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Program Narrative

# System Description: Structure and Function of the Juvenile Justice System

California’s objective is to improve its juvenile justice system by preventing juvenile delinquency, providing fair treatment and wellbeing of youth involved in the juvenile justice system, reducing crime, and ensuring compliance with Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) requirements. California is dedicated to successfully administering local grant programs and funding relevant and effective statewide initiatives.

California’s juvenile justice system encompasses the agencies that have a role in the processing of juveniles alleged to be involved in criminal or delinquent behavior, status offenses, and minor traffic violations. California’s juvenile justice system is composed of many responsible agencies that work in a coordinated fashion to address juvenile justice related issues:

1. Law Enforcement (County Sheriffs, City Police Departments, California Highway Patrol, etc.) – enforces the laws within its jurisdiction by investigating complaints and making arrests.[[1]](#footnote-2)
2. District Attorney – files WIC 602 petitions, represents the community at all Juvenile court hearings and may act in the juvenile’s behalf on WIC 300[[2]](#footnote-3) petitions. WIC 602 petitions allege that a juvenile committed an act that would be against the law if committed by an adult. WIC 300 petitions allege that a child has suffered, or is at risk of suffering serious physical harm, sexual abuse, neglect, etc.
3. Public Defender – represents juveniles in WIC 601[[3]](#footnote-4) and WIC 602 proceedings and may represent parents in WIC 300 petitions. A court appointed or private attorney may also be used. WIC 601 petitions allege runaway behavior, truancy, curfew violations, and/or regular disobedience.
4. Probation – provides a screening function for the Juvenile Court; maintains intake services and detention facilities for wards adjudicated pursuant to WIC 602, provides intake, shelter care, and counseling services for juveniles in WIC 601 cases; provides the court with a study of the minor’s situation; and provides supervision for the minor as ordered by the court.
5. Health and Human Services Department (dependent intake, Children’s Protective Services, placement, etc.) – offers services to juveniles referred as possible dependent/neglected children, investigates and files WIC 300 petitions on behalf of juveniles and provides supervision of WIC 300 cases.
6. Juvenile Court – hears facts regarding WIC 300, 601, and 602 petitions, makes findings and adjudicates cases. The juvenile court has the final authority in all juvenile matters under its jurisdiction.
7. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation’s (CDCR) Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) – DJJ houses for treatment, training and education youth committed by the juvenile and criminal courts. for serious and violent offenses set forth in Welfare and Institutions Code section 707(b), The DJJ population is a small percentage of the youth who are arrested in California each year, and they have needs that cannot be addressed by county programs. Most juvenile offenders today are committed to county facilities in their home community where they can be closer to their families and local social services that are vital to rehabilitation. DJJ’s population represents less than one percent of the 225,000 youths arrested in California each year.[[4]](#footnote-5) As part of the state's criminal justice system, the DJJ works closely with law enforcement, the courts, district attorneys, public defenders, probation and a broad spectrum of public and private agencies concerned with, and involved in, the problems of youth.

Upon making an arrest, a law enforcement agency typically refers youth to the applicable probation department in the juvenile’s county of residence. Probation departments investigate all referrals received and make a determination of how to proceed with each. Disposition of cases include counsel and release, transfer to the jurisdiction where the minor resides, wardship and probation, out-of-home placement, commitment to juvenile hall or camp, and commitment to the DJJ. Please see Appendix A for more information on the structure of the juvenile justice system in California.

In addition, there are non-justice related State agencies participating in the administration of programs for at-risk California youth:

California Department of Education (CDE)

Community Day Schools

Community day schools serve mandatory and other expelled students, and other high-risk youths. The instructional day includes academic programs that provide challenging curriculum, individual attention to student learning modalities and abilities and focus on the development of pro-social skills and student self-esteem and resiliency.

Juvenile Court Schools

Juvenile court schools provide mandated public education services for juvenile offenders who are under the protection or authority of the county juvenile justice system. The juvenile court school provides quality learning opportunities for students to complete a course of study leading to a high school diploma. Students must take all required public education assessments (e.g. The California High School Exit Examination, Standardized Testing and Reporting Program).

Opportunity Education Program

The Opportunity Education program provides support for students who struggle to perform in the traditional education system, as well as a supportive environment with specialized curricula, instruction, guidance and counseling, psychological services, and tutorial assistance to help students overcome barriers to learning.

Program Access & Retention Initiative

This program promotes dropout prevention, recovery, and retention services for all students at risk of not completing a high school education.

California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS)

The Adolescent Treatment Program provides substance abuse treatment and early intervention services.[[5]](#footnote-6) Generally, services include residential treatment for adolescents in group home settings, services for youth transitioning into the community after discharge from institutional facilities, outpatient programs in the community, and services at school sites.

California Department of Social Services (CDSS)

Chafee Educational Vouchers (ETV) program

The Chafee Educational Vouchers program provides Title IV-E eligible foster youth up to $5,000 per year for post-secondary education and training. Youth who received or were eligible to receive Independent Living Program (ILP) services between the ages of 16-19, and who do not reach their 22nd birthday by July 1 are eligible. Youth can continue to participate until they turn 23 years of age, if making satisfactory progress toward completion of a post-secondary education or training program.[[6]](#footnote-7)

Transitional Housing Placement Program (THPP)

THPP is a licensed placement opportunity for youth in foster care to help them emancipate successfully. THPP agency staff, county social workers, and ILP coordinators provide regular support and supervision. Support services include regular visits to participants' residences, educational guidance, employment counseling and assistance in reaching the emancipation goals outlined in participants’ transitional independent living plans.

Transitional Housing Placement Program for Emancipated Foster/Probation Youth (THP-Plus)

THP-Plus eligible youth are young adults who have emancipated from foster/probation care and are 18 to 24 years of age. THP-Plus provides a minimum of 24 months of affordable housing, coupled with supportive services.

Resource Family Approval (RFA) Program

The RFA program requires CDSS, in consultation with county child welfare agencies, including Juvenile Probation, foster parent associations and other interested community parties to implement a unified, family friendly and child-centered RFA process.[[7]](#footnote-8)

Employment Development Department (EDD)

Youth Employment Opportunity Program (YEOP)

This program provides services (e.g. peer advising, referrals to supportive services, workshops, job referrals and placement assistance, referrals to training, and community outreach efforts.[[8]](#footnote-9)) to assist youth in achieving their educational and vocational goals.

America’s Job Center of CaliforniaSM (AJCC)

The AJCC network links all state and local workforce services and resources across the state and country. The AJCC partners in California are the EDD, the California Workforce Development Board, and 49 Workforce Development Boards that administer the more than 200 job centers statewide.

# 2. Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems and Juvenile Justice Needs

Local data on juvenile crime in California are reported by the California Department of Justice (CalDOJ) Criminal Justice Statistics Center (CJSC) in its annual publication Juvenile Justice in California. Juvenile arrest data are collected from law enforcement through the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR). Additional juvenile justice data are collected from county probation departments through the Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS).

## Youth Crime Analysis

California’s youth crime analysis, presented in Appendix N, shows that youth crime continues to exist but has been declining in recent years. Further analysis shows a number of areas where improvements could be made including diversions and alternatives to incarceration, as well as continuing efforts around reducing racial and ethnic disparities. The qualitative data gathered point toward multiple options for addressing this crime and assisting youth in achieving positive outcomes.

## California’s Priority Juvenile Justice Needs/Problem Statements

The BSCC works in partnership with local corrections systems and assists efforts to achieve continued improvement in reducing recidivism with an emphasis on evidence-based practices (EBPs).

California counties have the responsibility to provide services to youth. The BSCC assists counties by providing federal and state grant awards that help support their youth services. The BSCC’s grant awards typically require counties and community partners to develop a local strategic plan that involves local stakeholders, leaders from multiple disciplines, and prior offenders to determine the gaps in the continuum of care for their youthful offenders. These plans may include leveraging resources to support collaboration and to sustain local projects once grant funds have ended.

### State Plan

The BSCC annually reviews its crime data analysis, needs, and program effectiveness and reports these in the annual GMS and DC-TAT progress report systems. The SACJJDP uses this information, along with other sources, to develop a Title II Three-Year State Plan that allows for the coordination of existing juvenile delinquency programs, programs operated by public and private agencies and organizations, and other related programs (such as education, special education, recreation, health, and welfare programs) in California. Both the SACJJDP and the BSCC Board are made up of a variety of state and local criminal/juvenile justice system stakeholders, community treatment providers, advocates and members of the public, which provide for active consultation with and participation of units of local government and the community in the development of the state plan. The SACJJDP began work on its 2021-23 State Plan in June 2020. The SACJJDP hosted a public listening session on November 12, 2020 to hear directly from the community about issues, concerns and priorities for juvenile justice. A SACJJDP e-mail box was established and public input was accepted from interested parties beginning in November 2020. *Add description of Public Comment Services Contract and Survey.* As a result of these efforts, the SACJJDP had the benefit of numerous data and information sources in making the important decision about how to prioritize the use of Title II funds over the next three years. All of these information sources, combined with the unique lived experiences of the SACJJDP members, pointed toward nine high priority needs within California’s juvenile justice system.

**Recommendation 1: Utilize the SACJJDP as a true State Advisory Group on critical issues related to juvenile justice including the implementation of Senate Bill 823.**

The SACJJDP is a federally mandated State Advisory Group with each member appointed by the Governor. One of our primary functions is to advise the Governor on critical issues related to juvenile justice in the State of California including but not limited to alternatives to detention, reentry, evidence-based programming, conditions of confinement, racial/ethnic disparities, tribal and native youth issues, addressing trauma among justice-involved youth, community-based programming, and delinquency prevention.

The Committee is specifically eager to support the Governor in the implementation of Senate Bill 823 with the overarching goals of creating the Office of Youth and Community Restoration in the California Health and Human Services Agency, realigning the Department of Juvenile Justice, and coordination and administration of juvenile justice grants.

**Recommendation 2: Ensure that Federal and State funds are routed directly to support the community.**

A significant amount of research and lived experience has confirmed that community-based programming and resources are more effective in reducing recidivism, improving public safety, promoting youth wellbeing, and saving tax dollars. In order to ensure that funding for such programming makes it into the community, local jurisdictions[[9]](#footnote-10) (e.g., Probation Departments, Law Enforcement Agencies, etc.) must be held accountable when receiving funds that are intended for youth-focused community-based programming. For example, state and federal dollars through the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) provided $321 million to counties in Fiscal Year 2018-19[[10]](#endnote-1). However, these funds are often spent on supplemental funds to staff probation departments or, even more concerning, are left unspent rather than being spent on community-based programs for which they were intended[[11]](#endnote-2). In addition, legislation that earmarks taxpayer dollars for youth-focused programming should not require a pass through with a City or County agency.

**Recommendation 3: Decisions about practice and policy must be data driven.**

The collection of actionable data at the County level is essential to reducing racial/ethnic disparities, identifying best practices, and developing evidence-principled policies. This first step in reducing racial/ethnic disparities is identifying the point(s) of contact in the system that contribute to the disparities at the County level which is required per the JJDPA[[12]](#endnote-3). Because juvenile justice data is decentralized in the State of California there is no uniform data collection occurring across counties and access to data are extremely limited. This makes data driven decision-making through research and evaluation extremely difficult, if not impossible in some areas. Per Senate Bill 823, a workgroup must be convened to develop a plan for ‘a modern database and reporting system’[[13]](#endnote-4). This provides an opportunity to begin to address the lack of juvenile justice data across the state.

**Recommendation 4: Implement a State level mandate to systematically reduce racial and ethnic disparities at all points of contact in the juvenile justice system.**

Based on data analysis at the County level, actionable steps must be taken and accountability measures implemented to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in measurable ways at all points of contact in the juvenile justice system. Reputable organizations have been successfully addressing racial and ethnic disparities for many years, such as the Haywood Burns Institute, the Annie E. Casey’s Juvenile Detention Alternatives Program, and the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform. Agencies of government including local law enforcement (police, sheriffs, CHP), justice system (DA, public defenders, judges, etc.), probation, health and human services, and others should be partnering with such subject matter expert organizations through technical assistance contracts in order to provide evidence of the reduction of racial and ethnic disparities.

**Recommendation 5: Encourage and support in every way the use of community-based diversion as the primary approach to justice system involvement; detention should be a last resort.**

As soon as a young person has contact with the juvenile justice system the goal should be figuring out how to successfully get them out of the system. Prioritizing diversion has been shown to positively impact youth of color given their increased likelihood of juvenile justice contact and disproportionate risk for more severe sanctions. If a youth can't be diverted away from the system initially, the system must continue to work to successfully transition each youth out of the system no matter where they are in the system. The best way to do that is with community-based organizations not through informal or formal probation. Community-based organizations are more likely to hire those with lived experience, who can address the root causes of trauma and focus on healing and mentoring in order for youth to thrive.

**Recommendation 6: Counties must have an effective and comprehensive plan for initial and ongoing training for those who work with youth involved in the juvenile justice system.**

It is essential that those who work with youth involved in the juvenile justice system are trained on issues related to racial/ethnic disparities, implicit bias, child and adolescent development, trauma-informed care, how to be anti-racist, evidence-based practices, principles and programs in juvenile justice, mental health, and positive youth development. Training must be interdisciplinary, ongoing, and skills based. Trainers should include individuals in the community who work directly with youth and/or individuals who have lived experience in the system themselves to ensure cultural appropriateness and community relevance. Technical assistance must be provided following trainings to ensure that skills learned in the trainings are applied, practiced, and become routine in daily practices.

**Recommendation 7: Hire individuals that understand the vast potential youth possess and their role in helping youth succeed.**

The Supreme Court has recognized that “children are different” and should be treated as such. This means that those who are hired to work with youth involved in the juvenile justice system must understand the developmental differences between adolescents and adults, take a non-punitive approach to youth justice, and recognize that working with youth and families in the communities in which they live and should draw on the principles of social work, adolescent development, public health, and racial equity. Adolescence is an age of opportunity, during which youth are highly sensitive to and influenced by their environments and their relationships such that when they are surrounded by positive people and experiences, they are most likely to succeed. Conversely, incarceration, punishment, and discrimination have the opposite effect by increasing the risk for adult criminal justice involvement, reducing educational attainment, and increasing racial and ethnic disparities.

**Recommendation 8: Reduce the use of detention.**

Youth of color bear the brunt of punitive detention practices which means many youth are detained for reasons that are not related to public safety such as certain violations of probation, status offenses, bench warrants for missing a court date, or pre-trial detention for youth who have not been charged with a violent or serious crime. In fact, pre-trial detention makes up 75% of local juvenile detention admissions across the nation[[14]](#endnote-5) and in California about one-third of youth petitioned to juvenile court experience pre-trial detention[[15]](#endnote-6). The use of detention, and its disproportionate impact on youth of color, can be dramatically reduced in very simple ways. For instance, notifying a family when a youth’s court date is coming up, not detaining youth for truancy in alignment with the JJDPA, or only detaining a youth on a probation violation when it includes a new crime.

**Recommendation 9: Detained and incarcerated youth and those being released to the community must have immediate access to a continuum of resources to meet their complex reentry needs.**

In the rare occurrences that youth need to be detained or incarcerated (i.e., for violent crimes or if they are an immediate threat to public safety), they must have access to programming. This should include, at minimum, education services, mental health services, life skills, job training, health care services, religious and cultural services, and access to services provided by culturally competent community-based organizations. As soon as youth are removed from the community, planning must begin for their return to the community so that there is a smooth transition and warm handoff between the facility and the community. Community-based organizations should be involved in the reentry process prior to the youth being released from detention to ensure a continuum of care is provided. Community-based organizations support young people and families in neighborhoods that are unique environments. Their inclusion in the reentry process is vital to ensuring the best possible outcomes for youth.

#### Formula Grant Program

The Formula Grant Program Areas identified by the SACJJDP for inclusion in any requests for local assistance grant proposals to be developed under the 2021-23 State Plan are:

* Aftercare/Reentry
* Alternatives to Detention and Placement
* Community-Based Programs and Services
* Diversion
* Mental Health Services
* Mentoring, Counseling, and Training Programs

Local Assistance Grant Administration

Many of the decisions made by the BSCC directly impact the day-to-day operations of local public safety agencies and service providers. To ensure successful program design and implementation, it is essential that those impacted are included in the decision making process. The BSCC uses Executive Steering Committees (ESCs) to inform decision making related to the Board’s programs, including distributing funds and developing regulations. ESCs help the BSCC to work collaboratively in changing environments and create positive partnerships critical for success. Active consultation with, and participation by, units of local government is provided through the appointment of local government representatives on ESCs. Moreover, the BSCC Board and the SACJJDP have multiple members who represent units of local government. Consequently, local government participation in the discussion and decision making processes related to juvenile justice in California is ensured on many levels.

This collaborative approach is supported by the BSCC’s statute, Penal Code section 6024 (c), which states:

The Board shall regularly seek advice from a balanced range of stakeholders and subject matter experts on issues pertaining to adult corrections, juvenile justice, and gang problems relevant to its mission. Toward this end, the Board shall seek to ensure that its efforts

1. are systematically informed by experts and stakeholders with the most specific knowledge concerning the subject matter,
2. include the participation of those who must implement a board decision and are impacted by a board decision, and
3. promote collaboration and innovative problem solving consistent with the mission of the Board.

The Board may create special committees, with the authority to establish working subgroups as necessary, in furtherance of this subdivision to carry out specified tasks and to submit its findings and recommendations from that effort to the board.

In order to provide for an equitable distribution of the assistance received under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632] within the state, ESCs may develop strategies to ensure rural areas have equitable access to funding opportunities. For example, an ESC may establish funding thresholds for small, medium, and large jurisdictions. Following a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process, ESC members (raters) are provided training and then rank proposals received in each jurisdiction size. Not later than 30 days after their submission to the SACJJDP for review, the SACJJDP is provided the opportunity to review the proposals and ESC proposal ratings and to develop an award recommendation to the Board.

Subgrants Awarded under the 2018-2020 Three-Year Plan

The SACJJDP previously recommended, and the BSCC approved, the allocation of over $4,000,000 per year for three years (12/1/19-11/30/22)] for local subgrantee awards to provide funding for the following federal program areas:

* Aftercare/Reentry
* Alternatives to Detention
* Community-Based Programs & Services
* Diversion
* Mental Health Services
* Mentoring, Counseling, & Training Programs

The 2019 Title II Grant Program Request for Proposals (RFP), as developed by the Title II Grant Program ESC with guidance and leadership from the SACJJDP included language that directed applicants to incorporate evidenced-based practices, principles, and strategies, consider racial and ethnic disparities in their system, and be prepared to delineate some outcome measures by age, gender, and race/ethnicity. Elogible applicants included California Counties, California Cities, California School Districts, Nonprofit Nongovernmental Organizations, and Federally recognized Indian Tribes in California.

Based on a competitive RFP process completed in the fall of 2019, Title II Formula Grant funds continue to support 12 local entities: eight (8) community-based organizations; one (1) community-based organization in partnership with a Native American Tribe; one (1) juvenile probation department; one (1) police department; and one (1) County office of education. These Title II subgrantees are in year two in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020.

#### 

#### Collecting and Sharing Juvenile Justice Information

##### 2.1: Title II Grant Program: Identifying Effective Interventions and Replicable Strategies for Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities.

The SACJJDP solicited a contractor by releasing a Request for Proposals (RFP) on November 20, 2020. The SACJJDP is seeking a contractor with Racial and Ethnic Disparity project experience to develop a State and County data dashboard, to conduct a review of a sample of factors that contribute to Racial and Ethnic Disparity, and to develop a replicable framework for determining the appropriate measurable intervention. The final product will assist the SACJJDP in making data-driven recommendations on the allocation of Title II funding directed towards reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparity in the Juvenile Justice system.

##### 2.2: Efforts by the designated state agency to partner with non-justice system agencies

In addition to the ESC process already described, the BSCC routinely provides technical assistance and subject matter expertise to a wide array of stakeholders and its non-justice system agencies to aid California’s legislative process. Attachment 1 lists new laws from 2019 that pertain to juvenile justice reform and are summarized as relevant to this State Plan:

##### 2.3: Challenges and plans to improve coordination and joint decision-making

California is a large and diverse state with 58 different counties that maintain high levels of autonomy. Consequently, coordination and standardization of efforts is challenging. We will continue to prioritize coordination and joint decision making amongst stakeholders and partners.

Arrest data is collected by CalDOJ and distributed upon request to the BSCC and annually to Chief Probation Officers. CalDOJ’s Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) collects a variety of juvenile statistical data, including information regarding R.E.D. from county probation departments on a yearly basis.

##### 2.4: Youth crime data collection and analysis

California is a large, diverse state whose 58 counties address juvenile justice and delinquency prevention in ways tailored to their individual and unique local environments. This provides for maximum effectiveness of interventions but does create challenges in collecting and analyzing related data. Addressing Youth crime remains a high priority in California and California and it continues to work towards improved coordinate, maintain quality of youth crime data collection and analysis.

The following agencies have a role in youth crime data collection and analysis:

*CalDOJ*

The CalDOJ collects statewide information through a variety of sources, makes data available on its website, and annually publishes data in its “Crime in California” and “Juvenile Justice in California” reports.[[16]](#footnote-11)

Local data on juvenile crime in California continues to be reported by the CalDOJ Criminal Justice Statistics Center (CJSC) in its annual publication Juvenile Justice in California. Juvenile arrest data is collected from law enforcement through the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR). Additional juvenile justice data is collected from county probation departments through the JCPSS.

*The BSCC*

There are several ways that the BSCC is involved in juvenile justice data collection as follows:

State law requires that counties annually submit to the BSCC data about programs, placements, services and system enhancements that were funded through specified state funds in the preceding fiscal year. These reports also include countywide figures for specified juvenile justice data elements available in existing statewide juvenile justice data systems, including a summary or analysis of how those programs have or may have contributed to or influenced the countywide data that is reported. Counties report data on their entire juvenile justice population and provide information on how the use of the specified funds has impacted the trends seen in that data.

The BSCC typically requires Local Evaluation Reports of its competitive grant funded programs that include performance and outcome data.

The BSCC routinely requires competitive grant funded programs to provide progress reports that provide demographic, service provision/system improvement, and outcome data.

#### Problem Statements, Goals/Objectives, & Implementation and Budget Narrative

##### 3.1: Program Descriptions

During development of the 2021-23 California State Plan, the BSCC had numerous active subgrants. The final subgrantee awards reviewed and approved by the SACJJDP and the BSCC. Program updates are shared with the SACJJDP upon request and outcomes will be reported at the conclusion of each grant cycle. All mandatory performance measures required by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) are included in the quarterly Title II progress reports that are provided to the BSCC directly from the project grantees. Across all grant programs, and within the various formula grant program areas, R.E.D. is a priority and to the degree possible is embedded in the planning and work of the BSCC.

##### 3.2: Formula Grants Priority Purpose Areas

TBD

1. Welfare and Institutions Code section 601 provides, in part, “any person who is under 18 years of age when he or she violates any law of this state or of the United States or any ordinance of any city or county of this state defining crime other than an ordinance establishing a curfew based solely on age, is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, which may adjudge such person to be a ward of the court.” [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Welfare and Institutions Code section 300 provides for a child to become a dependent child of the court when “[t]the child has suffered, or there is a substantial risk that the child will suffer, serious physical harm inflicted nonaccidentally upon the child by the child's parent or guardian.” [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Welfare and Insititutions Code section 602 provides, in part, “Any person under 18 years of age who persistently or habitually refuses to obey the reasonable and proper orders or directions of his or her parents, guardian, or custodian, or who is beyond the control of that person, or who is under the age of 18 years when he or she violated any ordinance of any city or county of this state establishing a curfew based solely on age is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court which may adjudge the minor to be a ward of the court.” [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. <http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Juvenile_Justice/index.html>. Includes referrals and arrests. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. <http://www.dhcs.ca.gov/individuals/Pages/youthSUDservices.aspx>. This data is the most recent available here. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. <http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/PG4861.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. <http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/res/RFA/pdf/RFA_Overview.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. <http://www.edd.ca.gov/jobs_and_training/Youth_Employment_Opportunity_Program.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. **Program Purpose Areas for this section will be determined at May 20, 2021 Meeting**

    ##### 

    ##### **VI: Compliance Monitoring**

    **Federal Program Number: 19 State Priority Ranking: n/a**

    Three of the four requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) have been codified in California statute and regulations and, in many cases, exceed JJDPA requirements. The BSCC is given the authority to monitor facilities affected by the JJDPA for compliance with federal and state standards. The range of facilities in the compliance monitoring universe, along with the transitional nature of many personnel working in these facilities, necessitates provision of ongoing monitoring and technical assistance.

    **Goal:** Maintain a high rate of compliance of state and local police, sheriff, and probation detention facilities with federal requirements to deinstitutionalize status offenders, remove juveniles from adult jails and lockups, and ensure separation between juveniles and adult inmates.

    **Objective 1:** Improve compliance monitoring.

    **Activities and Services:**

    * Conduct annual or biennial on-site inspections of each detention facility;
    * Review detention facility policies and procedures; and
    * Provide technical assistance.

    **Objective 2:** Verify data collection efforts/systems in detention facilities that are affected by the JJDPA.

    **Activities and Services:**

    * Collect regular data from detention facilities;
    * Follow up on self-report data; and
    * Conduct annual or biennial on-site inspections of each detention facility.

    **Objective 3:** Maintain compliance with core protections.

    **Activities and services**:

    * Collect regular data from detention facilities;
    * Follow up on self-report data;
    * Provide technical assistance; and
    * Conduct annual or biennial on-site inspections of each detention facility.

    ##### **X: Planning and Administration**

    **Federal Program Number: 28**

    The Planning and Administration funds are used for staff positions, administration expenses, and indirect costs. These funds also represent “fair share” obligations within California that are mandatory for federal awards; these funds make up the State-Wide Cost Allocation Plan (SWCAP) General Fund recoveries of statewide general administrative costs (i.e., indirect costs incurred by central service agencies) from federal funding sources [Government Code (GC) Sections 13332.01 through 13332.02]. The SWCAP apportions central services costs to state departments; however, it includes only statewide central services that are allowable under federal cost reimbursement policies. The SWCAP rate is developed and provided annually to all State Administering Agencies (SAA) of federal awards, grants, and contracts by the California Department of Finance (DOF). In addition, Administrative Planning and Administration funds are used for development of the Three Year Plan and related grant development, administration and monitoring. Examples of such expenses include, but are not limited to, the following: on-site travel expenses for fiscal and program monitoring responsibilities, CJJ/OJJDP conference registration/travel costs for both the BSCC staff and applicable SAG members; SACJJDP/ESC/R.E.D. Subcommittee work on Title II grant development (including producing an RFP for the local assistance grants and rating grant applications received). The BSCC provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures necessary to ensure prudent use, proper disbursement, and accurate accounting of funds received under Title II. During FFY years 2001-2021, the BSCC did not receive under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632] any amount that exceeded 105 percent of the amount the state received under such section for fiscal year 2000, which was $5,100,000. If an amount in excess of $5,100,000 should be received by the state under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632], all of such excess shall be expended through or for programs that are part of a comprehensive and coordinated community system of services.

    **Goal:** Provide effective and efficient support for the administration, monitoring, and fiduciary responsibilities of the Title II Formula Grant Program.

    **Objective:** Support and facilitate the work of California’s SAG, which includes meetings, State Plan and Title II application development, and the full range of work related to subgrantees.

    **Activities:** Roles and responsibilities of identified staff/positions are outlined on page 49 of this application.

    The source of state matching funds will be the state general fund and the match will be applied as a dollar-for-dollar correlative expenditure for any federal dollars expended (e.g., a single travel expenditure will be split 50/50: 50 percent from state general fund monies and 50 percent from federal Title II funds).

    ##### **XI: State Advisory Group Allocation**

    **Federal Program Number: 32**

    Five percent of funds received by the state under section 222 [42 U.S.C. 5632] are budgeted for the SACJJDP to carry out Section 223(a)(3) of the JJDPA of 2002. These funds enable the SAG/SACJJDP to carry out its duties and responsibilities, as specified by the Governor and the Act. The SACJJDP recommendations discussed at SACJJDP meetings are brought before the BSCC Board for review and final decision. The Governor appointed nine new members to the SACJJDP in 2016

    **Goal:**  Establish priorities, goals, objectives and a budget for the juvenile justice programming to be funded with the local assistance portion of California’s federal Title II grant award. Monitor compliance with Title II requirements.

    **Objective:** Designate funding and other needed support for activities and services that will help California address the SAG/SACJJDP identified priorities and goals.

    **Activities and Services:** The SAG/SACJJDP members actively participate in meetings that include time dedicated to development of priorities for juvenile justice efforts and expenditures, State Plan development, approval and monitoring of subgrantees, and identification of California’s juvenile justice needs and proposed solutions.

    #### Programmatic and Budget Assurances

    The BSCC is not designated high risk by another federal grant making agency.

    The BSCC does not have any pending applications for federal grants or subgrants to support the same project as Title II.

    The BSCC FFY 2018-20 Title II proposal does not anticipate inclusion of a formal research and/or evaluation project. As details of the work to be completed under the State Plan further develop, should the need for a formal research and/or evaluation project evolve, the BSCC will provide the required assurances*.*

    The BSCC complies with Title II Civil Rights requirements, notifies subgrantees of their responsibility to comply, and monitors compliance on site visits. In this way, the BSCC requires that youth in the juvenile justice system are treated equitably on the basis of gender, race, family income, and disability**.** In addition, the BSCC and subgrantees are subject to federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA) regulations and state law regarding the confidentiality of juvenile records. Data subgrantees are required to provide in progress reports is anonymous aggregate data.

    *The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) is the designated state department that oversees the OJJDP funded Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Initiative*.

    #### Subgrant Award Assurance

    First and foremost, the BSCC requires grantees of Title II funds to use proven, or evidence-based models during implementation as a way to ensure substantial success in reaching program goals. At any time where the BSCC has determined that funded objectives are not being met, the BSCC will provide technical assistance to subgrantees to assist in getting the project on course. In any instance where the BSCC determines that substantial success has not been achieved after two funded years, the BSCC has the contractual authority to withhold new funds for the program as administered by the funded grantee.

    Ongoing BSCC oversight to ensure substantial success includes:

    * An annual re-application process where subgrantees must demonstrate program effectiveness and measures of success as a requirement for future funding. The annual reapplication requires the submission of information and data that demonstrates that goals and objectives are being met.
    * Site visits by the BSCC staff which are used in part to discuss outcomes and to provide technical assistance where needed to strengthen outcomes. The BSCC staff meet with subgrantees and staff, subcontracted service providers where applicable and sometimes with the clients served. This provides the BSCC with observation and anecdotal information to help demonstrate success A
    * Quarterly Progress Reports by subgrantees are required. These reports provide the BSCC with regular information and measures of success. This allows the BSCC to recognize early the need for technical assistance and to then provide it so that substantial success can be achieved.
    * At the start of a grant cycle, the BSCC convenes all newly-awarded grantees for a Grantee Orientation.  Each grantee is invited to bring a team of 4-6 individuals including the Project Director, Financial Officer, day-to-day program or fiscal contacts, evaluator and community-based partners. At this orientation, the BSCC staff review grantee responsibilities including evaluation plans, progress reports, program and budget modifications, financial invoices, monitoring of sub-grantees and the BSCC site visits. Each grantee team shares with the group an overview of their project and what they hope to accomplish with the grant funding. Grantees are provided an opportunity to network, share ideas and ask questions. Each grantee leaves with a binder containing the information they will need to successfully meet the BSCC requirements.
    * The BSCC convenes quarterly conference calls as a part of our technical assistance and monitoring process. The purpose of the conference calls is to allow the BSCC staff to check in with grantees on a regular basis and answer questions on a flow basis. The calls also provide an opportunity for grantees to discuss challenges, share ideas and learn from each other. The typical agenda for a quarterly project director call includes:
    1. Grantee updates on program activities and spending;
    2. Troubleshooting;
    3. Notice of upcoming events; and
    4. Discuss grant accomplishments and/or challenges.

    #### State Advisory Board Membership

    The BSCC is California’s SAA for the Title II Formula Grants program. The BSCC oversees California’s SAG, which is the SACJJDP. The SACJJDP is made up of Governor-appointed members who are committed to enhancing the quality of life for all youth in California. The SACJJDP serves as a standing Executive Steering Committee of the BSCC. The current SACJJDP is comprised of a diverse group of 19 professionals and youth members who are subject matter experts in their respective fields.

    #### Add SACJJDP Roster

    #### Add BSCC Org Chart

    ##### 

    ##### 7.1: Staffing

    The following staff are assigned to the Title II Grant and Compliance Monitoring activities. Projections are rounded and based on timekeeping conducted during FFY 2017 for Title II and Compliance Monitoring program activities.

    CPGP

    *Percentages are projections that are rounded and based on actual time during state Fiscal Year 20/21 to date.*

    Ricardo Goodrish Deputy Director, CPGP 15%

    Timothy Polasik Juvenile Justice Specialist 50%

    Timothy Polasik R.E.D. Coordinator; 50%

    Juanita Reynaga Senior Management Auditor 13%

    Amanda Abucay Staff Services Manager I, Program 13%

    Rosa Pargas Staff Services Manager II 13%

    Deanna Ridgway Assoc. Govt. Program Analyst, Program 100%

    April Albright Assoc.Govt. Program Analyst, Fiscal 30%

    Facilities Standards and Operations (FSO)

    *Percentages are projections based on prior experience with Compliance Monitoring activities.*

    Allison Ganter Deputy Director, FSO 15%

    Eloisa Tuitama Field Representative, FSO 50%

    Compliance Monitor

    Lisa Southwell Field Representative, FSO 5%

    Craigus Thompson Field Representative, FSO 5%

    Elizabeth Gong Field Representative, FSO 5%

    Charlene Aboytes Field Representative, FSO 5%

    Kim Moule Field Representative, FSO 5%

    Mike Bush Field Representative, FSO 5%

    Steve Keithley Field Representative, FSO 5%

    Bob Takeshta Compliance Monitor, (Retired Annuitant) 100%

    Bill Crout Compliance Monitor, (Retired Annuitant) 100%

    Ginger Wolfe Assoc. Govt. Program Analyst, FSO 50%

    Tamaka Shedwin Staff Services Analyst, FSO 5%

    Tina Peerson Staff Services Analyst, FSO 25%

    Research

    *Percentages are projections based on State Fiscal year activities to date.*

    Kasey Warmuth Research Manager III 8%

    Ashley Van De Pol Research Analyst 20%

    Note: Due to vacations, absences, special projects and other events, other BSCC staff may periodically charge hours worked on Title II related projects to this fund.

    * 1. Classification Descriptions, CPGP:

    Deputy Director, CPGP: oversee procedures, processes and workload for all CPGP staff performing work related to Title II, Tribal Youth and R.E.D. grants and related budget activity, and all SACJJDP related work and administrative support.

    Juvenile Justice Specialist: The Juvenile Justice Specialist provides staff support for the SACJJDP and assists with the development, implementation, and monitoring of the Title II Three-Year Plan. The Juvenile Justice Specialist reports directly to the Deputy Director of the CPGP.

    R.E.D. Coordinator/Field Representative, CPGP: The R.E.D. coordinator collects and analyzes R.E.D. data, assists with the development, implementation, and monitoring of the R.E.D. Three-Year Plan, and provides technical assistance to subgrantees. The Field Representative performs a variety of activities relating to grant administration and oversight for the grant. The following is a list of general activities:

    * Assist in the preparation of federal applications submitted to the OJJDP for funding for the Title II Formula Grant Program;
    * Prepare competitive RFPs as needed and coordinate activities associated with the application process;
    * Prepare, review, and approve yearly re-applications;
    * Coordinate activities to get both new and on-going grantees under contract;
    * Collect and report data pertaining to federal program area activities;
    * Provide on-site technical assistance to new grantees regarding data collection, preparing and submitting invoices and budget/program modifications, preparing progress reports, and discussing contract requirements;
    * Review and approve/deny quarterly progress reports, invoices and budget/program modifications. If denied, provide technical assistance to correct problems;
    * Conduct site visits as needed;
    * Provide technical assistance as needed to address any problems noted during the on-site visit;
    * Prepare site/monitoring reports and monitor to ensure deficiencies are corrected;
    * Prepare correspondence sent to grantees, state and federal agencies, counties and cities, and the general public;
    * Provide training as needed to professional organizations, state, city, county and non-profit organizations;
    * Prepare and submit federal progress reports; and
    * Review annual financial audits and resolve any questioned or disallowed cost issues.

    The provision of technical assistance by Field Representatives includes review and recommendations regarding expenditures, program and budget modifications, local data collection procedures, local research designs and any proposed modifications; training local program evaluators with regard to conducting program evaluations and appropriate statistical analyses; and review and critique of final local program evaluation reports (which must be approved by the BSCC).

    Senior Management Auditor: review conditions and requirements of CPGP grants, develop, maintain and implement procedures to monitor ongoing compliance, and develop and provide management reports to executive staff.  Coordinate and manage all CPGP audits, develop audit responses and corrective action plans.  Confer with federal and state agencies including the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the State Controller’s office and the California Department of Finance.

    Staff Services Manager 1, Program: oversee procedures, processes, and workload for grant program administrative support; oversee program staff responsible for tracking grant contracting and program activities, data analysis, progress reporting, desk reviews, federal application processes, the SACJJDP support activities, and compliance with all federal reporting requirements.

    Staff Services Manager 1, Fiscal: oversee procedures, processes, and workload for fiscal administrative support; oversee fiscal staff responsible for invoicing, budgeting, projections, fiscal reporting systems maintenance and tracking activities, and compliance with federal fiscal reporting requirements.

    Associate Governmental Program Analyst, Program: maintains grant files, works with subgrantees to collect and process subgrantee applications and progress reports, tracks grantee activity, performs grantee desk reviews, and monitors grant agreement compliance. In addition, program analyst works with Field Representatives on data collection and reporting, progress report analysis, federal application and state plan preparation and submittal, grant administrative technical assistance, and reporting in the federal Data Collection and Technical Assistance Tool (DCTAT).

    Associate Governmental Program Analyst, Fiscal: develop and maintain budget projection and planning documents; analyze financial and budget status reports for accuracy and funds availability; evaluate and project program expenditures; resolve budget-related problems, accounting and/or coding errors; Review invoices and budget modifications to ensure accurate expenditure coding; maintain multiple internal and external tracking systems to ensure grant balances and expenditures are posted correctly; prepare financial data analysis reports for management as needed

    7.3 Classification Descriptions, FSO:

    Deputy Director, FSO: oversee procedures, processes and workload for all FSO staff performing work related to Compliance monitoring and related budget, data collection and reporting activity.

    Compliance Monitor/Field Representative, FSO: performs a variety of activities relating to compliance monitoring and oversight of the core requirements. The following is a list of general activities:

    * Assist in the preparation of federal applications submitted to the OJJDP for funding for the Title II Formula Grant Program including the Compliance Monitoring Three Year Plan;
    * Conduct juvenile facility site inspections;
    * Review annual facility inspection reports from Juvenile Court Judges/Juvenile Justice Commissions;
    * Follow up with facility administrators and/or Juvenile Court Judges as needed to address missing reports or issues identified during the inspection;
    * Provide on-site technical assistance to juvenile facility staff and law enforcement;
    * Prepare correspondence sent to grantees, state and federal agencies, counties and cities, and the general public;
    * Provide training as needed to professional organizations, state, city, county and non-profit organizations;
    * Review and evaluate county compliance with Federal and State laws;
    * Review and evaluate county compliance with the core requirements and State law regarding minimum requirements for juvenile justice facilities (including, but not limited to Title 15 and Title 24); and
    * Assist with the juvenile regulations revision process.

    The provision of technical assistance by the Field Representative (FSO) includes training stakeholders on the core requirements and California law regarding minimum standards for juvenile facilities.

    Associate Governmental Program Analyst, FSO: collects and analyzes compliance monitoring data and assists with preparation and submission of the Compliance Monitoring Three Year Plan and annual SACJJDP Report to the Governor and Legislature on Compliance Monitoring Recommendations.

    Staff Services Analyst, FSO: Data entry of all annual surveys and monthly reports. Maintenance of Compliance Monitoring database and physical files. Communicates with reporting agencies to verify data as necessary.

    7.4 Classification Descriptions, Research:

    Research Manager III: oversee procedures, processes and workload for all research staff performing work related to grant support including RFP rating criteria, evaluation processes, data collection and reporting.

    Research Analyst: provide grant support in RFP rating criteria and evaluation process as well as assistance in required federal and subgrantee data analysis and reporting.

    ##### **8. List of Juvenile Programs Administered by the BSCC**

    * Federal Title II Grants including Tribal Youth and R.E.D. – California’s current Title II plan emphasizes Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs), R.E.D., Quality Education for Youth, and Maintaining Compliance with the Four Core Protections. The BSCC Field Representatives conduct grantee monitoring visits and facility site inspections and coordinate/provide applicable training and technical assistance. There are currently 12 subgrantees with programs focusing on Diversion, Delinquency Prevention, and Aftercare/Reentry; two Tribal grantees with programs based around the Gathering of Native Americans (GONA) principles; and four R.E.D. grants based on data analysis and collaborative development of a R.E.D. reduction plan.
    * Federal Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG)–The JABG programs were zeroed out in the federal budget in 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017. The remaining balance of the 2013 federal allocation is being used to support the SACJJDP’s priority focus on the use of EBPs.

    JABG EBP Training Grants fund training for local probation departments to assist them in implementing or expanding the use of EBP within their local juvenile justice communities. While probation departments are the lead agency in the implementation of the training requested and the main recipient of the services, other key stakeholders within each juvenile justice community are also included in the training offered. The funding for this program expired on February 28, 2018.

    * Federal Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) – The JAG Program [42 U.S. Code §3751(a)] is a key provider of law enforcement funding to state and local jurisdictions. The JAG Program provides critical funding necessary to support state and local initiatives, to include: technical assistance, strategic planning, research and evaluation (including forensics), data collection, training, personnel, equipment, forensic laboratories, supplies, contractual support, and criminal justice information systems. It funds both adult and youth programs. California has prioritized the following three JAG program areas:
    * Education and Prevention Programs
    * Law Enforcement Programs
    * Prosecution and Court Programs, Including Indigent Defense
    * Juvenile Reentry Grant (JRG) - The JRG program was established to provide local supervision of youthful offenders discharged from the custody of the Division of Juvenile Facilities. Specifically, the JRG is intended to reimburse county probation departments for the costs associated with housing youthful offenders (including the costs of supervision, programming, education, and incarceration) following release from the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). County allocations of JRG funding are based on two factors:
      1. The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice provides an annual report identifying each ward discharged from a DJJ facility.
      2. The Board of State and Community Corrections, provides an annual report on discharged wards who are returned to a local juvenile detention facility for violating a condition of court-ordered supervision during the first 24 months after the ward's initial release to local supervision.

    The BSCC’s responsibilities are tied exclusively to the second factor. When Juvenile

    Justice Realignment shifted the responsibility of supervising youthful offenders from the state to the local level, the role of collecting data from each county regarding the number of youthful offenders housed in local juvenile detention facilities was assigned to the BSCC. This data is organized into a single report and submitted to the Department of Finance on an annual basis. When a claim for reimbursement is approved, payment is made directly to county probation departments by the State Controller’s Office.

    * Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act – Youthful Offender Block Grant Program (JJCPA-YOBG) – The state JJCPA program provides state funds for probation departments to implement programs that have proven effective in reducing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth and youthful offenders.  The YOBG program provides state funding for counties to deliver custody and care (i.e., appropriate rehabilitative and supervisory services) to offenders who previously would have been committed to the CDCR, Division of Juvenile Justice. California statute was enacted in 2016 to combine the planning and reporting requirements of these two programs.
    * Youth Reinvestment Grant (YRG) - The YRG Program was established in the 2018 budget Act (Senate Bill 840, Chapter 29. Statues pf 2018) and the related trailer bill (Assembly Bill (AB) 1812, chapter 36, Statutes of 2018). In 2019 the YRG Program was modified by AB 1454. This program supports diversion of youth away from the juvenile justice system by providing grants to various agencies. Youth Reinvestment Grant program is aimed at diverting youth who are at risk of juvenile justice involvement from initial contact with the juvenile justice system using approaches that are evidence-based, culturally relevant, trauma-informed, and developmentally appropriate. Funds may also be used to prevent further involvement in the juvenile justice system for those youth who have already experienced initial contact. Grant funds will be used to target underserved communities with high rates of youth arrests. Applicants must be local government entities or nonprofit organizations. Local government applicants will be required to pass through 90 percent of awarded funds to nonprofit community-based organizations
    * Youth Center/Youth Shelter Program– The state Youth Center/Youth Shelter Program provided $55 million for the construction, acquisition, and remodeling of 98 youth centers and youth shelters throughout the state. Youth centers are located in

    low income, high crime neighborhoods and provide youth with after-school programming including educational and recreational services. Many of these centers are operated by well-known youth service agencies such as the Boys and Girls Club and YMCA.Youth shelters provide overnight sleeping accommodations for homeless

    and transitional youth. The shelters also provide case management services, referrals to community resources, and assistance with family reunification. Although funding for this program has long been disbursed, the BSCC still has active contracts and oversight responsibilities.

    * Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction (MIOCR) Juvenile Grants – MIOCR state funds support appropriate prevention, intervention, diversion, supervision, and services through **promising and evidence-based** strategies to reduce recidivism in **managing** California’s mentally ill offender population, as well as improving outcomes for these offenders. Grant funds were awarded to implement locally-developed, collaborative and multidisciplinary projects that provide a cost-effective continuum of responses designed to provide youthful offenders alternatives to detention, reduce crime and juvenile justice costs as they relate to the mentally ill, and to maximize available and/or new local resources for prevention, intervention, diversion, detention, and aftercare services for juvenile offenders with mental health issues, while i**mproving public safety.** This grant program ends June 30, 2018.
    * Proud Parenting– Proud Parenting state funds support community-based parenting services to young parents between the ages of 14 and 25 who are involved in the juvenile or criminal justice system to break the inter-generational cycle of violence and delinquency.  Grantees provide classroom instruction, structured family events and mentoring as well as comprehensive assessments and assistance to young parents or those at risk of becoming parents. This program is subject to a state appropriation.
    * California Violence Intervention and Prevention (CalVIP) – CalVIP Program provides $9.215 million in grant funding to cities and CBOs to support a range of violence intervention and prevention activities. CalVIP is a state-funded grant program enacted by the 2017 State Budget Act and appropriated through the State General Fund. Cities and CBOs may apply for up to $500,000 for a two-year grant with a 100

    percent match (cash or in-kind). City applicants must form a coordinating and advisory council to prioritize the use of grant funds. Cities that are awarded funding must pass-through a minimum of 50 percent of grant funds to one or more CBOs and must commit to collaborating with local agencies and jurisdictions in violence reduction efforts. The BSCC must give preference to applicants in cities and regions that have been disproportionately affected by violence and to applicants that propose to direct CalVIP funds to programs that have been shown to be the most effective at reducing violence. This two year program can serve adults and juveniles.

    * Proposition 47–The ongoing state Proposition 47 program funds public agencies to provide mental health services, substance use disorder treatment and/or diversion programs for those in the criminal justice system. It may serve both adults and juveniles and also allows funds to be used for housing-related assistance and other community-based supportive services, including job skills training, case management or civil legal services.

    Washburn, M. & Menart, R. (2020). A Blueprint for Reform: Moving Beyond California’s Failed Youth Correctional System. Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice. Retrieved from: <http://www.cjcj.org/uploads/cjcj/documents/blueprint_for_reform.pdf> [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
11. Same as above [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
12. H.R.6964 - Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
13. SB-823 Juvenile justice realignment: Office of Youth and Community Restoration. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
14. Walker, S. C., & Herting, J. R. (2020). The Impact of Pretrial Juvenile Detention on 12-Month Recidivism: A Matched Comparison Study. Crime and Delinquency. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128720926115 [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
15. Becerra, X. (2018). Juvenile Justice in California. CA Department of Justice. Retrieved from: <https://data-openjustice.doj.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2019-07/Juvenile%20Justice%20In%20CA%202018%2020190701.pdf>

    # 

    # Attachment 1: New 2017 California Laws Relevant to Juvenile Justice

    Assembly Bill (AB) 823

    AB 90 (Chapter 695) “Fair and Accurate Gang Database Act”.AB 90 sets policies, procedures, training and oversight for the future use of shared gang databases, including, among other things, establishing the requirements for entering and reviewing gang designations, the retention period for listed gangs, and the criteria for identifying gang members. It further requires periodic audits by law enforcement agencies and department staff to ensure the accuracy, reliability, and proper use of any shared gang database, and the report of those results to the public. This is to address accuracy and fairness in the collection and accessing of gang allegations.

    AB 507 (Chapter 705) Resource family training. As part of CCR, AB 507 provides that a portion of annual resource family training shall support the case plans, goals, and needs of children in the resource family home, if there are any children in the home, in accordance with departmental directives and regulations. It also permits a county to require one or more hours of specialized training for resource families in addition to the 8 hours of caregiver training otherwise required by current law.

    AB 529 (Chapter 685) Sealing of juvenile offense records. AB 529 requires the juvenile court to order the sealing of arrest and related records held by law enforcement and probation agencies and the Department of Justice, in cases where a petition filed to declare the minor a ward of the court has been dismissed or has resulted in an acquittal on the charges. It also requires probation departments to seal records pertaining to a juvenile who completes a diversion program to which he or she is referred in lieu of the filing of a petition and it permits probation departments to access a record that has been sealed under Section 786 in order to determine eligibility for subsequent supervision programs under WIC Section 654.3.

    AB 766 (Chapter 710) Foster care independent living to include university and college housing. *AB 766* provides that a minor aged 16 or older who is otherwise eligible for AFDC-FC (foster care) benefits may directly receive those payments if he or she is enrolled in a postsecondary educational institution, living independently in a dormitory or other designated school housing and where the education placement is made pursuant to a supervised placement agreement and transitional independent living plan as described in the bill. AB 766 further provides that foster care payments made to a minor enrolled in a postsecondary education placement at the University of California or California Community Colleges shall not be counted in considering the minor’s eligibility for financial aid.

    AB 878 (Chapter 660) Mechanical restraints used on minors during transportation from local juvenile justice facilities.*AB 878*permits the use of “mechanical restraints” (including handcuffs, chains, irons, straightjackets) on a juvenile during transportation to or from a local secure juvenile facility (including probation camps or ranches) “only upon a determination made by the probation department, in consultation with the transporting agency, that the

    mechanical restraints are necessary to prevent physical harm to the juvenile or another person or due to a substantial risk of flight.” It requires that if the restraints are used, only the least restrictive form of restraint consistent with the legitimate security needs of the juvenile is to be used. It requires that a probation department choosing to use mechanical restraints other than handcuffs shall adopt procedures documenting their use and reasons for use. It limits the use of restraints during a court proceeding to situations where the court determines that the minor’s behavior in custody or in court makes the use of restraints necessary to prevent physical harm or flight, with the burden on the prosecution to demonstrate the need for restraints, and then requires that the least restrictive form of restraint be used and that the reasons for use of the restraint be documented.

    AB 1008 (Chapter 789) Ban the box/ fair employment limits on employer inquiry into criminal history.AB 1008 revises and expands California fair employment law by declaring it to be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to a) ask about conviction history on a job application, b) enquire about conviction history until after the applicant has been made a conditional job offer, or c) in conducting a background check to consider or use certain types of criminal history including arrest without conviction, diversion only and information contained in sealed records. This only applies to employers having five or more employees. The safeguards against inquiry into criminal history do not apply to certain background checks otherwise required by law, including background checks required for employment with a state or local agency or with a designated criminal justice agency. AB 1008 also sets out requirements for informing applicants about reasons for denial of employment related to criminal history and provides for a five-day period in which persons denied employment can challenge the accuracy of the information on which rejection was based.

    AB 1308 (Chapter 675) Eligibility for parole consideration for prisoners whose offenses were committed while age 25 or younger.AB 1308 raises the eligibility threshold for parole consideration to cover prisoners who were age 25 or younger at the time of their commitment offense (from age 23 under current law). Prisoners meeting this age criteria become eligible for release on parole after 15, 20 or 25 years of incarceration depending on the sentence originally imposed. AB 1308 requires the parole board, in making its determination, to consider maturity and development factors pertaining to juveniles and young adults and to provide “a meaningful opportunity for release”. It further sets out a range of future dates by which the parole board must complete sentence reviews for those made eligible for release by the bill, depending on the type of sentence that was imposed.

    SB 190 (Chapter 678) Elimination of costs imposed by counties for juvenile detention, placement, legal services and related charges. SB 190 deletes provisions in multiple sections of the Welfare and Institutions Code that now permit counties to assess minors and parents for the costs of juvenile processing, defense representation, detention, drug testing and placement. The bill is comprehensive in the sense that it strikes cost language from nearly every section of the Welfare and Institutions Code. SB 190 also provides additional relief from liability of parents or juveniles from having to pay the costs of designated juvenile court and probation services or operations.

    SB 312 (Chapter 679) Sealing of juvenile offense records involving listed serious (WIC Section 707 b) offenses. SB 312 modifies the lifetime ban on sealing of a juvenile record involving a WIC Section 707 (b) offense committed at age 14 or older, with certain limitations.

    SB 384 (Chapter 541) Tiered sex offender registration.SB 384, beginning January 2021, modifies Juvenile sex offender registration requirements as follows: establishes Tier 1 and Tier 2 registration periods for juveniles required to register after release from the Department of Correction’s Division of Juvenile Justice. Based on the underlying offense, juvenile registrants fall either into Tier 1 (5 years) or Tier 2 (10 years of registration). Upon meeting performance criteria during the registration period, the juvenile registrant may petition the Juvenile Court in the county of residence for removal from registration. The criteria applied by the Juvenile Court to rule on removal are the same criteria that apply to adult sex offense petitioners in Superior Court.

    SB 394 (Chapter 684) Parole hearings for persons sentenced to Life-Without-Parole (LWOP) for crimes committed prior to age 18.SB 394 expands the coverage of other law that provide for parole board review of long prison sentences imposed on individuals who were under the age of 23 at the time of commission of the offense. SB 394 adds and provides for parole board review of a LWOP sentence for an individual who received the LWOP sentence for a crime committed prior to age 18 and who has served at least 25 years of his or her sentence. Requires parole hearings for those whose eligibility is expanded by the bill to completed on or before July 1, 2020.

    SB 395 (Chapter 681) Juvenile interrogation and counsel rights.SB 395 requires that a youth 15 years of age or younger, prior to any custodial interrogation, and prior to the waiver of any Miranda rights, shall consult with counsel either in person, by telephone or by video conference. This right to consultation with counsel may not be waived. SB 395 requires a court, in considering the admissibility of any statements by the minor, to consider the effect of any failure to comply with the counsel consultation requirement. The SB 395 consultation requirement does not apply to the admissibility of any statement obtained without consultation for situations in which the law enforcement officer reasonably believed that the information sought was necessary “to protect life or property from an imminent threat”. SB 395 also states that a probation officer acting in the normal performance of referral and investigation activities as specified is not subject to the requirement of the counsel consultation

    SB 462 (Chapter 462) Accessing juvenile case files for data reports and evaluations.A juvenile case file is the court’s record of documents and reports pertaining to juvenile dependency or delinquency proceedings. By definition, the case file includes individual records in the custody probation agencies. Welfare and Institutions Code Section 827 generally provides that these records are confidential and may be accessed only by certain agencies or individuals for defined uses. SB 462 adds a new WIC Section 827.12 authorizing a law enforcement agency, probation department or any other state or local agency having custody of the juvenile case file to access and utilize the record for purposes of complying with grant reports or with data reports required by other laws, as long as no personally identifying information accessed under the bill is further released, disseminated

    or published. The bill also allows a chief probation officer to ask a court to authorize release of juvenile case file information for “data sharing” or for research and evaluation purposes with the ban on release of personally identifying information.

    SB 625 (Chapter 683) Honorable Discharge from the Division of Juvenile Facilities.Prior to the realignment of state youth parole to counties in 2010, Honorable Discharge status could be awarded to wards paroled from the Department of Correction’s Division of Juvenile Facilities (DJJ). After DJJ parole was realigned to counties, this practice became dormant. SB 625 now authorizes the Board of Juvenile Hearings (BJH) to award Honorable Discharge to DJJ wards who have been released to the county on local probation supervision. Individuals seeking this status must petition the BJH for an honorable discharge determination. Those eligible include all persons discharged from DJJ after the effective date of DJJ parole realignment (October 2010). The petition may not be considered by BJH until at least 18 months have passed since the ward’s released. When a request for honorable discharge is made, the probation department must furnish a report to BJH on the ward’s performance on local supervision. The bill lists criteria for honorable discharge to be considered by the Board including offense history since discharge and the “efforts made by the petitioner toward successful community reintegration, including employment history, educational achievements or progress toward obtaining a degree, vocational training, volunteer work, community engagement, positive peer and familial relationships, and any other relevant indicators of successful reentry and rehabilitation”. If honorable discharge is granted, the individual is “thereafter be released from all penalties or disabilities resulting from the offenses for which the person was committed, including, but not limited to,penalties or disabilities that affect access to education, employment, or occupational license”, with special limitations applicable to employment as a peace officer. It specifies that an individual granted honorable discharge is not relieved from any requirement to register as sex offender.

    Finally, in November 2016, California voters approved Proposition 57, which, among other things, ended the ability of prosecutors to “direct file,” i.e., file criminal cases against juveniles in adult court. This may increase the population of youth incarcerated in the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)’s Division of Juvenile Justice.

    # Appendix N: Juvenile Problem/Needs Analysis Data Elements

    In assessing the juvenile justice problems and needs in California, the SACJJDP looked at many different sets of data – both quantitative and qualitative. What follows is a youth crime analysis which assessed quantitative data trends in four areas, mental health indicators, and qualitative data trends.

    Executive Summary

    This document presents youth crime data gathered for the youth crime analysis required for the 2020 Title II Formula Grant Program application. The youth crime analysis assessed trends in four categories: juvenile arrests, referrals, status of juveniles’ post-referral to county probation departments, and juvenile hall bookings and secure holds in law enforcement facilities. Additionally, other trends relevant to delinquency prevention programming were considered, including social, economic, legal, and other organizational conditions. Findings for each of these are summarized below.

    1. Juvenile Arrests
    * Arrests have decreased since 2007, reaching a low of 43,181 arrests in 2019, representing a 81.8 percent decrease.
    * Percent of arrests by gender have remained consistent over the years with 72 percent for males and 28 percent for females in 2019.
    * Percent of arrests by age have remained consistent since 2009 with 71 percent for 15-17 year-olds and 28 percent for 12-14 year-olds.
    * Felony arrests have increased and accounted for 38 percent of arrests in 2019. Misdemeanor arrests have decreased to 53 percent of arrests in 2019. Arrests for status offenses have decreased and were at 9 percent in 2019.
    * Percent of arrests have decreased for White juveniles from 29 percent in 2004 to 20 percent in 2019; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 46 percent in 2004 to 53 percent in 2019; and ranged from 16 to 21 percent for Black juveniles over the years.
    1. Juvenile Referrals

    For juvenile referrals to probation departments:

    * Referrals have decreased since 2008, reaching a low of 59,371 referrals in 2019, representing a 73.1 percent decrease.
    * Percent of referrals by gender have remained consistent over the years with 75 percent for males and 25 percent for females in 2019.
    * The majority of referrals are for 15-17 year-olds, representing 67 percent of referrals in 2019.
    * Percent of referrals have: increased for Hispanic juveniles from 46 percent in 2006 to 54 percent in 2019; decreased for White juveniles from 27 percent in 2006 to 19 percent in 2019; and remained consistent for Black and Other juveniles.

    For juvenile referrals that resulted in petitions filed with the juvenile court:

    |  |
    | --- |
    | * Petitions have decreased since 2008, reaching a low of 31,717 in 2019, representing a 71.8 percent decrease. |
    | * Petitions by gender have remained consistent over the years with 80 percent for male juveniles and 20 for female juveniles in 2019. |
    | * The majority of petitions are for 15-17 year-olds, representing 69 percent of petitions in 2019. Petitions have decreased for juveniles 12-14 years-old from 18 percent in 2006 to 14 percent in 2019 and increased for 18-24 year-olds from 11 percent in 2006 to 16 percent in 2019. |
    | * Percent of petitions have: increased for Black juveniles from 21 percent in 2006 to 23 percent in 2019; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 47 percent in 2006 to 55 percent in 2019; decreased for White juveniles from 25 percent in 2006 to 15 percent in 2019; and remained consistent for Other (5-6 percent) juveniles over the years. |

    1. Status of Juveniles Post-Referral to County Probation Departments

    |  |
    | --- |
    | * The handling of juvenile referrals to county probation departments were classified into two categories: petitions filed and other actions taken. In 2019, 53 percent of referrals resulted in a petition filed and 47 percent of referrals resulted in other action taken. |
    | * For the 31,717 petitions filed in 2019, 61 percent resulted in wardship probation, 18 percent were dismissed, 8 percent resulted in informal probation, 7 percent resulted in non-ward probation, 3 percent resulted in deferred entry of judgement, 3 percent were transferred, less than 1 percent (n=42) were diverted, less than 1 percent (n = 64) were remanded to adult court, and zero juveniles were deported. |
    | * For the 27,654 referrals in 2019 that were non-petitioned and classified as other action taken, 76 percent were closed at intake, 13 percent resulted in the juveniles being diverted; 5 percent resulted in the juveniles sent to traffic court, 4 percent resulted in juveniles receiving informal probation, 2 percent resulted in juveniles being transferred to adult court, no juveniles were direct filed and no juveniles were deported. |

    1. Juvenile Hall Bookings and Secure Holds in Law Enforcement Facilities

    • Juvenile hall bookings increased between 2004 and 2006, reaching a high of 114,404 in 2006. Juvenile hall bookings have since declined reaching a low of 30,957 in 2019, representing a 72.9 percent decrease.

    • Secure holds of juvenile delinquent offenders under 6 hours increased between 2004 and 2006, reaching a high of 11,713 in 2006. They have since decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2018 with 2,097 holds. A slight increase was seen in 2019 with 2,108 holds.

    • Secure holds of juvenile delinquent offenders over 6 hours doubled between 2004 and 2006 reaching a high of 158 in 2006. Holds decreased in 2008 with 75 holds and have since remained steady.

    • Secure holds of juvenile status offenders increased between 2007 and 2011, reaching a high of 101 holds in 2011. Secure holds have since decreased with 4 holds in 2019.

    1. Mental Health Indicators
       * The average number of juveniles each month with open mental health cases decreased from 2,222 in 2010 to 988 in 2020. However, there is an upward trend in the percent of the population with open mental health cases, from 48.4 percent in 2010 to 65.5 percent in 2020.
       * The average number of juveniles who receive psychotropic medications each month decreased from 873 in 2010 to 498 in 2020. However, there is an upward trend in the percent of the population who receive psychotropic medications, from 19 percent in 2010 to 33 percent in 2020.
       * A total of one suicide was reported from 2010 through 2020. Suicide attempts of juveniles reached a high of 187 in 2013. They have since remained somewhat steady until 2018, when they began to decrease, reaching their lowest point in 2020 with 62 attempts.
    2. Other Trends
    * data and other social, economic, legal, and organizational conditions considered relevant to delinquency prevention programming.

    Introduction

    This document presents youth crime data gathered to assist the Board of State and Community Corrections’ (BSCC) State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention (SACJJDP) with the development of the 2021-2024 State Plan for the Title II Formula Grant Program and to fulfill the youth crime analysis required for the application. The subsequent sections address the following requirements of the youth crime analysis:

    1. Juvenile Arrests – Juvenile arrests by offense type, gender, age, and race.
    2. Juvenile Referrals – Number and characteristics (by offense type, gender, race, and age) of juveniles referred to juvenile court, a probation agency, or special intake unit for allegedly committing a delinquent or status offense.
    3. Status of Juveniles Post-Referral to County Probation Departments – Number of cases handled informally (non-petitioned) and formally (petitioned) by gender, race, and type of disposition (e.g., diversion, probation, commitment, residential treatment).
    4. Juvenile Hall Bookings and Secure Holds in Law Enforcement Facilities – Number of delinquent and status offenders admitted, by gender and race, to juvenile detention facilities and adult jails and lockups (if applicable).
    5. Mental Health Indicators – select mental health related data elements from the BSCC’s Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS).
    6. Other Trends – Data and other social, economic, legal, and organizational conditions considered relevant to delinquency prevention programming.

    For juvenile arrests, referrals and status of juveniles post-referral to county probation departments (items 1 through 3 above), data were obtained from the California Department of Justice’s published *Juvenile Justice in California* reports. Within these reports, data are provided for four race and ethnicity categories: Blacks, Hispanics, Whites, and Other.

    For juvenile bookings and holds (item 4 above), data were obtained from the BSCC’s *Juvenile Detention Profile Survey*  and *Minors in Detention Survey*. Within these two data sources, demographic information is not available for age, gender, or race and ethnicity.

    1. Juvenile Arrests

    Tables 1 through 6 below provide trend data for juvenile arrests from 2004 through 2019 by offense type, gender, age, and race, respectively. Figure 1 (which follows Tables 1 – 6) displays the percent of arrests by race and ethnicity. Trends in juvenile arrests are described below.

    * *Total Juvenile Arrests (Tables 1 - 6) –* Arrests steadily increased from 2004 through 2007 reaching a peak of 236,856. Arrests have since steadily decreased reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 43,181 arrests, representing an 81.8 percent decrease since 2007.
    * *Juvenile Arrests by Offense Type (Table 1) –* For the 43,181 juvenile arrests in 2019, 38 percent were felonies, 53 percent were misdemeanors, and 9 percent were status offenses. Felony arrests increased from 26 percent in 2004 to 38 percent in 2019. Misdemeanor arrests remained steady ranging between 56 to 58 percent from 2006 through 2015, decreasing to 53 percent in 2019. Arrests for status offenses decreased from 16 percent in 2006 to 9 percent in 2019.
    * *Juvenile Arrests by Gender (Table 2)* – For the 43,181 juvenile arrests in 2019, 72 percent were males and 28 percent were females. Percent of arrests by gender have remained steady from 2004 through 2019.
    * *Juvenile Arrests by Offense Type and Gender (Table 3 and Table 4) –* For arrests of juvenile males from 2006 through 2019, felony arrests increased from 23 percent to 31 percent, misdemeanor arrests decreased from 41 percent to 36 percent, and status offense arrests decreased from 10 percent to 5 percent. For arrests of juvenile females from 2006 through 2019, felony arrests have increased slightly from 5 percent to 7 percent, misdemeanor arrests increased from 16 percent to 17 percent; and status arrests remained around 5 percent.
    * *Juvenile Arrests by Age (Table 5) –* For the 43,181 juvenile arrests in 2019, 71 percent were for 15-17 year-olds and 28 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Percent of arrests by age group has remained steady from 2009 through 2019.
    * *Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity (Table 6 and Figure 1) –* For the 43,181 juvenile arrests in 2019, 20 percent were White, 53 percent Hispanic, 21 percent Black, and 6 percent Other. Percent of arrests have: decreased for Whites from 29 percent in 2004 to 20 percent in 2019; increased for Hispanics from 46 percent in 2004 to 53 percent in 2019; and ranged from 16 to 21 percent for Black juveniles over the years

    *Table 1. Juvenile Arrests by Offense Type for 2004 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Arrests** |  | **Felonies** | |  | **Misdemeanors** | |  | **Status Offenses** | |  |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  |
    | 2004 | 206,201 |  | 54,368 | 26% |  | 123,754 | 60% |  | 28,079 | 14% |  |
    | 2005 | 222,512 |  | 59,027 | 27% |  | 133,606 | 60% |  | 29,879 | 13% |  |
    | 2006 | 232,849 |  | 65,189 | 28% |  | 131,164 | 56% |  | 36,496 | 16% |  |
    | 2007 | 236,856 |  | 66,191 | 28% |  | 134,629 | 57% |  | 36,036 | 15% |  |
    | 2008 | 229,104 |  | 64,963 | 28% |  | 130,142 | 57% |  | 33,999 | 15% |  |
    | 2009 | 204,696 |  | 58,555 | 29% |  | 115,951 | 57% |  | 30,190 | 15% |  |
    | 2010 | 185,867 |  | 52,020 | 28% |  | 106,253 | 57% |  | 27,594 | 15% |  |
    | 2011 | 149,563 |  | 43,403 | 29% |  | 84,333 | 56% |  | 21,827 | 15% |  |
    | 2012 | 120,720 |  | 36,368 | 30% |  | 67,960 | 56% |  | 16,392 | 14% |  |
    | 2013 | 96,937 |  | 30,812 | 32% |  | 54,315 | 56% |  | 11,810 | 12% |  |
    | 2014 | 86,823 |  | 27,651 | 32% |  | 48,291 | 56% |  | 10,881 | 13% |  |
    | 2015 | 71,923 |  | 21,381 | 30% |  | 41,848 | 58% |  | 8,694 | 12% |  |
    | 2016 | 62,743 |  | 19,656 | 31% |  | 35,756 | 57% |  | 7,331 | 12% |  |
    | 2017 | 56,249 |  | 19,373 | 34% |  | 30,046 | 53% |  | 6,830 | 12% |  |
    | 2018 | 46,423 |  | 17,265 | 37% |  | 24,223 | 52% |  | 4,935 | 11% |  |
    | 2019 | 43,181 |  | 16,288 | 38% |  | 22,836 | 53% |  | 4,057 | 9% |  |

    *Table 2. Juvenile Arrests by Gender for 2004 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Arrests** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent of Arrests** |  | **Count** | **Percent of Arrests** |
    | 2004 | 206,201 |  | 150,223 | 73% |  | 55,978 | 27% |
    | 2005 | 222,512 |  | 163,663 | 74% |  | 58,849 | 26% |
    | 2006 | 232,849 |  | 172,747 | 74% |  | 60,102 | 26% |
    | 2007 | 236,856 |  | 175,449 | 74% |  | 61,407 | 26% |
    | 2008 | 229,104 |  | 169,270 | 74% |  | 59,834 | 26% |
    | 2009 | 204,696 |  | 151,274 | 74% |  | 53,422 | 26% |
    | 2010 | 185,867 |  | 135,795 | 73% |  | 50,072 | 27% |
    | 2011 | 149,563 |  | 107,653 | 72% |  | 41,910 | 28% |
    | 2012 | 120,720 |  | 87,286 | 72% |  | 33,434 | 28% |
    | 2013 | 96,937 |  | 71,008 | 73% |  | 25,929 | 27% |
    | 2014 | 86,823 |  | 63,221 | 73% |  | 23,602 | 27% |
    | 2015 | 71,923 |  | 51,693 | 72% |  | 20,230 | 28% |
    | 2016 | 62,743 |  | 44,980 | 72% |  | 17,763 | 28% |
    | 2017 | 56,249 |  | 41,017 | 73% |  | 15,232 | 27% |
    | 2018 | 46,423 |  | 33,559 | 72% |  | 12,864 | 28% |
    | 2019 | 43,181 |  | 31,044 | 72% |  | 12,137 | 28% |

    *Table 3. Number of Juvenile Arrests by Offense Type & Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Arrests** |  | **Male** | | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Felonies** | **Misdemeanors** | **Status Offenses** |  | **Felonies** | **Misdemeanors** | **Status Offenses** |
    | 2006 | 232,849 |  | 54,399 | 95,059 | 23,289 |  | 10,790 | 36,105 | 13,207 |
    | 2007 | 236,856 |  | 54,864 | 97,034 | 23,551 |  | 11,327 | 37,595 | 12,485 |
    | 2008 | 229,104 |  | 53,880 | 93,191 | 22,199 |  | 11,083 | 36,951 | 11,800 |
    | 2009 | 204,696 |  | 48,693 | 82,537 | 20,044 |  | 9,862 | 33,414 | 10,146 |
    | 2010 | 185,867 |  | 43,164 | 74,314 | 18,317 |  | 8,856 | 31,939 | 9,277 |
    | 2011 | 149,563 |  | 35,870 | 57,202 | 14,581 |  | 7,533 | 27,131 | 7,246 |
    | 2012 | 120,720 |  | 30,092 | 46,304 | 10,890 |  | 6,276 | 21,656 | 5,502 |
    | 2013 | 96,937 |  | 25,757 | 37,546 | 7,887 |  | 5,237 | 16,769 | 3,923 |
    | 2014 | 86,823 |  | 22,814 | 33,341 | 7,066 |  | 4,837 | 14,950 | 3,815 |
    | 2015 | 71,923 |  | 17,879 | 28,420 | 5,394 |  | 3,502 | 13,428 | 3,300 |
    | 2016 | 62,743 |  | 16,344 | 24,251 | 4,385 |  | 3,312 | 11,505 | 2,946 |
    | 2017 | 56,249 |  | 16,166 | 20,770 | 4,081 |  | 3,207 | 9,276 | 2,749 |
    | 2018 | 46,423 |  | 14,113 | 16,643 | 2,803 |  | 3,152 | 7,580 | 2,132 |
    | 2019 | 43,181 |  | 13,356 | 15,398 | 2,290 |  | 2,932 | 7,438 | 1,767 |

    *Table 4. Percent of Juvenile Arrests by Gender & Offense Type for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Arrests** |  | **Male** | | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Felonies** | **Misdemeanors** | **Status Offenses** |  | **Felonies** | **Misdemeanors** | **Status Offenses** |
    | 2006 | 232,849 |  | 23% | 41% | 10% |  | 5% | 16% | 6% |
    | 2007 | 236,856 |  | 23% | 41% | 10% |  | 5% | 16% | 5% |
    | 2008 | 229,104 |  | 24% | 41% | 10% |  | 5% | 16% | 5% |
    | 2009 | 204,696 |  | 24% | 40% | 10% |  | 5% | 16% | 5% |
    | 2010 | 185,867 |  | 23% | 40% | 10% |  | 5% | 17% | 5% |
    | 2011 | 149,563 |  | 24% | 38% | 10% |  | 5% | 18% | 5% |
    | 2012 | 120,720 |  | 25% | 38% | 9% |  | 5% | 18% | 5% |
    | 2013 | 96,937 |  | 27% | 39% | 8% |  | 5% | 17% | 4% |
    | 2014 | 86,823 |  | 26% | 38% | 8% |  | 6% | 17% | 4% |
    | 2015 | 71,923 |  | 25% | 40% | 7% |  | 5% | 19% | 5% |
    | 2016 | 62,743 |  | 26% | 39% | 7% |  | 5% | 18% | 5% |
    | 2017 | 56,249 |  | 29% | 37% | 7% |  | 6% | 16% | 5% |
    | 2018 | 46,423 |  | 30% | 36% | 6% |  | 7% | 16% | 5% |
    | 2019 | 43,181 |  | 31% | 36% | 5% |  | 7% | 17% | 4% |

    *Table 5. Juvenile Arrests by Age for 2004 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Arrests** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  |
    | 2004 | 206,201 |  | 4,474 | 2% |  | 58,125 | 28% |  | 143,602 | 70% |  |
    | 2005 | 222,512 |  | 4,667 | 2% |  | 60,409 | 27% |  | 157,436 | 71% |  |
    | 2006 | 232,849 |  | 4,701 | 2% |  | 64,122 | 28% |  | 164,026 | 70% |  |
    | 2007 | 236,856 |  | 4,393 | 2% |  | 61,647 | 26% |  | 170,816 | 72% |  |
    | 2008 | 229,104 |  | 3,647 | 2% |  | 58,767 | 26% |  | 166,690 | 73% |  |
    | 2009 | 204,696 |  | 2,883 | 1% |  | 51,146 | 25% |  | 150,667 | 74% |  |
    | 2010 | 185,867 |  | 2,462 | 1% |  | 46,222 | 25% |  | 137,183 | 74% |  |
    | 2011 | 149,563 |  | 2,032 | 1% |  | 36,632 | 24% |  | 110,899 | 74% |  |
    | 2012 | 120,720 |  | 1,912 | 2% |  | 29,687 | 25% |  | 89,121 | 74% |  |
    | 2013 | 96,937 |  | 1,394 | 1% |  | 23,715 | 24% |  | 71,828 | 74% |  |
    | 2014 | 86,823 |  | 1,181 | 1% |  | 21,145 | 24% |  | 64,497 | 74% |  |
    | 2015 | 71,923 |  | 984 | 1% |  | 17,459 | 24% |  | 53,480 | 74% |  |
    | 2016 | 62,743 |  | 804 | 1% |  | 15,716 | 25% |  | 46,223 | 74% |  |
    | 2017 | 56,249 |  | 777 | 1% |  | 14,637 | 26% |  | 40,835 | 73% |  |
    | 2018 | 46,423 |  | 636 | 1% |  | 12,186 | 26% |  | 33,601 | 72% |  |
    | 2019 | 43,181 |  | 402 | 1% |  | 12,117 | 28% |  | 30,662 | 71% |  |

    *Table 6. Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity for 2004 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Arrests** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2004 | 206,201 |  | 36,283 | 18% |  | 95,700 | 46% |  | 60,008 | 29% |  | 14,210 | 7% |
    | 2005 | 222,512 |  | 38,395 | 17% |  | 107,699 | 48% |  | 61,456 | 28% |  | 14,962 | 7% |
    | 2006 | 232,849 |  | 40,586 | 17% |  | 115,520 | 50% |  | 62,093 | 27% |  | 14,650 | 6% |
    | 2007 | 236,856 |  | 40,882 | 17% |  | 119,897 | 51% |  | 61,357 | 26% |  | 14,720 | 6% |
    | 2008 | 229,104 |  | 38,198 | 17% |  | 121,120 | 53% |  | 55,612 | 24% |  | 14,174 | 6% |
    | 2009 | 204,696 |  | 33,676 | 16% |  | 110,083 | 54% |  | 48,383 | 24% |  | 12,554 | 6% |
    | 2010 | 185,867 |  | 29,797 | 16% |  | 101,811 | 55% |  | 43,065 | 23% |  | 11,194 | 6% |
    | 2011 | 149,563 |  | 24,899 | 17% |  | 81,469 | 54% |  | 34,349 | 23% |  | 8,846 | 6% |
    | 2012 | 120,720 |  | 20,652 | 17% |  | 65,324 | 54% |  | 27,616 | 23% |  | 7,128 | 6% |
    | 2013 | 96,937 |  | 17,050 | 18% |  | 52,580 | 54% |  | 21,586 | 22% |  | 5,721 | 6% |
    | 2014 | 86,823 |  | 15,683 | 18% |  | 46,862 | 54% |  | 19,265 | 22% |  | 5,013 | 6% |
    | 2015 | 71,923 |  | 13,434 | 19% |  | 38,379 | 53% |  | 15,929 | 22% |  | 4,181 | 6% |
    | 2016 | 62,743 |  | 12,008 | 19% |  | 33,556 | 53% |  | 13,551 | 22% |  | 3,628 | 6% |
    | 2017 | 56,249 |  | 11,566 | 21% |  | 29,334 | 52% |  | 11,810 | 21% |  | 3,539 | 6% |
    | 2018 | 46,423 |  | 9,738 | 21% |  | 24,696 | 53% |  | 9,191 | 20% |  | 2,798 | 6% |
    | 2019 | 43,181 |  | 9,031 | 21% |  | 23,000 | 53% |  | 8,609 | 20% |  | 2,541 | 6% |

    *Figure 1. Percent of Arrests by Race/Ethnicity for 2004 through 2019*

    2. Juvenile Referrals

    * 2.1 Juvenile Referrals to Probation

    Tables 7, 8, and 9 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals to probation departments by gender, age, and race, respectively. Figure 2 displays the percent of referrals to probation by race and ethnicity. A referral is defined as a juvenile who is brought to the attention of the probation department for alleged behavior under Welfare and Institutions Code Section 601 and 602. Juveniles can be referred by a variety of sources including law enforcement, schools, parents, public agencies, private agencies, individuals, or transfers from another county or state. The largest percentage of referrals come from law enforcement. Trends in juvenile referrals to probation are described below.

    * *Total Juvenile Referrals to Probation* (Tables 7 - 9) *–* Referrals increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 220,896 in 2008. Referrals have since decreased reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 59,371 referrals, representing a 73.1 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Referrals by Gender* (Table 7) *–* For the 59,371 referrals in 2019, 75 percent were for males and 25 percent were for females. Percent by gender has remained consistent over the years.
    * *Referrals by Age* (Table 8) – For the 59,371 referrals in 2019, 67 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 12 percent were 18-24 year-olds and 20 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Percent of referrals for 12-14 year-olds have decreased slightly from 21 percent in 2006 to 20 percent in 2019, percent of 18-24 year-olds have slightly increased from 8 percent in 2006 to 12 percent in 2019, and percent of 15-17 year-olds have slightly decreased from 69 percent in 2006 to 67 percent in 2019.
    * *Referrals by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 9, Figure 2) *–* For the 59,371 referrals in 2019, 20 percent were Black, 54 percent were Hispanic, 19 percent were White, and 7 percent Other. Percent of referrals have increased for Hispanics from 46 percent in 2006 to 54 percent in 2019 and decreased for Whites from 27 percent in 2006 to 19 percent in 2019. Percent for Black and Other juveniles have remained consistent over the years.

    *Table 7. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Referrals** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent of Arrests** |  | **Count** | **Percent of Arrests** |
    | 2006 | 207,298 |  | 158,834 | 77% |  | 48,464 | 23% |
    | 2007 | 203,526 |  | 156,390 | 77% |  | 47,136 | 23% |
    | 2008 | 220,896 |  | 170,209 | 77% |  | 50,687 | 23% |
    | 2009 | 207,568 |  | 159,701 | 77% |  | 47,867 | 23% |
    | 2010 | 186,019 |  | 143,153 | 77% |  | 42,866 | 23% |
    | 2011 | 148,250 |  | 112,550 | 76% |  | 35,700 | 24% |
    | 2012 | 125,474 |  | 95,655 | 76% |  | 29,819 | 24% |
    | 2013 | 111,988 |  | 85,550 | 76% |  | 26,438 | 24% |
    | 2014 | 101,531 |  | 77,284 | 76% |  | 24,247 | 24% |
    | 2015 | 86,539 |  | 64,942 | 75% |  | 21,597 | 25% |
    | 2016 | 77,509 |  | 58,288 | 75% |  | 19,221 | 25% |
    | 2017 | 71,791 |  | 54,430 | 76% |  | 17,361 | 24% |
    | 2018 | 65,020 |  | 49,261 | 76% |  | 15,759 | 24% |
    | 2019 | 59,371 |  | 44,729 | 75% |  | 14,642 | 25% |

    *Table 8. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Referrals** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 207,298 |  | 2,655 | 1% |  | 43,955 | 21% |  | 143,209 | 69% |  | 17,479 | 8% |
    | 2007 | 203,526 |  | 2,295 | 1% |  | 41,171 | 20% |  | 141,379 | 69% |  | 18,681 | 9% |
    | 2008 | 220,896 |  | 2,231 | 1% |  | 43,581 | 20% |  | 154,192 | 70% |  | 20,892 | 9% |
    | 2009 | 207,568 |  | 1,958 | 1% |  | 39,806 | 19% |  | 145,734 | 70% |  | 20,070 | 10% |
    | 2010 | 186,019 |  | 1,582 | 1% |  | 34,820 | 19% |  | 130,769 | 70% |  | 18,848 | 10% |
    | 2011 | 148,250 |  | 1,307 | 1% |  | 27,606 | 19% |  | 104,819 | 71% |  | 14,518 | 10% |
    | 2012 | 125,474 |  | 1,046 | 1% |  | 22,287 | 18% |  | 88,243 | 70% |  | 13,898 | 11% |
    | 2013 | 111,988 |  | 931 | 1% |  | 19,493 | 17% |  | 78,890 | 70% |  | 12,692 | 11% |
    | 2014 | 101,531 |  | 897 | 1% |  | 18,117 | 18% |  | 70,457 | 69% |  | 12,062 | 12% |
    | 2015 | 86,539 |  | 687 | 1% |  | 15,259 | 18% |  | 60,238 | 70% |  | 10,355 | 12% |
    | 2016 | 77,509 |  | 652 | 1% |  | 13,968 | 18% |  | 53,561 | 69% |  | 9,328 | 12% |
    | 2017 | 71,791 |  | 637 | 1% |  | 13,386 | 19% |  | 49,148 | 68% |  | 8,620 | 12% |
    | 2018 | 65,020 |  | 603 | 1% |  | 12,390 | 19% |  | 43,789 | 67% |  | 8,238 | 13% |
    | 2019 | 59,371 |  | 313 | 1% |  | 11,649 | 20% |  | 40,020 | 67% |  | 7,389 | 12% |

    *Table 9. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Referrals** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 207,298 |  | 39,883 | 19% |  | 95,987 | 46% |  | 56,868 | 27% |  | 14,560 | 7% |
    | 2007 | 203,526 |  | 37,899 | 19% |  | 98,420 | 48% |  | 54,014 | 27% |  | 13,193 | 6% |
    | 2008 | 220,896 |  | 40,589 | 18% |  | 109,835 | 50% |  | 56,597 | 26% |  | 13,875 | 6% |
    | 2009 | 207,568 |  | 38,374 | 18% |  | 104,120 | 50% |  | 51,790 | 25% |  | 13,284 | 6% |
    | 2010 | 186,019 |  | 33,223 | 18% |  | 96,420 | 52% |  | 45,193 | 24% |  | 11,183 | 6% |
    | 2011 | 148,250 |  | 25,168 | 17% |  | 79,114 | 53% |  | 34,971 | 24% |  | 8,997 | 6% |
    | 2012 | 125,474 |  | 22,127 | 18% |  | 66,848 | 53% |  | 29,162 | 23% |  | 7,337 | 6% |
    | 2013 | 111,988 |  | 20,837 | 19% |  | 60,238 | 54% |  | 24,828 | 22% |  | 6,085 | 5% |
    | 2014 | 101,531 |  | 19,120 | 19% |  | 55,063 | 54% |  | 21,675 | 21% |  | 5,673 | 6% |
    | 2015 | 86,539 |  | 16,572 | 19% |  | 47,340 | 55% |  | 17,999 | 21% |  | 4,628 | 5% |
    | 2016 | 77,509 |  | 15,094 | 19% |  | 41,695 | 54% |  | 16,379 | 21% |  | 4,341 | 6% |
    | 2017 | 71,791 |  | 14,146 | 20% |  | 39,271 | 55% |  | 14,072 | 20% |  | 4,302 | 6% |
    | 2018 | 65,020 |  | 13,022 | 20% |  | 35,467 | 55% |  | 12,393 | 19% |  | 4,138 | 6% |
    | 2019 | 59,371 |  | 11,707 | 20% |  | 32,198 | 54% |  | 11,379 | 19% |  | 4,087 | 7% |

    *Figure 2. Percent of Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    * 2.2 Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Petitions Filed

    Tables 10, 11, and 12 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals that resulted in petitions filed with the juvenile court by gender, age, and race, respectively. Figure 3 displays the percent of petitions filed by race and ethnicity. Trends in petitions filed are described below.

    * *Total Petitions Filed* (Tables 10 - 12) – Petitions filed increased from 2006 through 2008, reaching a peak of 112,383 in 2008. Petitions have since steadily decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 31,717 petitions filed, representing a 71.7 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Petitions Filed by Gender* (Table 10) – For the 31,717 petitions filed in 2019, 80 percent were for males and 20 percent were for females. Percent by gender have remained steady over the years.
    * *Petitions Filed by Age* (Table 11) – For the 31,717 petitions filed in 2019, 69 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 16 percent for 18-24 year-olds and 14 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Petitions have: decreased for 12-14 year-olds from 18 percent in 2006 to 14 percent in 2019; slightly decreased for 15-17 year-olds from 71 percent in 2006 to 69 percent in 2019; and increased for 18-24 year-olds from 11 percent in 2006 to 16 percent in 2019.
    * *Petitions Filed by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 12, Figure 3) – For the 31,717 petitions filed in 2019, 23 percent were Black, 55 percent were Hispanic, 15 percent were White, and 6 percent Other. Percent of petitions have: increased for Hispanic juveniles from 47 percent in 2006 to 55 percent in 2019; steadily decreased for White juveniles from 25 percent in 2006 to 15 percent in 2019; and remained consistent for Black and Other juveniles over the years.

    *Table 10. Juvenile Petitions Filed by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Petitions** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent of Arrests** |  | **Count** | **Percent of Arrests** |
    | 2006 | 104,094 |  | 84,342 | 81% |  | 19,752 | 19% |
    | 2007 | 101,816 |  | 82,853 | 81% |  | 18,963 | 19% |
    | 2008 | 112,383 |  | 91,858 | 82% |  | 20,525 | 18% |
    | 2009 | 105,858 |  | 86,857 | 82% |  | 19,001 | 18% |
    | 2010 | 95,212 |  | 78,678 | 83% |  | 16,534 | 17% |
    | 2011 | 73,639 |  | 60,334 | 82% |  | 13,305 | 18% |
    | 2012 | 64,863 |  | 53,043 | 82% |  | 11,820 | 18% |
    | 2013 | 58,001 |  | 47,401 | 82% |  | 10,600 | 18% |
    | 2014 | 51,645 |  | 42,240 | 82% |  | 9,405 | 18% |
    | 2015 | 44,107 |  | 35,497 | 80% |  | 8,610 | 20% |
    | 2016 | 40,569 |  | 32,652 | 80% |  | 7,917 | 20% |
    | 2017 | 38,232 |  | 30,897 | 81% |  | 7,335 | 19% |
    | 2018 | 35,760 |  | 28,604 | 80% |  | 7,156 | 20% |
    | 2019 | 31,717 |  | 25,245 | 80% |  | 6,472 | 20% |

    *Table 11. Juvenile Petitions Filed by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Petitions** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 104,094 |  | 583 | 1% |  | 18,374 | 18% |  | 74,139 | 71% |  | 10,998 | 11% |
    | 2007 | 101,816 |  | 482 | 0% |  | 17,317 | 17% |  | 72,037 | 71% |  | 11,980 | 12% |
    | 2008 | 112,383 |  | 444 | 0% |  | 18,354 | 16% |  | 80,013 | 71% |  | 13,572 | 12% |
    | 2009 | 105,858 |  | 351 | 0% |  | 16,853 | 16% |  | 75,787 | 72% |  | 12,867 | 12% |
    | 2010 | 95,212 |  | 246 | 0% |  | 14,122 | 15% |  | 68,710 | 72% |  | 12,134 | 13% |
    | 2011 | 73,639 |  | 175 | 0% |  | 10,580 | 14% |  | 53,583 | 73% |  | 9,301 | 13% |
    | 2012 | 64,863 |  | 182 | 0% |  | 8,970 | 14% |  | 46,612 | 72% |  | 9,099 | 14% |
    | 2013 | 58,001 |  | 131 | 0% |  | 7,741 | 13% |  | 41,759 | 72% |  | 8,370 | 14% |
    | 2014 | 51,645 |  | 134 | 0% |  | 6,903 | 13% |  | 36,437 | 71% |  | 8,171 | 16% |
    | 2015 | 44,107 |  | 100 | 0% |  | 5,947 | 13% |  | 31,091 | 70% |  | 6,969 | 16% |
    | 2016 | 40,569 |  | 85 | 0% |  | 5,587 | 14% |  | 28,466 | 70% |  | 6,431 | 16% |
    | 2017 | 38,232 |  | 56 | 0% |  | 5,291 | 14% |  | 26,898 | 70% |  | 5,987 | 16% |
    | 2018 | 35,760 |  | 73 | 0% |  | 5,139 | 14% |  | 24,752 | 69% |  | 5,796 | 16% |
    | 2019 | 31,717 |  | 20 | 0% |  | 4,588 | 14% |  | 22,031 | 69% |  | 5,078 | 16% |

    *Table 12. Juvenile Petitions Filed by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Petitions** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 104,094 |  | 21,718 | 21% |  | 49,361 | 47% |  | 26,524 | 25% |  | 6,491 | 6% |
    | 2007 | 101,816 |  | 20,344 | 20% |  | 50,831 | 50% |  | 24,839 | 24% |  | 5,802 | 6% |
    | 2008 | 112,383 |  | 23,087 | 21% |  | 56,311 | 50% |  | 26,607 | 24% |  | 6,378 | 6% |
    | 2009 | 105,858 |  | 21,477 | 20% |  | 54,598 | 52% |  | 23,245 | 22% |  | 6,538 | 6% |
    | 2010 | 95,212 |  | 19,147 | 20% |  | 50,239 | 53% |  | 20,677 | 22% |  | 5,149 | 5% |
    | 2011 | 73,639 |  | 14,258 | 19% |  | 40,303 | 55% |  | 15,026 | 20% |  | 4,052 | 6% |
    | 2012 | 64,863 |  | 12,765 | 20% |  | 35,701 | 55% |  | 12,981 | 20% |  | 3,416 | 5% |
    | 2013 | 58,001 |  | 12,260 | 21% |  | 31,877 | 55% |  | 11,103 | 19% |  | 2,761 | 5% |
    | 2014 | 51,645 |  | 11,062 | 21% |  | 28,530 | 55% |  | 9,495 | 18% |  | 2,558 | 5% |
    | 2015 | 44,107 |  | 9,551 | 22% |  | 24,729 | 56% |  | 7,707 | 17% |  | 2,120 | 5% |
    | 2016 | 40,569 |  | 8,940 | 22% |  | 22,376 | 55% |  | 7,294 | 18% |  | 1,959 | 5% |
    | 2017 | 38,232 |  | 8,806 | 23% |  | 21,234 | 56% |  | 6,277 | 16% |  | 1,915 | 5% |
    | 2018 | 35,760 |  | 8,157 | 23% |  | 19,900 | 56% |  | 5,696 | 16% |  | 2,007 | 6% |
    | 2019 | 31,717 |  | 7,404 | 23% |  | 17,465 | 55% |  | 4,905 | 15% |  | 1,943 | 6% |

    *Figure 3. Percent of Petitions Filed by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3. Status of Juveniles Post-Referral to County Probation Departments

    3.1 Summary of Juvenile Referrals by Other Actions Taken and Petitions

    Table 13 provides the total number of juveniles referred to probation departments and provides a breakdown of how the referrals were handled by two categories: petitions filed and other actions taken for 2006 through 2019. Trends in juvenile probation department referrals are described below.

    * *Total Juveniles Referred to Probation* – Referrals increased from 2006 through 2008, reaching a peak of 220,896 in 2008. Juvenile referrals have since steadily decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 59,371 referrals, representing a 73.1 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Total Juvenile Petitions Filed (Formal)* – Petitions increased from 2006 through 2008, reaching a peak of 112,383 in 2008. Petitions have since decreased reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 31,717 petitions filed, representing a 71.8 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Total Other Actions Taken (non-petitioned) by Probation Departments* – Other actions taken in the handling of referrals increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 108,513 in 2008. Other actions taken have since decreased reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 27,654 other actions taken, representing a 74.5 percent decrease since 2008.

    *Table 13. Total Juveniles Referred to Probation and a Breakdown of Post-Referral Action by Other Actions Taken (non-petitioned) and Petitions Filed (Formal) for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    | **Year** | **Total Juveniles Referred** | **Other Actions Taken** | **Total Petitions Filed** |
    | 2006 | 207,298 | 103,204 | 104,094 |
    | 2007 | 203,526 | 101,713 | 101,816 |
    | 2008 | 220,896 | 108,513 | 112,383 |
    | 2009 | 207,568 | 101,710 | 105,858 |
    | 2010 | 186,019 | 90,807 | 95,212 |
    | 2011 | 148,250 | 74,611 | 73,639 |
    | 2012 | 125,474 | 60,611 | 64,863 |
    | 2013 | 111,988 | 53,987 | 58,001 |
    | 2014 | 101,531 | 49,886 | 51,645 |
    | 2015 | 86,539 | 42,432 | 44,107 |
    | 2016 | 77,509 | 36,940 | 40,569 |
    | 2017 | 71,791 | 33,559 | 38,232 |
    | 2018 | 65,020 | 29,260 | 35,760 |
    | 2019 | 59,371 | 27,654 | 31,717 |

    3.2 Summary of Other Actions Taken by Type

    Juvenile referrals to probation that were non-petitioned and categorized as “other actions taken” can be further broken down by seven action types: closed at intake, informal probation, diversion, transferred, traffic court, deported, and direct file. Table 14 provides a breakdown of the other actions taken by the seven action types for 2006 through 2019. Trend data for each of these action types by gender, age, and race are provided in the subsections that follow.

    *Table 14. Juvenile Referrals that were Non-Petitioned by Action Type for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    | **Year** | **Closed at Intake** | **Informal Probation** | **Diversion** | **Transferred** | **Traffic Court** | **Deported** | **Direct File** | **Total** |
    | 2006 | 72,961 | 6,792 | 10,856 | 2,110 | 9,771 | 60 | 654 | 103,204 |
    | 2007 | 72,706 | 6,472 | 11,474 | 2,067 | 8,216 | 54 | 724 | 101,713 |
    | 2008 | 77,759 | 7,167 | 12,576 | 2,132 | 7,929 | 84 | 866 | 108,513 |
    | 2009 | 73,922 | 5,805 | 14,413 | 2,428 | 4,324 | 49 | 769 | 101,710 |
    | 2010 | 67,818 | 4,202 | 11,958 | 2,195 | 3,889 | 29 | 716 | 90,807 |
    | 2011 | 55,949 | 3,699 | 10,070 | 1,673 | 2,523 | 11 | 686 | 74,611 |
    | 2012 | 46,441 | 2,456 | 7,352 | 1,390 | 2,327 | 41 | 604 | 60,611 |
    | 2013 | 41,175 | 2,957 | 5,887 | 1,153 | 2,175 | 7 | 633 | 53,987 |
    | 2014 | 36,396 | 2,733 | 7,563 | 857 | 1,851 | 12 | 474 | 49,886 |
    | 2015 | 31,830 | 2,165 | 5,600 | 634 | 1,706 | 5 | 492 | 42,432 |
    | 2016 | 27,001 | 1,471 | 5,723 | 611 | 1,788 | 6 | 340 | 36,940 |
    | 2017 | 24,651 | 1,210 | 5,517 | 683 | 1,498 | 0 | 0 | 33,559 |
    | 2018 | 21,395 | 1,135 | 4,754 | 590 | 1,383 | 3 | - | 29,260 |
    | 2019 | 21,083 | 1,049 | 3,457 | 573 | 1,492 | 0 | - | 27,654 |

    3.2.1 Other Actions Taken: Closed at Intake

    Tables 15, 16, and 17 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals that were closed at intake by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in referrals closed at intake are described below.

    * *Total Juvenile Referrals that were Closed at Intake* (Tables 15 - 17) – Referrals closed at intake steadily increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 77,759 in 2008. They have since steadily decreased reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 21,083 referrals closed at intake, representing a 72.9 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Closed at Intake by Gender* (Table 15) – For the 21,083 referrals closed at intake in 2019, 72 percent were for males and 28 percent were for female. Percent closed at intake from 2006 through 2019 have decreased slightly for males and increased slightly for females.
    * *Closed at Intake by Age* (Table 16) –For the 21,083 referrals closed at intake in 2019, 65 percent were for 15-17 year-old juveniles, 10 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 24 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent by age group have remained steady from 2006 through 2019.
    * *Closed at Intake by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 17, Figure 4) – For the 21,083 referrals closed at intake in 2019, 17 percent were for Blacks, 54 percent were for Hispanics, 22 percent were for Whites and 8 percent were Other. Percent of closed at intake have: steadily decreased for White juveniles from 27 percent in 2006 to 22 percent in 2019; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 46 percent in 2006 to 54 percent in 2019; and have remained somewhat consistent for Black and Other juveniles over the years.

    *Table 15. Other Actions Taken: Closed at Intake by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    | **Year** | **Total Closed at Intake** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | |
    |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 72,961 |  | 53,269 | 73% |  | 19,692 | 27% |
    | 2007 | 72,706 |  | 53,231 | 73% |  | 19,475 | 27% |
    | 2008 | 77,759 |  | 57,251 | 74% |  | 20,508 | 26% |
    | 2009 | 73,922 |  | 53,735 | 73% |  | 20,187 | 27% |
    | 2010 | 67,818 |  | 48,994 | 72% |  | 18,824 | 28% |
    | 2011 | 55,949 |  | 39,794 | 71% |  | 16,155 | 29% |
    | 2012 | 46,441 |  | 32,980 | 71% |  | 13,461 | 29% |
    | 2013 | 41,175 |  | 29,330 | 71% |  | 11,845 | 29% |
    | 2014 | 36,396 |  | 25,757 | 71% |  | 10,639 | 29% |
    | 2015 | 31,830 |  | 22,274 | 70% |  | 9,556 | 30% |
    | 2016 | 27,001 |  | 18,915 | 70% |  | 8,086 | 30% |
    | 2017 | 24,651 |  | 17,522 | 71% |  | 7,129 | 29% |
    | 2018 | 21,395 |  | 15,341 | 72% |  | 6,054 | 28% |
    | 2019 | 21,083 |  | 15,108 | 72% |  | 5,975 | 28% |

    *Table 16. Other Actions Taken: Closed at Intake by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Closed at Intake** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | **Count** | **Percent** |  |
    | 2006 | 72,961 |  | 1,471 | 2% |  | 17,838 | 24% |  | 48,364 | 66% | 5,288 | 7% |  |
    | 2007 | 72,706 |  | 1,320 | 2% |  | 16,549 | 23% |  | 49,376 | 68% | 5,461 | 8% |  |
    | 2008 | 77,759 |  | 1,235 | 2% |  | 17,568 | 23% |  | 52,891 | 68% | 6,065 | 8% |  |
    | 2009 | 73,922 |  | 1,192 | 2% |  | 16,321 | 22% |  | 50,513 | 68% | 5,896 | 8% |  |
    | 2010 | 67,818 |  | 1,017 | 1% |  | 15,160 | 22% |  | 46,019 | 68% | 5,622 | 8% |  |
    | 2011 | 55,949 |  | 859 | 2% |  | 12,587 | 22% |  | 38,126 | 68% | 4,377 | 8% |  |
    | 2012 | 46,441 |  | 686 | 1% |  | 10,205 | 22% |  | 31,485 | 68% | 4,065 | 9% |  |
    | 2013 | 41,175 |  | 625 | 2% |  | 8,915 | 22% |  | 27,937 | 68% | 3,698 | 9% |  |
    | 2014 | 36,396 |  | 583 | 2% |  | 8,000 | 22% |  | 24,623 | 68% | 3,190 | 9% |  |
    | 2015 | 31,830 |  | 476 | 1% |  | 6,859 | 22% |  | 21,655 | 68% | 2,840 | 9% |  |
    | 2016 | 27,001 |  | 383 | 1% |  | 5,951 | 22% |  | 18,203 | 67% | 5,288 | 7% |  |
    | 2017 | 24,651 |  | 392 | 2% |  | 5,422 | 22% |  | 16,558 | 67% | 2,279 | 9% |  |
    | 2018 | 21,395 |  | 378 | 2% |  | 4,842 | 23% |  | 14,118 | 66% | 2,057 | 10% |  |
    | 2019 | 21,083 |  | 245 | 1% |  | 5,112 | 24% |  | 13,682 | 65% | 2,044 | 10% |  |

    *Table 17. Other Actions Taken: Closed at Intake by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Closed at Intake** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 72,961 |  | 14,209 | 19% |  | 33,350 | 46% |  | 19,920 | 27% |  | 5,482 | 8% |
    | 2007 | 72,706 |  | 14,295 | 20% |  | 34,469 | 47% |  | 18,981 | 26% |  | 4,961 | 7% |
    | 2008 | 77,759 |  | 14,060 | 18% |  | 38,811 | 50% |  | 19,840 | 26% |  | 5,048 | 6% |
    | 2009 | 73,922 |  | 13,258 | 18% |  | 36,297 | 49% |  | 19,329 | 26% |  | 5,038 | 7% |
    | 2010 | 67,818 |  | 11,210 | 17% |  | 35,071 | 52% |  | 16,995 | 25% |  | 4,542 | 7% |
    | 2011 | 55,949 |  | 8,403 | 15% |  | 29,904 | 53% |  | 13,953 | 25% |  | 3,689 | 7% |
    | 2012 | 46,441 |  | 7,237 | 16% |  | 24,689 | 53% |  | 11,486 | 25% |  | 3,029 | 7% |
    | 2013 | 41,175 |  | 6,672 | 16% |  | 22,192 | 54% |  | 9,794 | 24% |  | 2,517 | 6% |
    | 2014 | 36,396 |  | 6,003 | 16% |  | 19,930 | 55% |  | 8,209 | 23% |  | 2,254 | 6% |
    | 2015 | 31,830 |  | 5,535 | 17% |  | 17,181 | 54% |  | 7,239 | 23% |  | 1,875 | 6% |
    | 2016 | 27,001 |  | 4,740 | 18% |  | 14,390 | 53% |  | 6,262 | 23% |  | 1,609 | 6% |
    | 2017 | 24,651 |  | 4,107 | 17% |  | 13,557 | 55% |  | 5,360 | 22% |  | 1,627 | 7% |
    | 2018 | 21,395 |  | 3,860 | 18% |  | 11,474 | 54% |  | 4,629 | 22% |  | 1,432 | 7% |
    | 2019 | 21,083 |  | 3,565 | 17% |  | 11,311 | 54% |  | 4,555 | 22% |  | 1,652 | 8% |

    *Figure 4. Percent of Juvenile Referrals that were Closed at Intake by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.2.2 Other Actions Taken: Informal Probation

    Tables 18, 19, and 20 below provide trend data for referrals to probation that resulted in the juveniles granted informal probation by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in juveniles granted informal probation are described below.

    * *Total Juveniles Referrals Resulting in Juveniles Granted Informal Probation* (Tables 18 - 20) –Informal probation steadily increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 7,167 in 2008. They have since steadily decreased reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 1,049 youth granted informal probation, representing an 85.4 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Informal Probation by Gender* (Table 18) – For the 1,049 youth granted informal probation in 2019, 67 percent were for males and 33 percent were for females. Percent of males have decreased slightly from 70 percent in 2006 to 67 percent in 2019 while females have increased slightly from 30 percent in 2006 to 33 percent in 2019.
    * *Informal Probation by Age* (Table 19) – For the 1,049 youth granted informal probation in 2019, 65 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 2 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 32 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent by age group have remained steady for Under 12 years old & 18-24 year-olds from 2006 through 2019. Percent of 12-14 year-olds decreased from 36 percent in 2006 to 32 percent in 2019. Percent of 15-17 year-olds have increased from 59 percent in 2006 to 65 percent in 2019.
    * *Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 20, Figure 5) – For the 1,049 youth granted informal probation in 2019, 10 percent were Blacks, 50 percent were Hispanics, 32 percent were Whites, and 8 percent were Other. Percent of youth on informal probation have: decreased for White juveniles from 35 percent of in 2006 to 32 percent in 2019 and remained steady for Hispanic, Black and Other juveniles over the years.

    *Table 18. Other Action Taken: Informal Probation by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Informal Probation** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 6,792 |  | 4,787 | 70% |  | 2,005 | 30% |
    | 2007 | 6,472 |  | 4,555 | 70% |  | 1,917 | 30% |
    | 2008 | 7,167 |  | 4,962 | 69% |  | 2,205 | 31% |
    | 2009 | 5,805 |  | 3,911 | 67% |  | 1,894 | 33% |
    | 2010 | 4,202 |  | 2,960 | 70% |  | 1,242 | 30% |
    | 2011 | 3,699 |  | 2,589 | 70% |  | 1,110 | 30% |
    | 2012 | 2,456 |  | 1,702 | 69% |  | 754 | 31% |
    | 2013 | 2,957 |  | 2,041 | 69% |  | 916 | 31% |
    | 2014 | 2,733 |  | 1,873 | 69% |  | 860 | 31% |
    | 2015 | 2,165 |  | 1,490 | 69% |  | 675 | 31% |
    | 2016 | 1,471 |  | 957 | 65% |  | 514 | 35% |
    | 2017 | 1,210 |  | 845 | 70% |  | 365 | 30% |
    | 2018 | 1,135 |  | 795 | 70% |  | 340 | 30% |
    | 2019 | 1,049 |  | 708 | 67% |  | 341 | 33% |

    *Table 19. Other Action Taken: Informal Probation by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Informal Probation** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 6,792 |  | 213 | 3% |  | 2,418 | 36% |  | 4,025 | 59% |  | 136 | 2% |
    | 2007 | 6,472 |  | 133 | 2% |  | 2,285 | 35% |  | 3,925 | 61% |  | 129 | 2% |
    | 2008 | 7,167 |  | 146 | 2% |  | 2,405 | 34% |  | 4,449 | 62% |  | 167 | 2% |
    | 2009 | 5,805 |  | 96 | 2% |  | 1,929 | 33% |  | 3,638 | 63% |  | 142 | 2% |
    | 2010 | 4,202 |  | 83 | 2% |  | 1,470 | 35% |  | 2,557 | 61% |  | 92 | 2% |
    | 2011 | 3,699 |  | 78 | 2% |  | 1,177 | 32% |  | 2,367 | 64% |  | 77 | 2% |
    | 2012 | 2,456 |  | 30 | 1% |  | 709 | 29% |  | 1,647 | 67% |  | 70 | 3% |
    | 2013 | 2,957 |  | 49 | 2% |  | 895 | 30% |  | 1,922 | 65% |  | 91 | 3% |
    | 2014 | 2,733 |  | 50 | 2% |  | 800 | 29% |  | 1,817 | 66% |  | 66 | 2% |
    | 2015 | 2,165 |  | 28 | 1% |  | 598 | 28% |  | 1,467 | 68% |  | 72 | 3% |
    | 2016 | 1,471 |  | 22 | 1% |  | 383 | 26% |  | 1,012 | 69% |  | 54 | 4% |
    | 2017 | 1,210 |  | 32 | 3% |  | 426 | 35% |  | 716 | 59% |  | 36 | 3% |
    | 2018 | 1,135 |  | 22 | 2% |  | 386 | 34% |  | 694 | 61% |  | 33 | 3% |
    | 2019 | 1,049 |  | 8 | 1% |  | 337 | 32% |  | 683 | 65% |  | 21 | 2% |

    *Table 20. Other Action Taken: Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Informal Probation** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 6,792 |  | 602 | 9% |  | 3,386 | 50% |  | 2,372 | 35% |  | 432 | 6% |
    | 2007 | 6,472 |  | 609 | 9% |  | 3,278 | 51% |  | 2,198 | 34% |  | 387 | 6% |
    | 2008 | 7,167 |  | 638 | 9% |  | 3,745 | 52% |  | 2,374 | 33% |  | 410 | 6% |
    | 2009 | 5,805 |  | 593 | 10% |  | 3,020 | 52% |  | 1,849 | 32% |  | 343 | 6% |
    | 2010 | 4,202 |  | 352 | 8% |  | 2,354 | 56% |  | 1,242 | 30% |  | 254 | 6% |
    | 2011 | 3,699 |  | 319 | 9% |  | 2,104 | 57% |  | 1,054 | 28% |  | 222 | 6% |
    | 2012 | 2,456 |  | 229 | 9% |  | 1,285 | 52% |  | 804 | 33% |  | 138 | 6% |
    | 2013 | 2,957 |  | 388 | 13% |  | 1,617 | 55% |  | 777 | 26% |  | 175 | 6% |
    | 2014 | 2,733 |  | 440 | 16% |  | 1,440 | 53% |  | 677 | 25% |  | 176 | 6% |
    | 2015 | 2,165 |  | 312 | 14% |  | 1,223 | 56% |  | 505 | 23% |  | 125 | 6% |
    | 2016 | 1,471 |  | 212 | 14% |  | 805 | 55% |  | 346 | 24% |  | 108 | 7% |
    | 2017 | 1,210 |  | 207 | 17% |  | 665 | 55% |  | 258 | 21% |  | 80 | 7% |
    | 2018 | 1,135 |  | 152 | 13% |  | 608 | 54% |  | 285 | 25% |  | 90 | 8% |
    | 2019 | 1,049 |  | 105 | 10% |  | 520 | 50% |  | 340 | 32% |  | 84 | 8% |

    *Figure 5. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles Granted Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.2.3 Other Actions Taken: Diversion

    Tables 21, 22, and 23 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals to probation that resulted in the juveniles being granted diversion by gender, age and race, respectively. Diversion is defined as any delivery or referral, by the probation department, of a minor to a public or private agency with which the city or county has an agreement to provided diversion services. Diversion services must meet the following criteria: the probation department must have referred the minor and continued to be responsible and maintained responsibility for the minor’s progress; and placement and monitoring of the minor must have a beginning and ending date. Trends in diversion are described below.

    * *Total Juveniles Referrals Resulting Juveniles being Diverted* (Tables 21 - 23) – Diversion increased from 2006 through 2009 reaching a peak of 14,413 in 2009. Diversions have since decreased reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 3,457 referrals resulting in the diversion of juveniles, representing a 76 percent decrease since 2009.
    * *Diversion by Gender* (Table 21) – For the 3,457 referrals resulting in diversion in 2019, 65 percent were for males and 35 percent were for females. Percent of diversions for males and females have remained steady from 2006 through 2019.
    * *Diversion by Age* (Table 22) – For the 3,457 referrals resulting in diversion in 2019, 59 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 3 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 37 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Diversions by age group have remained steady

    from 1 to 3 percent for Under 12 year-olds and 18-24 year-olds from 2006 through 2019. Percent of diversions for 12-14 year-olds decreased starting in 2006 with 32 percent to 28 percent in 2015 and have since begun to increase. Percent of diversions decreased for 15-17 year-olds from 62 percent in 2006 to 59 percent in 2019.

    * *Diversion by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 23, Figure 6) – For the 3,457 referrals resulting in diversion in 2019, 12 percent were for Blacks, 56 percent were for Hispanics, 26 percent were for Whites, and 6 percent were Other. Percent of diversions have: increased for Hispanics from 49 percent in 2006 to 56 percent in 2019; slightly increased for Blacks from 11 percent in 2006 to 12 percent in 2019; decreased for White juveniles from 34 percent in 2006 to 26 percent in 2019; and remained consistent for Other juveniles.

    *Table 21. Other Actions Taken: Diversion by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Diversion** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 10,856 |  | 7,157 | 66% |  | 3,699 | 34% |
    | 2007 | 11,474 |  | 7,444 | 65% |  | 4,030 | 35% |
    | 2008 | 12,576 |  | 8,111 | 64% |  | 4,465 | 36% |
    | 2009 | 14,413 |  | 9,695 | 67% |  | 4,718 | 33% |
    | 2010 | 11,958 |  | 7,671 | 64% |  | 4,287 | 36% |
    | 2011 | 10,070 |  | 6,366 | 63% |  | 3,704 | 37% |
    | 2012 | 7,352 |  | 4,734 | 64% |  | 2,618 | 36% |
    | 2013 | 5,887 |  | 3,860 | 66% |  | 2,027 | 34% |
    | 2014 | 7,563 |  | 5,054 | 67% |  | 2,509 | 33% |
    | 2015 | 5,600 |  | 3,582 | 64% |  | 2,018 | 36% |
    | 2016 | 5,723 |  | 3,815 | 67% |  | 1,908 | 33% |
    | 2017 | 5,517 |  | 3,648 | 66% |  | 1,869 | 34% |
    | 2018 | 4,754 |  | 3,144 | 66% |  | 1,610 | 34% |
    | 2019 | 3,457 |  | 2,251 | 65% |  | 1,206 | 35% |

    *Table 22. Other Actions Taken: Diversion by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Diversion** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  |
    | 2006 | 10,856 |  | 306 | 3% |  | 3,497 | 32% |  | 6,732 | 62% |  | 321 | 3% |  |
    | 2007 | 11,474 |  | 273 | 2% |  | 3,396 | 30% |  | 7,406 | 65% |  | 399 | 3% |  |
    | 2008 | 12,576 |  | 340 | 3% |  | 3,742 | 30% |  | 8,104 | 64% |  | 390 | 3% |  |
    | 2009 | 14,413 |  | 282 | 2% |  | 3,800 | 26% |  | 9,749 | 68% |  | 582 | 4% |  |
    | 2010 | 11,958 |  | 197 | 2% |  | 3,249 | 27% |  | 8,048 | 67% |  | 464 | 4% |  |
    | 2011 | 10,070 |  | 163 | 2% |  | 2,700 | 27% |  | 6,770 | 67% |  | 437 | 4% |  |
    | 2012 | 7,352 |  | 125 | 2% |  | 1,876 | 26% |  | 4,985 | 68% |  | 366 | 5% |  |
    | 2013 | 5,887 |  | 92 | 2% |  | 1,475 | 25% |  | 4,062 | 69% |  | 258 | 4% |  |
    | 2014 | 7,563 |  | 116 | 2% |  | 2,043 | 27% |  | 5,056 | 67% |  | 348 | 5% |  |
    | 2015 | 5,600 |  | 77 | 1% |  | 1,562 | 28% |  | 3,705 | 66% |  | 256 | 5% |  |
    | 2016 | 5,723 |  | 147 | 3% |  | 1,795 | 31% |  | 3,567 | 62% |  | 214 | 4% |  |
    | 2017 | 5,517 |  | 139 | 3% |  | 1,951 | 35% |  | 3,266 | 59% |  | 161 | 3% |  |
    | 2018 | 4,754 |  | 118 | 2% |  | 1,781 | 37% |  | 2,666 | 56% |  | 189 | 4% |  |
    | 2019 | 3,457 |  | 35 | 1% |  | 1,281 | 37% |  | 2,039 | 59% |  | 102 | 3% |  |

    *Table 23. Other Actions Taken: Diversion by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Diversion** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 10,856 |  | 1,175 | 11% |  | 5,367 | 49% |  | 3,644 | 34% |  | 670 | 6% |
    | 2007 | 11,474 |  | 1,230 | 11% |  | 5,442 | 47% |  | 4,007 | 35% |  | 795 | 7% |
    | 2008 | 12,576 |  | 1,410 | 11% |  | 6,213 | 49% |  | 4,144 | 33% |  | 809 | 6% |
    | 2009 | 14,413 |  | 2,252 | 16% |  | 6,958 | 48% |  | 4,410 | 31% |  | 793 | 6% |
    | 2010 | 11,958 |  | 1,767 | 15% |  | 5,883 | 49% |  | 3,570 | 30% |  | 738 | 6% |
    | 2011 | 10,070 |  | 1,637 | 16% |  | 4,766 | 47% |  | 2,997 | 30% |  | 670 | 7% |
    | 2012 | 7,352 |  | 1,361 | 19% |  | 3,331 | 45% |  | 2,242 | 30% |  | 418 | 6% |
    | 2013 | 5,887 |  | 1,057 | 18% |  | 2,754 | 47% |  | 1,724 | 29% |  | 352 | 6% |
    | 2014 | 7,563 |  | 1,209 | 16% |  | 3,722 | 49% |  | 2,193 | 29% |  | 439 | 6% |
    | 2015 | 5,600 |  | 832 | 15% |  | 2,806 | 50% |  | 1,677 | 30% |  | 285 | 5% |
    | 2016 | 5,723 |  | 870 | 15% |  | 2,844 | 50% |  | 1,609 | 28% |  | 400 | 7% |
    | 2017 | 5,517 |  | 808 | 15% |  | 2,801 | 51% |  | 1,455 | 26% |  | 453 | 8% |
    | 2018 | 4,754 |  | 633 | 13% |  | 2,569 | 54% |  | 1,119 | 24% |  | 433 | 9% |
    | 2019 | 3,457 |  | 428 | 12% |  | 1,924 | 56% |  | 897 | 26% |  | 208 | 6% |

    *Figure 6. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles being Diverted by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.2.4 Other Actions Taken: Transferred

    Tables 24, 25, and 26 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals that resulted in the juveniles being transferred to another county court or probation department by gender, age, and race, respectively. A transfer is defined as a disposition that transfers the juvenile to another county juvenile court or probation department. Trends in transfers are described below.

    * *Total Referrals Resulting in the Juveniles be Transferred* (Tables 24 - 26) – Transfers increased from 2006 through 2009 reaching a peak of 2,428 in 2009. They have since decreased reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 573 transfers, representing a 76.4 percent decrease since 2009.
    * *Transferred by Gender* (Table 24) – For the 573 transfers in 2019, 60 percent were for males and 40 percent were for females. Percentages have decreased for males from 65 percent in 2006 to 60 percent in 2019 and increased for females from 35 percent in 2006 to 40 percent in 2019.
    * *Transferred by Age* (Table 25) – For the 573 transfers in 2019, 69 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 5 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 25 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Percentages by age group have: remained steady for Under 12 year-olds and 18-24 year-olds, increased for 12-14 year-olds from 21 percent in 2006 to 25 percent in 2019; and decreased for 15-17 year-olds from 75 percent in 2006 to 69 percent in 2019.
    * *Transferred by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 26, Figure 7) – For the 573 transfers in 2019, 24 percent were for Blacks, 36 percent were for Hispanics, 31 percent were for Whites, and 9 percent were Other. Percentages have: increased for Blacks from 15 percent in 2006 to 24 percent in 2019; increased for Hispanics from 23 percent in 2006 to 36 percent in 2019; decreased for Whites from 49 percent in 2006 to 31 percent in 2019; and decreased for Other juveniles from 13 percent in 2006 to 9 percent in 2019.

    *Table 24. Other Actions Taken: Transferred by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Transferred** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 2,110 |  | 1,362 | 65% |  | 748 | 35% |
    | 2007 | 2,067 |  | 1,316 | 64% |  | 748 | 36% |
    | 2008 | 2,132 |  | 1,278 | 60% |  | 854 | 40% |
    | 2009 | 2,428 |  | 1,487 | 61% |  | 941 | 39% |
    | 2010 | 2,195 |  | 1,279 | 58% |  | 916 | 42% |
    | 2011 | 1,673 |  | 969 | 58% |  | 704 | 42% |
    | 2012 | 1,390 |  | 853 | 61% |  | 537 | 39% |
    | 2013 | 1,153 |  | 712 | 62% |  | 441 | 38% |
    | 2014 | 857 |  | 552 | 64% |  | 305 | 36% |
    | 2015 | 634 |  | 412 | 65% |  | 222 | 35% |
    | 2016 | 611 |  | 381 | 62% |  | 230 | 38% |
    | 2017 | 683 |  | 434 | 64% |  | 249 | 36% |
    | 2018 | 590 |  | 378 | 64% |  | 212 | 36% |
    | 2019 | 573 |  | 345 | 60% |  | 228 | 40% |

    *Table 25. Other Actions Taken: Transferred by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Transferred** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | **Count** | **Percent** |  |
    | 2006 | 2,110 |  | 21 | 1% |  | 434 | 21% |  | 1,579 | 75% | 76 | 4% |  |
    | 2007 | 2,067 |  | 24 | 1% |  | 410 | 20% |  | 1,537 | 74% | 93 | 4% |  |
    | 2008 | 2,132 |  | 13 | 1% |  | 404 | 19% |  | 1,603 | 75% | 112 | 5% |  |
    | 2009 | 2,428 |  | 18 | 1% |  | 427 | 18% |  | 1,847 | 76% | 136 | 6% |  |
    | 2010 | 2,195 |  | 24 | 1% |  | 402 | 18% |  | 1,672 | 76% | 97 | 4% |  |
    | 2011 | 1,673 |  | 13 | 1% |  | 305 | 18% |  | 1,293 | 77% | 62 | 4% |  |
    | 2012 | 1,390 |  | 13 | 1% |  | 231 | 17% |  | 1,083 | 78% | 63 | 5% |  |
    | 2013 | 1,153 |  | 6 | 1% |  | 169 | 15% |  | 899 | 78% | 79 | 7% |  |
    | 2014 | 857 |  | 5 | 1% |  | 124 | 14% |  | 676 | 79% | 52 | 6% |  |
    | 2015 | 634 |  | 2 | 0% |  | 81 | 13% |  | 514 | 81% | 37 | 6% |  |
    | 2016 | 611 |  | 5 | 1% |  | 85 | 14% |  | 493 | 81% | 28 | 5% |  |
    | 2017 | 683 |  | 6 | 1% |  | 112 | 16% |  | 525 | 77% | 40 | 6% |  |
    | 2018 | 590 |  | 5 | 1% |  | 83 | 14% |  | 470 | 80% | 32 | 5% |  |
    | 2019 | 573 |  | 3 | 1% |  | 142 | 25% |  | 398 | 69% | 30 | 5% |  |

    *Table 26. Other Actions Taken: Transferred by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Transferred** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 2,110 |  | 316 | 15% |  | 495 | 23% |  | 1,025 | 49% |  | 274 | 13% |
    | 2007 | 2,067 |  | 289 | 14% |  | 517 | 25% |  | 1,009 | 49% |  | 249 | 12% |
    | 2008 | 2,132 |  | 314 | 15% |  | 641 | 30% |  | 957 | 45% |  | 220 | 10% |
    | 2009 | 2,428 |  | 406 | 17% |  | 774 | 32% |  | 1,025 | 42% |  | 223 | 9% |
    | 2010 | 2,195 |  | 362 | 16% |  | 668 | 30% |  | 977 | 45% |  | 188 | 9% |
    | 2011 | 1,673 |  | 288 | 17% |  | 518 | 31% |  | 707 | 42% |  | 160 | 10% |
    | 2012 | 1,390 |  | 267 | 19% |  | 417 | 30% |  | 579 | 42% |  | 127 | 9% |
    | 2013 | 1,153 |  | 181 | 16% |  | 347 | 30% |  | 510 | 44% |  | 115 | 10% |
    | 2014 | 857 |  | 149 | 17% |  | 318 | 37% |  | 307 | 36% |  | 83 | 10% |
    | 2015 | 634 |  | 126 | 20% |  | 245 | 39% |  | 198 | 31% |  | 65 | 10% |
    | 2016 | 611 |  | 133 | 22% |  | 238 | 39% |  | 186 | 30% |  | 54 | 9% |
    | 2017 | 683 |  | 131 | 19% |  | 234 | 34% |  | 233 | 34% |  | 85 | 12% |
    | 2018 | 590 |  | 147 | 25% |  | 208 | 35% |  | 177 | 30% |  | 58 | 10% |
    | 2019 | 573 |  | 136 | 24% |  | 206 | 36% |  | 177 | 31% |  | 54 | 9% |

    *Figure 7. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles Transferred by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.2.5 Other Actions Taken: Traffic Court

    Tables 27, 28, and 29 below provide trend data for referrals to probation that resulted in the juveniles being sent to traffic court by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends for traffic court are described below.

    * *Total Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles Sent to Traffic Court* (Tables 27 - 29) –Traffic court steadily decreased from 2006 through 2018 reaching the lowest point of 1,383 in 2018, representing an 85.8 percent decrease since 2006.
    * *Traffic Court by Gender* (Table 27) – For the 1,492 referrals resulting in traffic court in 2019, 72 percent were for males and 28 percent were for females. Percent sent to traffic court for males decreased slightly from 74 percent in 2006 to 72 percent 2019. Percent sent to traffic court for females increased slightly from 26 percent in 2006 to 28 percent in 2019.
    * *Traffic Court by Age* (Table 28) – For the 1,492 referrals resulting in traffic court, 80 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 8 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 13 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Percent sent to traffic court have remained steady for juveniles in all age groups.
    * *Traffic Court by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 29, Figure 8) – For the 1,492 referrals resulting in traffic court in 2019, 5 percent were for Blacks, 52 percent were for Hispanics, 34 percent were for Whites, and 10 percent were Other. Percent of referrals resulting in traffic court have: remained steady for Whites and Other juveniles; decreased for Blacks from 17 percent in 2006 to 5 percent in 2019 and increased for Hispanics from 38 percent in 2006 to 52 percent in 2019.

    *Table 27. Other Actions Taken: Traffic Court by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Referrals Resulting in Traffic Court** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 9,771 |  | 7,241 | 74% |  | 2,530 | 26% |
    | 2007 | 8,216 |  | 6,250 | 76% |  | 1,966 | 24% |
    | 2008 | 7,929 |  | 5,843 | 74% |  | 2,086 | 26% |
    | 2009 | 4,324 |  | 3,232 | 75% |  | 1,092 | 25% |
    | 2010 | 3,889 |  | 2,866 | 74% |  | 1,023 | 26% |
    | 2011 | 2,523 |  | 1,838 | 73% |  | 685 | 27% |
    | 2012 | 2,327 |  | 1,722 | 74% |  | 605 | 26% |
    | 2013 | 2,175 |  | 1,588 | 73% |  | 587 | 27% |
    | 2014 | 1,851 |  | 1,336 | 72% |  | 515 | 28% |
    | 2015 | 1,706 |  | 1,215 | 71% |  | 491 | 29% |
    | 2016 | 1,788 |  | 1,246 | 70% |  | 542 | 30% |
    | 2017 | 1,498 |  | 1,084 | 72% |  | 414 | 28% |
    | 2018 | 1,383 |  | 997 | 72% |  | 386 | 28% |
    | 2019 | 1,492 |  | 1,072 | 72% |  | 420 | 28% |

    *Table 28. Other Actions Taken: Court by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Referrals Resulting in Traffic Court** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 9,771 |  | 61 | 1% |  | 1,369 | 14% |  | 7,782 | 80% |  | 559 | 6% |
    | 2007 | 8,216 |  | 63 | 1% |  | 1,172 | 14% |  | 6,413 | 78% |  | 568 | 7% |
    | 2008 | 7,929 |  | 53 | 1% |  | 1,071 | 14% |  | 6,256 | 79% |  | 549 | 7% |
    | 2009 | 4,324 |  | 19 | 0% |  | 457 | 11% |  | 3,448 | 80% |  | 400 | 9% |
    | 2010 | 3,889 |  | 15 | 0% |  | 391 | 10% |  | 3,073 | 79% |  | 410 | 11% |
    | 2011 | 2,523 |  | 19 | 1% |  | 244 | 10% |  | 2,037 | 81% |  | 223 | 9% |
    | 2012 | 2,327 |  | 10 | 0% |  | 272 | 12% |  | 1,852 | 80% |  | 193 | 8% |
    | 2013 | 2,175 |  | 10 | 0% |  | 278 | 13% |  | 1,738 | 80% |  | 149 | 7% |
    | 2014 | 1,851 |  | 7 | 0% |  | 233 | 13% |  | 1,427 | 77% |  | 184 | 10% |
    | 2015 | 1,706 |  | 4 | 0% |  | 196 | 11% |  | 1,369 | 80% |  | 137 | 8% |
    | 2016 | 1,788 |  | 10 | 1% |  | 157 | 9% |  | 1,508 | 84% |  | 113 | 6% |
    | 2017 | 1,498 |  | 12 | 1% |  | 184 | 12% |  | 1,185 | 79% |  | 117 | 8% |
    | 2018 | 1,383 |  | 7 | 1% |  | 159 | 11% |  | 1,087 | 79% |  | 130 | 9% |
    | 2019 | 1,492 |  | 2 | 0% |  | 189 | 13% |  | 1,187 | 80% |  | 114 | 8% |

    *Table 29. Other Actions Taken: Traffic Court by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Referrals Resulting in Traffic Court** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 9,771 |  | 1,646 | 17% |  | 3,669 | 38% |  | 3,319 | 34% |  | 1,137 | 12% |
    | 2007 | 8,216 |  | 947 | 12% |  | 3,396 | 41% |  | 2,923 | 36% |  | 950 | 12% |
    | 2008 | 7,929 |  | 856 | 11% |  | 3,531 | 45% |  | 2,598 | 33% |  | 944 | 12% |
    | 2009 | 4,324 |  | 186 | 4% |  | 1,992 | 46% |  | 1,833 | 42% |  | 313 | 7% |
    | 2010 | 3,889 |  | 182 | 5% |  | 1,755 | 45% |  | 1,679 | 43% |  | 273 | 7% |
    | 2011 | 2,523 |  | 73 | 3% |  | 1,120 | 44% |  | 1,173 | 46% |  | 157 | 6% |
    | 2012 | 2,327 |  | 127 | 5% |  | 1,019 | 44% |  | 1,007 | 43% |  | 174 | 7% |
    | 2013 | 2,175 |  | 130 | 6% |  | 1,045 | 48% |  | 861 | 40% |  | 139 | 6% |
    | 2014 | 1,851 |  | 129 | 7% |  | 838 | 45% |  | 745 | 40% |  | 139 | 8% |
    | 2015 | 1,706 |  | 92 | 5% |  | 853 | 50% |  | 622 | 36% |  | 139 | 8% |
    | 2016 | 1,788 |  | 122 | 7% |  | 835 | 47% |  | 642 | 36% |  | 189 | 11% |
    | 2017 | 1,498 |  | 87 | 6% |  | 780 | 52% |  | 489 | 33% |  | 142 | 9% |
    | 2018 | 1,383 |  | 73 | 5% |  | 705 | 51% |  | 487 | 35% |  | 118 | 9% |
    | 2019 | 1,492 |  | 69 | 5% |  | 772 | 52% |  | 505 | 34% |  | 146 | 10% |

    *Figure 8. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles being Sent to Traffic Court by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.2.6 Other Actions Taken: Deported

    Tables 30, 31, and 32 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals to probation that resulted in the juveniles being deported by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in deportation are described below.

    * *Total Juveniles Deported* (Tables 30 - 31) – Deportation increased between 2006 and 2008, reaching a peak of 84 in 2008. Deportations have since decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 0 deportations, representing a 100 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Deported by Gender* (Table 30) – No juveniles were deported in 2019.
    * *Deported by Age* (Table 31) – No juveniles were deported in 2019.
    * *Deported by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 32, Figure 9) – No juveniles were deported in 2019.

    *Table 30. Other Actions Taken: Deported by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Deported** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 60 |  | 54 | 90% |  | 6 | 10% |
    | 2007 | 54 |  | 45 | 83% |  | 9 | 17% |
    | 2008 | 84 |  | 76 | 90% |  | 8 | 10% |
    | 2009 | 49 |  | 43 | 88% |  | 6 | 12% |
    | 2010 | 29 |  | 25 | 86% |  | 4 | 14% |
    | 2011 | 11 |  | 10 | 91% |  | 1 | 9% |
    | 2012 | 41 |  | 37 | 90% |  | 4 | 10% |
    | 2013 | 7 |  | 7 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2014 | 12 |  | 10 | 83% |  | 2 | 17% |
    | 2015 | 5 |  | 3 | 60% |  | 2 | 40% |
    | 2016 | 6 |  | 5 | 83% |  | 1 | 17% |
    | 2017 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |
    | 2018 | 3 |  | 2 | 67% |  | 1 | 33% |
    | 2019 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |

    *Table 31. Other Actions Taken: Deported by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Deported** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | **Count** | **Percent** |  |
    | 2006 | 60 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 5 | 8% |  | 53 | 88% | 2 | 3% |  |
    | 2007 | 54 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 7 | 13% |  | 47 | 87% | 0 | 0% |  |
    | 2008 | 84 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 8 | 10% |  | 76 | 90% | 0 | 0% |  |
    | 2009 | 49 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 3 | 6% |  | 43 | 88% | 3 | 6% |  |
    | 2010 | 29 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 3% |  | 22 | 76% | 6 | 21% |  |
    | 2011 | 11 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 9% |  | 10 | 91% | 0 | 0% |  |
    | 2012 | 41 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 4 | 10% |  | 34 | 83% | 3 | 7% |  |
    | 2013 | 7 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 3 | 43% |  | 4 | 57% | 0 | 0% |  |
    | 2014 | 12 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 2 | 17% |  | 9 | 75% | 1 | 8% |  |
    | 2015 | 5 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 20% |  | 3 | 60% | 1 | 20% |  |
    | 2016 | 6 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 2 | 33% |  | 4 | 67% | 0 | 0% |  |
    | 2017 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - | 0 | - |  |
    | 2018 | 3 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 2 | 67% | 1 | 33% |  |
    | 2019 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - | 0 | - |  |

    *Table 32. Other Actions Taken: Deported by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Deported** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 60 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 57 | 95% |  | 1 | 2% |  | 2 | 3% |
    | 2007 | 54 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 54 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2008 | 84 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 77 | 92% |  | 3 | 4% |  | 4 | 5% |
    | 2009 | 49 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 44 | 90% |  | 5 | 10% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2010 | 29 |  | 1 | 3% |  | 27 | 93% |  | 1 | 3% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2011 | 11 |  | 1 | 9% |  | 9 | 82% |  | 1 | 9% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2012 | 41 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 39 | 95% |  | 1 | 2% |  | 1 | 2% |
    | 2013 | 7 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 7 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2014 | 12 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 11 | 92% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 8% |
    | 2015 | 5 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 4 | 80% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 20% |
    | 2016 | 6 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 5 | 83% |  | 1 | 17% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2017 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |
    | 2018 | 3 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 3 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2019 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |

    *Figure 9. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles being Deported by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.2.7 Other Actions Taken: Direct Filed

    Tables 33, 34, and 35 below provide trend data for juvenile referrals to probation that resulted in the juveniles being direct filed to adult court by county prosecutors by gender, age, and race, respectively. Trends in direct files to adult court are described below.

    * *Total Direct Files to Adult Court* (Tables 33 -35) – No juveniles were Direct Filed in 2019. California no longer transfers (direct files) juveniles to adult court.
    * *Juveniles Direct Filed by Gender* (Table 33) – No juveniles were Direct Filed in 2019. California no longer transfers (direct files) juveniles to adult court.
    * *Juveniles Direct Filed by Age* (Table 34) – No juveniles were Direct Filed in 2019. California no longer transfers (direct files) juveniles to adult court.
    * *Juveniles Direct Filed by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 35, Figure 10) – No juveniles were Direct Filed in 2019. California no longer transfers (direct files) juveniles to adult court.

    *Table 33. Other Actions Taken: Direct Filed by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Direct Files** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 654 |  | 622 | 95% |  | 32 | 5% |
    | 2007 | 724 |  | 696 | 96% |  | 28 | 4% |
    | 2008 | 866 |  | 830 | 96% |  | 36 | 4% |
    | 2009 | 769 |  | 741 | 96% |  | 28 | 4% |
    | 2010 | 716 |  | 680 | 95% |  | 36 | 5% |
    | 2011 | 686 |  | 650 | 95% |  | 36 | 5% |
    | 2012 | 604 |  | 584 | 97% |  | 20 | 3% |
    | 2013 | 633 |  | 611 | 97% |  | 22 | 3% |
    | 2014 | 474 |  | 462 | 97% |  | 12 | 3% |
    | 2015 | 492 |  | 469 | 95% |  | 23 | 5% |
    | 2016 | 340 |  | 317 | 93% |  | 23 | 7% |
    | 2017 | 0 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2018 | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |
    | 2019 | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |

    *Table 34. Other Actions Taken: Direct Filed by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Direct Files** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | **Count** | **Percent** |  |
    | 2006 | 654 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 20 | 3% |  | 535 | 82% | 99 | 15% |  |
    | 2007 | 724 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 35 | 5% |  | 638 | 88% | 51 | 7% |  |
    | 2008 | 866 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 29 | 3% |  | 800 | 92% | 37 | 4% |  |
    | 2009 | 769 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 16 | 2% |  | 709 | 92% | 44 | 6% |  |
    | 2010 | 716 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 25 | 3% |  | 668 | 93% | 23 | 3% |  |
    | 2011 | 686 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 12 | 2% |  | 633 | 92% | 41 | 6% |  |
    | 2012 | 604 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 20 | 3% |  | 545 | 90% | 39 | 6% |  |
    | 2013 | 633 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 17 | 3% |  | 569 | 90% | 47 | 7% |  |
    | 2014 | 474 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 12 | 3% |  | 412 | 87% | 50 | 11% |  |
    | 2015 | 492 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 15 | 3% |  | 434 | 88% | 43 | 9% |  |
    | 2016 | 340 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 8 | 2% |  | 308 | 91% | 24 | 7% |  |
    | 2017 | 0 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |  |
    | 2018 | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | - | - | - |  |
    | 2019 | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | - | - | - |  |

    *Table 35. Other Actions Taken: Direct Filed by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Direct Files** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 654 |  | 217 | 33% |  | 302 | 46% |  | 63 | 10% |  | 72 | 11% |
    | 2007 | 724 |  | 185 | 26% |  | 433 | 60% |  | 57 | 8% |  | 49 | 7% |
    | 2008 | 866 |  | 224 | 26% |  | 506 | 58% |  | 74 | 9% |  | 62 | 7% |
    | 2009 | 769 |  | 202 | 26% |  | 437 | 57% |  | 94 | 12% |  | 36 | 5% |
    | 2010 | 716 |  | 202 | 28% |  | 423 | 59% |  | 52 | 7% |  | 39 | 5% |
    | 2011 | 686 |  | 189 | 28% |  | 390 | 57% |  | 60 | 9% |  | 47 | 7% |
    | 2012 | 604 |  | 141 | 23% |  | 367 | 61% |  | 62 | 10% |  | 34 | 6% |
    | 2013 | 633 |  | 149 | 24% |  | 399 | 63% |  | 59 | 9% |  | 26 | 4% |
    | 2014 | 474 |  | 128 | 27% |  | 274 | 58% |  | 49 | 10% |  | 23 | 5% |
    | 2015 | 492 |  | 124 | 25% |  | 299 | 61% |  | 51 | 10% |  | 18 | 4% |
    | 2016 | 340 |  | 77 | 23% |  | 202 | 59% |  | 39 | 11% |  | 22 | 6% |
    | 2017 | 0 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2018 | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |
    | 2019 | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |  | - | - |

    *Figure 10. Percent of Juvenile Referrals Resulting in Juveniles Direct Filed by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.3 Summary of Juvenile Petitions by Court Action

    Juvenile referrals to probation that resulted in the district attorney filing a petition with the juvenile court can be broken down into the nine court action categories of: dismissed, transferred, remanded, deported, informal probation, non-ward probation, diversion, deferred entry of judgement, and wardship probation. Table 36 provides a breakdown of the petitions by the nine court action categories for 2006 through 2019. Trend data for each of these categories by gender, age, and race are provided in the subsections that follow.

    *Table 36. Juvenile Petitions by Court Action for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    | **Year** | **Dismissed** | **Transferred** | **Remanded to Adult Court** | **Deported** | **Informal Probation** |
    | 2006 | 20,994 | 3,487 | 275 | 26 | 5,756 |
    | 2007 | 19,435 | 3,714 | 399 | 25 | 6,642 |
    | 2008 | 25,094 | 3,533 | 335 | 27 | 7,093 |
    | 2009 | 24,766 | 2,798 | 346 | 30 | 6,815 |
    | 2010 | 22,623 | 2,455 | 260 | 14 | 5,743 |
    | 2011 | 10,868 | 1,659 | 226 | 10 | 4,866 |
    | 2012 | 9,753 | 1,539 | 146 | 7 | 4,223 |
    | 2013 | 8,612 | 1,447 | 122 | 2 | 3,887 |
    | 2014 | 7,717 | 1,196 | 123 | 2 | 3,956 |
    | 2015 | 7,359 | 1,082 | 74 | 0 | 2,940 |
    | 2016 | 6,975 | 1,041 | 66 | 1 | 2,899 |
    | 2017 | 6,762 | 930 | 158 | 0 | 2,860 |
    | 2018 | 6,468 | 1,032 | 77 | 0 | 2,678 |
    | 2019 | 5,831 | 992 | 64 | 0 | 2,426 |

    *Table 36.* Juvenile Petitions by Court Action for 2006 through 2019 *(Continued)*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    | **Year** | **Non-Ward Probation** | **Diversion** | **Deferred Entry of Judgement** | **Wardship Probation** | **Total** |
    | 2006 | 4,744 | 673 | 3,681 | 64,458 | 104,094 |
    | 2007 | 4,959 | 444 | 4,556 | 61,642 | 101,816 |
    | 2008 | 5,540 | 528 | 5,125 | 65,108 | 112,383 |
    | 2009 | 5,296 | 217 | 4,699 | 60,891 | 105,858 |
    | 2010 | 4,853 | 141 | 4,354 | 54,769 | 95,212 |
    | 2011 | 4,522 | 149 | 3,684 | 47,655 | 73,639 |
    | 2012 | 4,075 | 118 | 3,247 | 41,755 | 64,863 |
    | 2013 | 3,482 | 126 | 2,708 | 37,615 | 58,001 |
    | 2014 | 2,717 | 114 | 2,394 | 33,426 | 51,645 |
    | 2015 | 2,404 | 151 | 1,650 | 28,447 | 44,107 |
    | 2016 | 2,529 | 86 | 1,501 | 25,471 | 40,569 |
    | 2017 | 2,469 | 69 | 1,295 | 23,689 | 38,232 |
    | 2018 | 2,338 | 25 | 1,384 | 21,758 | 35,760 |
    | 2019 | 2,071 | 42 | 1,075 | 19,216 | 31,717 |

    3.3.1 Juvenile Petitions: Dismissed

    Tables 37, 38, and 39 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions resulting in court dismissal by gender, age, and race, respectively. Trends in dismissed petitions are described below.

    * *Total Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Court Dismissal* (Tables 37 - 39) – Dismissals increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 25,094 in 2008. Dismissals have since steadily decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 5,831 dismissals, representing a 76.8 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Dismissed by Gender* (Table 37) – For the 5,831 dismissals in 2019, 78 percent were for males and 22 percent were for females. Percent of dismissals for males decreased slightly from 81 percent in 2006 to 78 percent in 2019 while females increased slightly from 19 percent in 2006 to 22 percent in 2019.
    * *Dismissed by Age* (Table 38) – For the 5,831 dismissals in 2019, 60 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 26 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 14 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of dismissals for 12-14 year-olds have slightly decreased starting in 2006 with 18 percent to 14 percent in 2019. Percent of juveniles 15-17 years old have decreased starting in 2006 with 66 percent to 60 percent in 2019. Percent of 18-24 year-olds have increased from 16 percent in 2006 to 26 percent in 2019.
    * *Dismissed by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 39, Figure 11) – For the 5,831 dismissals in 2019, 25 percent were for Blacks, 50 percent were for Hispanic, 18 percent were for Whites, and 7 percent were Other. Percent of dismissals have: increased for Hispanic juveniles from 41 percent in 2006 to 50 percent in 2019; decreased for White juveniles from 28 percent 2006 to 18 percent in 2019; and have remained steady for Black and Other juveniles.

    *Table 37. Juvenile Petitions: Dismissed by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Dismissed** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 20,994 |  | 16,924 | 81% |  | 4,070 | 19% |
    | 2007 | 19,435 |  | 15,921 | 82% |  | 3,514 | 18% |
    | 2008 | 25,094 |  | 20,566 | 82% |  | 4,528 | 18% |
    | 2009 | 24,766 |  | 20,138 | 81% |  | 4,628 | 19% |
    | 2010 | 22,623 |  | 18,623 | 82% |  | 4,000 | 18% |
    | 2011 | 10,868 |  | 8,753 | 81% |  | 2,115 | 19% |
    | 2012 | 9,753 |  | 7,802 | 80% |  | 1,951 | 20% |
    | 2013 | 8,612 |  | 6,882 | 80% |  | 1,730 | 20% |
    | 2014 | 7,717 |  | 6,119 | 79% |  | 1,598 | 21% |
    | 2015 | 7,359 |  | 5,793 | 79% |  | 1,566 | 21% |
    | 2016 | 6,975 |  | 5,470 | 78% |  | 1,505 | 22% |
    | 2017 | 6,762 |  | 5,325 | 79% |  | 1,437 | 21% |
    | 2018 | 6,468 |  | 5,029 | 78% |  | 1,439 | 22% |
    | 2019 | 5,831 |  | 4,534 | 78% |  | 1,297 | 22% |

    *Table 38. Juvenile Petitions: Dismissed by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Dismissed** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Count** |  | **Count** | **Count** |  |
    | 2006 | 20,994 |  | 215 | 1% |  | 3,680 | 18% |  | 13,820 | 13,820 |  | 3,279 | 16% |  |
    | 2007 | 19,435 |  | 142 | 1% |  | 3,198 | 16% |  | 12,591 | 12,591 |  | 3,504 | 18% |  |
    | 2008 | 25,094 |  | 137 | 1% |  | 3,925 | 16% |  | 16,584 | 16,584 |  | 4,451 | 18% |  |
    | 2009 | 24,766 |  | 109 | 0% |  | 3,905 | 16% |  | 16,265 | 16,265 |  | 4,487 | 18% |  |
    | 2010 | 22,623 |  | 93 | 0% |  | 3,429 | 15% |  | 14,935 | 14,935 |  | 4,166 | 18% |  |
    | 2011 | 10,868 |  | 61 | 1% |  | 1,526 | 14% |  | 6,717 | 6,717 |  | 2,564 | 24% |  |
    | 2012 | 9,753 |  | 63 | 1% |  | 1,407 | 14% |  | 5,920 | 5,920 |  | 2,363 | 24% |  |
    | 2013 | 8,612 |  | 41 | 0% |  | 1,188 | 14% |  | 5,331 | 5,331 |  | 2,052 | 24% |  |
    | 2014 | 7,717 |  | 56 | 1% |  | 1,096 | 14% |  | 4,648 | 4,648 |  | 1,917 | 25% |  |
    | 2015 | 7,359 |  | 40 | 1% |  | 985 | 13% |  | 4,423 | 4,423 |  | 1,911 | 26% |  |
    | 2016 | 6,975 |  | 30 | 0% |  | 960 | 14% |  | 4,270 | 4,270 |  | 1,715 | 25% |  |
    | 2017 | 6,762 |  | 17 | 0% |  | 922 | 14% |  | 4,138 | 61% |  | 1,685 | 25% |  |
    | 2018 | 6,468 |  | 30 | 0% |  | 872 | 13% |  | 3,984 | 62% |  | 1,582 | 24% |  |
    | 2019 | 5,831 |  | 14 | 0% |  | 830 | 14% |  | 3,488 | 60% |  | 1,499 | 26% |  |

    *Table 39. Juvenile Petitions: Dismissed by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Dismissed** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 20,994 |  | 5,153 | 25% |  | 8,535 | 41% |  | 5,862 | 28% |  | 1,444 | 7% |
    | 2007 | 19,435 |  | 4,811 | 25% |  | 8,103 | 42% |  | 5,248 | 27% |  | 1,273 | 7% |
    | 2008 | 25,094 |  | 5,988 | 24% |  | 10,956 | 44% |  | 6,677 | 27% |  | 1,473 | 6% |
    | 2009 | 24,766 |  | 5,910 | 24% |  | 11,227 | 45% |  | 5,879 | 24% |  | 1,750 | 7% |
    | 2010 | 22,623 |  | 5,417 | 24% |  | 10,511 | 46% |  | 5,369 | 24% |  | 1,326 | 6% |
    | 2011 | 10,868 |  | 2,322 | 21% |  | 5,421 | 50% |  | 2,432 | 22% |  | 693 | 6% |
    | 2012 | 9,753 |  | 2,118 | 22% |  | 4,803 | 49% |  | 2,230 | 23% |  | 602 | 6% |
    | 2013 | 8,612 |  | 1,978 | 23% |  | 4,177 | 49% |  | 1,961 | 23% |  | 496 | 6% |
    | 2014 | 7,717 |  | 1,752 | 23% |  | 3,783 | 49% |  | 1,687 | 22% |  | 495 | 6% |
    | 2015 | 7,359 |  | 1,618 | 22% |  | 3,873 | 53% |  | 1,419 | 19% |  | 449 | 6% |
    | 2016 | 6,975 |  | 1,631 | 23% |  | 3,500 | 50% |  | 1,421 | 20% |  | 423 | 6% |
    | 2017 | 6,762 |  | 1,611 | 24% |  | 3,456 | 51% |  | 1,264 | 19% |  | 431 | 6% |
    | 2018 | 6,468 |  | 1,536 | 24% |  | 3,332 | 52% |  | 1,177 | 18% |  | 423 | 7% |
    | 2019 | 5,831 |  | 1,451 | 25% |  | 2,921 | 50% |  | 1,037 | 18% |  | 422 | 7% |

    *Figure 11. Percent of Juvenile Petitions that Resulted in Dismissals by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.3.2 Juvenile Petitions: Transferred

    Tables 40, 41, and 42 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions that resulted in the juveniles being transferred to another county juvenile court or probation department by gender, age, and race, respectively. Trends for these transfers are described below.

    * *Total Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Transfers* (Tables 40 - 42) – Transfers increased from 2006 through 2007 reaching a peak of 3,714 in 2007. Transfers have since steadily decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2017 with 930 transfers, representing a 75 percent decrease since 2007. Transfers increased to 1,032 in 2018, then began to decrease again in 2019 with 992.
    * *Transferred by Gender* (Table 40) – For the 992 transfers in 2019, 75 percent were for males and 25 percent were for females. Percent of transfers for males have slightly decreased starting in 2006 with 77 percent to 75 percent in 2019. Percent of transfers for females have increased slightly starting in 2006 with 23 percent to 25 percent in 2019.
    * *Transferred by Age* (Table 41) – For the 992 transfers in 2019, 78 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 10 percent were fore 18-24 year-olds and 12 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of transfers for 12-14 year-olds have slightly decreased starting in 2006 with 15 percent to 12 percent in 2019. Percent of 18-24 year-olds have increased from 8 percent in 2006 to 10 percent in 2019. Percent of transfers for 15-17 years old have remained steady from 2006 to 2019.
    * *Transferred by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 42, Figure 12) – For the 992 transfers in 2019, 36 percent were for Blacks, 43 percent were for Hispanics, 16 percent were for Whites, and 6 percent were Other. Percent of transfers have: increased for Black juveniles from 29 percent of petitions in 2006 to 36 percent in 2019; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 39 percent in 2006 to 43 percent in 2019; decreased for White juveniles from 24 percent of transfers in 2006 to 16 percent in 2019; have remained steady for Other juveniles from 2006 to 2019.

    *Table 40. Juvenile Petitions: Transferred by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Transferred** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 3,487 |  | 2,672 | 77% |  | 815 | 23% |
    | 2007 | 3,714 |  | 2,824 | 76% |  | 890 | 24% |
    | 2008 | 3,533 |  | 2,686 | 76% |  | 847 | 24% |
    | 2009 | 2,798 |  | 2,158 | 77% |  | 640 | 23% |
    | 2010 | 2,455 |  | 1,939 | 79% |  | 516 | 21% |
    | 2011 | 1,659 |  | 1,300 | 78% |  | 359 | 22% |
    | 2012 | 1,539 |  | 1,200 | 78% |  | 339 | 22% |
    | 2013 | 1,447 |  | 1,124 | 78% |  | 323 | 22% |
    | 2014 | 1,196 |  | 950 | 79% |  | 246 | 21% |
    | 2015 | 1,082 |  | 842 | 78% |  | 240 | 22% |
    | 2016 | 1,041 |  | 803 | 77% |  | 238 | 23% |
    | 2017 | 930 |  | 739 | 79% |  | 191 | 21% |
    | 2018 | 1,032 |  | 784 | 76% |  | 248 | 24% |
    | 2019 | 992 |  | 747 | 75% |  | 245 | 25% |

    *Table 41. Juvenile Petitions: Transferred by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Transferred** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  |
    | 2006 | 3,487 |  | 8 | 0% |  | 522 | 15% |  | 2,675 | 77% |  | 282 | 8% |  |
    | 2007 | 3,714 |  | 13 | 0% |  | 485 | 13% |  | 2,878 | 77% |  | 338 | 9% |  |
    | 2008 | 3,533 |  | 9 | 0% |  | 457 | 13% |  | 2,727 | 77% |  | 340 | 10% |  |
    | 2009 | 2,798 |  | 2 | 0% |  | 402 | 14% |  | 2,149 | 77% |  | 245 | 9% |  |
    | 2010 | 2,455 |  | 6 | 0% |  | 307 | 13% |  | 1,920 | 78% |  | 222 | 9% |  |
    | 2011 | 1,659 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 203 | 12% |  | 1,299 | 78% |  | 157 | 9% |  |
    | 2012 | 1,539 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 212 | 14% |  | 1,165 | 76% |  | 162 | 11% |  |
    | 2013 | 1,447 |  | 6 | 0% |  | 188 | 13% |  | 1,110 | 77% |  | 143 | 10% |  |
    | 2014 | 1,196 |  | 2 | 0% |  | 132 | 11% |  | 923 | 77% |  | 139 | 12% |  |
    | 2015 | 1,082 |  | 1 | 0% |  | 141 | 13% |  | 819 | 76% |  | 121 | 11% |  |
    | 2016 | 1,041 |  | 3 | 0% |  | 133 | 13% |  | 774 | 74% |  | 131 | 13% |  |
    | 2017 | 930 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 118 | 13% |  | 730 | 78% |  | 82 | 9% |  |
    | 2018 | 1,032 |  | 2 | 0% |  | 135 | 13% |  | 774 | 75% |  | 121 | 12% |  |
    | 2019 | 992 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 120 | 12% |  | 769 | 78% |  | 103 | 10% |  |

    *Table 42. Juvenile Petitions: Transferred by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Transferred** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 3,487 |  | 1,026 | 29% |  | 1,375 | 39% |  | 843 | 24% |  | 243 | 7% |
    | 2007 | 3,714 |  | 1,092 | 29% |  | 1,558 | 42% |  | 810 | 22% |  | 254 | 7% |
    | 2008 | 3,533 |  | 1,107 | 31% |  | 1,388 | 39% |  | 808 | 23% |  | 230 | 7% |
    | 2009 | 2,798 |  | 834 | 30% |  | 1,132 | 40% |  | 635 | 23% |  | 197 | 7% |
    | 2010 | 2,455 |  | 753 | 31% |  | 1,013 | 41% |  | 506 | 21% |  | 183 | 7% |
    | 2011 | 1,659 |  | 510 | 31% |  | 730 | 44% |  | 322 | 19% |  | 97 | 6% |
    | 2012 | 1,539 |  | 430 | 28% |  | 699 | 45% |  | 313 | 20% |  | 97 | 6% |
    | 2013 | 1,447 |  | 474 | 33% |  | 637 | 44% |  | 248 | 17% |  | 88 | 6% |
    | 2014 | 1,196 |  | 375 | 31% |  | 540 | 45% |  | 212 | 18% |  | 69 | 6% |
    | 2015 | 1,082 |  | 331 | 31% |  | 526 | 49% |  | 171 | 16% |  | 54 | 5% |
    | 2016 | 1,041 |  | 313 | 30% |  | 503 | 48% |  | 158 | 15% |  | 67 | 6% |
    | 2017 | 930 |  | 354 | 38% |  | 393 | 42% |  | 144 | 15% |  | 39 | 4% |
    | 2018 | 1,032 |  | 370 | 36% |  | 469 | 45% |  | 130 | 13% |  | 63 | 6% |
    | 2019 | 992 |  | 354 | 36% |  | 426 | 43% |  | 157 | 16% |  | 55 | 6% |

    *Figure 12. Percent of Juvenile Petitions that Resulted in Juvenile Transfers by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.3.3 Juvenile Petitions: Remanded to Adult Court

    Tables 43, 44, and 45 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions that were remanded to adult court by gender, age and race, respectively. A remand to adult court is defined as a disposition resulting from a fitness hearing that finds a juvenile unfit for the juvenile system and transfers the juvenile to the adult system. Trends in petitions that were remanded to adult court are described below.

    * *Total Juvenile Petitions Remanded to Adult Court* (Tables 43 - 45) – Juvenile petitions remanded to adult court reached a peak of 399 in 2007. Remands steadily decreased to 66 in 2016 then increased to 158 in 2017. Since 2018, remands have begun to decrease again, reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 64 remands, representing an 84 percent decrease since 2007.
    * *Remanded to Adult Court by Gender* (Table 43) – For the 64 juveniles with petitions that were remanded in 2019, 100 percent were male. Percent of remands for males has increased from 95 percent in 2006 to 100 percent in 2019 while females decreased from 5 percent in 2006 to 0 percent in 2019.
    * *Remanded to Adult Court by Age* (Table 44) – For the 64 juveniles with petitions that were remanded in 2019, 28 percent were for 15-17 year-olds and 72 percent were fore 18-24 year-olds. Percent of remands for 12-14 year-olds remained steady from 2006 through 2019. Percent of juveniles 15-17 years old have significantly decreased starting in 2006 with 76 percent to 28 percent in 2019. Percent of 18-24 year-olds have increased significantly from 23 percent in 2006 to 72 percent in 2019.
    * *Remanded to Adult Court by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 45, Figure 13) – For the 64 juveniles with petitions that were remanded in 2019, 19 percent were Black, 66 percent were Hispanic, 13 percent were White, and 3 percent Other. Percent of remands have: decreased for Black juveniles from 24 percent of petitions in 2006 to 19 percent in 2019; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 63 percent in 2006 to 66 percent in 2019; increased for White juveniles from 8 percent of petitions in 2006 to 13 percent in 2019; have decreased for Other juveniles from 6 percent of petitions in 2006 to 3 percent in 2019.

    *Table 43. Juvenile Petitions: Remanded to Adult Court by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Remanded** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 275 |  | 262 | 95% |  | 13 | 5% |
    | 2007 | 399 |  | 387 | 97% |  | 12 | 3% |
    | 2008 | 335 |  | 319 | 95% |  | 16 | 5% |
    | 2009 | 346 |  | 336 | 97% |  | 10 | 3% |
    | 2010 | 260 |  | 254 | 98% |  | 6 | 2% |
    | 2011 | 226 |  | 215 | 95% |  | 11 | 5% |
    | 2012 | 146 |  | 144 | 99% |  | 2 | 1% |
    | 2013 | 122 |  | 117 | 96% |  | 5 | 4% |
    | 2014 | 123 |  | 121 | 98% |  | 2 | 2% |
    | 2015 | 74 |  | 74 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2016 | 66 |  | 63 | 95% |  | 3 | 5% |
    | 2017 | 158 |  | 156 | 99% |  | 2 | 1% |
    | 2018 | 77 |  | 73 | 95% |  | 4 | 5% |
    | 2019 | 64 |  | 64 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |

    Table 44. Juvenile Petitions: Remanded to Adult Court by Age for 2006 through 2019

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Remanded** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 275 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 4 | 1% |  | 208 | 76% |  | 63 | 23% |
    | 2007 | 399 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 0% |  | 285 | 71% |  | 113 | 28% |
    | 2008 | 335 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 7 | 2% |  | 247 | 74% |  | 81 | 24% |
    | 2009 | 346 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 5 | 1% |  | 233 | 67% |  | 108 | 31% |
    | 2010 | 260 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 167 | 64% |  | 93 | 36% |
    | 2011 | 226 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 2 | 1% |  | 147 | 65% |  | 77 | 34% |
    | 2012 | 146 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 4 | 3% |  | 96 | 66% |  | 46 | 32% |
    | 2013 | 122 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 1% |  | 78 | 64% |  | 43 | 35% |
    | 2014 | 123 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 1% |  | 78 | 63% |  | 44 | 36% |
    | 2015 | 74 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 1% |  | 47 | 64% |  | 26 | 35% |
    | 2016 | 66 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 39 | 59% |  | 27 | 41% |
    | 2017 | 158 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 50 | 32% |  | 108 | 68% |
    | 2018 | 77 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 23 | 30% |  | 54 | 70% |
    | 2019 | 64 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 18 | 28% |  | 46 | 72% |

    *Table 45. Juvenile Petitions: Remanded to Adult Court by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Remanded** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 275 |  | 66 | 24% |  | 172 | 63% |  | 21 | 8% |  | 16 | 6% |
    | 2007 | 399 |  | 98 | 25% |  | 260 | 65% |  | 31 | 8% |  | 10 | 3% |
    | 2008 | 335 |  | 90 | 27% |  | 209 | 62% |  | 22 | 7% |  | 14 | 4% |
    | 2009 | 346 |  | 79 | 23% |  | 232 | 67% |  | 20 | 6% |  | 15 | 4% |
    | 2010 | 260 |  | 63 | 24% |  | 171 | 66% |  | 19 | 7% |  | 7 | 3% |
    | 2011 | 226 |  | 60 | 27% |  | 143 | 63% |  | 19 | 8% |  | 4 | 2% |
    | 2012 | 146 |  | 51 | 35% |  | 84 | 58% |  | 7 | 5% |  | 4 | 3% |
    | 2013 | 122 |  | 29 | 24% |  | 79 | 65% |  | 9 | 7% |  | 5 | 4% |
    | 2014 | 123 |  | 34 | 28% |  | 76 | 62% |  | 6 | 5% |  | 7 | 6% |
    | 2015 | 74 |  | 17 | 23% |  | 45 | 61% |  | 10 | 14% |  | 2 | 3% |
    | 2016 | 66 |  | 21 | 32% |  | 26 | 39% |  | 12 | 18% |  | 7 | 11% |
    | 2017 | 158 |  | 22 | 14% |  | 109 | 69% |  | 18 | 11% |  | 9 | 6% |
    | 2018 | 77 |  | 14 | 18% |  | 53 | 69% |  | 7 | 9% |  | 3 | 4% |
    | 2019 | 64 |  | 12 | 19% |  | 42 | 66% |  | 8 | 13% |  | 2 | 3% |

    *Figure 13. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Remanded to Adult Court by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.3.4 Juvenile Petitions: Deported

    Tables 46, 47, and 48 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions resulting in the deportation of juveniles by gender, age, and race, respectively. Trends in juvenile petitions resulting in deportations are described below.

    * *Total Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Deportation* (Tables 46 - 48) – Deportations reached a peak of 30 in 2009 and have since steadily decreased reaching zero deportations in 2019.
    * *Deported by Gender* (Table 46) – In 2019 no deportations occurred.
    * *Deported by Age* (Table 47) – In 2019 no deportations occurred.
    * *Deported by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 48, Figure 14) – In 2019 no deportations occurred.
    * Historically, overwhelmingly the juvenile petitions that resulted in the deportation of juveniles were for Hispanic males between 15-17 years old. This number has decreased from 26 in 2006 to zero in 2019.

    *Table 46. Juvenile Petitions: Deported by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Deported** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 26 |  | 24 | 92% |  | 2 | 8% |
    | 2007 | 25 |  | 22 | 88% |  | 3 | 12% |
    | 2008 | 27 |  | 25 | 93% |  | 2 | 7% |
    | 2009 | 30 |  | 26 | 87% |  | 4 | 13% |
    | 2010 | 14 |  | 13 | 93% |  | 1 | 7% |
    | 2011 | 10 |  | 7 | 70% |  | 3 | 30% |
    | 2012 | 7 |  | 5 | 71% |  | 2 | 29% |
    | 2013 | 2 |  | 1 | 50% |  | 1 | 50% |
    | 2014 | 2 |  | 2 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2015 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |
    | 2016 | 1 |  | 1 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2017 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |
    | 2018 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |
    | 2019 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |

    *Table 47. Juvenile Petitions: Deported by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Deported** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 26 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 26 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2007 | 25 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 4% |  | 19 | 76% |  | 5 | 20% |
    | 2008 | 27 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 2 | 7% |  | 21 | 78% |  | 4 | 15% |
    | 2009 | 30 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 2 | 7% |  | 26 | 87% |  | 2 | 7% |
    | 2010 | 14 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 14 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2011 | 10 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 10 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2012 | 7 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 7 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2013 | 2 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 2 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2014 | 2 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 2 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2015 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |
    | 2016 | 1 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2017 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |
    | 2018 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |
    | 2019 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |

    *Table 48. Juvenile Petitions: Deported by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Deported** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 26 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 26 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2007 | 25 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 24 | 96% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 4% |
    | 2008 | 27 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 27 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2009 | 30 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 29 | 97% |  | 1 | 3% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2010 | 14 |  | 3 | 21% |  | 9 | 64% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 2 | 14% |
    | 2011 | 10 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 8 | 80% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 2 | 20% |
    | 2012 | 7 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 7 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2013 | 2 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 50% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 50% |
    | 2014 | 2 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 2 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2015 | 0 |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |
    | 2016 | 1 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 1 | 100% |  | 0 | 0% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2017 | 0 |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |
    | 2018 | 0 |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |
    | 2019 | 0 |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |  | 0 | - |

    *Figure 14. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Deported by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.3.5 Juvenile Petitions: Informal Probation

    Tables 49, 50, and 51 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions that resulted in the juvenile receiving informal probation by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in informal probation are described below.

    * *Total Juveniles Petitions Resulting in Informal Probation* (Tables 49 - 51) – Informal probation steadily increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 7,093 in 2008. Informal probation has since steadily decreased reaching the lowest point in 2019 with 2,426 grants, representing a 65.8 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Informal Probation by Gender* (Table 49) – For the 2,426 youth granted informal probation in 2019, 74 percent were for males and 26 percent were for females. Percent of informal probation by gender has remained steady from 2006 through 2019.
    * *Informal Probation by Age* (Table 50) – For the 2,426 youth granted informal probation in 2019, 62 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 9 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 29 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of informal probation for all age categories have remained steady from 2006 through 2019.
    * *Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 51, Figure 15) – For the 2,426 youth granted informal probation in 2019, 14 percent were for Blacks, 53 percent were for Hispanics, 23 percent were for Whites, and 10 percent were Other. Percent of youth granted of informal probation have: increased for Hispanic juveniles from 43 percent in 2006 to 53 percent in 2019; decreased for White juveniles from 37 percent in 2006 to 23 percent in 2019; and have remained steady for Black and Other juveniles.

    *Table 49. Juvenile Petitions: Informal Probation by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Informal Probation** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 5,756 |  | 4,309 | 75% |  | 1,447 | 25% |
    | 2007 | 6,642 |  | 4,897 | 74% |  | 1,745 | 26% |
    | 2008 | 7,093 |  | 5,228 | 74% |  | 1,865 | 26% |
    | 2009 | 6,815 |  | 5,042 | 74% |  | 1,773 | 26% |
    | 2010 | 5,743 |  | 4,196 | 73% |  | 1,547 | 27% |
    | 2011 | 4,866 |  | 3,474 | 71% |  | 1,392 | 29% |
    | 2012 | 4,223 |  | 3,044 | 72% |  | 1,179 | 28% |
    | 2013 | 3,887 |  | 2,847 | 73% |  | 1,040 | 27% |
    | 2014 | 3,956 |  | 2,906 | 73% |  | 1,050 | 27% |
    | 2015 | 2,940 |  | 2,161 | 74% |  | 779 | 26% |
    | 2016 | 2,899 |  | 2,204 | 76% |  | 695 | 24% |
    | 2017 | 2,860 |  | 2,116 | 74% |  | 744 | 26% |
    | 2018 | 2,678 |  | 1,961 | 73% |  | 717 | 27% |
    | 2019 | 2,426 |  | 1,788 | 74% |  | 638 | 26% |

    *Table 50. Juvenile Petitions: Informal Probation by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Informal Probation** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 5,756 |  | 119 | 2% |  | 1,518 | 26% |  | 3,581 | 62% |  | 538 | 9% |
    | 2007 | 6,642 |  | 105 | 2% |  | 1,783 | 27% |  | 4,115 | 62% |  | 639 | 10% |
    | 2008 | 7,093 |  | 108 | 2% |  | 1,781 | 25% |  | 4,525 | 64% |  | 679 | 10% |
    | 2009 | 6,815 |  | 113 | 2% |  | 1,726 | 25% |  | 4,316 | 63% |  | 660 | 10% |
    | 2010 | 5,743 |  | 73 | 1% |  | 1,402 | 24% |  | 3,694 | 64% |  | 574 | 10% |
    | 2011 | 4,866 |  | 49 | 1% |  | 1,194 | 25% |  | 3,214 | 66% |  | 409 | 8% |
    | 2012 | 4,223 |  | 50 | 1% |  | 1,054 | 25% |  | 2,747 | 65% |  | 372 | 9% |
    | 2013 | 3,887 |  | 33 | 1% |  | 925 | 24% |  | 2,569 | 66% |  | 360 | 9% |
    | 2014 | 3,956 |  | 42 | 1% |  | 884 | 22% |  | 2,663 | 67% |  | 367 | 9% |
    | 2015 | 2,940 |  | 22 | 1% |  | 738 | 25% |  | 1,892 | 64% |  | 288 | 10% |
    | 2016 | 2,899 |  | 19 | 1% |  | 757 | 26% |  | 1,813 | 63% |  | 310 | 11% |
    | 2017 | 2,860 |  | 20 | 1% |  | 787 | 28% |  | 1,767 | 62% |  | 286 | 10% |
    | 2018 | 2,678 |  | 22 | 1% |  | 737 | 28% |  | 1,667 | 62% |  | 252 | 9% |
    | 2019 | 2,426 |  | 1 | 0% |  | 702 | 29% |  | 1,497 | 62% |  | 226 | 9% |

    *Table 51. Juvenile Petitions: Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Informal Probation** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 5,756 |  | 747 | 13% |  | 2,472 | 43% |  | 2,105 | 37% |  | 432 | 8% |
    | 2007 | 6,642 |  | 782 | 12% |  | 3,075 | 46% |  | 2,380 | 36% |  | 405 | 6% |
    | 2008 | 7,093 |  | 926 | 13% |  | 3,261 | 46% |  | 2,419 | 34% |  | 487 | 7% |
    | 2009 | 6,815 |  | 962 | 14% |  | 3,285 | 48% |  | 2,149 | 32% |  | 419 | 6% |
    | 2010 | 5,743 |  | 779 | 14% |  | 2,756 | 48% |  | 1,808 | 31% |  | 400 | 7% |
    | 2011 | 4,866 |  | 671 | 14% |  | 2,378 | 49% |  | 1,525 | 31% |  | 292 | 6% |
    | 2012 | 4,223 |  | 521 | 12% |  | 2,131 | 50% |  | 1,292 | 31% |  | 279 | 7% |
    | 2013 | 3,887 |  | 550 | 14% |  | 2,017 | 52% |  | 1,109 | 29% |  | 211 | 5% |
    | 2014 | 3,956 |  | 525 | 13% |  | 2,076 | 52% |  | 1,062 | 27% |  | 293 | 7% |
    | 2015 | 2,940 |  | 403 | 14% |  | 1,604 | 55% |  | 786 | 27% |  | 147 | 5% |
    | 2016 | 2,899 |  | 389 | 13% |  | 1,547 | 53% |  | 785 | 27% |  | 178 | 6% |
    | 2017 | 2,860 |  | 410 | 14% |  | 1,563 | 55% |  | 666 | 23% |  | 221 | 8% |
    | 2018 | 2,678 |  | 401 | 15% |  | 1,431 | 53% |  | 614 | 23% |  | 232 | 9% |
    | 2019 | 2,426 |  | 339 | 14% |  | 1,286 | 53% |  | 568 | 23% |  | 233 | 10% |

    *Figure 15. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Granted Informal Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.3.6 Juvenile Petitions: Non-Ward Probation

    Tables 52, 53, and 54 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions that resulted in juveniles receiving non-ward probation by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in non-ward probation are described below.

    * *Total Juveniles Petitions Resulting in Juveniles Receiving Non-Ward Probation* (Tables 52 - 54) –Non-ward probation steadily increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 5,540 in 2008. Non-ward probation has since steadily decreased reaching the lowest point in 2019 with 2,071 granted, representing a 62.6 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Non-Ward Probation by Gender* (Table 52) – For the 2,071 youth granted non-ward probation in 2019, 73 percent were for males and 27 percent were for females. Percent of youth granted non-ward probation by gender have remained steady from 2006 through 2019.
    * *Non-Ward Probation by Age* (Table 53) – For the 2,071 youth granted non-ward probation, 68 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 13 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 19 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of juveniles 15-17 years old have increased starting in 2006 with 63 percent to 68 percent in 2019. Percent of juveniles 12-14 years old have decreased starting in 2006 with 23 percent to 19 percent in 2019. Percent of 18-24 year-olds have remained steady from 2006 through 2019.
    * *Non-Ward Probation by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 54, Figure 16) – For the 2,071 youth granted Non-ward probation in 2019, 20 percent were for Blacks, 53 percent were for Hispanics, 20 percent were for Whites, and 7 percent for Other. Percent of youth granted non-ward probation have: increased for Hispanic juveniles from 40 percent in 2006 to 53 percent in 2019; decreased for White juveniles from 31 percent in 2006 to 20 percent in 2019; and have remained steady for Black and Other juveniles.

    *Table 52. Juvenile Petitions: Non-Ward Probation by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Non-Ward Probation** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 4,744 |  | 3,410 | 72% |  | 1,334 | 28% |
    | 2007 | 4,959 |  | 3,649 | 74% |  | 1,310 | 26% |
    | 2008 | 5,540 |  | 4,066 | 73% |  | 1,474 | 27% |
    | 2009 | 5,296 |  | 3,845 | 73% |  | 1,451 | 27% |
    | 2010 | 4,853 |  | 3,608 | 74% |  | 1,245 | 26% |
    | 2011 | 4,522 |  | 3,324 | 74% |  | 1,198 | 26% |
    | 2012 | 4,075 |  | 2,879 | 71% |  | 1,196 | 29% |
    | 2013 | 3,482 |  | 2,528 | 73% |  | 954 | 27% |
    | 2014 | 2,717 |  | 2,064 | 76% |  | 653 | 24% |
    | 2015 | 2,404 |  | 1,750 | 73% |  | 654 | 27% |
    | 2016 | 2,529 |  | 1,859 | 74% |  | 670 | 26% |
    | 2017 | 2,469 |  | 1,866 | 76% |  | 603 | 24% |
    | 2018 | 2,338 |  | 1,728 | 74% |  | 610 | 26% |
    | 2019 | 2,071 |  | 1,508 | 73% |  | 563 | 27% |

    *Table 53. Juvenile Petitions: Non-Ward Probation by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Non-Ward Probation** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 4,744 |  | 28 | 1% |  | 1,099 | 23% |  | 2,997 | 63% |  | 620 | 13% |
    | 2007 | 4,959 |  | 43 | 1% |  | 1,064 | 21% |  | 3,244 | 65% |  | 608 | 12% |
    | 2008 | 5,540 |  | 37 | 1% |  | 1,146 | 21% |  | 3,599 | 65% |  | 758 | 14% |
    | 2009 | 5,296 |  | 27 | 1% |  | 1,114 | 21% |  | 3,513 | 66% |  | 642 | 12% |
    | 2010 | 4,853 |  | 22 | 0% |  | 985 | 20% |  | 3,250 | 67% |  | 596 | 12% |
    | 2011 | 4,522 |  | 13 | 0% |  | 891 | 20% |  | 3,123 | 69% |  | 495 | 11% |
    | 2012 | 4,075 |  | 23 | 1% |  | 794 | 19% |  | 2,776 | 68% |  | 482 | 12% |
    | 2013 | 3,482 |  | 10 | 0% |  | 693 | 20% |  | 2,348 | 67% |  | 431 | 12% |
    | 2014 | 2,717 |  | 6 | 0% |  | 486 | 18% |  | 1,903 | 70% |  | 322 | 12% |
    | 2015 | 2,404 |  | 7 | 0% |  | 440 | 18% |  | 1,638 | 68% |  | 319 | 13% |
    | 2016 | 2,529 |  | 7 | 0% |  | 453 | 18% |  | 1,738 | 69% |  | 331 | 13% |
    | 2017 | 2,469 |  | 2 | 0% |  | 425 | 17% |  | 1,766 | 72% |  | 276 | 11% |
    | 2018 | 2,338 |  | 1 | 0% |  | 425 | 18% |  | 1,592 | 68% |  | 320 | 14% |
    | 2019 | 2,071 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 393 | 19% |  | 1,414 | 68% |  | 264 | 13% |

    *Table 54. Juvenile Petitions: Non-Ward Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Non-Ward Probation** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 4,744 |  | 1,017 | 21% |  | 1,901 | 40% |  | 1,467 | 31% |  | 359 | 8% |
    | 2007 | 4,959 |  | 995 | 20% |  | 2,248 | 45% |  | 1,385 | 28% |  | 331 | 7% |
    | 2008 | 5,540 |  | 1,054 | 19% |  | 2,584 | 47% |  | 1,569 | 28% |  | 333 | 6% |
    | 2009 | 5,296 |  | 963 | 18% |  | 2,471 | 47% |  | 1,541 | 29% |  | 321 | 6% |
    | 2010 | 4,853 |  | 837 | 17% |  | 2,333 | 48% |  | 1,352 | 28% |  | 331 | 7% |
    | 2011 | 4,522 |  | 800 | 18% |  | 2,242 | 50% |  | 1,188 | 26% |  | 292 | 6% |
    | 2012 | 4,075 |  | 667 | 16% |  | 2,098 | 51% |  | 1,049 | 26% |  | 261 | 6% |
    | 2013 | 3,482 |  | 598 | 17% |  | 1,755 | 50% |  | 884 | 25% |  | 245 | 7% |
    | 2014 | 2,717 |  | 496 | 18% |  | 1,413 | 52% |  | 645 | 24% |  | 163 | 6% |
    | 2015 | 2,404 |  | 437 | 18% |  | 1,287 | 54% |  | 546 | 23% |  | 134 | 6% |
    | 2016 | 2,529 |  | 407 | 16% |  | 1,392 | 55% |  | 586 | 23% |  | 144 | 6% |
    | 2017 | 2,469 |  | 452 | 18% |  | 1,328 | 54% |  | 523 | 21% |  | 166 | 7% |
    | 2018 | 2,338 |  | 472 | 20% |  | 1,241 | 53% |  | 467 | 20% |  | 158 | 7% |
    | 2019 | 2,071 |  | 419 | 20% |  | 1,092 | 53% |  | 411 | 20% |  | 149 | 7% |

    *Figure 16. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Granted Non-Ward Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.3.7 Juvenile Petitions: Diversion

    Tables 55, 56, and 57 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions that resulted in the juveniles being diverted by gender, age and race, respectively. Trends in juveniles who were granted diversion are described below.

    * *Total Juveniles with Petitions Who Were Diverted* (Tables 55 - 57) – From 2006 through 2018, juvenile petitions resulting in diversion have steadily decreased reaching their lowest point in 2018 with 25 granted diversion, representing a 96.3 percent decrease since 2006.
    * *Diversion by Gender* (Table 55) – For the 42 diversions in 2019, 67 percent were for males and 33 percent were for females. Percent of diversions by gender have remained steady from 2006 through 2019.
    * *Diversion by Age* (Table 56) – For the 42 diversions in 2019, 60 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 2 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 36 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of diversions have: decreased for 15-17 year-olds from 79 percent of diversions in 2006 to 60 percent in 2019, increased for 12-14 year-olds from 16 percent in 2006 to 36 percent in 2019, and remained steady for 18-24 year-olds.
    * *Diversion by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 57, Figure 17) – For the 42 diversions in 2019, 17 percent were for Blacks, 64 percent were for Hispanics, 17 percent were for Whites, and 2 percent were Other. Percent of youth granted diversion have: increased for Black juveniles from 5 percent in 2006 to 17 percent in 2019; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 57 percent in 2006 to 64 percent in 2019; decreased for White juveniles from 34 percent in 2006 to 27 percent in 2019; and decreased for Other juveniles from 4 percent in 2006 to 2 percent in 2019.

    *Table 55. Juvenile Petitions: Diversion by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Diversion** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 673 |  | 466 | 69% |  | 207 | 31% |
    | 2007 | 444 |  | 280 | 63% |  | 164 | 37% |
    | 2008 | 528 |  | 334 | 63% |  | 194 | 37% |
    | 2009 | 217 |  | 160 | 74% |  | 57 | 26% |
    | 2010 | 141 |  | 104 | 74% |  | 37 | 26% |
    | 2011 | 149 |  | 90 | 60% |  | 59 | 40% |
    | 2012 | 118 |  | 81 | 69% |  | 37 | 31% |
    | 2013 | 126 |  | 94 | 75% |  | 32 | 25% |
    | 2014 | 114 |  | 87 | 76% |  | 27 | 24% |
    | 2015 | 151 |  | 87 | 58% |  | 64 | 42% |
    | 2016 | 86 |  | 61 | 71% |  | 25 | 29% |
    | 2017 | 69 |  | 56 | 81% |  | 13 | 19% |
    | 2018 | 25 |  | 24 | 96% |  | 1 | 4% |
    | 2019 | 42 |  | 28 | 67% |  | 14 | 33% |

    *Table 56. Juvenile Petitions: Diversion by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Diversion** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 673 |  | 3 | 0% |  | 110 | 16% |  | 532 | 79% |  | 28 | 4% |
    | 2007 | 444 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 62 | 14% |  | 364 | 82% |  | 18 | 4% |
    | 2008 | 528 |  | 1 | 0% |  | 74 | 14% |  | 433 | 82% |  | 20 | 4% |
    | 2009 | 217 |  | 1 | 0% |  | 20 | 9% |  | 179 | 82% |  | 17 | 8% |
    | 2010 | 141 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 15 | 11% |  | 120 | 85% |  | 6 | 4% |
    | 2011 | 149 |  | 1 | 1% |  | 13 | 9% |  | 128 | 86% |  | 7 | 5% |
    | 2012 | 118 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 11 | 9% |  | 99 | 84% |  | 8 | 7% |
    | 2013 | 126 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 12 | 10% |  | 111 | 88% |  | 3 | 2% |
    | 2014 | 114 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 13 | 11% |  | 92 | 81% |  | 9 | 8% |
    | 2015 | 151 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 31 | 21% |  | 115 | 76% |  | 5 | 3% |
    | 2016 | 86 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 10 | 12% |  | 71 | 83% |  | 5 | 6% |
    | 2017 | 69 |  | 1 | 1% |  | 11 | 16% |  | 54 | 78% |  | 3 | 4% |
    | 2018 | 25 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 4 | 16% |  | 18 | 72% |  | 3 | 12% |
    | 2019 | 42 |  | 1 | 2% |  | 15 | 36% |  | 25 | 60% |  | 1 | 2% |

    *Table 57. Juvenile Petitions: Diversion by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Diversion** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 673 |  | 37 | 5% |  | 381 | 57% |  | 227 | 34% |  | 28 | 4% |
    | 2007 | 444 |  | 17 | 4% |  | 258 | 58% |  | 152 | 34% |  | 17 | 4% |
    | 2008 | 528 |  | 20 | 4% |  | 329 | 62% |  | 166 | 31% |  | 13 | 2% |
    | 2009 | 217 |  | 14 | 6% |  | 117 | 54% |  | 82 | 38% |  | 4 | 2% |
    | 2010 | 141 |  | 7 | 5% |  | 83 | 59% |  | 46 | 33% |  | 5 | 4% |
    | 2011 | 149 |  | 12 | 8% |  | 97 | 65% |  | 40 | 27% |  | 0 | 0% |
    | 2012 | 118 |  | 7 | 6% |  | 64 | 54% |  | 40 | 34% |  | 7 | 6% |
    | 2013 | 126 |  | 5 | 4% |  | 82 | 65% |  | 37 | 29% |  | 2 | 2% |
    | 2014 | 114 |  | 12 | 11% |  | 68 | 60% |  | 31 | 27% |  | 3 | 3% |
    | 2015 | 151 |  | 1 | 1% |  | 111 | 74% |  | 38 | 25% |  | 1 | 1% |
    | 2016 | 86 |  | 1 | 1% |  | 58 | 67% |  | 19 | 22% |  | 8 | 9% |
    | 2017 | 69 |  | 1 | 1% |  | 51 | 74% |  | 16 | 23% |  | 1 | 1% |
    | 2018 | 25 |  | 7 | 28% |  | 12 | 48% |  | 5 | 20% |  | 1 | 4% |
    | 2019 | 42 |  | 7 | 17% |  | 27 | 64% |  | 7 | 17% |  | 1 | 2% |

    *Figure 17. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Diverted by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.3.8 Juvenile Petitions: Deferred Entry of Judgment

    Tables 58, 59, and 60 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions resulting in grants of deferred entry of judgment by gender, age and race, respectively. Deferred entry of judgment is defined as a treatment program for first-time felony offenders aged 14 to 17 (pursuant to WIC section 790). Trends in grants of differed entry of judgment are described below.

    * *Total Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Deferred Entry of Judgement* (Tables 58 - 60) – Grants of deferred entry of judgement increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 5,125 in 2008. They have since steadily decreased, reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 1,075 granted, representing a 79 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Deferred Entry of Judgement by Gender* (Table 58) – For the 1,075 youth granted deferred entry of judgement in 2019, 84 percent were for males and 16 percent were for females. Percent of youth granted deferred judgement by gender have remained steady from 2006 through 2019.
    * *Deferred Entry of Judgement by Age* (Table 59) – For the 1,075 youth granted deferred entry of judgement in 2019, 73 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 14 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 13 percent were for 12-14 year-olds. Percent by age have: slightly decreased for 12-14 year-olds from 15 percent in 2006 to 13 percent in 2019; decreased for 15-17 year-olds from 77 percent in 2006 to 73

    percent in 2019; increased for 18-24 year-olds from 8 percent in 2006 to 14 percent in 2019.

    * *Deferred Entry of Judgement by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 60, Figure 18) – For the 1,075 youth granted deferred entry of judgement in 2019, 12 percent were for Blacks, 56 percent were for Hispanics, 19 percent were for Whites, and 13 percent for Others. Percent of youth granted deferred entry of judgement have: increased for Hispanic juveniles from 44 percent in 2006 to 56 percent in 2019; decreased for White juveniles from 34 percent in 2006 to 19 percent in 2019; increased for Other juveniles from 9 percent in 2006 to 13 percent in 2019; and remained steady for Black juveniles.

    *Table 58. Juvenile Petitions: Deferred Entry of Judgement by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Deferred Entry of Judgment** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 3,681 |  | 3,116 | 85% |  | 565 | 15% |
    | 2007 | 4,556 |  | 3,838 | 84% |  | 718 | 16% |
    | 2008 | 5,125 |  | 4,344 | 85% |  | 781 | 15% |
    | 2009 | 4,699 |  | 4,017 | 85% |  | 682 | 15% |
    | 2010 | 4,354 |  | 3,644 | 84% |  | 710 | 16% |
    | 2011 | 3,684 |  | 3,177 | 86% |  | 507 | 14% |
    | 2012 | 3,247 |  | 2,809 | 87% |  | 438 | 13% |
    | 2013 | 2,708 |  | 2,354 | 87% |  | 354 | 13% |
    | 2014 | 2,394 |  | 2,056 | 86% |  | 338 | 14% |
    | 2015 | 1,650 |  | 1,430 | 87% |  | 220 | 13% |
    | 2016 | 1,501 |  | 1,285 | 86% |  | 216 | 14% |
    | 2017 | 1,295 |  | 1,145 | 88% |  | 150 | 12% |
    | 2018 | 1,384 |  | 1,184 | 86% |  | 200 | 14% |
    | 2019 | 1,075 |  | 907 | 84% |  | 168 | 16% |

    Table 59. Juvenile Petitions: Deferred Entry of Judgement by Age for 2006 through 2019

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Deferred Entry of Judgment** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 3,681 |  | 4 | 0% |  | 553 | 15% |  | 2,836 | 77% |  | 288 | 8% |
    | 2007 | 4,556 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 665 | 15% |  | 3,447 | 76% |  | 444 | 10% |
    | 2008 | 5,125 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 771 | 15% |  | 3,877 | 76% |  | 477 | 9% |
    | 2009 | 4,699 |  | 6 | 0% |  | 691 | 15% |  | 3,540 | 75% |  | 462 | 10% |
    | 2010 | 4,354 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 582 | 13% |  | 3,266 | 75% |  | 506 | 12% |
    | 2011 | 3,684 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 459 | 12% |  | 2,879 | 78% |  | 346 | 9% |
    | 2012 | 3,247 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 462 | 14% |  | 2,467 | 76% |  | 318 | 10% |
    | 2013 | 2,708 |  | 1 | 0% |  | 373 | 14% |  | 2,048 | 76% |  | 286 | 11% |
    | 2014 | 2,394 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 348 | 15% |  | 1,773 | 74% |  | 273 | 11% |
    | 2015 | 1,650 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 224 | 14% |  | 1,236 | 75% |  | 190 | 12% |
    | 2016 | 1,501 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 204 | 14% |  | 1,119 | 75% |  | 178 | 12% |
    | 2017 | 1,295 |  | 0 | 0% |  | 190 | 15% |  | 943 | 73% |  | 162 | 13% |
    | 2018 | 1,384 |  | 1 | 0% |  | 227 | 16% |  | 995 | 72% |  | 161 | 12% |
    | 2019 | 1,075 |  | 1 | 0% |  | 138 | 13% |  | 786 | 73% |  | 150 | 14% |

    *Table 60. Juvenile Petitions: Deferred Entry of Judgement by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Deferred Entry of Judgment** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 3,681 |  | 429 | 12% |  | 1,636 | 44% |  | 1,269 | 34% |  | 347 | 9% |
    | 2007 | 4,556 |  | 536 | 12% |  | 2,090 | 46% |  | 1,547 | 34% |  | 383 | 8% |
    | 2008 | 5,125 |  | 695 | 14% |  | 2,382 | 46% |  | 1,606 | 31% |  | 442 | 9% |
    | 2009 | 4,699 |  | 599 | 13% |  | 2,404 | 51% |  | 1,272 | 27% |  | 424 | 9% |
    | 2010 | 4,354 |  | 604 | 14% |  | 2,131 | 49% |  | 1,269 | 29% |  | 350 | 8% |
    | 2011 | 3,684 |  | 471 | 13% |  | 1,826 | 50% |  | 1,066 | 29% |  | 321 | 9% |
    | 2012 | 3,247 |  | 431 | 13% |  | 1,641 | 51% |  | 877 | 27% |  | 298 | 9% |
    | 2013 | 2,708 |  | 316 | 12% |  | 1,480 | 55% |  | 722 | 27% |  | 190 | 7% |
    | 2014 | 2,394 |  | 326 | 14% |  | 1,265 | 53% |  | 637 | 27% |  | 166 | 7% |
    | 2015 | 1,650 |  | 210 | 13% |  | 878 | 53% |  | 438 | 27% |  | 124 | 8% |
    | 2016 | 1,501 |  | 209 | 14% |  | 797 | 53% |  | 404 | 27% |  | 91 | 6% |
    | 2017 | 1,295 |  | 149 | 12% |  | 713 | 55% |  | 325 | 25% |  | 108 | 8% |
    | 2018 | 1,384 |  | 142 | 10% |  | 823 | 59% |  | 302 | 22% |  | 117 | 8% |
    | 2019 | 1,075 |  | 127 | 12% |  | 605 | 56% |  | 206 | 19% |  | 137 | 13% |

    *Figure 18. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Granted Deferred Entry of Judgement by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    3.3.9 Juvenile Petitions: Wardship Probation

    Tables 61, 62, and 63 below provide trend data for juvenile petitions resulting in wardship probation by gender, age, and race, respectively. Trends in wardship probation are described below.

    * *Total Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Wardship Probation* (Tables 61 - 63) – Wardship probation increased from 2006 through 2008 reaching a peak of 65,108 in 2008. Wardship probation has since steadily decreased reaching their lowest point in 2019 with 19,216 granted, representing a 70.5 percent decrease since 2008.
    * *Wardship Probation by Gender* (Table 61) – For the 19,216 youth granted wardship probation in 2019, 82 percent were male and 18 percent were female. Wardship probation by gender has remained steady from 2006 through 2019.
    * *Wardship Probation by Age* (Table 62) – For the 19,216 youth granted wardship probation, 73 percent were for 15-17 year-olds, 15 percent were for 18-24 year-olds and 12 percent were for 12-14 year-old juveniles. Percent of juveniles 15-17 years old have remained steady from 2006 through 2019. Percent of juveniles 12-14 years old have decreased starting in 2006 with 17 percent to 12 percent in 2019. Percent of 18-24 year-olds have increased from 9 percent in 2006 to 15 percent in 2019.
    * *Wardship Probation by Race/Ethnicity* (Table 63, Figure 19) – For the 19,216 youth granted wardship probation in 2019, 24 percent were Black, 58 percent were Hispanic, 13 percent were White, and 5 percent Other. Percent of youth granted wardship probation have: increased for Black juveniles from 21 percent in 2006 to 24 percent in 2019; increased for Hispanic juveniles from 51 percent in 2006 to 58 percent in 2019; decreased for White juveniles from 23 percent in 2006 to 13 percent in 2019; and have remained steady for Other juveniles.

    *Table 61. Wardship Probation by Gender for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Wardship Probation** |  | **Male** | |  | **Female** | | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** | |
    | 2006 | 64,458 |  | 53,159 | 82% |  | 11,299 | 18% |
    | 2007 | 61,642 |  | 51,035 | 83% |  | 10,607 | 17% |
    | 2008 | 65,108 |  | 54,290 | 83% |  | 10,818 | 17% |
    | 2009 | 60,891 |  | 51,135 | 84% |  | 9,756 | 16% |
    | 2010 | 54,769 |  | 46,297 | 85% |  | 8,472 | 15% |
    | 2011 | 47,655 |  | 39,994 | 84% |  | 7,661 | 16% |
    | 2012 | 41,755 |  | 35,079 | 84% |  | 6,676 | 16% |
    | 2013 | 37,615 |  | 31,454 | 84% |  | 6,161 | 16% |
    | 2014 | 33,426 |  | 27,935 | 84% |  | 5,491 | 16% |
    | 2015 | 28,447 |  | 23,360 | 82% |  | 5,087 | 18% |
    | 2016 | 25,471 |  | 20,906 | 82% |  | 4,565 | 18% |
    | 2017 | 23,689 |  | 19,494 | 82% |  | 4,195 | 18% |
    | 2018 | 21,758 |  | 17,821 | 82% |  | 3,937 | 18% |
    | 2019 | 19,216 |  | 15,669 | 82% |  | 3,547 | 18% |

    *Table 62. Wardship Probation by Age for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Wardship Probation** |  | **Age Group Under 12** | |  | **Age Group 12-14** | |  | **Age Group 15-17** | |  | **Age Group 18-24** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 64,458 |  | 206 | 0% |  | 10,888 | 17% |  | 47,464 | 74% |  | 5,900 | 9% |
    | 2007 | 61,642 |  | 179 | 0% |  | 10,058 | 16% |  | 45,094 | 73% |  | 6,311 | 10% |
    | 2008 | 65,108 |  | 152 | 0% |  | 10,191 | 16% |  | 48,003 | 74% |  | 6,762 | 10% |
    | 2009 | 60,891 |  | 93 | 0% |  | 8,988 | 15% |  | 45,566 | 75% |  | 6,244 | 10% |
    | 2010 | 54,769 |  | 52 | 0% |  | 7,402 | 14% |  | 41,344 | 75% |  | 5,971 | 11% |
    | 2011 | 47,655 |  | 51 | 0% |  | 6,292 | 13% |  | 36,066 | 76% |  | 5,246 | 11% |
    | 2012 | 41,755 |  | 46 | 0% |  | 5,026 | 12% |  | 31,335 | 75% |  | 5,348 | 13% |
    | 2013 | 37,615 |  | 40 | 0% |  | 4,361 | 12% |  | 28,162 | 75% |  | 5,052 | 13% |
    | 2014 | 33,426 |  | 28 | 0% |  | 3,943 | 12% |  | 24,355 | 73% |  | 5,100 | 15% |
    | 2015 | 28,447 |  | 30 | 0% |  | 3,387 | 12% |  | 20,921 | 74% |  | 4,109 | 14% |
    | 2016 | 25,471 |  | 23 | 0% |  | 3,070 | 12% |  | 18,641 | 73% |  | 3,734 | 15% |
    | 2017 | 23,689 |  | 16 | 0% |  | 2,838 | 12% |  | 17,450 | 74% |  | 3,385 | 14% |
    | 2018 | 21,758 |  | 17 | 0% |  | 2,739 | 13% |  | 15,699 | 72% |  | 3,303 | 15% |
    | 2019 | 19,216 |  | 3 | 0% |  | 2,390 | 12% |  | 14,034 | 73% |  | 2,789 | 15% |

    *Table 63. Wardship Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  | **Total Wardship Probation** |  | **Blacks** | |  | **Hispanics** | |  | **Whites** | |  | **Others** | |
    | **Year** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |  | **Count** | **Percent** |
    | 2006 | 64,458 |  | 13,243 | 21% |  | 32,863 | 51% |  | 14,730 | 23% |  | 3,622 | 6% |
    | 2007 | 61,642 |  | 12,013 | 19% |  | 33,215 | 54% |  | 13,286 | 22% |  | 3,128 | 5% |
    | 2008 | 65,108 |  | 13,207 | 20% |  | 35,175 | 54% |  | 13,340 | 20% |  | 3,386 | 5% |
    | 2009 | 60,891 |  | 12,116 | 20% |  | 33,701 | 55% |  | 11,666 | 19% |  | 3,408 | 6% |
    | 2010 | 54,769 |  | 10,684 | 20% |  | 31,232 | 57% |  | 10,308 | 19% |  | 2,545 | 5% |
    | 2011 | 47,655 |  | 9,412 | 20% |  | 27,458 | 58% |  | 8,434 | 18% |  | 2,351 | 5% |
    | 2012 | 41,755 |  | 8,540 | 20% |  | 24,174 | 58% |  | 7,173 | 17% |  | 1,868 | 4% |
    | 2013 | 37,615 |  | 8,310 | 22% |  | 21,649 | 58% |  | 6,133 | 16% |  | 1,523 | 4% |
    | 2014 | 33,426 |  | 7,542 | 23% |  | 19,307 | 58% |  | 5,215 | 16% |  | 1,362 | 4% |
    | 2015 | 28,447 |  | 6,534 | 23% |  | 16,405 | 58% |  | 4,299 | 15% |  | 1,209 | 4% |
    | 2016 | 25,471 |  | 5,969 | 23% |  | 14,552 | 57% |  | 3,909 | 15% |  | 1,041 | 4% |
    | 2017 | 23,689 |  | 5,807 | 25% |  | 13,621 | 57% |  | 3,321 | 14% |  | 940 | 4% |
    | 2018 | 21,758 |  | 5,215 | 24% |  | 12,539 | 58% |  | 2,994 | 14% |  | 1,010 | 5% |
    | 2019 | 19,216 |  | 4,695 | 24% |  | 11,066 | 58% |  | 2,511 | 13% |  | 944 | 5% |

    *Figure 19. Percent of Juvenile Petitions Resulting in Juveniles being Granted Wardship Probation by Race/Ethnicity for 2006 through 2019*

    4. Juvenile Hall Bookings & Secure Holds in a Law Enforcement Facility

    4.1 Juvenile Hall Bookings

    Table 64 and Figure 20 provide trend data for juvenile hall bookings from 2004 through 2019. Juvenile hall bookings increased between 2004 and 2006, reaching a high of 114,404 in 2006. Juvenile hall bookings have since declined reaching a low of 30,957 in 2019, representing a 72.9 percent decrease.

    *Table 64. Juvenile Hall Bookings for 2004 through 2019*

    |  |  |
    | --- | --- |
    | **Year** | **Juvenile Hall Bookings** |
    | 2004 | 112,049 |
    | 2005 | 112,207 |
    | 2006 | 114,404 |
    | 2007 | 113,006 |
    | 2008 | 111,876 |
    | 2009 | 85,037 |
    | 2010 | 81,612 |
    | 2011 | 74,365 |
    | 2012 | 66,515 |
    | 2013 | 58,544 |
    | 2014 | 52,797 |
    | 2015 | 46,723 |
    | 2016 | 41,248 |
    | 2017 | 39,168 |
    | 2018 | 34,602 |
    | 2019 | 30,957 |

    *Figure 20. Juvenile Hall Bookings for 2004 through 2019*

    4.2 Juvenile Secure Holds in a Law Enforcement Facility

    Juvenile secure holds are defined as post-arrest holds in law enforcement facilities and are broken down into two types: secure holds for juvenile delinquent offenders and secure holds for juvenile status offenders. The term juvenile delinquent offender refers to a juvenile who has been charged with or adjudicated for a crime that would be illegal regardless of whether the individual were a juvenile or adult. Secure holds of delinquent offenders are tracked for both under 6 hours and over 6 hours. The term status offender refers to a juvenile offender who has been charged with or adjudicated for conduct which would not be a crime if committed by an adult. Status offenses include truancy, violations of curfews, and runaway.

    Table 65 provides trend data for juvenile secure holds by type (delinquent offenders under 6 hours, delinquent offenders over 6 hours, and status offenders) for 2004 through 2019. Figure 21 displays secure holds for juvenile delinquent offender holds under 6 hours. Figure 22 displays juvenile delinquent offender secure holds over 6 hours and status offender secure holds. Trends in juvenile secure holds are described below.

    * *Juvenile Delinquent Offender Secure Holds U*nder 6 Hours (Table 65, Figure 21) – Secure holds increased between 2004 and 2006, reaching a high of 11,713 in 2006. Starting in 2007 through 2018, holds began to decrease, reaching their lowest point in 2018 with 2,097 holds. Holds then increased slightly, reaching 2,108 in 2019.
    * *Juvenile Delinquent Offender Secure Holds* Over 6 Hours (Table 65, Figure 22) – Secure holds doubled between 2004 and 2006 reaching a high of 158 in 2006. Holds decreased in 2008 with 75 holds and have since remained steady.
    * *Juvenile Status Offender Secure Holds* (Table 65, Figure 22) – Secure holds increased between 2007 and 2011, reaching a high of 101 holds in 2011. From 2012 to 2018, holds fluctuated but generally decreased from the highest total, reaching 4 in 2019.

    *Table 65. Juvenile Secure Holds by Type for 2004 through 2019*

    |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    | **Year** | **Delinquent Offenders Under 6 Hours** | **Delinquent Offenders Over 6 Hours** | **Status Offenders\*** |
    | 2004 | 9,981 | 73 | - |
    | 2005 | 10,579 | 79 | - |
    | 2006 | 11,713 | 158 | - |
    | 2007 | 10,336 | 107 | 47 |
    | 2008 | 8,655 | 75 | 19 |
    | 2009 | 7,095 | 87 | 18 |
    | 2010 | 6,644 | 81 | 76 |
    | 2011 | 5,806 | 65 | 101 |
    | 2012 | 4,254 | 69 | 67 |
    | 2013 | 3,616 | 57 | 45 |
    | 2014 | 3,149 | 71 | 57 |
    | 2015 | 2,804 | 78 | 46 |
    | 2016 | 2,682 | 76 | 19 |
    | 2017 | 2,306 | 73 | 14 |
    | 2018 | 2,097 | 58 | 24 |

    \*Note: Data was not collected as part of the MID Survey until 2007.

    *Figure 21. Juvenile Delinquent Offender Secure Holds Under 6 Hours for 2004 through 2019*

    *Figure 22. Juvenile Delinquent Offender Secure Holds for 2004 through 2019 and Juvenile Status Offender Secure Holds for 2007 through 2019*

    5. Mental Health Indicators

    5.1: Select Juvenile Detention Profile Survey Data Trends

    The BSCC’s Juvenile Detention Profile Survey (JDPS) is a data collection instrument designed to gather pertinent data related to juvenile detention to provide state and local decision makers with information about the changing populations and needs of local juvenile detention facilities. This document presents juvenile detention trends for calendar years 2010 through 2020 for the JDPS’s population, mental health and suicide-related data elements defined below.

    * *Average Daily Population (ADP)* **–** The ADP of juvenile detention facilities is collected *each* *month* and is calculated by taking a count of the number of juveniles in custody each day of the month, adding these daily counts together, and dividing the sum by the number of days in each month.
    * *Number of Juveniles with Open Mental Health Cases* – The total number of juveniles who have an open mental health case with the mental health provider is collected *each* *month* and is a *snapshot* taken on the 15th day of the month. As a snapshot, the count does not necessarily represent the total number of juveniles who have an open case simply because they were not in custody during the snapshot day or did not have an open case on the snapshot day.
    * *Number of Juveniles Receiving Psychotropic Medication* – The total number of juveniles who were administered psychotropic medication is collected *each month* and is a *snapshot* taken on the 15th day of the month. As a snapshot, the count does not necessarily represent the total number of juveniles receiving psychotropic medication simply because they were not in custody during the snapshot day or did not receive medication on the snapshot day.
    * *Number of Suicide Attempts* – The total number of *instances* in which a juvenile made a physical attempt at suicide requiring staff intervention and placement on a suicide watch (e.g., five-minute watches or one-on-one direct visual supervision) is collected *each quarter*. This count does not include juveniles identified as suicidal because of notice on admission related to prior history. Because these are instances, the count does not necessarily represent a unique count of juveniles.
    * *Number of Suicides* – The total number of instances in which a juvenile committed suicide is collected *each quarter*.

    5.2: Juvenile Mental Health-Related Trends for 2010 through 2020

    A total of 44 jurisdictions report data to the BSCC through the JDPS (see Attachment 1 for a list of jurisdictions). From 2010 through 2020, 29 jurisdictions consistently reported the mental health-related data elements. Juvenile Halls, Special Purpose Juvenile Halls and Camps/Ranches are included. For this sample of jurisdictions, Table 66 provides the ADP

    and number and percent of ADP for both juveniles with open mental health cases each month and juveniles receiving psychotropic medications each month, aggregated for each year from 2010 through 2020. Figure 23 provides a visual of the percent of ADP for the mental health-related data elements for the same timeframe. Based on this sample of jurisdictions, trends for these mental health-related data elements are described below.

    *Open Mental Health Cases -* There has been a consistent downward trend in the average number of juveniles each month with open mental health cases, from 2,222 in 2010 to 988 in 2020. This decrease has coincided with a decrease in the ADP. However, there is an upward trend in the percent of the population with open mental health cases, from 48.4 percent in 2010 to 65.5 percent in 2020.

    *Psychotropic Medications -* There has also been a consistent downward trend in the average number of juveniles who receive psychotropic medications each month, from 873 in 2010 to 498 in 2020. This decrease has coincided with a decrease in the ADP. However, there is an upward trend in the percent of the population who receive psychotropic medications, from 19 percent in 2010 to 33 percent in 2020.

    *Table 66. Juvenile Mental Health-Related Trends from 2010 through 2020 for a Sample of Reporting Jurisdictions*

    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    |  |  |  | Juveniles with Open Mental Health Cases Each Month | |  | Juveniles Receiving Psychotropic Medications each Month | |
    | Year | ADP |  | Average | Percent of ADP |  | Average | Percent of ADP |
    | 2010 | 4,589 |  | 2,222 | 48.4% |  | 873 | 19.0% |
    | 2011 | 4,144 |  | 2,040 | 49.2% |  | 869 | 21.0% |
    | 2012 | 3,674 |  | 1,928 | 52.5% |  | 843 | 22.9% |
    | 2013 | 3,332 |  | 1,851 | 55.5% |  | 824 | 24.7% |
    | 2014 | 2,976 |  | 1,816 | 61.0% |  | 778 | 26.2% |
    | 2015 | 2,733 |  | 1,791 | 65.5% |  | 750 | 27.5% |
    | 2016 | 2,494 |  | 1,647 | 66.0% |  | 741 | 29.7% |
    | 2017 | 2,374 |  | 1,544 | 65.0% |  | 667 | 28.1% |
    | 2018 | 2,182 |  | 1,455 | 66.7% |  | 593 | 27.2% |
    | 2019 | 2,024 |  | 1,292 | 63.8% |  | 610 | 30.1% |
    | 2020 | 1,508 |  | 988 | 65.5% |  | 498 | 33.0% |

    Note. 2020 data through third quarter only (January - September). Based on JDPS quarterly and monthly Juvenile Hall, Special Purpose Juvenile Halls and Camps/Ranch data available on February 2, 2020 from January 2010 through September 2020. Based on data for 22 reporting jurisdictions and 7 jurisdictions that consistently provided data during this timeframe, but no longer have juvenile detention facilities. The 15 excluded jurisdictions were Alameda, Contra Costa, Del Norte, Lake, Lassen, Los Angeles, Madera, Monterey, Nevada, Orange, Solano, Tehama, Tulare, and Yuba/Sutter.

    *Figure 23. Juvenile Mental Health-Related Trends as a Percentage of ADP for 2010 through 2020 for a Sample of Reporting Jurisdictions*

    Note. Based on JDPS monthly data available on February 2, 2020 from January 2010 through September 2020. Based on data for 22 reporting jurisdictions and 7 jurisdictions that consistently provided data during this timeframe, but no longer have juvenile detention facilities. The 15 excluded jurisdictions were Alameda, Contra Costa, Del Norte, Lake, Lassen, Los Angeles, Madera, Monterey, Nevada, Orange, Solano, Tehama, Tulare, and Yuba/Sutter.

    5.3 Juvenile Suicide-Related Trends for 2010 through 2020

    From 2010 through 2020, 36 of the 44 reporting jurisdictions have consistently reported the suicide-related data elements. For this sample of jurisdictions, Table 67 provides yearly totals for the suicide-related data elements and the ADP, aggregated for each year from 2010 through 2020. For this sample of jurisdictions, a total of one suicide was reported from 2010 through 2020. This total changes to two suicides when data for all 44 jurisdictions are included. Although there has been a consistent downward trend in the statewide ADP between 2010 and 2020, there has not been a consistent corresponding decrease in the total number of instances of suicide attempts until 2018. Suicide attempts began to decrease in 2018 from 123 to 62 in 2020.

    *Table 67. Juvenile Suicide-Related Trends for 2010 through 2020 for a Sample of Reporting Jurisdictions*

    |  |  |  |  |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    | Year | Total Number of Instances of Suicide Attempts | Total Number of Suicides | Average Daily Population |
    | 2010 | 176 | 0 | 7,548 |
    | 2011 | 95 | 0 | 6,806 |
    | 2012 | 107 | 0 | 6,118 |
    | 2013 | 187 | 1 | 5,478 |
    | 2014 | 103 | 0 | 4,759 |
    | 2015 | 127 | 0 | 4,387 |
    | 2016 | 124 | 0 | 3,867 |
    | 2017 | 130 | 0 | 3,649 |
    | 2018 | 123 | 0 | 3,269 |
    | 2019 | 115 | 0 | 3,006 |
    | 2020 | 62 | 0 | 2,215 |

    Note. 2020 data through third quarter only (January - September). Based on JDPS quarterly and monthly Juvenile Hall, Special Purpose Juvenile Halls and Camps/Ranch data available on February 2, 2020 from January 2010 through September 2020. Based on data for 28 reporting jurisdictions and 8 jurisdictions that consistently provided data during this timeframe, but no longer have juvenile detention facilities. The 8 excluded jurisdictions were El Dorado, Kern, Merced, Orange, San Francisco, San Mateo, Shasta, and Yolo.

    5.4 JDPS Reporting Jurisdictions as of September 2020

    As of September 2020, a total of 44 jurisdictions report data to the BSCC through the JDPS.Jurisdictions generally represent counties. However, the Yuba/Sutter jurisdiction represents both counties with Yuba county reporting data for the jointly run facility. Table 68 provides a list of each reporting jurisdiction and, for each jurisdiction, identifies the type of juvenile detentions options (juvenile halls and camps/ranches), size of the county (small, medium, or large) , and location of the county (Northern, Central, or Southern).

    *Table 68. JDPS Reporting Jurisdictions and Juvenile Detention Options*

    | **Reporting Jurisdictions** | **Juvenile Hall/SPJH** | | **Camp**  **/ Ranch** | | **Size** | | **Location** | |
    | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
    | **Alameda** | X | X | | L | | Central | |
    | **Butte** | X | X | | M | | Northern | |
    | **Contra Costa** | X | X | | L | | Central | |
    | **Del Norte** | X | X | | S | | Northern | |
    | **El Dorado** | X | X | | S | | Central | |
    | **Fresno** | X | X | | L | | Central | |
    | **Humboldt** | X | -- | | S | | Northern | |
    | **Imperial** | X | -- | | S | | Southern | |
    | **Inyo** | X | -- | | S | | Central | |
    | **Kern** | X | X | | L | | Southern | |
    | **Kings** | X | X | | S | | Central | |
    | **Los Angeles** | X | X | | L | | Southern | |
    | **Madera** | X | X | | S | | Central | |
    | **Marin** | X | -- | | M | | Central | |
    | **Mariposa** | X | -- | | S | | Central | |
    | **Mendocino** | X | -- | | S | | Northern | |
    | **Merced** | X | X | | M | | Central | |
    | **Monterey** | X | X | | M | | Central | |
    | **Napa** | X | X | | S | | Central | |
    | **Nevada** | X | -- | | S | | Northern | |
    | **Orange** | X | X | | L | | Southern | |
    | **Placer** | X | -- | | M | | Northern | |
    | **Riverside** | X | X | | L | | Southern | |
    | **Sacramento** | X | -- | | L | | Central | |
    | **San Benito** | X | -- | | S | | Central | |
    | **San Bernardino** | X | X | | L | | Southern | |
    | **San Diego** | X | X | | L | | Southern | |
    | **San Francisco** | X | X | | L | | Central | |
    | **San Joaquin** | X | X | | L | | Central | |
    | **San Luis Obispo** | X | X | | M | | Southern | |
    | **San Mateo** | X | X | | L | | Central | |
    | **Santa Barbara** | X | X | | M | | Southern | |
    | **Santa Clara** | X | X | | L | | Central | |
    | **Santa Cruz** | X | -- | | M | | Central | |
    | **Shasta** | X | -- | | S | | Northern | |
    | **Solano** | X | X | | M | | Central | |
    | **Sonoma** | X | X | | M | | Central | |
    | **Stanislaus** | X | X | | M | | Central | |
    | **Tehama** | X | -- | | S | | Northern | |
    | **Tulare** | X | X | | M | | Central | |
    | **Tuolumne** | X | X | | S | | Central | |
    | **Ventura** | X | X | | L | | Southern | |
    | **Yolo** | X | -- | | M | | Central | |

    6. Other Trends/Qualitative Data

    The following trend data and other social, economic, legal, and organizational information is considered relevant to delinquency prevention programming and was provided to SACJJDP members for consideration during the process of developing the 2018-20 Title II State Plan. The following four components are included:

    1. Literature Review

    Findings from our review of current literature – “Literature review: Qualitative research organized around priority areas”

    1. Title II State Plan Survey

    Results obtained from a widely distributed survey of interested parties

    1. Public Listening Session

    Summary of information obtained during a public listening session held on November 12, 2020

    1. Public Comment Contracts

    6.1: Literature Review

    Findings from a review of current literature containing qualitative research organized around the following priority areas:

    * Mental Health Services
    * Rural Areas Juvenile Programs
    * Gender-Specific Services
    * Aftercare Services
    * Alternatives to Detention and Placement
    * Graduated and Appropriate Sanctions
    * Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)
    * Diversion
    * Juvenile Justice Improvement
    * School Programs
    * Afterschool Programs
    * Community-Based Programs and Services
    * Learning and Other Disabilities
    * References

    **Mental Health Services**

    Between 60 and 70 percent of youth involved with the justice system have been diagnosed with a mental health disorder (Skowyra & Cocozza, 2006 in Calleja et al, 2016). According to the research, psychological factors throughout the developmental stages of adolescence are correlated with antisocial behavior and criminal activity (NCJRS, 2016).

    Existing needs (Llamas & Chandler, 2017; Nissen, 2006 in Llamas & Chandler, 2017)

    * There is a need to overcome the blocks to service utilization
    * To measure program effectiveness, there is a need for policies based on empirical research
    * There is a need for policies to generate uniformity about services within juvenile facilities
    * There is a need to overcome the stigmatization around mental health issues

    Potential reform areas (Models for Change, 2017a; OJJDP, 2010)

    * Addressing collaborative approaches to the youth’s mental health needs of youth to avoid (unnecessary) JJS involvement
    * Addressing general improvement of the mental health services)
    * Addressing the standards for the qualifications of mental health providers

    Recommendations to Treatment Providers (Lipsey et al, 2010)

    * To recognize the importance of quality research (for youth, families, and communities)
    * To target and serve high risk youth by using the appropriate and approved JJ risk assessment tools
    * To clearly articulate (via treatment service manuals) the clinical protocols and procedures that are used by clinicians

    **Rural Areas Juvenile Programs**

    About 20 percent of the US residents live in rural areas (a quarter of the Native American and Alaska native population live in the rural areas; Hispanic population is increasingly populating rural areas) (The Justice Innovation Center, 2016). Certain facets rural juvenile recidivism correlate with the juvenile crime in rural areas (i.e., housing instability, ethnic heterogeneity, etc.), while others show little or no correlation with the juvenile crime (i.e., poverty rate, unemployment, etc.) (OJJDP, 2015).

    Factors that impact Rural Youth (Family Justice, 2009; The Justice Innovation Center, 2016)

    * Housing
    * Race and ethnicity
    * Family dynamics
    * Income
    * Homelessness
    * Re-entry issues
    * Access to health and social services
    * Community belonging
    * Access to transportation
    * Access to employment
    * Access to mental health and substance-abuse programs

    Challenges (The Justice Innovation Center, 2016)

    * Geography
    * Access to funding
    * Access to social service provision
    * Access to personnel
    * Access to communications and information-technology management
    * Data-Sharing and Interoperability
    * Crime-related issues
    * Access to adequate infrastructure
    * Legal and policy challenges

    Potential goals and areas of priority (Family Justice, 2009; The Justice Innovation Center, 2016)

    * Decreasing youth recidivism
    * Decreasing youth homelessness
    * Supporting family health and well-being
    * Increasing public safety
    * Generating cost-effective solutions
    * Supporting collaboration and partnership
    * Improving inter-agency information sharing
    * Assisting with the procurement and management of information-technology systems
    * Assisting with grant applications

    **Gender-Specific Services**

    Girls and young women make up about 30 percent of arrested juveniles – the number that increased in the last 20 years. Most often, these are the girls of color that grew up in poverty and are victims of abuse, trauma and continuous racial bias. In addition, LGBTQI youth also experiences high systemic inequalities (OJJDP, n.d.).

    Focus areas for states, tribes and local communities (OJJDP, n.d.)

    * Prohibiting girl placement (girls that are status offenders) in the JJS
    * Reducing arrest and detention for status offences, probation violation, prostitution-related charges, etc.
    * Improving collaboration among state and national juvenile advocates, agencies and coalitions
    * Implementing the PREA on state level
    * Developing alternatives to detention and incarceration
    * Applying a developmental approach (with communal and family support)
    * Identifying the needs of the girls who have interacted with child welfare and/or the juvenile justice system
    * Supporting gender- and culture-sensitive programs

    Potential elements as part of the reforms (Watson & Edelman, 2012)

    * Developing quality research around needs, service-availability, and gender-responsiveness of jurisdictions
    * Promoting public education through campaigns
    * Strategic planning
    * Supporting stakeholder-inclusion
    * Improving legislation
    * Training staff
    * Developing community-based prevention programs
    * Measuring and evaluating outcomes
    * Providing technical assistance
    * Promoting sustainability

    Federal policy recommendations in support of state and local reforms (Watson & Edelman, 2012)

    * Investing in research
    * Investing in assessment and data collection tools
    * Encouraging state advisory groups to support girl programs and reforms
    * Supporting interagency working groups on federal and state levels
    * Eliminating Valid Court Order Exception for status offenders
    * Banning handcuffing for pregnant girls
    * Monitoring compliance with the PREA
    * Encouraging the development and progress of national standards for gender-responsive programming

    **Aftercare Services**

    Challenges to re-entry (Calleja et al, 2016)

    * Returning to the unstable environment (home and community) that lacks opportunities
    * Lack of access to education
    * Lack of access to employment
    * Lack of access to housing
    * Lack of access to quality mental health

    Reform areas (Models for Change, 2017a; NJJN, 2016)

    * [Aftercare](http://www.modelsforchange.net/reform-areas/aftercare/index.html)
    * Post-release services, supervision and supports
    * Education
    * Interagency cooperation
    * Community cooperation
    * Family involvement
    * Speedy and appropriate placement
    * Improved transfer of records
    * Improved school reenrollment and drop-out reengagement programs

    Other recommendations (Llamas & Chandler, 2017; Grisso, 2005 in Llamas & Chandler, 2017; Cavendish, 2014 in Llamas & Chandler, 2017)

    * Developing issue-specific and individual rehabilitation plans
    * Supporting reintegration into the community
    * Supporting follow-ups
    * Offering transitional support
    * Supporting parental support
    * Supporting state investment into rehabilitation

    **Alternatives to Detention and Placement**

    According to the research, placing juveniles in community settings with supporting services has a greater impact on youth rehabilitation than detention and confinement. Confinement has a strong impact on youth’s mental state, academic performance, employment, etc. (OJJDP 2014; Holman and Ziedenberg 2007 in OJJDP 2014).

    The Impact of Detention (Holman, B. & Ziedenberg, 2007)

    * Potentially increases recidivism
    * Negatively impacts youth’s behavior and increases their chance of re-offending
    * Pulls youth deeper into the JJS
    * Potentially interrupt the natural process of maturing out of delinquency
    * Negatively impacts youth’s mental health
    * Negatively impacts mentally ill youth
    * Negatively impacts the special needs youth’s chances to return to school
    * Negatively impacts youth’s chances to find employment
    * Detention is more expensive than alternatives to detention

    The alternatives to detention/confinement (OJJDP, 2014; Owen, Wettach & Hoffman, 2015)

    * Community based programs
    * Community-school partnerships
    * Home confinement
    * Day (or evening) treatment
    * Shelter care
    * Group homes
    * Intensive supervision programs
    * Specialized foster care
    * Positive behavior intervention and support
    * Safe and responsive school environment
    * Limiting the role of school resource officers
    * Assessment
    * Restorative justice
    * Substance abuse interventions
    * Alternative schools
    * Reducing the use of suspension for discipline

    **Graduated and Appropriate Sanctions**

    Graduated responses is a “structured system of graduated incentives and sanctions to respond to youth behavior” (Center for Children’s Law and Policy, 2016, p. 8). Research shows that combining sanctions and progressive incentives can help reduce racial and ethnic disparities (Njjn, n.d.). A system of graduated responses should be: certain, immediate, proportionate, fair and tailored to individual youth (Center for Children’s Law and Policy, 2016).

    The graduated sanctions continuum consists of (Louisiana District Attorneys Association, 2012)

    * Immediate (Diversion)
    * Intermediate sanctions
    * Secure care
    * Reentry

    Community alternatives to secure care (Louisiana District Attorneys Association, 2012)

    * Home detention
    * Employment projects
    * Evening reporting centers
    * Electronic monitoring
    * Intensive supervision

    Steps involved in creating a graduated responses system (Njjn, n.d.)

    * Defining the purpose of implementing a graduated responses practice
    * Gathering data on youth under supervision/youth sanctioned for violations (of probation/other court orders)
    * Interviewing to gain an understand of youth supervision in the community.
    * Forming a committee to develop the graduated responses system
    * Thinking of behaviors and skills to promote among youth under supervision
    * Identifying reward incentives
    * Identifying negative behaviors (low-, medium-, or high-severity)
    * Identifying possible sanctions for specific behaviors
    * Developing a system to the system effectiveness
    * Training staff
    * Gathering data and evaluating implementation

    **Racial and Ethnic Disparity**

    Racial and Ethnic Disparity refers to prominence of contact with the JJS by minority groups in comparison to the rates of contact by white juveniles. According to data, youth of color are more likely to be arrested and later go deeper in the JJS (Puzzanchera and Hockenberry 2013 in OJJDP 2014). There exist 2 theoretical frameworks of looking at DMC:

    Differential offending (OJJDP, 2014) - Youths of color commit more crimes due to the context (socio-economic disadvantages, family context, greater exposure to violence, etc.)

    Differential treatment (OJJDP, 2014) - JJS treats youth of color differently than white youth (bias theory)

    Contributing factors (OJJDP, 2014)

    * Differential behavior
    * Indirect/environmental effects (socio-economic status, quality and level of education, location, etc.)
    * Geography (harsher laws)
    * Legislation, policies, and legal factors

    Strategies for reducing DMC (OJJDP 2014):

    * Direct services that address the risks and needs
    * Training and technical assistance (juvenile justice personnel and law enforcement)
    * Systemic change (OJJDP, 2009)

    Guidelines for developing DMC Intervention Plan (OJJDP, 2009)

    * Designing a comprehensive approach
    * Focusing on critical areas
    * Choosing community-friendly interventions
    * Using evidence-based strategies

    **Diversion**

    Diversion refers to “channeling youths away from the juvenile justice system and into an alternative program before formal court involvement” (Models of Change 2011, p. 1). Research shows that the formal system processing may lead to higher rates of re-offending (Models of Change 2011).

    Diversion programs are designed to (OJJDP 2017)

    * Reduce recidivism
    * Reduce stigma
    * Reduce coercive entry into the system
    * Provide services
    * Offer alternative community services
    * Reduce the risk of criminal socialization
    * Instill discipline
    * Improve school engagement
    * Reduce the cost of formal court proceedings

    Six components of diversion programs (why diversion programs might vary) (OJJDP 2017)

    * Points of contact
    * Setting
    * Structure
    * Target population
    * Types of intervention of delivered services
    * Formal and informal processing

    **Juvenile Justice System Improvement**

    Restorative justice is an approach based on the belief that delinquency impacts victims, communities, and delinquent youth themselves. By following the approach, youth are held accountable for their actions and are guided through a process to restore and amends for the loss and damage caused (OJJDP 2017).

    Recommendations (Lipsey et al, 2010)

    * Legislating evidence-based programming for youth services
    * Promoting pilot programs and providing limited funding, for developing evidence-based practices
    * Building a far-reaching administrative model and increasing system capacity for:
    1. Improved matching of specific treatment needs with effective services
    2. Targeting higher risk offenders
    3. Improving prevention, court, and correctional programs.
    * Improving cross-system coordination and collaboration
    * Addressing excessive confinement
    * Supporting evidence-based programming
    * Bringing together agencies and individuals that are part of the JJS to work on the system reform
    * Working with treatment providers

    **School Programs**

    The U.S. Departments of Justice and Education suggested five guiding principles for quality education programs in JDCs (Benner et al, 2016): Positive climate, community engagement, effective classroom practices, academic engagement, and coordinated transition supports

    Barriers to education the JJS-involved youth (Juveniles for Justice, 2015; National Juvenile Justice Network, 2016)

    * A lack of adequate work in the JJ facilities
    * A lack of adequate education in the JJ facilities (resources, staff, teachers)
    * Improper use of discipline in in the JJ facilities
    * Difficulties around transitioning back to school and issues around alternative schools
    * Difficulties around curricula alignment with state standards and transfer of the correctional educational records to the home schools after release

    Recommendations

    * Performing student assessments (Juveniles for Justice, 2015; Benner et al, 2016)
    * Aligning curriculum with state standards
    * Ensuring reenrollment
    * Arranging formal hearings before placement in alternative schools
    * Providing diverse educational options
    * Providing access to higher education credits
    * Providing classroom resources and work technology
    * Recruiting qualified teachers
    * Establishing rules and responses to classroom misbehavior
    * Increasing data collection on discipline
    * Promoting restorative practices
    * Arranging transition meetings
    * Promoting professional development
    * Tracking recidivism

    Suggested reforms (NJJN, 2016)

    * Facility reforms
    * Providing a safe climate that prioritizes education in facilities
    * Providing funding to support education for youth in long-term secure care facilities
    * Recruiting qualified education staff
    * Supporting college readiness programs
    * Supporting transition from child-serving systems into communities.
    * Re-entry reforms
    * Supporting inter-agency and community cooperation
    * Supporting youth and family involvement
    * Supporting speedy placement
    * Improving record transfer
    * Improving school reenrollment practices

    **Afterschool Programs**

    The afterschool programs and the programs for youth with academic challenges. These youths are more likely to struggle academically, struggle with learning disabilities and drop out of school (Calleja et al, 2016; Leone & Weinberg, 2010 in Calleja et al, 2016; Llamas & Chandler, 2017):

    Effective afterschool programs (OJJDP, 2010; Durlak and Weissberg 2007 in OJJDP, 2010)

    * Have an emphasis on social skills
    * Target specific skills
    * Are more structured
    * Are smaller in size and with options for one-on-one training/tutoring
    * Offer qualified staff
    * Have low attrition
    * Use evidence-based approaches
    * Use active forms of learning

    **Community-Based Programs and Services**

    [Community-based alternatives](http://www.modelsforchange.net/reform-areas/community-based-alternatives/index.html) are the local alternatives to incarceration (Models for Change, 2017a).

    Reform areas (NJJN, 2014; OJJDP, 2014)

    * Developing more community-based alternatives
    * Developing more community-focused programs

    **Learning and Other Disabilities**

    There are between 4 and 10 percent of the incarcerated population with intellectual disabilities (ID) in the US1 (Scheyett, Vaughn, Taylor, & Parish, 2008). Research shows that more than 50 percent of juvenile offenders show evidence of an ID (Katsiyannis et al, 2008). Research has also shown that the juvenile population with ID tends to be associated with more serious offenses and is at a higher risk of second- and third-time offending (Zhang et al. 2010). Certain groups of youths have higher likelihood to be diagnosed with a disability (i.e. black, Native American, and/or Latino; Low socioeconomic status (Quinn et al. 2005), etc.

    There are four general types of disabilities (OJJDP, 2017)

    * Intellectual
    * Developmental
    * Learning
    * Emotional

    Links to Delinquent Behavior (OJJDP, 2017)

    * Low Intellectual Functioning
    * Susceptibility to Delinquent Behavior
    * Differential Treatment
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