Disproportionate Minority Contact-Technical Assistance Project (DMC-TAP)

MAY 2014

SUMMARY REPORT

Submitted by:
W. Haywood Burns Institute

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

II. Key Themes

A. Using Data: The BI Process for Using Data to Reduce RED

Site Example: The BI's Process for Using Data in Ventura County

B. Data Capacity

Site Example: Improving Data Capacity in Sacramento County

C. Community Engagement

Site Example: Strategic Community Outreach in Marin County

Site Example: Importance of Family Engagement in Ventura

Site Example: Culturally Relevant Programming in Fresno County

D. Collaboration

Site Example: Working to Build an Effective Collaboration in Humboldt County

III. Conclusion

IV. Appendix: Key Indicators of Disparities in Detention Utilization and Measures of Progress

A. Fresno County

B. Humboldt County

C. Marin County

D. Orange County

E. Sacramento County

F. Ventura County

G. Yolo County

I. Introduction

In 1999, California became the first "majority-minority" state, and as of March 2014, Latinos make up the largest single racial/ethnic group in the state. As the racial and ethnic demographics of the United States also continue to change, the need to address racial and ethnic disparities (RED) in our youth justice systems becomes even more imperative. The 2011 groundbreaking study from the Council of State Governments and the Public Policy Research Institute, *Breaking Schools' Rules,*[1] continues to motivate child-serving systems around the country to address the school to prison pipeline, particularly as it impacts youth of color. This year, President Barack Obama has added momentum to this critical issue with the launch of the My Brother's Keeper initiative, which seeks to improve life outcomes for boys and men of color. While the rest of the country scrambles to get on board, California has pioneered innovative strategies for addressing racial and ethnic inequalities within the youth justice system.

In the continuing effort to address racial and ethnic disparities within California's youth justice system, the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC, formerly known as the Corrections Standards Authority) announced its Disproportionate Minority Contact - Technical Assistance Project (DMC-TAP) grant in July of 2009. The grant's goal was to provide local jurisdictions with tools and resources needed to demonstrate leadership in a collaborative process comprised of youth justice and community stakeholders working to reduce disproportionality. Seven counties were awarded the DMC-TAP grant: Ventura, Fresno, Marin, Humboldt, Sacramento, Orange, and Yolo. As part of the grant, counties were required to select an expert consultant to train and guide them through the three-year project. The W. Haywood Burns Institute (BI) was selected by all seven counties to serve as the technical assistance provider.

The BI is a national, non-profit organization whose mission is to protect and improve the lives of youth of color and poor youth by ensuring fairness and equity throughout the youth justice system. The BI was honored by the opportunity to serve all seven counties in their efforts to reduce disparities. Moreover, we want to express our appreciation to the BSCC for incentivizing counties to engage this important issue.

The DMC-TAP grant included three phases: (1) Infrastructure and Education; (2) Stakeholder Collaboration and Plan Development; (3) Implementation of DMC Reduction Plan.

Phase One: Infrastructure and Education

The first phase of the DMC-TAP grant focused on developing Probation's capacity to collect and/or extract data from its information system to better understand whether and to what extent racial and ethnic disparities exist. Phase one also included trainings on racial and ethnic disparities and successful strategies implemented across the nation to reduce disparities.

[1] Fabelo, Tony, et.al. (July 2011). *Breaking Schools' Rules: A Statewide Study of How School Discipline Relates to Students' Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement.* The Council of State Governments Justice Center and Public Policy Research Institute, Texas A&M University.

Phase Two: Stakeholder Collaboration and Development of DMC Reduction Plan
The second phase of the DMC-TAP grant focused on engaging system and community stakeholders in the process of data deliberation and developing a plan, including an intervention and/or policy and practice modification to reduce system involvement, for youth of color.

Phase Three: Implementation of DMC Reduction Plan
The third phase of the DMC-TAP grant focused on implementation of the DMC Reduction Plan.

This report provides an overview of key aspects of BI's work with the seven selected counties. This report is not intended to detail every aspect of BI's work over the course of the grant. Instead, it highlights progress made by the counties over the past three years through representative examples. The body of the report is organized by key themes with at least one site example for each theme. The appendix includes a table with indicators of detention utilization for each county that participated in the grant. For more information about the work and its impact, please see progress reports submitted by the counties to BSCC, as well as final reports submitted to each county by the BI.

A. Using Data: The BI Process for Using Data to Reduce RED

An essential component to reducing racial and ethnic disparities in the youth justice system is the capacity to collect, analyze and use data. Stakeholders must have the ability to accurately identify which youth are system-involved and why in order to know where to target racial and ethnic disparity reduction efforts. To do so, system stakeholders and analysts must not only collect certain data, but they must know the appropriate data-related questions to ask next. This process includes evaluating gaps in current data systems and the quality of the available data. In addition, there must be an intentional process of deliberating on the data in collaborative meetings. Oftentimes, the most challenging step is making concrete changes in policies, practices, and programs based on what stakeholders have learned from the data. The goal of these policy, practice, and program changes is to improve outcomes and decrease unnecessary system involvement for youth of color.

In each of the DMC-TAP counties, the BI used local data to identify whether and to what extent youth of color are overrepresented at various decision-making points in the youth justice system. In the DMC-TAP counties, the BI focused initial attention on the decision regarding secure detention.

The BI process for using data to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in detention utilization follows three basic steps:

(1) **Identifying** racial and ethnic disparities;
(2) Identifying, analyzing, and strategizing on a **target population** and implementing or piloting policy and practice change to reduce disparities; and
(3) **Monitoring** reductions and measuring progress.

The BI worked with the DMC-TAP sites to identify whether and to what extent disparities existed at various decision-making points throughout the youth justice system with a focus on pre-adjudication detention.

Second, the BI helped sites identify a target population that would be the focus of the disparities reduction efforts. Once a target population was identified, the BI assisted with analyzing or "digging deeper" into the target population to learn more about policies, practices, and other factors that contributed to disproportionality and disparities. Once jurisdictions understood more about factors contributing to disparities that are under system stakeholder control, the BI helped strategize about how changes in policy, practice, and/or procedure can result in reductions in disparities. In the BI's experience, the use of target populations works to focus disparity reduction efforts. When modifications to existing policy, practice, and/or procedures were developed, the BI assisted the jurisdiction in adopting or piloting change. In some jurisdictions we encountered the usual reluctance to change. This report discusses our ability to effect change as well as barriers we encountered in the DMC-TAP sites.

Finally, the BI assisted the sites to continually monitor how interventions reduce unnecessary detention of youth of color and disparities. It is critical that jurisdictions do not assume that a successful intervention will remain successful over time. Sometimes interventions require modification, and monitoring progress regularly can help ensure that adjustments are made in a timely manner. Monitoring interventions is also useful in order to document success and share strategies with the field.

Importantly, these three steps for using data to reduce disparities must take place in the right context. A collaborative body comprised of system and community stakeholders must regularly review and deliberate on the data. The collaborative body must develop an institutional response to using the data. Not only should the collaborative body become comfortable with reviewing data representing key indicators of disparities in the youth justice system, the collaborative should also develop a process for asking and answering data related questions in order to drive their disparity reduction efforts forward.

Each of the seven counties used the BI methodology to identify disparities and analyze a target population to focus reform efforts. Below, we highlight one example of applying the BI process.

Site Example: The BI's Process for Using Data in Ventura County

(1) Identifying RED

2009 Ventura County	White	Black	Latino	API	Native American	Total
Youth Population (10-17)[2]	42,537	2,039	48,910	6,376	403	100,265
Admissions to Secure Detention	320	63	1,008	24	2	1,459
Rate of Admission *(per 1,000 youth in the population)*	7.5	30.9	20.6	3.8	5.0	14.6
Disparity Gap	1.0	4.1	2.7	.5	.7	1.9

The BI collected baseline data to identify whether and to what extent racial and ethnic disparities existed in Ventura County. According to 2009 data, Black youth in Ventura County were four times more likely than White youth to be securely detained, and Latino youth were nearly three times as likely.

(2) Identifying, analyzing, and strategizing on a target population

Next, the collaborative in Ventura County reviewed the top two reasons youth were admitted to secure detention. The result of this analysis was that youth were primarily detained for bench warrants and violations of probation (VOPs). The DMC sub-committee decided to dig deeper into VOPs. They analyzed their currently policies and practices regarding the use of detention for youth in violation of their probation conditions and conducted case file reviews to learn more about the reasons why youth were detained.

Analysis revealed that there were 220 admissions to secure detention that resulted from youth violating probation in 2010. This represented 15 percent of the total 1,504 detentions. Sixty percent of the youth detained as a result of VOPs were Latino, 57 percent were being supervised under the Juvenile Specialty Programs (JSP). In 51 cases, only one violation was attached to the notice of charges (NOC) or commonly known as petitions. The majority of these cases were drug related (alcohol, marijuana or "other drugs").

Youth were detained, pre-disposition, for an average of 12 days. With 220 admissions for the year, 2,640 bed days were utilized to detain probation violators. At an average cost of $279 per bed day, approximately $736,560 was spent to detain youth who violated probation in just one year.

As previously stated, the primary condition violated most by system-involved youth in Ventura County was drug-related. In an effort to learn more about the extent and nature of the substance use, the DMC Committee collected additional qualitative data. The Committee held a focus group with numerous service providers. Findings from the convening revealed that marijuana was the primary drug of choice

[2] See Puzzanchera, C., Sladky, A. and Kang, W. (2012). "Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2011." Online. Available: http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/. These are 2009 Population Estimates.

among youth in Ventura County, but a variety of other drugs were also used by youth in the jurisdiction. The service providers agreed that additional community-based substance abuse treatment was needed. They agreed that an Evening Reporting Center would be an appropriate intervention to address the target population. Additionally, the Committee decided that the center should incorporate (1) Family Involvement and Empowerment; (2) Employment Development; (3) Educational Services; and (4) Mentoring.

After months of planning which included tours of multiple reporting centers in California, including Alameda, Santa Cruz, Orange and Santa Barbara counties, the Ventura County Reporting Center took its first client in May of 2013.

(3) Monitoring reductions and measuring progress.

	White	Black	Latino	Asian	Pacific Islander	Native American	Other	Total
Youth Population (10-17)								
Arrests								
Bookings to Juvenile Hall								
Admissions to Secure Detention								
Releases from Secure Detention								
Number of Overrides into Detention								
Detention Override Rate								
Average Length of Stay (ALOS)								
Median Length of Stay (MLOS)								
Average Daily Population (ADP)								

Ventura County is working with a professor from California Lutheran University to collect data on outcomes from the ERC. In late 2013, the professor completed an evaluation of the first six months of the ERC's operation. Sources of data were pre- and post-project surveys of participating youth; information gathered by the club and youth justice system on the ongoing status of youth from their date of entry; and arrest and VOP data for participants. The findings indicate early success.

At the six-month mark, 17 youth had completed the program. Thirty-seven youth had been referred to the ERC, five never attended and 15 were waiting to start or currently attending. Out of the 17 youth who had completed, 14 did not have any new offense or violation of probation. One youth had a new offense and two youth had violated probation. In the pre-project survey, 29 percent of youth said they believed they were not good students. The post-project survey showed a significant improvement, with 90 percent saying they believed they were good students.

B. Data Capacity

Phase one of the DMC-TAP grant involved assisting probation departments in establishing or strengthening the foundation for a DMC reduction effort. Part of building this infrastructure was

ensuring that key data are collected in the local information system and that the jurisdiction has the capacity to query key decision making points to learn whether and to what extent disproportionality exists.

The BI developed a data template for the DMC-TAP sites that includes tables for various key indicators of racial and ethnic disparities. All the sites had to make adjustments to their data gathering practices in order to reveal disparities at certain decision points. The template is designed to assist jurisdictions in (1) achieving the goals laid out in Phase One of the DMC-TAP grant and (2) sustaining their RED reduction activities. The template serves as a tool to assist local jurisdictions with measuring and monitoring disparities at key youth justice decision-making points and includes automatically populated charts, graphs and various formulas for measuring racial and ethnic disparities. In addition, the file includes worksheets with automatically populated quarterly and annual trends to monitor progress in disparity reduction efforts.

Through the template, the BI asked the sites to answer the following questions on a quarterly basis, with a lens towards the impact on youth of color:

(1) *How many youth were arrested?*
(2) *How many youth were booked at the detention facility?*
(3) *Which departments or agencies referred youth to secure detention?*
(4) *How many of the youth booked at the detention facility were detained?*
(5) *How did youths' Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI)—or other objective detention screening tool—score inform the detention decision?*
(6) *For what offenses or technical/administrative violations were youth admitted to the detention facility?*
(7) *Where do youth who were admitted to secure detention reside?*
(8) *What was the average daily population in the detention facility?*
(9) *How long did youth remain in secure detention?*
(10) *Are there any racial and ethnic disparities in lengths of stay in juvenile hall when controlling for the offenses or technical/administrative violations for which youth were admitted?*

At the beginning of the DMC-TAP grant, every county experienced some challenges populating the BI data template. In most counties, probation's information systems were designed for case management, not for analytics. Answering the questions listed above required a restructuring of how data on youth in the system are inputted, extracted and reviewed. While this restructuring required data input for some counties, others required their information system programmers to develop regular reports to populate the BI data template. Regardless of the extent of the need, the BI worked diligently with IT and program staff to improve data capacity in each county. The increased data capacity of each site should be a legacy of the DMC-TAP work.

Site Example: Improving Data Capacity in Sacramento County

All counties faced challenges in answering questions regarding the reasons youth were admitted to secure detention for technical and administrative violations. With assistance from the BI, Sacramento County greatly improved its capacity to gather critical data to use in its work to reduce disparities.

Initially, Sacramento County's information system could not disaggregate technical and administrative admission categories into specific reasons. Because the threshold question regarding *why* youth are admitted to secure detention is critical to identifying a target population for policy or practice modification, the BI worked with the department to develop solutions.

The quarter 1, 2011 analysis of detention admissions in Sacramento County revealed that 36 percent of admissions were the result of technical or administrative violations, not new law violations. Moreover, youth of color were detained for technical and administrative violations more often than White youth. Without more detailed information regarding the types of violations included within those admissions, the BI was unable to make recommendations regarding appropriate policy or practice changes to reduce those numbers.

Identification of "Technical and Administrative Violations"

JUVENILE REFERRALS – VOP REASON

The table below shows categories and reasons that fall under the categories.

VOP Category	VOP Reason
Motion to Modify Custody Status (MMCS)	Placement Failure Placement Abscond Electronic Monitor (EM) Failure Home Supervision (HS) Failure MMCS Non-Det
Violation of Probation	Field Officer Placement VOP WIC 602/778 DA Filed Violation
Warrants	Failure to Appear (FTA) Warrant Probation Supervision Abscond Warrant DA Arrest Warrant Out of County Warrant Out of State Warrant
Other	ICE Holds 601 Contempt Holds

The BI recommended an expedited modification to the information system, the Juvenile Arrest Referral System (JARS) to more efficiently and effectively collect data on technical/administrative violations. The BI worked with probation staff and analysts to identify appropriate categories for technical and administrative violations including:

(1) Motion to Modify Custody Status (MMCS)
(2) Violation of Probation
(3) Warrants
(4) All Other Technical and Administrative Violations

The BI then worked with staff and analysts to identify and develop categories for the underlying reasons for these violations (see Identification of Technical and Administrative Violations table above). The BI then integrated these modifications into the BI Data Template. Now, each quarter, detailed information regarding admissions for these technical and administrative violations is included in the template.

Although this is an example of the level of data capacity building conducted in one jurisdiction, it is worth noting that each DMC-TAP site working with the BI received similar technical assistance. The ability for jurisdictions to efficiently and accurate utilize data to inform their policies and practices are critical to any effort to reduce racial and ethnic disparities.

C. Community Engagement

The active participation of community leaders from the neighborhoods most affected by the youth justice system is a critical component of the work to reduce racial and ethnic disparities. These community-based, non-traditional stakeholders often bring information, insight into the community, as well as a sense of urgency. This relationship serves the dual purpose of ensuring youth are properly supervised in the community and potentially providing youth with access to positive role models, programs and community based services. The BI commonly refers to such collaboration between community representatives and system officials as "community engagement."

Community Engagement is a process by which members of the community are invited to meaningfully participate and provide insight regarding the youth justice system as it relates to youth and families. Community engagement efforts in each county required intentionality and innovative thinking in order to ensure that community insight was incorporated into any RED reduction effort.

Site Example: Strategic Community Outreach in Marin County

Using the BI process, all counties were able to identify target populations in which to focus their efforts. In order to develop intervention to address these target populations, probation needed the expertise and knowledge of the impacted communities. For Marin County, this meant reaching out to youth, families, and organizations in the Latino community of the Canal neighborhood, and the Black community in Marin City. To assist counties in their effort to effectively outreach to the community, the BI developed a community engagement training for system stakeholders. The training focused on effective community outreach, orientation, and retention efforts.

The Marin DMC Collaborative successfully brought in stakeholders from the communities identified, including a new co-chair with experience in restorative justice in the Canal neighborhood. The BI developed a series of "Coach Up" mini-trainings to orient and empower stakeholders to understand and address racial and ethnic disparities and also provided a three-hour training for the new co-chair to prepare her for leading the Collaborative.

To better understand the issues facing the county and provide additional context to the data findings, the Marin Collaborative decided to hold focus groups with the community. Marin developed a committee to establish focus groups, by identifying and training youth to be the facilitators. Marin had great success in its focus groups, which actively involved and gave a voice to system-involved youth and their families. The report generated from the focus groups provided insight into the system and ideas for improvement. Focus groups with parents and committed youth were also a tool used by Fresno and Humboldt. These focus groups used in various counties informed the design and implementation of policy and practice change.

Site Example: Importance of Family Engagement in Ventura

There is no stakeholder better positioned to provide insight regarding the direct impact of the youth justice system than a parent who has had first-hand experience themselves. Youth and parents are the only stakeholders who have experienced each decision-making point in the system. Despite having the most intimate experience with the youth justice system, parents are typically excluded from any participation in reform efforts. Although mending historically tumultuous relationships between system stakeholders and families can be challenging, it is the BI's experience that it is possible.

In Ventura County, the DMC Committee decided to implement an Evening Reporting Center in response to the high numbers of youth detained for violations of probation. After digging deep into the data and thoughtful deliberation, the committee agreed that an essential component of the ERC should include Family Engagement. During the planning phase of the ERC, the BI coordinated a tour of two bay area reporting centers (i.e. Oakland and Santa Cruz) by a Ventura County delegation. In order to ensure that a family perspective was considered during the planning phase of the ERC, a Parent Mentor from United Parents was included in the delegation. The ERC was successfully implemented in May of 2013 and the center has incorporated a family orientation for each youth participating in the ERC programming. Additionally, parents are provided with a Juvenile Justice 101 workshop focused on helping families to understand and effectively navigate the local youth justice system.

In addition to ensuring that family engagement principles are incorporated at the ERC, the BI helped the Collaborative host a presentation by Grace Bauer, Executive Director of Justice for Families. Ms. Bauer spoke to the Collaborative about effective strategies for engaging families throughout the Youth Justice System.

Site Example: Culturally Relevant Programming in Fresno County

In addition to serving as a resource for system-involved youth, community can also provide critical insight regarding the needs of youth and families specifically with regard to culturally relevant programming. Prior to implementing any new policy and/or practice change, it is absolutely imperative that community and system stakeholders determine whether the programming is culturally-relevant to the youth served.

After identifying violations of probation as a target population, the DMC Committee underwent a series of digging deeper exercises to gain further insight regarding internal and external factors leading to VOPs. These exercises included an extensive case file review, focus groups with youth and Probation Officers, and surveying parents of system involved youth. The focus groups and parent surveys confirmed a number of case file review findings such as truancy, drugs and failure to participate in treatment programs were conditions frequently violated by youth.

Based on these findings, the DMC Committee engaged in a brainstorming session facilitated by the BI. The Collaborative decided to develop a Youth Leadership Retreat which would provide culturally relevant programming aimed at developing probation-involved youth into community leaders. In order

to ensure that the retreat was connected to the communities from which these youth reside, it was important that a community-based organization played a key role in its design and implementation. The committee partnered with two community-based organizations, Fresno Barrios Unidos and Focus Forward, who were using El Joven Noble programming. El Joven Noble is a nationally renowned youth development, support, and leadership enhancement curriculum designed to strengthen protective factors among male youth ages 14 through 18. The 8 to 10 week curriculum aims to promote the character development of young men and supports them through their "rites of passage" process. The program works to reduce and prevent unwanted or unplanned pregnancies, substance abuse, school failure, and community and relationship violence.

Importantly, Joven Noble is targeted at and culturally relevant to many youth who are detained for violating probation in Fresno County. As a reminder, the majority of these youth are Latino males who have violated probation for drug- and school-related conditions, as well as failed to participate in a program. By increasing the number of youth who have access to and complete Joven Noble, the Collaborative seeks to reduce violations of probation, particularly for Latino youth. Additionally, these youth will experience other positive outcomes, including connecting to positive and supportive adults through community-based groups such as Fresno Barrios Unidos.

D. Working to Build an Effective Collaboration: Humboldt County

Collaboration is a key component of any reform effort. This is particularly true in the difficult work to reduce racial and ethnic disparities. It is critical that the collaborative include key traditional (e.g. Police, Probation, the Judiciary) and non-traditional (e.g. community providers, neighborhood leader, parents) stakeholders. Then, these stakeholders should work to establish a data-driven action plan with clear goals and objectives to tackle DMC. A well-functioning committee should benefit from the natural tension that often exists between traditional system stakeholders and community members and collaboratively develop sustainable solutions to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and objectivity of the youth justice system. In fact, any collaborative focused on RED issues should take advantage of the collective expertise of both the traditional and non-traditional stakeholders and identify the unique ways both sets of stakeholders can support RED-related work.

Data analysis in Humboldt County identified Native American youth detained for VOPs and warrants as the target population. However, the Native American communities in Humboldt and Probation have had difficulty developing collaborative partnerships for many years.

In order to gain insight into the families' experiences and better develop appropriate interventions, the Humboldt County Cultural Diversity and Awareness Committee (CDAC) led a series of interviews and surveys with youth who had incurred a warrant and their families. While the information was insightful, the low level of response highlighted the challenges to community engagement. A lack of trust of the system by some Native American communities impacted the level of participation.

In advance of the first DMC Collaborative meeting, the BI worked with the CDAC to develop an outreach-engagement plan. The process included identifying individuals, service organizations, community groups, and Native American representatives to include in the outreach efforts. The outreach efforts were successful, and members of the newly formed DMC Collaborative signed a "Participant Agreement" that explained the goals of the collaborative and the expectations of its members. The Collaborative decided to focus on strengthening relationships with specific Tribal communities and organizations including the Hoopa and Yurok Nations, and the Northern California Tribal Court Council (NCTCC). Members of the BI team reached out and met with Yurok and Hoopa tribal members, as well as the NCTCC in an effort to broker a meeting between native entities and the Collaborative. These efforts led to a number of successes. In response to an invitation from NCTCC to Collaborative stakeholders to attend an NCTCC meeting, the Humboldt Collaborative began putting together a delegation to meet with the NCTCC with the goal to develop a partnership that will lead to increased support for Native American Youth that are system-involved.

It took months, with the BI serving as a facilitator, to bring the Coalition and the Native American community to a point in their dialogues where they no longer need a third party facilitator. The building of these foundational relationships will be critical to the future implementation of alternatives to secure detention.

Not all counties faced the same challenge as Humboldt, but the BI worked closely with all counties to facilitate the engagement of community stakeholders. These diverse collaborations have been pivotal in instituting successful policy changes and developing alternatives to secure detention.

III. Conclusion:

The DMC - TAP grant enabled important progress toward reducing racial and ethnic disparities in all seven counties the BI worked with. Counties overcame challenges to the collection, analysis, and use of data, and increased collaboration with important system and community stakeholders.

Prior to this process, no county possessed the capacity to collect, analyze and examine data on a level that could show where and how disparities existed. Improved data capacity and understanding of data will allow counties to monitor their progress and continue to re-focus on those areas with the most severe racial and ethnic disparities.

Relationships created with community members are already providing new perspective to the youth justice system, and helping system stakeholders tap into resources. Beyond the requirements of the TAP grant and the contract with the BI, positive relationships with community stakeholders will provide assistance and accountability to counties by those most impacted.

The Burns Institute is optimistic in the continued success of all the DMC-TAP counties to reduce disparities in years to come.

IV. Appendix: Key Indicators of Disparities in Detention Utilization by County

This appendix provides a brief summary of key quantitative indicators of disparities and how these changed over the course of the grant for each county. Counties are presented alphabetically as follows: Fresno, Humboldt, Marin, Orange, Sacramento, Ventura, and Yolo.

The starting and ending year for each county varies due to the availability of data. Where noted, tables omit some racial/ethnic groups with small youth populations or very small numbers of admissions to detention. Therefore, the total column is not always a sum of the other columns. This was done in order to focus attention on the populations experiencing the highest disparities or rates of admission in each county.

FRESNO COUNTY

		White	Black	Latino	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American	Other	Total
2010	Youth Population (10-17)	29,893	6,565	68,498	11,943	1,013	2,013	119,866
	Admissions to Secure Detention	250	444	1,103	57	25	10	1,889
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	8.4	67.6	16.1	4.8	24.7	5.0	15.8
	Disparity Gap in Admissions per population		8.1	1.9	0.6	3.0	0.6	1.9
2012	Youth Population (10-17)	28,877	6,265	69,039	11,273	883	2,666	119,003
	Admissions to Secure Detention	270	421	1,215	66	12	5	1,989
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	9.4	67.2	17.6	5.9	13.6	1.9	16.7
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		7.2	1.9	0.6	1.5	0.2	1.8
Percent Change 2010-2012	Youth Population (10-17)	-3%	-5%	1%	-6%	-13%		-1%
	Admissions to Secure Detention	8%	-5%	10%	16%	-52%	-50%	5%
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	12%	-1%	9%	23%	-45%		6%
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		**-11%**	**-2%**	10%	-51%		-5%

The disparity gap for Black and Latino youth decreased slightly, although admission rates increased slightly between 2010 and 2012 for White, Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander Youth. Admission rates decreased for Black and Native American youth. With BI's technical assistance, Fresno County took important steps towards improving outcomes for youth of color during the grant.

HUMBOLDT COUNTY

		White	Black	Latino	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American	Total[3]
2010	Youth Population (10-17)	8,927	128	1,531	278	1,149	12,571
	Admissions to Secure Detention	170	10	33	5	56	274
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	19.0	78.1	21.6	18.0	48.7	21.8
	Disparity Gap in Admissions per population		4.1	1.1	0.9	2.6	0.3
2013	Youth Population (10-17)	8,678	99	1,576	217	979	12491
	Admissions to Secure Detention	147	21	23	0	21	225
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	16.9	215.5	14.4	0.0	21.8	18.0
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		12.8	0.9	0.0	1.3	0.1
Percent Change 2010-2013	Youth Population (10-17)	-3%	-23%	3%	-22%	-15%	-1%
	Admissions to Secure Detention	-14%	113%	-31%	-100%	-62%	-18%
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	**-11%**	**176%**	**-33%**	**-100%**	**-55%**	-17%
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		**211%**	**-25%**	**-100%**	**-50%**	-70%

Admission rates decreased by 17 percent overall and for every group except Black youth. The disparity gap also decreased for every group except Black youth. For Black youth, admission rates almost doubled, although the small population of Black youth and the low numbers of admissions (10 in 2010 and 21 in 2013) cause large changes in percentages and must be interpreted with caution. For Native American youth, admissions decreased by 62 percent; admission rates decreased by 55 percent; and the disparity gap decreased by 50 percent.

[3] This chart omits "other" youth because there were no admissions of other youth recorded in 2010 or 2013.

MARIN COUNTY

		White	Black	Latino	Asian/Pacific Islander	Total[4]
2009	Youth Population (10-17)	16,255	746	4,123	1,483	22681
	Admissions to Secure Detention	174	146	282	4	612
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	10.7	195.7	68.4	2.7	27.0
	Disparity Gap in Admissions per population		18.3	6.4	0.3	2.5
2013	Youth Population (10-17)	16,306	750	4,721	1,624	23481
	Admissions to Secure Detention	56	79	103	1	240
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	3.4	105.3	21.8	0.6	10.2
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		30.7	6.4	0.2	3.0
Percent Change 2009-2013	Youth Population (10-17)	0%	1%	15%	10%	4%
	Admissions to Secure Detention	-68%	-46%	-63%	-75%	-61%
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	**-68%**	**-46%**	**-68%**	**-77%**	**-62%**
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		68%	-1%	-29%	18%

Admission rates decreased dramatically for all groups between 2009 and 2013. For Latino youth, admission rates decreased by an impressive 68 percent and for Black youth, they decreased by 46 percent. Because the White youth rate of admission also decreased 68 percent, the disparity gap for Latino youth only fell by one percent and grew by 68 percent for Black youth.

[4] Note: this chart omits Native American and "other" youth due to low numbers. There were 74 Native Youth in the population, none admitted to detention. No population data were available for other. There were six admissions of other youth in 2009, only one admission in 2013.

ORANGE COUNTY

		White	Black	Latino	Asian	Pacific Islander	Native American	Other	Total
2010	Youth Population (10-17)	127,355	4,983	158,994	48,733	1,342	1,465	11,113	353,985
	Admissions to Secure Detention	586	191	2404	106	10	0	43	3,340
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	4.6	38.3	15.1	2.2	7.5	0.0	3.9	9.4
	Disparity Gap in Admissions per population		8.3	3.3	0.5	1.6	0.0	0.8	2.1
2012	Youth Population (10-17)	118,561	4,320	160,511	49,250	1,244	1,231	13,576	348,693
	Admissions to Secure Detention	469	160	2,212	83	15	2	45	2,986
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	4.0	37.0	13.8	1.7	12.1	1.6	3.3	8.56
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		9.4	3.5	0.4	3.0	0.4	0.8	2.16
Percent Change 2010-2012	Youth Population (10-17)	-7%	-13%	1%	1%	-7%	-16%	22%	-1%
	Admissions to Secure Detention	-20%	-16%	-8%	-22%	50%		5%	-11%
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	**-14%**	**-3%**	**-9%**	**-23%**	**62%**		**-14%**	**-9%**
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		12%	6%	-10%	88%		0%	6%

Overall, admission rates decreased nine percent or by 354 admissions. Rates decreased 14 percent for White youth, three percent for Black youth, nine percent for Latino youth and 23 percent for Asian youth. Because the decrease in the White youth admission rate outpaced decreases for Black and Latino youth, the disparity gap increased by 12 percent for Black youth and by six percent for Latino youth.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY

		White	Black	Latino	Asian	Pacific Islander	Native American	Other	Total
2010	Youth Population (10-17)	71,489	18,418	44,055	20,701	1669	1092	12,346	169,770
	Admissions to Secure Detention	402	1,250	528	75	7	10	21	2,293
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	5.6	67.9	12.0	3.6	4.2	9.2	1.7	13.5
	Disparity Gap in Admissions per population		12.1	2.1	0.6	0.7	1.6	0.3	
2013	Youth Population (10-17)	57,131	17,695	47,343	22,042	1516	746	11,220	157,693
	Admissions to Secure Detention	346	932	426	45	20	3	21	1,793
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	6.1	52.7	9.0	2.0	13.2	4.0	1.9	11.4
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		8.7	1.5	0.3	2.2	0.7	0.3	
Percent Change 2010-2013	Youth Population (10-17)	-20%	-4%	7%	6%	-9%	-32%	-9%	-7%
	Admissions to Secure Detention	-14%	-25%	-19%	-40%	186%	-70%	0%	-22%
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	8%	**-22%**	**-25%**	**-44%**	215%	-56%	10%	-16%
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		**-28%**	**-30%**	**-48%**	192%	-59%	2%	

Admission rates decreased 16 percent overall and 22 percent for Black youth, who comprised the largest group of admissions in both 2010 and 2013. There were 318 fewer admissions of Black youth in 2013 than there were in 2010. Admission rates decreased 25 percent for Latino youth and 44 percent for Asian youth. Due to the strong decreases in admission rates for most youth of color, as well as an 8 percent increase for White youth, the disparity gap decreased for all groups except Pacific Islander youth. The gap decreased 28 percent for Black youth and 30 percent for Latino youth.

VENTURA COUNTY

		White	Black	Latino	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American	Total[5]
2009	Youth Population (10-17)	42,537	2,039	48,910	6,376	403	100,265
	Admissions to Secure Detention	320	63	1,008	24	2	1,459
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	7.5	30.9	20.6	3.8	5.0	14.6
	Disparity Gap in Admissions per population		4.1	2.7	0.5	0.7	1.9
2012	Youth Population (10-17)	39,764	2,120	49,093	6,480	366	97,823
	Admissions to Secure Detention	267	50	692	21	2	1,044
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	6.7	23.6	14.1	3.2	5.5	10.7
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		3.5	2.1	0.5	0.8	0.8
Percent Change 2009-2012	Youth Population (10-17)	-7%	4%	0%	2%	-9%	-2%
	Admissions to Secure Detention	-17%	-21%	-31%	-13%	0%	-28%
	Rate of Admission (*per 1,000 youth in population)*	**-11%**	**-24%**	**-32%**	-14%	10%	-27%
	Disparity Gap in Admissions *(per youth population)*		**-14%**	**-23%**	-4%	23%	-61%

Admission rates decreased 27 percent overall. Rates decreased 32 percent for Latino youth, who by far comprise the largest group of youth admitted to detention each year. Rates decreased 24 percent for Black youth and 11 percent for White youth and the disparity gap decreased 14 percent for Black youth and 23 percent for Latino youth. With BI's technical assistance and strong leadership from Probation, Ventura County took important steps towards improving outcomes for youth of color during the grant.

[5] Note: this chart omits "other" youth because no youth population data was available. There were 42 admissions of other youth in 2009 and 12 admissions of other youth in 2012, a 71 percent decrease in admissions.

YOLO COUNTY

		White	Black	Latino	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American	Other	Total
2010	Youth Population (10-17)	9,468	857	8,847	1,556	144	833	21,705
	Average Daily Population (ADP) in Detention	9.3	4.4	11.4	1.2	0.1	0.7	27.2
	Rate of Detention (per 10,000 youth ADP)	9.8	51.6	12.9	7.9	9.2	7.9	12.5
	Disparity Gap		5.2	1.3	0.8	0.9	0.8	1.3
2013	Youth Population (10-17)	9,082	1,021	9,201	1,581	118	1,040	22,043
	Average Daily Population (ADP) in Detention	4.1	1.1	10.6	0.2	0.3	0.9	17.1
	Rate of Detention (per 10,000 youth ADP)	4.5	10.5	11.5	1.5	22.5	8.6	7.8
	Disparity Gap		2.3	2.6	0.3	5.0	1.9	1.7
Percent Change 2010-2013	Youth Population (10-17)	-4%	19%	4%	2%	-18%	25%	2%
	Admissions to Secure Detention	-56%	-76%	-7%	-80%	101%	36%	-37%
	Rate of Detention (per 10,000 youth ADP)	**-54%**	**-80%**	**-11%**	-81%	145%	9%	-38%
	Disparity Gap		-55%	96%	-57%	437%	140%	36%

The rate of detention (based on average daily population) decreased 54 percent for White youth, 80 percent for Black youth, and 11 percent for Latino youth. The disparity gap decreased 55 percent for Black youth, but almost doubled for Latino youth.

475 14th Street
Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612
415-321-4100