gather research, pertinent statistical information and other documentation in support of the state wide DMC policy and Minnesota’s continued compliance with the four fore protections of the JJDP Act.

Finally, JJAC will work to explore ways so that counties and local jurisdictions are able to collect and report DMC data.

The statewide policy is the keystone in building an equitable juvenile justice system since it is the Governor who exercises the leadership with relevant state department commissioners to identify what they could do to implement this policy. For example: The Department of Public Safety in light of the JJAC funded Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) could partner with law enforcement agencies throughout Minnesota to identify alternative strategies to address the disparate treatment that results in DMC.

The Judicial Council, representing the Judicial Branch of government, could work with local district courts in examining sentencing decisions and to suggest alternatives when needed. Every department which involves juveniles has a connection that could benefit from this state-wide policy. Finally, state agencies collecting data from all decision points could have it analyzed at a central clearinghouse within state government and it would guarantee consistent and usable data.

2. Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI)

Successful strategies to address DMC include working to reduce racially disparate treatment of youthful offenders at every decision point in the juvenile justice system. One such decision is the decision for secure detention for the juvenile. Studies have shown that detention should only be used to protect public safety and to prevent flight.¹⁹

JDAI is a focused approach in working with the juvenile justice system at the county level to reduce the numbers of youth in secure detention and racial and

¹⁹ See Congressional Record for the JJDP Act for supporting data.

ethnic disparities in the system through a coordinated, multi-faceted approach involving changes in system operations and the employment of alternative approaches to working with youth in healthier ways. The Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI), formulated by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, has proven to have significant success in reducing youth in detention, and is currently being implemented in three Minnesota counties: Dakota, Hennepin, and Ramsey. An out state county will soon, it is hoped, also adopt this initiative. JJAC has funded this effort in partnership with the Annie E. Casey Foundation for the past three years.

JDAI is an important response to the problems of de-institutionalization of status offenders, inappropriate confinement of youth and DMC. JJAC recommends the continued expansion of JDAI to more counties in Minnesota with the goal of making it's presence known throughout the state.

When initiated in 2006, the three pilot sites in Minnesota had detention facilities that were overcrowded or functioning at capacity, significant racial and ethnic disparities and no objective screening for detention admissions. The three facilities have a joint detention capacity of 61 beds per day, and in 2005 had a combined average daily population of 72.8 youth in detention with youth of color comprising 67.2% of that population, more than double their 30.9% in 2006, of the 10 to 17 year old population in these sites.

Today, Minnesota's JDAI sites have implemented detention screening tools to ensure objective and appropriate use of secure detention in line with the purpose of detention - for youth who are an imminent public safety threat or would fail to appear for court, supported by a range of community based alternatives.

JDAI reform strategies naturally lead to systemic change beyond detention, and Minnesota is implementing reform in court process timeframes and notifications to families, probation responses to technical violations and use of out of home placements and improving conditions within secure facilities to further ensure youth safety.

As a result of JDAI reforms, 2007 compared to 2005 statistics indicate a 22% drop in the average daily population of youth in detention cumulatively in the three sites, and a 36% drop in the average daily population of youth of color in detention in Dakota and Ramsey counties combined. Dakota County specifically, has seen a 10% reduction in the percentage of youth of color in detention from 2005 to 2007, a difficult achievement for most sites.

JDAI Minnesota intends to continue to ensure objective and appropriate utilization of secure detention and to continue to promote the effective, efficient and equitable outcomes in juvenile justice practice that JDAI promotes through its systemic change approach. (Please see comprehensive data on the JDAI program in Appendix C.)

Recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature on JDAI:

Support and expand Juvenile Detention Reform in all 87 Minnesota counties.

Early indications show not only better outcomes for those juveniles who find themselves within the juvenile justice system but also point to significant budget reductions as a collateral result for each county's correctional department. More data and time is needed to study this cost benefit analysis in order for it to be definitive.

3. Coordination of Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Services

Identifying and responding to the mental health needs of youth in contact with the juvenile justice system is recognized as a critical issue at the national, state, and local levels.²⁰ Based on 2005 mental health screening data, it appears that approximately seventy percent of justice-involved youth in Minnesota have mental health disorders.²¹

The issues are myriad and complex. An extensive literature review along with statewide focus group data identified several areas as critical in improving outcomes for these youth.²² JJAC will work on the following areas as a part of its three year plan: (1) the need to collect data that better informs the process and to share that data without jeopardizing the legal interests of youth as defendants and (2) the need for a more coordinated system when screening, assessing, and treating justice involved youth with mental health disorders.

Data Collection

- Support the Departments of Corrections and Human Services to collect mental health screening data by race and by gender.
- Promote and encourage a comprehensive review of relevant federal and state data privacy statutes so that practitioners and policy-makers better understand the type and level of information that can be shared and with whom.
- Support the work of the relevant state agencies to address system wide disparity issues by assembling and publicizing existing data related to disproportionality in each department or governmental branch (Corrections, Public Safety, Education, Human Services, and Courts).

²⁰ Cocozza & Skowrya, 2000

²¹ MN Department of Human Services, 2005

²² MN Department of Corrections, 2008

Mental Health Screening Coordination

- Promote the use of a statewide screening and post screening coordinated model so that disparities do not exist among youth based on their race or gender. Elements of a successful model include early identification through the administration of a screen and diagnostic assessment when needed, timely court hearings to ensure that needed services are provided; structured decision by combining risk and need assessments; multidisciplinary teams to provide case planning; and outcome tracking at the local level to ensure that youth receive needed services.
- Promote the use of a Navigator Function within a lead agency to better engage parents as partners in their child's mental health recovery process and to reduce disparities that often exist when families do not trust the system.

Recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature on Coordination of Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Services:

Support the recommendations from the Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Initiative convened in 2007 by the Commissioner of Corrections in partnership with the Department of Human Services along with multiple state and local partners.

4. De-institutionalization of Status Offenders

Juvenile status offenders must not be confined in locked settings, according to the JJDP Act. The Minnesota Office of Justice Programs reported 11.5 instances where Status Offenders or Non-Offenders were held securely in jails or lockups, or secure juvenile detention in excess of 24 hours. This resulted in a DSO Violation rate of 0.94.²³

A snapshot of the offenses committed by Minnesota's status offenders from the UCR²⁴ includes:

- Curfew/Loitering 2,791 offenses in 2007 compared to 10,227 in 2001.
- Runaway at 2,350 offenses in 2007 compared to 2,779 in 2001.

JJAC is aware that keeping status offenders out of secure settings is a difficult challenge. There is a danger that juvenile justice practitioners may believe they

²³ Source: *Minnesota 2008 Compliance Monitoring Report*. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Office of Justice Programs.

²⁴ Source: *2007 Minnesota Crime Information*. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Criminal Justice Information Systems: Uniform Crime Report.

are holding youth in secure facilities in order to protect them and because there is no appropriate non-secure alternative available. But research shows that detaining these non-offenders in secure detention has a counter affect in that those youth subsequently go on to offend at a higher frequency and with more serious offenses.²⁵ These decision-makers voice a need for more early intervention services in our communities and point out the scarcity of prevention programs to help youth in positive ways and re-entry programs and services for youth leaving out-of-home placements to return home.

The Subcommittee on Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders offers this vision:

Every jurisdiction will have in place strategies and programs that are evidence-based and focused on positive youth development to address the status offense behaviors in order to prevent further involvement in the juvenile justice system and placement in secure detention.

The vision is a challenging one. If Minnesota is to attain it, there are needs to be filled:

- The need for many more evidence-based programs that will engage youth.
- The need for objective criteria and accountability at every decision-making point for the juvenile justice practitioner.
- The need for commitment from policymakers to make juvenile justice a funding priority.
- The need for strong and healthy support from family, school and community.

JJAC's Goal on De-institutionalization: Appropriate services will be provided to status offenders so that their needs are met and they are never placed in secure detention.

The measure of success is that detention admission data from the Office of Justice Programs in the Department of Public Safety will show a steady decline in the numbers of status offenders detained in a secure detention facility.

Strategies for reaching this goal include:

1. To develop within one year a service plan for status offenders incorporating identified promising practices and identifying/articulating the need for appropriate services.
2. To promote the enforcement of existing laws by providing training to all practitioners statewide.

²⁵ Source: *JJAC Sub Committee on Deinstitutionalization, July 25, 2008*

Removing status offenders from secure detention is a priority high on the list of other juvenile justice stakeholder organizations as well. These include, nationally, the Children's Defense Fund, the American Bar Association and the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Locally the Wilder Foundation Research Center is also concerned. Common to the positions of these organizations is recognition that, in order to accomplish the goal, alternative programs and services in communities must be developed,

Recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature on DSO:

Promote evidence-based strategies and non secure programs that address status offense behaviors to prevent further involvement in the juvenile justice system and promote safe and healthy outcomes for youth.

Reduce repeat offender rates by focusing on treatment and family oriented approaches in non secure facilities.

Invest funding in non secure community-based programs to serve as alternatives to juvenile detention.

5. Use of Jails and Other Secure Detention Facilities

A requirement of the JJDP Act is that no juvenile should be held in an adult jail or lockup; time limits on holding juveniles in adult facilities are six hours in Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) counties and twenty-four hours in non-MSA counties.

Based on data received from the DOC S3 database, Minnesota had 3,649 contacts of juveniles with County Jails and Municipal Police Departments in 2007. These are short term detention events, not the number of individual juveniles. Fifty juveniles were held in excess of the allowable six or twenty-four hours. This resulted in a Jail Removal Rate of 5.81 violations per 100,000 juveniles; violations have been reported to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention as required.

A second requirement of the JJDP Act is that states must ensure that a juvenile charged with a delinquent offense who is detained or confined in an adult jail or lockup will not have verbal or visual contact with adult offenders. Minnesota facilities report no violations of this requirement in 2007.²⁶

No Sight and Sound Violations were reported. Therefore the rate for is 00.

²⁶ *Minnesota 2007 Disproportionate Minority Contact Report*, Department of Public Safety, Office of Justice Programs

OJP reported 11.5 instances where Status Offenders or Non-Offenders were held securely in adult jails or lockups, or secure juvenile detention in excess of twenty-four hours. This resulted in a DSO Violation rate of 0.94.²⁷

JJAC's plan on jail issues includes the following activities:²⁸

- Define this monitoring universe. Collect information from facilities on their ability/obstacles to comply with the protections of Sight & Sound Separation, and Jail Removal.
- Establish requirements for comparative data and collect it annually.
- Develop a training PowerPoint and/or training lesson plan for jail/detention gatekeepers in the counties.
- Distribute briefing cheat sheets for decision makers that define laws/policies/acts regarding juvenile jail issues.
- Identify partners and resources that might help in the education/outreach rollout – develop a standard request form for involving businesses in the community.
- Create an inspection team comprised of representatives of both the Department of Corrections and Office of Justice Programs in the Department of Public Safety.

Recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature on Jail Issues in Juvenile Justice:

The Office of Justice Programs in the Department of Public Safety and the Department of Corrections should work together to strengthen inspection of jails and lockups to monitor compliance with JJDP Act regulations regarding juveniles in adult jails and lockups.

6. Prevention, Diversion, Aftercare, Family Engagement and Community-based Services

The success of several of JJAC's other priority issues – reducing DMC, keeping status offenders out of locked facilities, and coordination of mental health and juvenile justice services – depend on the availability of appropriate alternative services and programs. Evidence based best practice programs can demonstrate that they are effective tools in changing a youth's direction and progression into the juvenile justice system.

²⁷ Source: *Minnesota 2008 Compliance Monitoring Report*. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Office of Justice Programs.

²⁸ *Report from JJAC's Subcommittee on Jail Issues, July 25, 2008*

State collaborators on this issue include the Youth Intervention Programs Association (YIPA), the Wilder Foundation Research Center and the Minnesota Alliance with Youth. These practitioners and researchers are able to demonstrate the need for a range of community-based services providing counseling, education, job training, mental health and substance abuse treatment, school liaison services and youth development and leadership. All of the above are concerned about the reduction in funding for youth work and are calling for an increase of funds to make such services possible.

Federal funding for Title II, Title V and JABG has diminished 75 percent in the last eight years. (See appendix E on funding allocations). The effect on availability of services and programs for youth in Minnesota has been drastic. JJAC has seen the effect of these cuts as it oversees these three funds, specifically Title II funds for community-based programs and Title V funds which are available to units of government for youth-serving programs. There will be no new request for proposals in 2009 from these funds due to their diminution.

Recommendation to the Governor and to the Legislature on Community-Based Services:

JJAC joins with the organizations mentioned above for the expansion of community based programs providing prevention, intervention, treatment and aftercare/re-entry services to keep youth out of the justice system and speed their return to successful lives in their communities.

7. Impact and improvement of school/juvenile justice interface

Schools are experiencing more disruptive and unsafe behavior than in the past. In response, school policies regarding student sanctions have changed, and recent years have brought schools and the juvenile justice system into closer proximity with programs that bring law enforcement into the schools as liaison officers and with schools adopting zero tolerance policies.

One unintended consequence of the close proximity of law enforcement coupled with zero tolerance policies is that a huge proportion of youth in the juvenile justice system are there as a result of school based incidents that, in the past, were handled by the school administration, resolved on site and which kept the individual in school. Now, according to a knowledgeable JJAC youth member the truant is rewarded by receiving suspension from school for “ditching”.

An example of a working public/private partnership in this area is the Saint Paul Public School’s On Track Program in conjunction with Ramsey County Human

Services and 180 Degrees, a non-profit agency whose case managers work as early intervention specialists in a classroom setting.

The case managers work with school officials to address the underlying problems affect the youth in an effort to improve education engagement, attendance and performance. Case managers also work with parents and other caregivers to help improve the individual's performance. There are approximately sixty youth who participate in the program in the seventh and eighth grades and are at high risk of not advancing to high school due to credit deficiency. Their high risk status is determined by habitual truancy (90%) and delinquency (60%). The program's goals are to provide immediate intervention in the classroom setting to minimize unnecessary suspensions or expulsions and to re-engage the youth. Program staff work closely with child serving agencies through the county including but not limited to Child Protection, Children's Mental Health, Community Corrections, and the Truancy Intervention Program.

Recommendation to the Governor and to the Legislature on Improvement of School and Juvenile Justice Interface:

The Department of Education and the Department of Public Safety should explore strategies that address behavior and keep youth in school.

The two departments should work together to prepare and provide training to school administrators, teachers and law enforcement on how they can best work together to control behavior while keeping individual youth in school.

8. The Adam Walsh Act: Juvenile Sex Offender Registration

Congress has passed the Adam Walsh Act and Minnesota, along with all other states and territories has until July 2009 to incorporate the act. Serious concerns about this act's requirements have arisen with the question of whether this act should be implemented. The cost of implementation would be high which results in a large financial obstacle. Ohio, the only state to date that has attempted implementation has found insurmountable legal and practical barriers to its implementation.

But the larger question is whether or not it would be good public policy for Minnesota. The Adam Walsh Act contains rules concerning community Identification of juvenile sex offenders. The act requires juvenile sex offenders to be registered by the state on a list available to the public via the Internet. Serious questions such as the retroactivity clause in the

regulations promulgated by the Justice Department and the public access to juvenile criminal histories remain controversial. As a result, many important organizations such as the Minnesota County Attorneys Association are recommending that Minnesota take no further action to adopt the Adam Walsh Act at this time.

Rather than implementing this act, JJAC suggests a one-year extension of the July 2009 implementation deadline. This would give all parties an opportunity to fully understand what costs and benefits would be to Minnesota. A final decision on implementation would still be timely if made in 2010.

In light of the information above, JJAC, in support of the Minnesota Association of County Attorneys and the Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties recommend Minnesota take no further action to adopt the Adam Walsh Act at this time.

Recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature on the Adam Walsh Act: Juvenile Sex Offender Registration

Minnesota should take no further action towards implementing the Adam Walsh Act as it relates to juveniles at this time.

Minnesota should request a one year extension to 2010 without penalty on the Adam Walsh Act as provided in the federal rules.

The relevant state departments should come together to engage all parties in an ongoing discussion on the Adam Walsh Act and its relevance to good public policy in Minnesota.

Appendix A: 2008 JJAC Membership Roster

	<u>Term Expires:</u>
Gail Chang Bohr 1537 Pascal Street St. Paul, MN 55108 (651) 644-4438 (O) (651) 647-9035 (H) Email: gcbuhr@clcmn.org	2009
Chris Bray 10050 Keswick Avenue North Stillwater, MN 55082 (763) 464-3843 (C) 651-429-8248 (H) chris.bray@state.mn.us	2011
Danielle Chelmo 336 Cherry Hill Court Medina, MN 55340 (612) 269-2996 (C) 763-478-9776 sophie221155@aol.com	2011 youth member
William Collins 1231 Sherburne Avenue St. Paul, MN 55104 (651) 222-3741 (O) Email: bcollins@ywcaofstpaul.org	2009 Co-Vice Chair
Freddie Davis-English 12800 50 th Avenue North Plymouth, MN 55442 (612)554-8524 (C) (763)694-0824 (H) Email: Freddie.english63@gmail.com	2009 Co-Chair, DMC Committee
Amanda Dionne 5122 50 th Avenue North Crystal, MN 55429 (612) 290-1759 (C) Email: Dionne@augzburg.edu	2012 youth member
Sarah Dixon 2021 East Hennepin Avenue, Suite 420 Minneapolis, MN 55413 (612) 616-1305 (C) Email: sdixon@mnyouth.net	2012 Executive Committee
Richard Gardell 236 Clifton Avenue So. Mpls., MN 55403 (612) 813-5010 (O) (612) 247-1484 (C) Email: Richard@180degrees.org	2011 Chair
Amanda Heu 367 Grove Street West Saint Paul, MN 55101 (651) 266-5563 (O) (651) 266-9000 x 71185# (Voicemail) Email: Amanda.heu@ci.stpaul.mn.us	2010 youth member

Appendix A: 2008 JJAC Membership Roster (cont'd)

	<u>Term Expires:</u>
<p>Chong Y. Lo Suite 410 816 West St. Germain St. Cloud, MN 56301 (320) 255-3873 (O) (320) 255-3753 (O) Email: chong.lo@pubdef.state.mn.us chnqlo@aol.com</p>	2010
<p>Honorable Michael Mayer 4790 Weston Hills Drive Eagan, MN 55123 (952) 891-7181 (O) (651) 456-0698 (H) Email: lnreMayer@aol.com</p>	2010 Co-Vice Chair
<p>Brenda Pautsch Fifth Judicial District Administration P.O. Box 3366 Mankato, MN 56002-3366 (507) 388-5204 x 253 (507) 237-3670 (H) Email: Brenda.pautsch@courts.state.mn.us</p>	2010
<p>Mary Claire Picard 1679 Palace Avenue St. Paul, MN 55105 (651) 338-0985 (C) maryclaire_picard@yahoo.com</p>	2012 youth member
<p>Kathryn "Kate" Richtman 50 West Kellogg Boulevard, Suite 315 St. Paul, MN 55102 (651) 266-3125 (O) (651) 690-9550 (H) kathryn.richtman@co.ramsey.mn.us</p>	2009
<p>Honorable Kathryn N. Smith 505 West Becker Avenue Willmar, MN 56201 (320) 231-6209 (O) Email: Kathryn.Smith1@courts.state.mn.us</p>	2012 Co-Chair, DMC Committee
<p>Richard Smith 5140 Ives Lane Plymouth, MN 55442 (612) 596-1169 (O) (763) 519-0382 (H) Email: Richard.Smith@courts.state.mn.us</p>	2009
<p>Antonio Tejada PO Box 776 Willmar, MN 56201 (320) 235-1902 (O) Email: Antoniotejeda@yahoo.com</p>	2011
<p>Emily Tischer 731 21st Avenue South, Campus Box 1725 Minneapolis, MN 55454 (507) 358-1182 (C) (612) 373-7909 (H) tischere@augsborg.edu</p>	2009 youth member

Appendix A: 2008 JJAC Membership Roster (cont'd)

Ex-officio State Agency Members

Kim Larson
Minnesota Court Services Division
105 State Court Administrator's Office
25 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
St. Paul, MN 55155
(651) 282-6769 (O)
Email: kimberly.larson@courts.state.mn.us

Amy Roberts, Director
Department of Education
Division of Compliance and Assistance
1500 Highway 36 W
Roseville, MN 55113
(651) 582-8482 (O)
Email: Amy.Roberts@state.mn.us

Jennifer O'Brien
Adolescent Health Coordinator
Department of Health
85 East Seventh Place
P.O. Box 64882
St. Paul, MN 55164-0882
(651) 281-9955 (O)
Email: jennifer.obrien@health.state.mn.us

Kyiunga Olson
Department of Corrections
1079 Highway 292
Red Wing, MN 55066
(651) 283 2200 (C)
(651) 267-3667 (O)
Email: kolson@rw.doc.state.mn.us

Bill Wyss
Children's Mental Health Division
Department of Human Services
PO Box 64985
Saint Paul, MN 55164-0985
(651) 431-2329
Email: Bill.Wyss@state.mn.us

Lynn Douma
Department of Employment and Economic Development
Office of Youth Development
332 Minnesota Street, Suite E200
Saint Paul, MN 55101
(651) 259-7536 (O)
Email: Lynn.Douma@state.mn.us

Staff

Department of Public Safety
Office of Justice Programs
444 Cedar St. - Suite 100
St. Paul, MN 55101
Fax: (651) 201-7350

Maurice Nins
Disproportionate Minority Contact Coordinator
(651) 201-7334 (O)
Email: Maurice.Nins@state.mn.us

Debi Reynolds
JABG Grants Coordinator
(651) 201-7342
Email: Debi.reynolds@state.mn.us

Carrie Wasley
Juvenile Justice Specialist
(651) 201-7348 (O)
Email: Carrie.Wasley@state.mn.us

Appendix B: 2008 JJAC Membership Profile

Gender:

Female = 12
Male = 6

Occupations:

Government Employees/Full Time:	8
High school student (youth member)	1
Non-Profit:	4
Private Legal Practice	1
Retired	1
Youth members*	5

Race:

African American =	2
Asian American =	3
European American =	10
Hispanic =	1
Native American =	2

Geographic Distribution:

Greater MN:	6
MPLS/STP	6
Metro Suburban	6

County

Congressional District

Blue Earth	1	1
Dakota	1	2
Hennepin	5	3/5**
Kandiyohi	2	7
Olmstead	1	1
Ramsey	5	4
St. Louis	1	8
Stearns	1	6
Washington	1	6

*one is also a full time government employee

** one is in Mpls and thus in the 5th Congressional District

Appendix C: Minnesota JDAI Results Report 2008

Report Period 1/2007~12/2007

Minnesota JDAI site demographics: 10 – 17 Population by Race and Ethnicity, 2006

2006	American Indian	Asian/ Pacific IIs.	Black	Hispanic /Latino	White	Total
State	10,274 (1.6%)	28,395 (4.6%)	40,777 (6.7%)	27,395 (4.5%)	499,448 (82.3%)	606,289
Dakota County	269 (0.5%)	2,058 4.1%)	2,903 (5.9%)	2,371 (4.8%)	41,541 (84.5%)	49,142
Hennepin County	1,647 (1.4%)	8,658 (7.6%)	19,450 (17.2%)	7,279 (6.4%)	78,929 (69.8%)	112,963
Ramsey County	602 (1.0%)	9,446 (17.1%)	8,336 (15.1%)	4,276 (7.7%)	32,455 (58.5%)	55,115

Source: Puzanchera, C., Finnegan, T. and Kang, W. (2007). "Easy Access to Juvenile Populations" <http://www.ojdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/>

IMPACT

A. AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION

ALL MINNESOTA JDAI SITES	Pre-JDAI (01/01/05 – 12/31/05)	Most Recent (01/01/07-12/31/07)
ADP Secure Facilities (All Programs)	72.8	61.4 (15.6% Drop in ADP)
Annual Admissions	9400	7530 (19.8% Drop in Annual Admissions)
ADP Detention Programs	55.9	43.4 (22.3% Drop in Detention ADP)
ALOS in Detention Programs	6.8*	7
ADP Secure Treatment Programs	N/A	11.2
ALOS Secure Treatment Programs	N/A	111.7

*Excludes Ramsey Co. as system was unable to aggregate 2005 data

DAKOTA COUNTY Capacity 40 Beds	Pre-JDAI (1/1/05-12/31/05)	Most Recent (1/1/07-12/31/07)
ADP Facility (All Programs)	35.5	21
Annual Admissions	876	549
ADP Detention Program	12	8.5
ALOS in Detention Program	6.2	7.6
ADP Treatment Programs (Short Term)	243 (admissions) N/A (ADP)	146 (admissions) 8.2 (ADP)
(Long Term)	17 (admissions) N/A (ADP)	16 (admissions) 6 (ADP)
ALOS Treatment Programs (Short Term Program)	22	22
(Long Term Program)	157	180

HENNEPIN COUNTY Capacity 87 Beds	Pre-JDAI 1/05 -12/05	1/06-12/06	01/07-12/07
ADP²⁹ Facility	94	99.2 (Detention & BETA)	95.4 (Detention & BETA)
Total Annual Admissions³⁰	4500	4656	3957 ³¹
ADP Detention Program	94	85	79
ALOS³² Detention Program	Total 7.54 Female 5.0 Male 8.32	Total 6.8 days Female 4.5 days Male 7.4 days	Total 7.3 days Female 4.4 days Male 8.1 days
ADP Treatment Program (BETA)	Data not available – BETA Program was not established yet	14.2	16.4
ALOS Treatment Program (BETA)	As above	24.9	27.2

RAMSEY COUNTY Capacity 86 Beds	Pre-JDAI 2005	Most Recent 1/1/07 - 12/31/07
ADP Facility	89	68
Annual Admissions	4,024	3,024

²⁹ Data taken from Monthly JDC Population –developed by Greg Wagner and submitted monthly to HC Board.

³⁰ Data from 2005 and 2006 JDC Annual Reports

³¹ Data from 2007 on-line JdcEhm Population Annual Report

³² Data for 2005 taken from 2006 AECF Results report. Data from 2006 and 2007 from on-line JdcEhm Population report annual 2006 and 2007, and on-line JdcEhm report for Q1 and Q2 for 2008.

ADP Detention Program	61.8	42.9
ALOS in Detention Program	N/A	6.2
ADP Treatment Programs (Work Program) *Work Program removed from Facility in March 2008	25	17.6
(START)	8	7.9
ALOS Treatment Programs (Work Program)	14.3	14.5
(START)	439	315

B. POST DISPOSITIONAL OUT OF HOME PLACEMENTS

ALL MINNESOTA JDAI SITES	Pre-JDAI (1/1/05-12/31/05)	Most Recent (1/1/07-12/31/07)
Youth committed to state corrections (DOC run facilities/programs)	9 (Ramsey County only)*	19
Youth placed in Group Homes, Ranch Camps and other Residential Settings	861*	1,083

* OHP Data unavailable for Hennepin Co. in 2005 at time of report

DAKOTA COUNTY	Pre-JDAI Jan.-Dec. 2005	Most Recent Jan.-Dec. 2007
Youth committed to state corrections	0	0
Youth placed in Group Homes, Ranch Camps and other Residential Settings	539	246

HENNEPIN COUNTY	Pre-JDAI Jan.-Dec. 2005	Most Recent Jan.-Dec. 2007
Youth committed to state corrections	N/A	15
Youth placed in Group Homes, Ranch Camps and other Residential Settings	N/A	585

RAMSEY COUNTY	Pre-JDAI 2005	Most Recent 1/1/07 - 12/31/07
Youth committed to state corrections	9	4
Youth placed in Group Homes, Ranch Camps and other Residential Settings (Excludes placements by joint Corrections/Social Services Delinquency Unit)	322	252

C. PUBLIC SAFETY

ALL MINNESOTA JDAI SITES	Pre-JDAI (1/1/05-12/31/05)	Most Recent (1/1/07-12/31/07)	Clarifications
Failure-to-Appear Rate	N/A	N/A	Mix of percentages and raw numbers
Pre-Adjud. Re-Arrest Rate	N/A	N/A	Mix of percentages and raw numbers
Juvenile Crime Indicator	2,421*	1,990* (17.8% Drop)	Petitions filed by County Attorney – FE & Gross M.

*Excludes Ramsey Co. as only Felony petitions filed, available at time of report

DAKOTA COUNTY	Pre-JDAI Jan.-Dec. 2005	Most Recent Jan.-Dec. 2007	Clarifications
Failure-to-Appear Rate	202	20	Failure to Appear Warrants
Pre-Adjudication Re-Arrest Rate			Not available
Juvenile Crime Indicator	567	230	Felony & Gross Misdemeanor Petitions Filed

HENNEPIN COUNTY	Pre-JDAI 1/05 -12/05	2006 1/06-12/06	2007 1/07-12/07
Failure-to-Appear Rate³³	Not available	Not available	Not available
Pre-Adjudication Re-Arrest Rate³⁴	Not available	Not available	Not available

Juvenile Arrest Rate³⁵	Pre-JDAI	2006	2007
<i>Reporting Period</i>	1/05 -12/05	1/06-12/06	01/07-12/07
Person Offenses (Part 1)	2179	2873	3188
Property Offenses (Part 2)	8555	8710	8147
Total	10734	11583	11335

Serious Cases Referred	2004	2005	2006	2007

³³ We are working with the Courts and the new court data system to figure out how to track and measure failure-to-appear. We hope to have this measure available in 2008.

³⁴ We plan to measure pre-adjudication crime using juvenile citations and petitions filed. We hope to gather this measure in 2008.

³⁵ Data from Brad Kaeter, Hennepin County Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee – Arrests by police agency 2005, 2006 and 2007.

to County Attorney for Prosecution³⁶				
Felony	2064	2012	2120	1913
Gross Misdemeanor	599	526	743	607
Total	2664	2539	2863	2520

Serious Case Juvenile Delinquency Filings³⁷	2004	2005	2006	2007
Felony	1427	1416	1461	1252
Gross Misdemeanor	476	438	588	508
Total	1903	1854	2049	1760

RAMSEY COUNTY	Pre-JDAI 2005	2006	Most Recent 2007	RAI YTD 2008	Clarifications
Failure-to-Appear Rate	6%	N/A	7.7%	5.9%*	
Pre-Adjudication Re-Arrest Rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.2%	Not available prior to RAI
Juvenile Crime Indicator	911	965	N/A	N/A	Felony petitions only, Data N/A for 2007

³⁶ Data from 2004 and 2005 taken from the annual 2006 JDAI Annual Results Report. Data from 2006, 2007 and January – June of 2008 provided by Patty Moses, Hennepin County Attorney's Office. Number includes all cases that came to the county Attorney's office for review including those that were declined, returned to police for further investigation or diverted.

³⁷ Data from list Delinquency Filings Per year from 1996 through 2006 created by Gail Clapp in Court administration. Data from 2007 from Marcy Podkpacz, Court Research Director.

D. RACIAL DISPROPORTIONALITY

ALL MINNESOTA JDAI SITES	Pre-JDAI (1/1/05-12/31/05)	Most Recent (1/1/07-12/31/07)
Youth of Color ADP Detention Programs	33.2*	21.2* (Excludes Hennepin Co) (36.1% Drop in YOC ADP in Detention)
Youth of Color % of ADP Detention Programs	67.2%	71.7% (Drop in numbers, increase in percent – Indicates that YOC still overrepresented in comparison to total detention population)
Youth of Color % of ADP Treatment Programs	N/A	57.1% (Excludes Ramsey Co)*
Youth of Color Committed to State Corrections *Placements not disaggregated by race and ethnicity at time of report	N/A*	N/A*
Youth of Color receiving post- dispositional placements in Ranch Camps, Group Homes and other out-of-home Residential Settings	234 (43.3%) Dakota Co.* *Hennepin and Ramsey unable to disaggregate data for Youth of Color 2005 OHP)	527 (65.1%) (Excludes Ramsey Co)*

*Excludes Hennepin Co. - YOC Detention ADP not available at time of report

*Excludes Ramsey County - System unable to disaggregate data at time of report

DAKOTA COUNTY	Pre-JDAI Jan.-Dec. 2005	Most Recent Jan.-Dec. 2007
ADP of Youth of Color in Detention Program	17	8
Youth of Color Percentage of ADP in Detention	47%	38% (10% Drop in YOC of total detention population)
Youth of Color Percentage of ADP in Treatment Programs	N/A	5.5 (38.7%)
Youth of Color committed to state corrections	0	0
Youth of Color receiving post- dispositional placements in Ranch Camps, Group Homes and other out-of-home Residential Settings	234 (43.3%)	116 (47.1%)

HENNEPIN COUNTY Percentage of Admits by Self-Reported Race of Juvenile	2004³⁸	2005	2006³⁹	2007⁴⁰
Juveniles of color	77.1%	79.8%	83.4%	85.1%
Asian	4.2	4.5	4.5	3.2
Nat. Hawaiian Pacific Islander	.1	.4	0.3	0.4
Black or African American	65.4	67.8	69.1	72.3
American Indian/Native Alaskan	7.4	7.1	7.2	6.6
Other			2.3	2.6
Caucasian	22.9	20.1	16.7	14.9
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Hispanic Ethnicity (All Races)	8.2%	8.3%	9.0%	9.5%
Youth of Color Committed to state corrections *Data not disaggregated by race and ethnicity for these placements		N/A*	N/A*	N/A*
Youth of Color Youth of Color receiving post-dispositional placements in Ranch Camps, Group Homes and other out-of-home Residential Settings		N/A	N/A	411 (83.1%)
Youth of Color Percent of ADP Treatment Program		N/A Program not yet established	n/a data not disaggregated at time of report	12.4 (75.6%)

Definitions and qualifiers:

- “Admits” refers to juveniles brought to JDC and admitted by JDC Staff. (???)
- Excludes bookings with missing self-reported race. (????)

Average Length of Stay for Youth of Color

NA=Not Available	2005⁴¹	2006	2007
Caucasian	NA	7.4	7.2
Juveniles of Color	NA		6.6
Black/African American	NA	6.9	7.4
Am. Indian/N. Alaskan	NA	5.6	6.8
Asian	NA	5.1	5.9
Hawaiian/Pac. Isl.	NA	2.4	6.5
Other		5.1	6.8

³⁸ Data from 2004-2005 taken from 2006 annual results report – unknown how data originally gathered

³⁹ Data from on-line JdcEhm Population report Admissions by race annual 2006 (pulled 7/27/07)

⁴⁰ Data from on-line JdcEhm Population report Admissions by race Annual 2007

RAMSEY COUNTY	Pre-JDAI 2005	Most Recent 2007
ADP of Youth of Color in Detention Program	49.5	34.2
Youth of Color Percentage of ADP in Detention Program	80%	80%
Total Annual Admissions of Youth of Color	2,877	2,439
Youth of Color Percentage of Admissions	71%	81%
ALOS of Youth of Color in Detention Program	N/A	6.2
Youth of Color committed to state corrections	N/A *	N/A*
Youth of Color receiving post-dispositional placements in Ranch Camps, Group Homes and other out-of-home Residential Settings	N/A*	N/A*

*Placements are not available disaggregated by race and ethnicity prior to January 2008

*Youth of Color percent of ADP for Secure Treatment Programs was not available at time of report

I. INFLUENCE

A. DETENTION REFORMS IMPLEMENTED Specific Reforms Implemented This Reporting Period

STATE LEVEL ACTIVITY	
1.	Sessions on the purpose of detention and JDAI progress in sites with managing Juvenile Prosecutors, Judges and Probation directors. All three sessions facilitated by Casey JDAI team leader, James Payne. Discussions focused on challenges with reform for the various practitioner groups and next steps to further appropriate detention utilization – February, June and August, 2008.
2.	Addressing Racial and Ethnic Disparities Training: The three JDAI sites attended the Burns Institute training in Nevada in March, 2008. As a result, sites established definitions of DMC success with benchmarks. The definition of success for the three sites is eliminating racial and ethnic disparities. The benchmarks include, a 10% reduction in youth of color

⁴¹ ALOS for youth broken down by race is not available for 2005. The more detailed annual and quarterly reports with ALOS and ADP broken down by race and ethnicity became available at the start of 2006.

	population in detention, objective criteria at decision points that define profiles of offenders matched with appropriate responses and sought outcomes and community engagement for culturally specific alternatives.
3.	Final model site visits were attended by the counties to Santa Cruz, Cook and Multnomah Counties. The significant lessons include the importance of leadership in reform, that reform must be comprehensive (probation reform) and inclusiveness of impacted communities of color in reform processes and establishing alternatives.
4.	Addressing Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Juvenile Justice , August, 2008: Training by James Bell, W. Haywood Burns Institute, and JDAI team leader, James Payne. Target audience was state and JDAI site executive leadership. Focused on the role and importance of leadership in addressing racial and ethnic disparities in juvenile justice systems, and special detention cases as a clear area to impact DMC.
5.	Detention reform efforts presented at the OJJDP 2008 Conference in Nashville, Tennessee: Minnesota State JDAI Coordinator Angelique Kedem and State DMC Coordinator Maurice Nins, presented a summary of Minnesota's JDAI efforts at the workshop entitled 'Developing and Implementing Detention Reform Efforts' August, 2008.
6.	State expansion efforts: In collaboration with Minnesota's State Advisory Group: the Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC), JDAI was presented to the 9 th Judicial District which represents four northern, rural Minnesota counties: Cass, Beltrami, Hubbard and Itasca counties. These counties have two neighboring reservations - Red Lake and Leech Lake. JDAI has been approached as a means to address the disproportionate minority contact for American Indian youth in their systems. St. Louis County, which provides detention services for three surrounding counties in northern Minnesota, is also interested in JDAI and did a readiness assessment consultation with the Burns Institute. A meeting to debrief the results of the assessment, facilitated by Burns Institute staff, was held in March, 2008. St. Louis County's DMC is most significant with American Indian youth. Minnesota's JJAC has set aside funds to contribute to detention reform efforts for outstate Minnesota counties.
	JDAI was introduced to the Association of Minnesota Counties' Public Safety Committee at their annual planning conference for the Association's legislative agenda in July, 2008. JDAI presentations were also given at the Minnesota State Conference for Children with Mental Health (MACMH), the African American Leadership Council, the State Council on Black Minnesotans, Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties annual conference (MACCAC) and 'Connecting Youth to Success' Minnesota state conference on juvenile justice hosted by the Juvenile Justice Coalition.
7.	Collaboration: Minnesota JDAI co-hosted with the Juvenile Justice Coalition and State Public Defenders Office, a discussion of legislative platforms and session outcomes with juvenile justice agencies and associations, the first gathering of its kind in Minnesota. This collaborative includes a range of groups such as the County Attorney's Association, Probation associations, Public Defenders, Mental Health advocacy groups, Minnesota Counties' Association and Corrections associations. The groups prioritized areas of focus and mutual support for the 2009 legislative session with the top two priorities 1) Defining use of secure detention for youth posing an imminent public safety risk and the creation of objective detention screening tools for all facilities in the state, and 2) Addressing racial and ethnic disparities through comprehensive data collection by race and ethnicity at each decision point along the juvenile justice continuum.

8.	State level collaboration on data collection: Minnesota has three delivery systems for corrections services – State Department of Corrections supervision, county run supervision and a mixture of county and state run supervision where corrections is under supervision of the court. These three delivery systems, the Department of Public Safety (Office of Justice Programs) and JDAI are collaborating regarding juvenile justice data collection for racial and ethnic disparities work and defining outcomes for juvenile justice in Minnesota.
----	--

CORE STRATEGY	<u>DAKOTA COUNTY</u> : SPECIFIC REFORMS IMPLEMENTED	Please Specify: Policy, Program or Practice
Collaboration	School Collaborative formed to address school referrals and DMC.	Practice
Use Of Data	Implementation of the Risk Assessment Instrument on CJIIN database to assess youth to determine level of risk to the public and level detention alternative needed. Quarterly data reports to assist in monitoring detention utilization and other data reports developed to monitor other programs.	Practice
Objective Screening	Policies and procedures implemented to ensure appropriate detention utilization. Established a triage procedure to expedite youth to a detention alternative.	Policy/Practice
Alternatives to Detention	Dakota County utilizes the following ATDs: electronic monitoring, Robocuff, and shelters.	Policy/Practice
Case Processing	Placement team meeting added; twice per week.	Practice
	The additional meeting further expedites the process of getting youth into court.	
Special Populations	Development of the sanction grid to address probation violations.	Practice
ERDD*	Data collected by race/ethnicity and gender. The DMC Committee review of each decision point in the juvenile system by population & admission criteria.	Practice
Conditions of Confinement	Dakota County facility assessment completed & an action plan developed. A monthly review schedule to monitor progress in Completing the identified actions in the plan.	Practice
Misc.		

CORE STRATEGY	<u>HENNEPIN COUNTY</u> : SPECIFIC REFORMS IMPLEMENTED	Please Specify: Policy, Program or Practice
Collaboration		
Use Of Data		
Objective Screening	Current Detention Criteria retained – adopted February 2008 We decided that RAI would not supplant the current detention	Policy

	<p>criteria. Instead the RAI along with the Mandatory Crimes list would be used to all new JDC admissions only. Youth admitted to the JDC on Warrants and A & Ds would not be given a RAI.</p> <p>RAI – begins – April 2008</p> <p>Hennepin County’s Risk Assessment Instrument goes on line, April 7. A small group of individuals reverse the policy decision of the P&I committee and determines that youth in ATD will have an “out-of-custody” status. However, they will be subject to the same case processing timelines as “in-custody” youth. It was also decided that the RAI and mandatory offense categories would remain un-touched for 6-months.</p>	Policy & Practice
	<p>All Youth admitted to the JDC given RAI – Adopted May 2008</p> <p>A decision was made to have all youth admitted to the JDC given the RAI. However, youth brought in on warrants and A & Ds were not given full RAI. Only youth brought in on new crimes are administered full RAIs.</p>	Practice
Alternatives to Detention	<p>Policy decision to keep youth in ATDs on-custody status – adopted in March 2008</p> <p>During the March Policy & Implementation Committee meeting it was decided that youth who go to detention Alternative would remain on “in-custody status”. That way they would be subject to the same accelerated timelines as youth in secure detention</p>	Policy
Case Processing	<p>A new form for warrants for juveniles who do not complete their community service was implemented in September 2007 – this form allows more low-level juvenile offenders to be released</p>	Policy & Practice
	<p>New Court Bench warrant Policy adopted January 2008</p> <p>The Juvenile Court adopted a new Bench Warrant policy has a system default to release unless a judicial officer affirms that they want a juvenile held due to underlying public safety concerns.</p>	Policy
	<p>Printed Copies of the RAI given to Court – Adopted May 2008.</p> <p>After a long contentious debate, the P & I committee adopted a policy to provide printed copies of the RAI to the juvenile court during detention hearings. The RAI scores are for information purposes only and (by policy) cannot be changed by the court. Judges wanted these scores as one more tool to assist them in their decision-making in detention hearings.</p>	Policy & Practice
Special Populations	<p>Juvenile Probation pilots Administrative Sanctions Grid – May 2008</p>	Practice Pilot
	<p>Juvenile Probation institutes new A & D policy – Adopted June 2008</p> <p>Juvenile Probation’s new policy prohibits probation officers from issuing A & Ds for juvenile petty, traffic and status offenses.</p>	Policy
Ethnic/Racial Disparities	<p>Collaborative set 10% reduction goal in 2008 for Youth of Color in detention</p> <p>Data is being collected, particularly RAI information by race, ethnicity, gender, geography and connected offenses</p>	

Conditions of Confinement		
Misc.		

CORE STRATEGY	<u>RAMSEY COUNTY</u> : SPECIFIC REFORMS IMPLEMENTED	Please Specify: Policy, Program or Practice
Collaboration	Resolution in support of JDAI passed by Saint Paul City Council	Policy
	Corrections and Saint Paul Police weekly meetings to discuss reform issues established	Practice
Use Of Data	Produce quarterly reports for detention showing admissions, ALOS, ADP by race, ethnicity, gender	Practice
	Implemented monthly reports of RAI results showing scores and override rates by race, ethnicity, geography, gender, offense level and reason for override. (Data can be further disaggregated upon request)	Practice
Objective Screening	Implemented the a risk screening tool for detention based on the established purpose of detention	Practice
	Detention criteria and worksheet for law enforcement established for use at arrest.	Practice
	Risk assessment instrument qualitative study completed	
Alternatives to Detention	Probation alternatives implemented: home detention alternative and GPS home monitoring.	Policy
	Increased the use of shelters as a defined alternative to detention	Policy
	Crisis response program for youth with domestic assault and mental health issues implemented	Program
Case Processing	Next day court schedules for ATD youth Established	Policy
	Established an 8 day detention review for trials, dispositions and placements with bench.	Policy
	Established Case Processing Committee	Practice
Special Populations	Established policy that all recommendations to detention for probation violations require a supervisor's approval	Practice / Policy
	Walk-in calendar implemented for youth with misdemeanor level offenses or less with technical probation violations.	Practice
	Implemented the required completion of YLSI for all youth on probation to determine risk level.	Practice
ERDD*	Established the DMC Committee to look at policies and practices through a racial lens.	Practice
	Began collecting data by ethnicity.	Practice
Conditions of Confinement	Completed the Facility Assessment, implemented corrective action plan and established annual review process with Tri-County JDAI jurisdictions.	Practice

	Improved quality and portion of food.	Practice
	Weekly STD clinic for male and female residents added	Practice
	Sexual abuse screening and triage protocol implemented at admissions.	Practice
Misc.	Hand-gathered data for 2007 warrants by race, gender, offence levels	n/a
	Implemented reminder phone calls for youth with initial hearings	Practice

B. MEDIA COVERAGE

DAKOTA COUNTY		
Date	Description of Coverage	Name of Media
6/2008	Tri-County JDAI work	Star Tribune
6/2008	<i>JDAI "Kick Off" Press Release</i> Introduced detention reform plan for Dakota County – releasing youth inappropriate for secure detention to community alternatives.	Star Tribune
6/2008	<i>JDAI "Kick Off" Press Release</i>	Pioneer Press
6/2008	<i>Detention Reform; "When Detention isn't the answer to keep numbers down in juvenile lock up, county reexamines how it decides who belongs where"</i> Dakota County JSC Data Article delves into overrepresentation of youth of color in detention and Dakota's efforts to address the issue through JDAI.	Pioneer Press

HENNEPIN COUNTY		
Date	Description of Coverage	Name of Media
4/10/08	<i>State of the County Address:</i> Hennepin County Board of Commissioners Chair, Randy Johnson references JDAI as an important strategy in his annual, televised address.	State of County Address
5/22/08	<i>Voices of the African American Community</i> - Presiding Juvenile Court Judge, Tanya Bransford is an hour-long guest on radio. Entire show is devoted to JDAI.	KMOJ Radio
5/23/08	<i>Urban Agenda</i> – Brian Smith (JDAI) answers questions on community radio forum on JDAI.	KMOJ Radio
6/08/08	<i>News Paper Article entitled: <u>Dakota County – When Detention isn't the answer to keep numbers down in juvenile lock up, county reexamines how it decides who belongs where.</u></i> Hennepin County is mentioned in this article.	St. Paul Pioneer Press
6/18/08	A basic re-hash of the Pioneer Press article.	Star Tribune
8/08	Updated (2008) Hennepin County JDAI factsheet posted.	Hennepin County Website
RAMSEY COUNTY		
Date	Description of Coverage	Name of Media

October 2007	JDAI structure and general overview	JDAI News (Ramsey County)
6/8/08	Ramsey County mention as part of Dakota "kick-off"	Pioneer Press
6/18/08	Tri-County JDAI overview	Star Tribune
June 2008	RAI implementation and process	JDAI News (Ramsey County)
7//15/08	Ramsey County JDAI Overview and Community Coach-up Announcement	KFAI
Ongoing	Ramsey JDAI, Association of MN Counties, Juvenile Justice Advisory Council, MN Courts, Employ Ex-Offenders	Websites

B. MEETINGS, CONFERENCES, PRESENTATIONS, TRAINING

DAKOTA COUNTY		
Date	Description of Event	# Attendees
4/2008	Community Engagement- Garage Program	8
5/2008	Community Engagement- Apple Valley Youth Center	6
5/2008	Youth Council- Presentation on JDAI	15
7/2008	Community Engagement- Hastings Comm. Collaborative	12
4/2008	Risk Assessment & Triage Training	8
6/2008	Risk Assessment & Triage Training	5

HENNEPIN COUNTY		
Date	Description of Event	# Attendees
9/25 - 9/27/07	JDAI Inter site Conference in Dallas, TX	A 6-member delegation from Hennepin County
10/25 – 10/26/07	OJJDP Conference on DMC, Denver, CO	2 people from Hennepin County attended this conference
1/30 – 1/31/08	Model site visit to Santa Cruz County, CA	13
3/14 – 3/15/08	Model site visit to Multnomah County, Oregon	1 person from Hennepin County
3/25/08	Burns Institute Training on Eliminating Racial Disparities – Las Vegas, Nevada	5 From Hennepin County
5/07 – 5/08/08	Model site Visit to Cook County, Illinois	4 from Hennepin County
6/19/08	Juvenile Justice Coalition Conference – <i>Connecting Youth to Success – Doing Juveniles Justice in Minnesota</i> Conference had several workshops that featured JDAI and Burns Institute strategies.	300 community people, juvenile justice professionals and community service professions in attendance
7/31/08	Association of Minnesota Counties – Juvenile Justice legislative subcommittee meeting – State and Hennepin County JDAI Coordinators and State DMC Coordinator & Compliance Monitor made a presentation to this group	25

8/15/08	Burns Institute Policy makers Coach-up. An excellent training on Eliminating Racial Disparities. Has had a positive impact on juvenile justice policy leaders in Hennepin County. Bravo!	Approx. 100 in attendance from all 3 JDAI Minnesota counties.
----------------	--	---

RAMSEY COUNTY		
Date	Description of Event	# Attendees
9/25-9/26/07	JDAI Interstate Conference	6
10/7-10/8/07	OJJDP DMC Conference	5
2/5/08	County Board of Commissioners presentation on JDAI	53
2/2008	Suburban Collaborative presentation on JDAI	25
6/10/08	Black Ministerial Alliance presentation on JDAI	17
5/14/08	Saint Paul City Council presentation on JDAI	10
6/05/08	Presented to community-based organizations on ATD development	10
6/19/08	Connecting Youth to Success Forum on juvenile justice reforms	15
7/10/08	Presentation on JDAI to African American Leadership Council	15
8/20/08	Presentation on detention reform to Congresswoman Betty McCollum's Aide	9
8/22/08	Presentation/ discussion with community-based organizations on ATDs	23
8/23/08	Presentation on JDAI to Hmong 18 Council	24
12/2007 - ongoing	RAI Training for JDC staff and stakeholders	50+

II. LEVERAGE RESULTS

DAKOTA COUNTY		
Project/Staff Description	Fund Type⁴²	Amount
Local JDAI Coordinator	A/C	\$47,000
Expeditor	A	\$25,342
Supervisor (for JDAI Coordinator)	A	\$51,044
FullThought, Consultancy (Consultant services for Community Engagement Project)	C	\$10,000
MACRO Group (Data System Enhancements)	C	\$50,000

HENNEPIN COUNTY		
Project/Staff Description	Fund Type⁴³	Amount
Corrections Admin Support 20% effort	A	\$9,000
Site Coordinator Salary Support. Data Coordinator .5 FTE Community Liaison	A B (JJAC)	\$106,000 \$40,000 \$40,000
RAI development Court Administration Research – 500 hours Detention Center staff - 230 hours Juvenile Judge – 80 hours	A A B	\$26,000 \$10,000 \$ 7,000
Committee member time – too much to count, from county, state and community based organizations	A, D	

⁴² A = local government funds; B = state or federal grants; C = foundation/private grants; D = in-kind match

⁴³ A = local government funds; B = state or federal grants; C = foundation/private grants; D = in-kind match

RAMSEY COUNTY		
Project/Staff Description	Fund Type⁴⁴	Amount
JDAI Coordinators	A/C	\$64,0000
Staff time for special projects (report generation, data collection, programming, etc.)	A	\$35,055
Staff time for special projects (report generation, data collection, programming. etc.)	A/C	\$75,0000
Training for Community Engagement / Sanctions Grid	C	\$25,000

⁴⁴ A = local government funds; B = state or federal grants; C = foundation/private grants; D = in-kind match

Appendix D: Compilation of Relevant Youth Data

MN POPULATION & YOUTH POPULATION OVERVIEW: 2007

Source: Estimates of the Population by Selected Age Groups for the United States, States, and Puerto Rico: July 1, 2007. US Census Bureau. Available at <http://www.census.gov/popest/states/asrh/tables/SC-EST2007-01.xls>

- US Census Bureau Population estimates for 2007 indicate that the population for Minnesota is 5,197,621.
- In 2007, there are estimated to be 1,260,282 youth under the age of 18. (24 percent of MN's total population).
- Population estimates over the past three years (05, 06 and 07) have shown that youth have been holding steady at 24 percent of the population.
- The population of youth who can potentially become justice system involved (ages 10-17) was 578,894 in 2006 and 585,085 in 2005. This age breakout is not yet available from the same source for 2007 but it is reasonable to estimate that it is likely between 575,000 and 580,000. (46.5 percent of youth or 11.1 percent of the total population)
- Those at highest risk for jj system involvement (ages 14 to 17) in 2007 was 296,917. This has been fairly constant over the past three years.

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2006. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Accessible at <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/ezapop/>

MN RACE DATA, GENERAL: 2006

- 2006 population estimates MN's population is 87.8% Caucasian alone, 4.4% African American alone, 1% American Indian/Alaskan Native alone, 3.5% Asian alone, 1.6% some other race alone, 1.6% two or more races. Hispanic/Latino ethnicity of any race is estimated to be 3.8%.

Source: 2006 American Community Survey Demographic and Housing Estimates: Minnesota. US Census Bureau, American Fact Finder.

- MN's youth population, 2006 is estimated to be: 79% Caucasian, 6% African American, 5 % Asian, 1% Indian, 3 percent two or more races, 6% Hispanic of any race.
- Racial and ethnic minorities are a greater percentage of the youth population than of the total population.

Source: "From "Getting By" to "Getting Ahead," Kids County Data Book 2008. Children's Defense Fund Minnesota.

JUVENILE ARREST TREND DATA:

- In 2007 there were a total of 213,350 total arrests. Of these, juveniles accounted for 44,615 or 20.9 percent.
- 2007 saw a decrease in percentage of juvenile arrests. In 2006, juvenile arrests accounted for 24.2 percent of all arrests; in 2005 juveniles accounted for 24.2 percent of all arrests; in 2000, juveniles accounted for 27.3 percent of all arrests.

- As an age group, adults 18 to 24 consistently have the highest number of arrests (73,986). Arrests are the highest for 18 and 19 year olds (29,527). The second most arrested age group is youth under age 18 (54,384). The two ages most arrested under 18 are 16 and 17 year olds (24,494). Factors related to the maturation, decision-making processes, and lifestyles of youth as they age through their teens and early 20s are often used to explain why these age groups are arrested at a disproportionately higher rate.
- Overall, juvenile arrests have been declining since peaking in 2000 at 74,751.
- Between 2001 and 2006, juvenile arrests fluctuated up and down between 50,942 and 59,348 until reaching a new low in 2007: 44,615. Conversely, adult arrests have been slowly rising since their low in 2003. There were 1,168 fewer adult arrests in 2007 than 2006 compared to a decrease of 9,769 juvenile arrests between 2006 and 2007.
- There was a substantial drop in juvenile arrests between the year 2000 and 2001 when arrests decreased from 74,751 to 52,452 (29.8 percent decrease).
- Examination of arrest data from 2000, 2001 and 2007 reveal large decreases in arrests in certain areas on the table below. It is unlikely that there was a significant decrease in crime between 2000 and 2001, rather a change in law enforcements' willingness or ability to arrest for these offenses. Reasons for the change may be related to changes in legislation, reductions in budgets and resources, expansions in arrest alternatives, or changes in philosophy about arresting youth for largely status level, non-violent or impudent behaviors. No change in reporting methodology is mentioned in the crime reports between 2000 and 2001 that would clearly account for the decrease.

Offense	2000	2001	2000-2001 (% change)	2007	2000-2007 (% change)	2001-2007 (% change)
“other offenses”*	12,166	7,508	-38.3	5,579	-54.1	-25.7
Curfew/ loitering	10,227	5,971	-41.6	2,791	-72.7	-53.3
Liquor Laws	10,032	7,144	-28.8	7,299	-27.2	2.2
Narcotics	5,418	3,745	-30.9	2,834	-47.7	-24.3
Vandalism	4,125	2,509	-39.2	1,999	-51.5	-20.3
Disorderly conduct	4,627	3,462	-25.2	4,547	-1.7	31.3
Runaway	3,618	2,779	-23.2	2,350	-35.0	-15.4
PART 1 assault	1,113	785	-29.5	691	-37.9	-12.0
Other assault	4,896	3,938	-19.6	3,928	-19.8	-0.3
Motor vehicle theft	1,471	911	-38.1	428	-70.9	-53.0

*“Other Offenses” includes all state and local offenses not included in the 27 UCR categories except traffic offenses.

- The second largest drop in juvenile arrests has just occurred between 2006 and 2007. In 2006 there were 54,384 juvenile arrests compared to 44,615 in 2007. The largest drop occurred in the two juvenile categories of curfew/loitering (down 2,175) and runaway (down 2,043). Other decreases again occurred in “other offenses” (down 1,221); Liquor laws (down 731); assault (down 721) and vandalism (down 606). Again, reasons for decreases in these areas are somewhat speculative. The fact that curfew/loitering and runaway arrests have nearly been cut in half in one year may be connected to changes in policy about arresting for these offenses.

2007 JUVENILE ARREST DATA:

- Arrests are divided into three categories for juveniles: Part I (typically serious, violent or person offenses); PART II (typically less serious, property related offenses); and “status” related offenses of curfew/ loitering and runaway. PART I offenses reflect the greatest public safety risk.
- In 2007, 24 percent of juvenile arrests were PART I offenses, 64 percent of arrests were PART II, and 12 percent were STATUS. This offense distribution has remained fairly constant for the past three years. STATUS arrests are down from 17 percent in 2006 to 12 percent in 2007. Consequently, the percentage of total arrests for PART I and PART II offenses has increased slightly in 2007.

MALE v FEMALE

- Between 2005 and 2007, males have consistently accounted for 2/3rds (67%) of all juvenile arrests.
- Over the past three years, on average, males have accounted for 64 percent of PART I arrests, 71 percent of PART II arrests and 53 percent of status offenses. These distributions have remained fairly constant.
- The only offenses where juvenile females have higher arrest rates than juvenile males are Prostitution (12 v. 7), Family/Children (7 v. 4) and Runaway (1,404 v. 946).

By RACE:

	2007	% of arrests	2006	% of arrests	2005	% of arrests
Total juvenile arrests	44615		54384		50942	
White	28,678	64.3	32228	59.3	32707	64.2
African American	12,822	28.7	17644	32.4	14224	27.9
American Indian/Native Alaskan	1,895	4.2	2333	4.3	1999	3.9
Asian	1,220	2.7	2179	4.0	2012	3.9
Total	44,615	100.0	54384	100.0	50942	100.0

CAUCASIAN YOUTH:

- Caucasians, who are the majority of the population, commit the majority of the crime. Caucasian juveniles accounted in 2007 for 64.3 percent of juvenile arrests. Caucasians are 79 percent of the youth population under 18.
- Caucasians accounted in 2007 for 63% of PART I arrests; 70% of PART II arrests; but only 34% of STATUS arrests.

AFRICAN AMERICAN YOUTH:

- In 2007, African American youth accounted for 28.7 percent of youth arrests. African American youth are 6% of the juvenile population.

- African Americans accounted for 30% of PART I arrests; 24% of PART II arrests; and 54% of STATUS arrests. These disparities are significant when related to use of Curfew/Loitering as arrest for African American youth as this is often the first contact with the justice system.

AMERICAN INDIAN YOUTH:

- In 2007 American Indian youth accounted for 4.2 percent of arrests. American Indian youth are 1% of the juvenile population.
- American Indian youth accounted for 3% of PART I arrests; 4% of PART II arrests; and 5% of STATUS arrests.

ASIAN YOUTH:

- Asian youth in 2007 accounted for 4% of juvenile arrests. Asians are 3% of the total youth population.
- Asians accounted for 4% of PART I arrests; 2% of PART II arrests; 4% of status arrests.

Sources: *2007 Minnesota Crime Information. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Criminal Justice Information Systems: Uniform Crime Report.*

2006 Minnesota Crime Information. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Criminal Justice Information Systems: Uniform Crime Report.

2005 Minnesota Crime Information. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Criminal Justice Information Systems: Uniform Crime Report.

2001 Minnesota Crime Information. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Criminal Justice Information Systems: Uniform Crime Report.

2000 Minnesota Crime Information. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension, Criminal Justice Information Systems: Uniform Crime Report.

JUVENILE PETITIONS (CHARGES FILED) 2006:

Source: “Who are the Youth in Minnesota’s Juvenile Justice System?” Chris Bray, Director of Juvenile Services, Minnesota Department of Corrections. Data provided to Chris Bray by the Minnesota State Court Administrator’s Office.

Total Delinquency Petitions: 21,595

White or Caucasian: 39% (8,373)

Black or African American: 21% (4,551)

Hispanic or Latino: 6% (1,237)

American Indian or Alaskan Native: 5% (1,096)

Asian/Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 3% (645)

Other/Mixed: 3% (747)

Unknown: 23% (4,946)*

*It is current practice that the courts changed race to be “self report” by the petitioned. If a worker does not expressly ask race or if the petitioned does not answer, it is getting recorded as “unknown” resulting in the large percentage with no race assigned.

- Minority petitions account for 38% of all petitions. It is unknown if the “unknown” race category is predominantly Caucasian, minority, or an equal combination.

YOUTH under DOC authority

MCF REDWING: State Commits

CY2007: 35 Caucasian 33%; African American 30%, American Indian 22%, Hispanic 10%, Asian 5%

CY2006: 37

Source: *Juvenile Inmate Profile as of 01-01-2008. Minnesota Department of Corrections*

Number of youth under age 18 in adult prison as of 01-01-2008: 13

Number of inmates certified as adults at time of sentencing: 321

Source: *Adult Inmate Profile as of 01-01-2008. Minnesota Department of Corrections*

As of December 31st, 2007: 22 Juveniles were on Parole, 23 Certified Adults were on Supervised Release, and 19 Certified Adults were on Intensive Supervised Release.

Source: *2007 Probation Survey. Minnesota Department of Corrections.*

YOUTH TRANSFERRED TO ADULT COURT: 2006

Total: 98

Caucasian: 23 (23%)

African American: 29 (30%)

Hispanic/Latino: 4 (4%)

American Indian/Alaskan Native: 9 (9%)

Asian; 2 (2%)

Other/Mixed: 0 (0%)

Unknown: 31 (32%)

All Minorities 44 (45%)

Source: *“Who are the Youth in Minnesota’s Juvenile Justice System?” Chris Bray, Director of Juvenile Services, Minnesota Department of Corrections. Data provided to Chris Bray by the Minnesota State Court Administrator’s Office.*

JUVENILE PROBATIONERS:

	2007	percent	2006	percent	2005	percent
Total Probationers	141,978		142,031		131,385	
Juvenile Probationers	14,181	10.0	14,742	10.4	14,312	10.9
male	10182	71.8	10690	72.5	10421	72.8
female	3999	28.2	4052	27.5	3891	27.2
white		54.0		54.0		55.0
black		25.0		24.0		23.0
american indian		6.0		6.0		7.0
asian/pacific islander		3.0		4.0		4.0
other race		12.0		10.0		11.0
unknown race		0.0		2.0		0.0
nonhispanic		93.0		94.0		95.0
hispanic		7.0		6.0		5.0

- Juveniles account for approximately 10 percent of the state’s probation population.
- Juvenile probationers are approximately 70 percent male and 30 percent female.

- Statewide, Caucasian youth account for just over half of probationers (54%). There is a difference between the 7 county metro area which has 38 percent Caucasian probationers vs. non-metro counties which have 69 percent Caucasian probationers.
- Agencies were asked to report the most serious offense for which an individual was on probation. The top categories for juveniles were as follows: Status/Federal/Miscellaneous 3,232 (23%), Disturbing Peace 1,755 (12%), Theft 1,505 (11%), Assault 1,409 (10%), and Property Damage 980 (7%).

Source: 2007 Probation Survey. Minnesota Department of Corrections.
 2006 Probation Survey. Minnesota Department of Corrections.
 2005 Probation Survey. Minnesota Department of Corrections.

JUVENILE PLACEMENTS:

Accurate correctional placement numbers can be difficult to obtain. The MN DOC uses the Statewide Supervision System (S3) database to track secure admissions of both adults and juveniles, however not all admissions data is uploading to this system reliably from all secure juvenile facilities. Likewise, the DOC Inspection and Enforcement Unit (I & E) maintains a list where facilities self report their admissions at the end of the year, but not all facilities submit their totals in a timely fashion.

There are 21 juvenile facilities that have the capability of holding juveniles securely. Of those, four are post-disposition facilities only (they do not provide any detention services) and they predominantly have non-secure beds.

Best estimates at this time by cross checking both the S3 admission numbers against the I&E report numbers puts admissions to secure beds to the 17 facilities that offer secure detention and regular secure programming are between 14,500 and 15,000. Note this is the total number of admissions, not the total number of individuals admitted. The same youth can be admitted to secure detention multiple times over the course of a year. Similarly, a youth may be admitted to secure detention and then after court be admitted to a secure residential program. This individual would count as two admissions even if he or she just changed programs within the same facility.

Source: *In-State Juvenile Placement Data, 2007. Minnesota Department of Corrections, Inspection and Enforcement Unit.*

2008 COMPLIANCE MONITORING REPORT /Contact with ADULT FACILITIES: (uses 2007 admissions data)

Based on data received from the DOC S3 database, OJP is recording 3,649 contacts of juveniles with County Jails and Municipal Police Departments. Again, these are short term detention events, not the number of individual juveniles.

OJP has reported 50 hold violations to the OJJDP where it appears juveniles were held in excess of the allowable 6 or 24 hours. This resulted in a Jail Removal Rate of 5.81 violations per 100,000 juveniles.

No Sight and Sound Violations were reported. Violation Rate for Sight/Sound = 0.00
 OJP reported 11.5 instances where Status Offenders or Non-Offenders were held securely in adult jails or lockups, or secure juvenile detention in excess of 24 hours. This resulted in a DSO Violation rate of 0.94.

Source: Minnesota 2008 Compliance Monitoring Report. Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Office of Justice Programs.

2007 DMC REPORT: RELATIVE RATE INDEX (uses calendar year 2006 data).

Points of Contact	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other/ Mixed	All Minorities
Juvenile Arrests	4.84	2.76	0.63	*	3.16	*	3.03
Refer to Juvenile Court	--	--	--	*	--	*	--
Cases Diverted	--	--	--	*	--	*	--
Cases Involving Secure Detention	2.66	1.45	4.24	*	3.44	*	2.54
Cases Petitioned	1.38	0.97	2.15	*	2.02	*	1.52
Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	--	--	--	*	--	*	--
Cases Resulting in Probation Placement	0.03	0.05	0.06	*	0.04	*	0.03
Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	1.40	1.66	2.28	*	1.53	*	1.40
Cases Transferred to Adult Court	2.32	**	**	*	2.99	*	1.94
Group meets 1% Threshold?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	

Source: Minnesota 2007 Disproportionate Minority Contact Report. Department of Public Safety, Office of Justice Programs.

Examination of the below national DMC rates (for 2005 data) show that Minnesota has significant issues with DMC at all points in the Juvenile Justice system as compared to the national average.

RELATIVE RATES		Minority	Black	AIAN*	AHPI**
trends	Arrest rate	1.7	2.1	1.1	0.3
trends	Referral rate	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.2
trends	Diversion rate	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.8
trends	Detention rate	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.1
trends	Petitioned rate	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.1
trends	Adjudicated rate	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.0
trends	Probation rate	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.1
trends	Placement rate	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.0
trends	Waiver rate	1.1	1.1	1.9	0.6

Puzzanchera, C. and Adams, B. (2008). National Disproportionate Minority Contact Databook. Developed by the National Center for Juvenile Justice for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Online. Available: <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/dmcdcb/>

Appendix E: OJJDP Allocations

U.S. Department of Justice Allocations to Minnesota by Federal Fiscal Year: 2000-2008

Total for all Juvenile Justice Allocations for the state of Minnesota

Federal Fiscal Year	Amount	Percentage Change per year
2000	\$6,244,300	NA
2001	\$5,952,800	(-) 5%
2002	\$6,152,300	(+) 3%
2003	\$5,213,200	(-) 15%
2004	\$3,916,600	(-) 25%
2005	\$2,197,085	(-) 44%
2006	\$1,683,550	(-) 23%
2007	\$1,722,489	(+) 2%
2008	\$1,674,760	(-) 3%

Title II: Formula Grants

2000	\$1,209,000	NA
2001	\$1,190,000	(-) 2%
2002	\$1,193,000	0%
2003	\$1,173,000	(-) 2%
2004	\$1,060,000	(-) 10%
2005	\$1,104,000	(+) 4%
2006	\$932,000	(-) 16%
2007	\$962,000	(+) 3%
2008	\$893,000	(-) 7%

Title V: Community Delinquency Prevention

2000	\$733,000	NA
2001	\$659,000	(-) 10%
2002	\$679,000	(+) 3%
2003	\$473,000	(-) 30%
2004	\$0	NA
2005	\$246,000	NA
2006	\$56,250	(-) 77%
2007	\$75,250	(+) 34%
2008	\$48,360	(-) 36%

State Challenge Grants

2000	\$146,000	NA
2001	\$141,000	(-) 3%
2002	\$140,000	(-) 1%
2003	\$135,000	(-) 4%
2004	\$212,000	(+) 57%
2005	Program Discontinued	NA

Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG)

2000	\$4,156,300	NA
2001	\$3,962,800	(-) 5%
2002	\$4,140,300	(+) 4%
2003	\$3,432,200	(-) 17%
2004	\$2,644,600	(-) 23%
2005	\$847,085	(-) 68%
2006	\$695,300	(-) 18%
2007	\$685,239	(-) 1%
2008	\$733,400	(+) 7%

Appendix F: Report on Youth Summits

In 2008 JJAC partnered with the Minnesota Alliance with Youth, the MN Department of Education, the SEARCH Institute and State Farm Insurance and other local organizations to sponsor ten mini Youth Summits across the state. The summits were conducted in the communities of: Brainerd, Brooklyn Park, Duluth, Fairmont, Minneapolis, Moorhead, Northfield, Rochester, West Saint Paul and Worthington. Summit attendance ranged from fifteen to over one hundred participants. The mixture of youth, parents and teachers or staff varied.

Each summit engaged their area's youth to participate and to focus on those issues that the community's youth felt were important to them. At all of the youth summits four questions were asked on juvenile justice, specifically status offenses. The questions are the following:

1. What programs or strategies do you know in your community that are successfully assisting status offenders (runaways, curfew violators, truancy, possession of alcohol or tobacco) and their families?
2. What other things should we do to address status offense issues?
3. Have you noticed a disproportionately high percentage of youth of color in the juvenile justice system in your community?
4. How would you address the issue of disproportionate representation of youth of color in the juvenile justice system?

The following are observances on the four questions:

1. Participants responded with well known youth programs either from their perspective as a participant or from having heard about the specific program and surmising that it dealt with juvenile status offenders. There were many responses of "unknown" which reflected on that individual's familiarity with the juvenile justice system.
2. Many more responses of "unknown" to this question.
3. The vast majority of respondents to this question answered no. However, there was a healthy minority with the ubiquitous "yes" response at every summit.
4. Again, popular or known programs were suggested along with suggestions for law enforcement training, culture awareness, and the admonition to just get along with each other.

An overarching observation is the lack of specific knowledge on what are status offenses. A quick tutorial was offered at each summit, but it was clear that the youth in attendance had not been involved with the juvenile justice system and

were not used to thinking about school, law enforcement or the courts as being in an adversarial relationship with them.