

2014 JAC Referral Data	
Total Referred (for Assessment)⊗	1059
RACE/ETHNICITY	Referred
White	523
American Indian or Alaskan Native	6
Black or African American	346
Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	19
Hispanic	162
Unknown/ "Other"/Mixed	2
Not Selected/ Not Answered	1
GENDER	Referred
Male	662
Female	397
AGE (age at the time of CA review)	Referred
10 (>11)	9
11	16
12	55
13	96
14	168
15	219
16	240
17	250
18	6

2015 JAC Referral Data	
Total Referred (for Assessment)⊗	1210
RACE/ETHNICITY	Referred
White	584
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7
Black or African American	407
Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	13
Hispanic	182
Unknown/ "Other"/Mixed	14
Not Selected/ Not Answered	3
GENDER	Referred
Male	679
Female	531
AGE (age at the time of CA review)	Referred
10 (>11)	23
11	10
12	46
13	104
14	165
15	232
16	305
17	306
18	19

2014 Youth Impact	
Youth Identified	177
Race/Ethnicity	
White	61
American Indian or Alaskan Native	10
Black or African American	71
Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3
Hispanic	22
Unknown/"Other"/Mixed	4
Not Selected/Not Answered	6
Gender	
Male	97
Female	80
Age At Time of Identification	
10 (>11)	8
11	6
12	7
13	28
14	32
15	34
16	33
17	22
18	7

2015 Youth Impact	
Youth Identified	185
Race/Ethnicity	
White	57
American Indian or Alaskan Native	5
Black or African American	96
Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1
Hispanic	23
Unknown/ "Other"/Mixed	1
Not Selected/ Not Answered	2
Gender	
Male	101
Female	84
Age at Time of Identification	
10 (>11)	8
11	4
12	14
13	28
14	31
15	32
16	43
17	22
18	3

- The Douglas County Attorney's Office referred 112 youth and/or families to the Douglas County Juvenile Assessment Center for various status related issues from April 1st through December 31st, 2015.
- The Douglas County Attorney's Office received 402 Truancy referrals from August 1st through December 31st, 2015. Youth reviewed and monitored from the end of the 2014-2015 school year (monitored through December 31st, 2015) = 106.

DOUGLAS COUNTY

4Q 2015 QRS DATA MEMO

JDAI Priority Areas: Warrants and DMC

FOURTH QUARTER RESULTS

1. **How Many Were Detained?** 166 youth were detained in the fourth quarter of 2015.
 - a. 80 of total youth detained for whom the RAI was administered (116) were considered low to medium risk according to the RAI, which means that 69% of the youth being detained are recommended to be served in the community instead of in detention.
2. **What Are The Reasons Youth Were Detained?** 16% for offenses (26/166), 78% for technical reasons (129/166) and 7% were post-adjudicated (11/166).
3. **How Long Were Youth Detained?** Young people were detained for an ALOS of 36 days.
4. **How Many Were Detained on a Warrant?** 38% of youth were detained on a warrant (63/166).
 - a. 79% of those youth detained on a warrant scored either low or medium risk on the RAI (50/63).
5. **What Are Our DMC Numbers?** 75% of youth admitted to detention in Q4 (125/166) were youth of color.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR THE SYSTEM?

- The majority of youth detained are low to medium risk youth.
- Most youth are detained for technical reasons; and of those technical reasons, warrants are the most common reason.
- Disproportionate minority contact in terms of youth detained remains high.

NOW WHAT?

Before solutions are implemented, more information is needed. Possible additional lines of inquiry for working groups include:

1. Explore how warrants are issued, for which reasons and which populations.
2. Explore the use of process mapping to understand DMC throughout the juvenile justice pipeline.
3. Examine the circumstances of youth who are being detained for technical reasons.
4. Explore recent trends in the administration of the RAI.