

An Assessment of Disproportionate Minority Contact in Mississippi's Juvenile Justice System

Sheena K. Gardner, Ph.D.
Andrew Tatch, M.S.

Social Science Research Center
Mississippi State University

February 2019

Key Findings

Eighty-one (81) counties reported juvenile court referrals to the Mississippi Youth Court Information Data System (MYCIDS) in 2018. There were 7,861 unique youth aged 10-17 entered into MYCIDS in 2018 and, because some individuals were referred to youth court more than once during the year and may have committed multiple offenses, the total number of cases was 9,970 with 12,030 offenses committed. All analyses were conducted at the case level and, in the event that a case had multiple associated offenses, the most serious offense was selected for inclusion.

Phase 1: Extent of Minority Over-representation in Mississippi

1. State-Level RRI

- a. The state-level RRI indicates that Black juveniles were more likely than White juveniles to be referred to youth court, placed in a secure juvenile detention facility pre-trial, placed in a secure juvenile correctional facility post-adjudication, and have their cases transferred to adult court. Black youth were also less likely than White youth to have their cases diverted.
- b. State-level RRI also indicate that Hispanic/Latino and Asian juveniles are less likely to be referred to youth court compared to White juveniles.
- c. Over the course of a three-year period between 2016 and 2018, the levels of DMC at three points of contact remained consistent – Black youth were more likely to be referred to juvenile court, more likely to be placed in pre-trial detention, and less likely to have their cases diverted compared to White youth. There were fluctuations across the three-year period at the five other points of contact. Continuing the trend set in 2016 and 2017 there was no significant difference in the rate in which cases were formally petitioned between Black and White youth. In 2016 and 2017, black youth more likely to have cases resulting in delinquent findings. In 2018, however, this difference was not significant. Over this three-year period, 2017 was the only year in which there were significant differences between Black and White youth with respect to probation placement; in this year, black youth were less likely to have cases resulting in probation placement than were white youth. Although there were no significant differences in 2016, in both 2017 and 2018, black youth were at greater risk than were white youth to have their cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities and were more likely to have cases transferred to adult court than compared to white youth.

2. County-Level RRI

- a. DMC was also assessed among nine county youth courts that handled 400 or more juveniles in 2018. In all nine counties, Black youth were referred to juvenile court at a disproportionately higher rate than White youth. Jackson and Lee counties had relative risk indexes (RRI) lower than or equal to the state level for juvenile referrals.
- b. With the exception of referrals, the nine youth courts varied in rates of DMC when comparing White youth to minority youth.

- i. Desoto County: referral to juvenile court, cases involving secure detention, cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities, and cases transferred to adult court (4 points of contact)
 - ii. Harrison County: referral to juvenile court, cases diverted, cases involving secure detention, cases petitioned, cases resulting in delinquent findings, cases resulting in probation placement, and cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities (7 points of contact)
 - iii. Hinds County: referral to court and cases diverted (2 points of contact)
 - iv. Jackson County: referral to juvenile court, cases diverted, cases involving secure detention, cases petitioned, and cases resulting in delinquent findings (5 points of contact)
 - v. Jones County: referral to juvenile court, cases involving secure detention, and cases resulting in delinquent findings (3 points of contact)
 - vi. Lauderdale County: refer to juvenile court, cases diverted, and cases petitioned (3 points of contact)
 - vii. Lee County: referral to juvenile court, cases involving secure detention, and cases petitioned (3 points of contact)
 - viii. Rankin County: referral to juvenile court (1 point of contact)
 - ix. Washington County: referral to juvenile court (1 point of contact)
3. While it is understandable that the limited number of youths placed in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities or transferred to youth court would affect the ability to calculate RRIs, there are still issues with the quality and completeness of the case processing information entered into MYCIDS for other points of contact. RRIs were not calculated at certain points of contact for the following counties:
- a. Desoto: cases transferred to adult court
 - b. Harrison: cases transferred to adult court
 - c. Hinds: cases resulting in delinquent findings, cases resulting in probation placement, cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities, and cases transferred to adult court
 - d. Jackson: cases resulting in probation placement, cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities, and cases transferred to adult court
 - e. Jones: cases transferred to adult court
 - f. Lauderdale: cases resulting in probation placement, cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities, and cases transferred to adult court
 - g. Lee: cases transferred to adult court
 - h. Rankin: cases resulting in probation placement, cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities, and cases transferred to adult court
 - i. Washington: cases resulting in delinquent findings, cases resulting in probation placement, cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities, and cases transferred to adult court
4. Regardless of the data issues noted above, the differences in DMC that were observed between the nine youth courts suggest that court-related and county-related factors may be influencing DMC in Mississippi.

1. Analyses were conducted at the bivariate and multivariate levels.
2. Bivariate Analyses
 - a. Results of bivariate analyses suggested that there were several points of contact in which Black and White youth were moved through the juvenile justice system at disproportionate rates.
 - i. Black youth were more likely than White youth to be:
 1. referred to youth court
 2. have cases petitioned
 3. held in confinement in a secure correctional facility
 - ii. Black youth were less likely than White youth to be:
 1. diverted
3. Multivariate Analyses
 - a. After controlling for offender characteristics (gender, age, offense severity, prior referrals, referral for contempt of court/VOP, and number of offenses per case) in multivariate analyses, race no longer predicted whether a case would be diverted, petitioned, or the youth would be held in a secure juvenile correctional facility.
 - b. Because the state does not maintain arrest records, multivariate analyses could not be used to determine if offender characteristics accounted for disproportionate rates of referral to youth court. This remains the only point of contact where disproportionality exists.

Table of Contents

Key Findings	2
Assessment Study Goals and Methods	6
Phase 1: Identification of DMC	6
Methods	7
Identifying the Population at Risk and Points of Contact	7
Calculating the Relative Rate Index	9
Study Findings	10
State-Level Relative Rate Indices	10
County-Level Relative Rate Indices.....	11
Phase 2: Assessment of DMC	12
Methods	12
Study Findings.....	14
Referral to Youth Court.....	14
Diversion	15
Petitioned/Filed Charges	16
Secure Pre-Adjudication/Trial Detention	17
Delinquent Findings	18
Probation.....	19
Confinement in Secure Correctional Facilities.....	20
Transfer to Adult Court	21
Conclusion.....	22
Appendices	23
Appendix A	24
Appendix B	27
Appendix C	28
Appendix D	31
Appendix E	34
Appendix F	40

Assessment Study Goals and Methods

The current study assesses disproportionate minority contact within Mississippi's juvenile justice system through three research questions:

1. To what extent are minorities over-represented in the Mississippi juvenile justice system?
2. Are there specific points of contact within the Mississippi juvenile justice system where differences in the processing of minority and White juveniles exist?
3. If disparities exist, can they be explained by characteristics of the juvenile or other legal factors?

The research questions are addressed in two phases. Phase 1 focuses on the first and second questions by comparing the frequency with which White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian juveniles, aged 10 to 17, encounter the various points of contact within the Mississippi juvenile justice system. The third research question examining why disparities exist are answered in Phase 2.

Phase 1: Identification of DMC

Phase 1 examines the extent to which minorities are over-represented in Mississippi's juvenile justice system. Eighty-one (81) counties reported juvenile court referrals to the Mississippi Youth Court Information Data System (MYCIDS) in 2018. There were 7,861 unique youth aged 10-17 entered into MYCIDS in 2018 and, because some individuals were referred to youth court more than once during the year and may have committed multiple offenses, the total number of cases was 9,970 with 12,030 offenses committed (see Appendix A).

In 2018, Black youth had the highest total number of referrals to youth court followed by White youth and youth grouped into the "Other" category – individuals who identified as Asian, Hispanic, Native American, or other (see Appendix B). In each racial category, youth were most often referred for status offenses (e.g., truancy and CHINS/runaway) while the second and third most common reason for referral varied by race. The second most common reason for referral among White youth was simple assault, while the third most common was drug offenses. Disorderly conduct and simple assault were the second and third most common reason for referral among Black youth. Among youth grouped into the "Other" category, drug offenses followed status offenses as the second most common reason for referral, while simple assault was the third most common reason for referral.

The types of offenses committed within each racial category also varied by sex. Status offenses were the most common reason for referrals for White males and females in 2018. For both white males and females, simple assault was the second most common reason for referral. The third most common reason for referral varied by sex. For White males, the next most common referral reason was for drug offenses, while White females were more likely to be referred for petit larceny. Among Black youth of both sexes, status offenses were the most commonly committed offenses. The second and third most common offenses among Black males were simple assault and disorderly conduct. Among Black females, disorderly conduct and simple assault were the second and third most common reason for referral. Among those grouped into the "Other" category, status offenses were the most commonly committed offenses for males and females.

For males, the second and third most common offenses were drug offenses and simple assault; for females, however, the next most common reasons for referral were disorderly conduct and domestic violence.

Methods

All analyses were conducted at the case level. In the event that a case had multiple associated offenses, the most serious offense was selected for inclusion. Using data entered into MYCIDS in 2018, we examined eight of the nine points of contact outlined by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP): (1) referral to juvenile court, (2) diversion, (3) pre-trial detention, (4) formal petition or filing of charges by the county prosecutor, (5) adjudication or finding that the child is delinquent, (6) probation, (7) confinement in secure correctional facilities, and (8) transfer of the case to adult court. According to OJJDP, the first point of contact, arrest, occurs when a law enforcement agency apprehends, stops, or otherwise contacts a youth suspected of having committed a delinquent act or criminal offense. In Mississippi, there is no centralized database for capturing juvenile arrests as defined by OJJDP. With the data we have available, we are only capable of reporting the number of juveniles referred to youth court.

Juveniles' age at the time of referral was calculated in years by subtracting the date of birth from the intake date. In accordance with OJJDP's DMC assessment guidelines, the analysis sample was restricted to juveniles 10 to 17 years of age leaving 12,030 eligible cases.

The racial categories used in MYCIDS are White, Black, American Indian, Asian, Other, and Unknown. Hispanic ethnicity is a separate variable within the system. We recoded the racial categories to include Hispanic as an option by grouping all individuals who identified with the ethnicity, regardless of what they marked as their race, in a new "Hispanic" racial category. In all, 199 cases in 2018 did not have a race/ethnicity reported. These cases were dropped from the analyses. The final sample size, which includes cases where the youth has a racial/ethnic designation and is between the ages of 10 and 17, is 11,831 for 2018 (see Appendix C for more details).

Identifying the Population at Risk and Points of Contact

Population at Risk: Youth aged 10 to 17 years are the population identified by the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) as at-risk for juvenile justice involvement. The racial distribution of youth aged 10 to 17 was obtained for each of Mississippi's counties using OJJDP's web-based analysis tool "Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 2017" (see Appendix D for more details). The total at-risk youth population for the state in 2018 was 328,751. White youth comprise about half the population (51.1%) and are followed by Black (43.3%), Hispanic (3.8%), Asian (1.1%), and American Indian (0.6%) youth (see Appendix D for more information).

Points of Contact: OJJDP has identified nine specific points of contact within the scope of the juvenile justice process. Definitions and the method for obtaining the number of youths for each of the points of contact are described below.

1. **Arrest:** Youth are considered to be arrested when law enforcement agencies apprehend, stop or otherwise contact them and suspect them of having committed a delinquent act or criminal offense. In Mississippi, there is no centralized database for capturing juvenile arrests. We are only able to gather information on juveniles who are referred to youth courts as captured by MYCIDS.
2. **Referral to Juvenile Court:** When a potentially delinquent youth is sent forward for legal processing, either as a result of law enforcement action or upon a complaint by a citizen or school, and has been entered into MYCIDS, he/she has been “referred” to juvenile court. Each child referred to court and entered into MYCIDS is assigned a unique child identification number (CHILD_ID), case number (UCID), and a referral identification number (REFERRAL_ID) for each delinquent act or offense. Because youth can be referred more than once during the year (i.e. have more than one case) or referred for multiple reasons (i.e. have multiple delinquent offenses associated with each case), we used the most serious offense for a particular case as the unit of analysis. The most serious offense was chosen over other options such as first appearance in the dataset because more serious offenses are less likely to be dismissed or diverted and more likely to be processed through the juvenile court system. Among cases that met criteria for inclusion, a total of 11,831 cases were referred to juvenile courts in 2018.
3. **Cases Diverted:** Youth referred to juvenile court are screened by intake officers to determine if the case should be (1) dismissed, (2) resolved informally without filing formal charges, or (3) handled formally through the filing of a petition. Details of how a case was handled at intake are captured by the variable ORDER_OF_THE_COURT in the MYCIDS database. Cases in which “informal adjustment” (coded 2), “take no action” (coded 3), “child warned or counseled informally” (coded 5), “MDHS Monitor Child or Family Informally” (coded 6), “Parents Warned or Counseled” (coded 8), or “MDCPS to monitor child or family informally” (coded 10) are counted as a diversion. Of those referred, 4,558 were diverted in 2018 (38.5%).
4. **Cases Involving Secure Detention:** This category refers to youth who were held in pre-trial detention. Youth who appeared at a detention hearing (HEARING_TYPE=2) *prior* to attending an adjudication hearing (HEARING_TYPE=1) were flagged as having been detained prior to trial. In 2018, 2,887 cases (24.4%) referred to juvenile court were held in pre-trial detention.
5. **Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed):** Formally charged (petitioned) delinquency cases are those that appear on a court calendar in response to the filing of a petition, complaint, or other legal instrument requesting the court to (1) adjudicate a youth as a delinquent or status offender or (2) waive jurisdiction and transfer a youth to criminal court. Cases in which a “formal petition” is ordered (ORDER_OF_THE_COURT=1) or the case is “referred to prosecutor for formal proceedings” (ORDER_OF_THE_COURT=11) are categorized as petitioned cases. Of the cases referred to juvenile court in 2018, 6,132 (51.8%) had a formal petition filed.
6. **Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings:** When a case is brought forward by the filing of a formal petition, an adjudicatory hearing is held. The judge may dismiss the case, find the child delinquent, find the child not delinquent, or issue another disposition

(HEARING_ACTION_TYPE). In the juvenile justice system being found delinquent is analogous to being found guilty in the adult criminal justice system. Cases were counted as having a delinquent finding if a formal petition was filed (ORDER_OF_THE_COURT=1), an adjudication hearing was held (HEARING_TYPE=1), and the youth was found to be either a child in need of supervision (HEARING_ACTION_TYPE=5) or a delinquent child (HEARING_ACTION_TYPE=6). Of the youth formally petitioned in 2018, 2,387 (38.9%) were found to be delinquent.

7. **Cases Resulting in Probation Placement:** Youth placed on formal or court-ordered supervision following a youth court disposition hearing have been placed on probation. Once a child is found to be a child in need of supervision (CHINS) or delinquent, a disposition hearing is held (HEARING_TYPE=3). A final disposition (HEARING_ACTION_TYPE) ordering entrance into an intensive supervision program (HEARING_ACTION_TYPE=13) or other supervision agreement (coded 53, 118, and 141) or requiring youth to serve probation (71, 110, 120, and 165) are all counted as cases in which an individual was placed on formal probation. Of the cases in which youth were found delinquent, 2,144 (89.8%) were placed on formal probation.
8. **Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Correctional Facilities:** Cases involving confinement include those in which youth placed in secure residential or correctional facilities (i.e., adult jails and lockups, juvenile detention centers, or correctional facilities) following a court disposition. Youth who had a disposition hearing (HEARING_TYPE=3) **and** were either transferred to a private correctional program (HEARING_ACTION_TYPE=46), a training school or youth development center (HEARING_ACTION_TYPE=48, 81, 82, and 172), a public correctional facility (HEARING_ACTION_TYPE=47), detention (HEARING_ACTION_TYPE=3, 80, and 92), or ordered to serve weekend detention (HEARING_ACTION_TYPE=116). Of the cases in which youth were found delinquent, the number who received a post-adjudication disposition of confinement was 640 (26.8%) in 2018.
9. **Cases Transferred to Adult Court:** Waived cases are those in which a youth is transferred to criminal court as a result of a judicial finding in juvenile court. Both a special transfer hearing must be conducted (HEARING_TYPE=6) **and** the juvenile court finding must be to transfer the youth (HEARING_ACTION_TYPE=45, 50, and 117) before the individual can be transferred to adult court. Of the cases formally petitioned, 39 (0.6%) youth were transferred to the adult system in 2018.

Calculating the Relative Rate Index

The Relative Rate Index (RRI) was developed by the OJJDP and is used to assess whether the degree to which minority youth are moved through the juvenile justice system is disproportionately higher than White youth. The OJJDP suggests rates be calculated by dividing a count of individuals at a particular contact point (numerator) by a population measure from the preceding stage (denominator). The OJJDP offers the following outline:

1. juvenile court referrals are the denominator for cases involving secure detention
2. juvenile court referrals are the denominator for cases diverted
3. juvenile court referrals are the denominator for cases petitioned
4. cases petitioned are the denominator for cases resulting in delinquent findings

5. cases resulting in delinquent findings are the denominator for cases resulting in probation placement
6. cases resulting in delinquent findings are the denominator for cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities
7. cases petitioned are the denominator for waivers

At each point of contact an RRI can be calculated by dividing the rate of contact for the minority group by the rate of contact for White youth (see Appendix E for raw data). An RRI of 1.00 indicates that the level or rate of contact is the same for the minority and White groups. An RRI above 1.00 indicates that the rate of contact is higher (i.e. minority youth are over-represented) for the minority group relative to the white group. ***While a high RRI for a particular racial group at a specific decision point does not necessarily mean disparities exist in decision-making, it does, however, suggest that a problem may exist and that further research is needed.***

The extent to which minority youth are over-represented in the Mississippi juvenile justice system is presented in Appendix F for the state as a whole as well as the counties that handled cases for 400 or more unique individuals. The table reports two pieces of information: (1) a percentage breakdown of White, Black, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian youth population and (2) the RRI of those minority groups in comparison to Whites at each point of contact within the juvenile justice system. RRIs are only calculated for racial groups that make up at least 1% of the total population – those with less than 1% are marked by a single asterisk (*). Statewide, White youth comprise 50.9% and Black youth 43.3% of the youth population at risk between 10 and 17 years of age. Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and American Indian youth make up a much smaller portion of the youth population coming in at 1.2%, 4.0%, and 0.7% respectively (see Appendix D). Because of the low number of Asian, Hispanic/Latino, and American Indian youth relative to Whites, RRIs for these racial/ethnic groups should be interpreted with caution. In addition, RRIs are tested for statistical significance – they appear in bolded, red font in the tables (see Appendix F).

Study Findings

State-Level Relative Risk Indices

In 2018 (see Appendix F), Black juveniles were more likely than White juveniles to be referred to juvenile court (2.17), be placed in pre-trial detention (1.10), have cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities (1.23), and have their cases transferred to adult court (1.59). Black juveniles were less likely to have their cases diverted (0.94) than their White counterparts. RRIs were also computed for Hispanic/Latino and Asian youth. Hispanic/Latino juveniles were less likely to be referred to juvenile court (0.73) than were white juveniles. Because of their relatively small population, an RRI could only be calculated for Asian youth at the point of referral to court. Compared to White youth, Asian youth were less likely to be referred to juvenile court (0.25).

Over the course of a three-year period between 2016 and 2018, the presence of DMC among Black youth relative to White youth remained consistent at three points of contact (see Table 1).

Over this period, Black youth remained more likely to be referred to juvenile court, more likely to be placed in pre-trial detention, and less likely to have their case diverted. There were fluctuations across the three-year period at the five other points of contact. Continuing the trend set in 2016 and 2017 there was no significant difference in the rate in which cases were formally petitioned between Black and White youth. In 2016 and 2017, black youth more likely to have cases resulting in delinquent findings. In 2018, however, this difference was not significant. Over this three-year period, 2017 was the only year in which there were significant differences between Black and White youth with respect to probation placement; in this year, black youth were less likely to have cases resulting in probation placement than were white youth. For cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities, 2016 was the sole year across the three-year span in which there were no significant differences. In both 2017 and 2018, black youth were at greater risk than were white youth to have their cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities. Contrary to 2016, when there were no differences between Black and White youth, Black youth were more likely to have cases transferred to adult court than were white youth in both 2017 and 2018.

Table 1. RRIs for Black Youth Relative to White Youth, 2016 -2018

	2016	2017	2018
Refer to Juvenile Court	2.17	2.14	2.17
Cases Diverted	0.88	0.90	0.94
Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.20	1.18	1.10
Cases Petitioned	1.02	1.03	1.03
Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.13	1.10	1.04
Cases resulting in Probation Placement	0.99	0.91	0.96
Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	1.04	1.12	1.23
Cases Transferred to Adult Court	1.23	1.61	1.59

Statistically significant results:

Bold font

Results that are not statistically significant

Regular font

County-Level Relative Risk Indices

RRIs were calculated for courts that handled cases for 400 or more unique individuals in 2018. These courts include Desoto, Harrison, Hinds, Jackson, Jones, Lauderdale, Lee, Rankin, and Washington counties. With the exception of juvenile court referrals – all courts referred Black youth at a higher rate than White youth – the selected youth courts varied along the other points of contact both in comparison to one another and to the state as a whole (see Appendix F for more information).

Referral to Youth Court: Taking population proportions into consideration, we find a statistically significant difference in the rate at which Black youth were referred to juvenile court compared to their White counterparts. Black youth were referred at a disproportionately higher rate than White youth in all of the selected youth courts. In 2018, the Rankin County youth court had the lowest RRI at 1.24. In addition to Rankin County, Jackson (1.96) and Lee (2.11) counties had

rates that were less than or equal to the state level of 2.17. Hinds (3.58) had the highest RRI. Desoto (2.83), Harrison (2.51), Jones (3.27), Washington (3.33) and Lauderdale (3.30) counties had rates above the state level of 2.14. Only two counties had statistically significant differences at the point of referral between White youth and Hispanic/Latino youth; in both Jackson (0.39) and Rankin (0.60) counties, Hispanic/Latino youth were less likely to be referred to youth court than were white youth. There were no statistically significant differences at the point of referral between white youth and Asian youth at the county level.

Diversion: Four courts, Harrison County, Hinds County, Lauderdale County, and Jackson County, had significant disproportionality at this point of contact. In Harrison County (0.74) and Lauderdale County (0.59), similarly to the state as a whole, Black youth were less likely to be diverted than White youth. In both Hinds (1.39) and Jackson County (1.36), Black juveniles were more likely to have a case diverted than White juveniles. There were no statistically significant differences in diversion in Desoto, Jones, Lee, Washington, and Rankin counties.

Detention: Five counties showed evidence of disproportionality. In Harrison County (RRI of 1.55), Desoto County (RRI of 2.08), Lee County (RRI of 1.28), Black youth were more likely to be held in pre-trial detention than White youth. On the other hand, Black youth in Jackson (0.61) and Jones County (0.74) were less likely to be held in pre-trial detention compared to White youth. There were no statistically significant differences in pre-trial detention in Hinds, Lauderdale, Rankin, or Washington Counties.

Petitioned/Filed Charges: Four counties had disproportionality at the point of contact for petition. In Harrison (RRI of 1.36) and Lauderdale (RRI of 1.79) counties, Black youth were more likely to have their cases formally petitioned compared to White youth. There were two counties where there were Black youth were less likely to be petitioned than White youth at a statistically significant level (Jackson County: RRI of 0.57 and Lee County: RRI of 0.68). There were no statistically significant differences in pre-trial detention in Desoto, Hinds, Jones, Rankin, and Washington counties. In addition to differences in cases petitioned (charge filed) between black and white youth, Hispanic/ Latino youth were at less risk in Harrison County (RRI of 0.44) than were white youth.

Delinquent Findings: There were statistically significant differences in delinquent findings in four counties. In Desoto (RRI of 1.19) and Harrison (RRI of 1.33) counties, black youth were more likely to have their cases resulting in delinquent findings. In Jackson (RRI of 0.52) and Jones (0.75) counties, black youth were less likely to their cases resulting in delinquent findings than were white youth. There were no significant differences in Lauderdale, Lee, or Rankin County. Hinds and Washington Counties did not have enough cases to calculate a reliable RRI.

Probation: There was only one county in which there was a statistically significant difference in the rate at which Black and White youth are placed on probation. In Harrison County, black youth were at greater risk of having their cases result in probation placement than were white youth (RRI of 1.65). There were no statistically significant differences in three counties: Desoto, Jones, and Lee. Hinds, Jackson, Lauderdale, Rankin, and Washington counties did not have enough cases to calculate a reliable RRI.

Confinement in Secure Correctional Facilities: Among those counties that had enough juveniles ordered to confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities (Harrison, RRI of 0.58), Black youth were less likely to experience confinement in secure juvenile facilities relative to White youth. There were no statistically significant differences in delinquent findings in three counties: Desoto, Jones, and Lee. Hinds, Jackson, Lauderdale, Rankin, and Washington counties did not have enough cases to calculate a reliable RRI.

Transfer to Adult Court: There were not enough cases in any of the counties to calculate a reliable RRI.

Phase 2: Assessment of DMC

The preceding section of the report revealed that at the state and county levels there is disproportionate contact for Black juveniles at several points of contact in 2018. In the second phase of this study, we analyze MYCIDS data to answer the following question: If there are observed differences, do the racial disparities remain when controlling offender characteristics and other legal factors?

Methods

At each point of contact, we charted the percent breakdown of various offenses committed by White and Black juveniles. We also used logistic regression to determine whether differences attributed to race/ethnicity remain when controlling for legal and extra-legal factors. The following factors were included in analyses based on a review of the literature and on the availability of measures:

1. **Age** is a continuous variable measured in years that is calculated using birth date and intake date.
2. **Gender** is a dichotomous variable coded “0” for females (reference category) and “1” for males.
3. **Race** is a dichotomous variable coded “0” for White (reference category) and “1” for Black.
4. **Contempt of Court** is a dichotomous variable code “1” if the offense was either a contempt of court or probation/parole violation (VOP) and “0” if there was another reason for referral. It is not possible in MYCIDS to determine the severity of the original crime for which a juvenile was ordered to serve probation. This factor is included because violations of court order and VOP result in the juvenile being referred back to the court and may lead to an increase in sanctions and/or further processing into the juvenile justice system.
5. **Severity Score** is an ordinal variable representing categorization of offenses according to their severity on a five-point scale item: status (coded 0), minor (coded 1), moderate (coded 2), serious (coded 3) and, very serious (coded 4). The offense severity ranking system was developed by the Juvenile Classification Task Force (Robertson & Dunaway, 1998).
6. **Prior Referral** is a dichotomous variable coded “1” if the individual had a referral in the previous calendar year and “0” if the individual did not have a referral in the previous year.
7. The **Offenses per Case** is a count of all the total number of offenses that are associated with a particular case.

Descriptive statistics for the variables are located in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Assessment Variables, 2018

	White		Black	
	N	%	N	%
Gender				
Female	1,402	34.8%	2,475	33.4%
Male	2,626	65.2%	4,925	66.6%
Total	4,028	100.0%	7,400	100.0%
Age				
Mean	15.09		15.03	
Crime Severity				
Status	1,124	28.5%	1,437	19.7%
Minor	141	3.6%	155	2.1%
Moderate	1,580	40.0%	3,570	49.0%
Serious	1,035	26.2%	1,995	27.4%
Very Serious	68	1.7%	131	1.8%
Total	3,948	100.0%	7,288	100.0%
Contempt of Court				
Yes	237	5.9%	349	4.7%
Prior Arrest in 2017				
Yes	1,026	25.4%	2,441	32.9%
Offenses Per Case				
Mean	1.36		1.39	
Range	1 - 20		1 - 24	

Study Findings

Referral to Youth Court

Bivariate analyses identified significant differences in referrals to youth court between Black and White youth among four of the six independent variables in 2018 (see Table 3). Black youth referred to youth court were more likely to have committed an offense in the prior year compared to White youth. Black youth also had significantly higher severity scores (1.90) relative to White youth (1.70). Compared to Black youth, Whites had a higher average age. There were no statistically significant differences between Black and White youth with respect to the number of offenses per sex and mean number of offenses per case.

Table 3. Race-Based Differences in Referrals, 2018

	White	Black
Prior Referral		
No	74.6%	67.1%
Yes	25.4%	32.9%
Sex		
Male	65.2%	66.6%
Female	34.8%	33.4%
Contempt Status		
Not in Contempt	94.1%	95.3%
Held in Contempt	5.9%	4.7%
Mean Severity Score	1.70	1.90
Mean # of Offenses per Case	1.36	1.39
Mean Age	15.09	15.03

Bold Font: Statistically significant

Diversion

Bivariate analyses of cases in 2018 showed a significant relationship between the majority of predictor variables and diversion (see Table 4). Black youth (37.7%), males (34.8%), individuals held in contempt (22.5%), and individuals with prior offenses in 2017 (29.2%) were less likely to be diverted. A higher number of offenses per case (1.52) and more severe offenses (1.95) were also associated with a lower likelihood of being diverted. At the bivariate level, age was not a significant predictor of diversion. When controlling for offender characteristics and legal factors in a multivariate logistic regression, age remained and race became an insignificant predictor of diversion. All other variables remained statistically significant predictors of diversion.

Table 4. Differences in Rates of Diversion, 2018

	Bivariate		Multivariate
	Not Diverted	Diverted	Sig.
Prior Referral			0.000
No Priors	57.5%	42.5%	
Priors	70.8%	29.2%	
Sex			0.000
Female	54.0%	46.0%	
Male	65.2%	34.8%	
Contempt Status			0.000
Not Held in Contempt	60.6%	39.4%	
Held in Contempt	77.5%	22.5%	
Race			0.266
White	59.7%	40.3%	
Black	62.3%	37.7%	
Mean Number of Offenses Per Case	1.52	1.16	0.000
Mean Age	15.05	15.03	0.700
Mean Severity Score	1.95	1.60	0.000

Bold Font: Statistically significant

Petitioned/Filed Charges

Bivariate analyses of cases in 2018 showed a significant relationship between several of the predictor variables and rates of formal petition (see Table 5). Males (55.9%), individuals held in contempt (70.8%), and individuals with prior offenses (61.6%) were more likely to be formally petitioned. Those with a higher number of offenses committed per case (1.56) and those with higher severity scores (1.95) were more likely to be formally petitioned. Race and age were not significant determinants. When controlling for offender characteristics and legal factors, the significance changed for two variables. At the multivariate level, age became a significant predictor of whether a case was formally petitioned while the mean number of offenses became an insignificant predictor.

Table 5. Differences in Rates of Formal Petitioning, 2018

	Bivariate		Multivariate
	Not Petitioned	Formally Petitioned	Sig.
Prior Referral			0.000
No Priors	52.5%	47.5%	
Priors	38.4%	61.6%	
Sex			0.000
Female	56.6%	43.4%	
Male	44.1%	55.9%	
Contempt Status			0.000
Not Held in Contempt	49.3%	50.7%	
Held in Contempt	29.2%	70.8%	
Race			0.797
White	49.2%	50.8%	
Black	47.7%	52.3%	
Mean Number of Offenses Per Case	1.17	1.56	0.288
Mean Age	15.02	15.06	0.000
Mean Severity Score	1.67	1.95	0.000

Bold Font: Statistically significant

Secure Pre-Adjudication/Trial Detention

Bivariate analyses of cases in 2018 showed a significant relationship between each predictor variable and pretrial detention (see Table 6). Black youth (25.3%), males (26.3%), individuals held in contempt (38.1%), and individuals with prior offenses in 2017 (33.9%) were more likely to be held in pretrial detention. Older individuals (15.90), those with a higher number of offenses committed per case (1.63), and those with higher severity scores (2.36) were more likely to be held in pretrial detention. When analyzed using multivariate logistic regression, three of the predictors – prior referral, number of offenses per case, and severity score – remained a statistically significant indicator of whether a youth was held in pretrial detention.

Table 6. Differences in Rates of Secure Pre-Adjudication/Pretrial Detention, 2018

	Bivariate		Multivariate
	Not Held in Pretrial Detention	Held in Pretrial Detention	Sig.
Prior Referral			0.000
No Priors	79.7%	20.3%	
Priors	66.1%	33.9%	
Sex			0.871
Female	79.7%	20.3%	
Male	73.5%	26.5%	
Contempt Status			0.264
Not Held in Contempt	76.4%	23.6%	
Held in Contempt	61.9%	38.1%	
Race			0.859
White	77.0%	23.0%	
Black	74.7%	25.3%	
Mean Number of Offenses Per Case	1.29	1.63	0.000
Mean Age	14.99	15.90	0.104
Mean Severity Score	1.64	2.36	0.000

Bold Font: Statistically significant

Delinquent Findings

With the exception of one variable, bivariate analyses of cases in 2018 showed significant relationships between the predictor variables and whether a youth was found delinquent (see Table 7). Males (44.3%), older individuals (15.15), individuals held in contempt (50%), and individuals with prior offenses (49.1%) were more likely to be found delinquent. Those with higher severity scores (2.47) and a higher number of offenses per case (1.88) were also more likely to be found delinquent. Race was not a significant predictor. Multivariate logistic regression analysis reveals that prior offenses in 2017, mean number of offenses per case, and mean severity score remained significant factors in predicting whether a juvenile is found delinquent when controlling for offender characteristics and other legal factors. Age, contempt status, and sex – significant factors at the bivariate level – were not significant predictors of delinquent findings at the multivariate level.

Table 7. Differences in Rates of Delinquent Findings, 2018

	Bivariate		Multivariate
	Not Delinquent	Delinquent	Sig.
Prior Referral			0.000
No Priors	62.1%	37.9%	
Priors	50.9%	49.1%	
Sex			0.101
Female	63.6%	36.4%	
Male	55.7%	44.3%	
Contempt Status			0.505
Not Held in Contempt	58.7%	41.3%	
Held in Contempt	50.0%	50.0%	
Race			0.079
White	58.8%	41.2%	
Black	57.5%	42.5%	
Mean Number of Offenses Per Case	1.37	1.88	0.000
Mean Age	14.98	15.15	0.357
Mean Severity Score	1.58	2.47	0.000

Bold Font: Statistically significant

Probation

Bivariate analyses of cases in 2018 showed a significant relationship between two predictor variables and placement on probation (see Table 8). Those with a higher number of offenses per case (1.77), and those with a higher severity score (2.17) were more likely to be placed on probation. Following the multivariate logistic regression analysis, prior referrals became a significant predictor while mean number of offenses per case was no longer a predictor of probation placement.

Table 8. Differences in Rates of Probation, 2018

	Bivariate		Multivariate
	Not Placed on Probation	Placed on Probation	Sig.
Prior Referral			0.001
No Priors	32.9%	67.1%	
Priors	35.6%	64.4%	
Sex			0.665
Female	35.8%	64.2%	
Male	33.1%	66.9%	
Contempt Status			0.135
Not Held in Contempt	33.8%	66.2%	
Held in Contempt	35.7%	64.3%	
Race			0.273
White	35.8%	64.2%	
Black	32.6%	67.4%	
Mean Number of Offenses Per Case	1.56	1.77	0.375
Mean Age	15.08	15.07	0.167
Mean Severity Score	1.69	2.17	0.000

Bold Font: Statistically significant

Confinement in Secure Correctional Facilities

Bivariate analyses of cases in 2018 showed a significant relationship between all of the predictor variables and placement in a secure correctional facility (see Table 9). Black youth (21.8%), males (21.8%), individuals held in contempt (41.4%), and individuals with prior offenses (31.0%) were more likely to be held in post-adjudication detention. Older youth (15.30), those with a higher number of offenses committed per case (2.41), and those with higher severity scores (2.65) were more likely to be placed in post-disposition detention. Multivariate logistic regression analysis reveals that, with the exception of sex, race, and age, all of the variables remained significant factors in determining whether a juvenile was placed in confinement in a secure correctional facility.

Table 9. Differences in Rates of Confinement in Secure Correctional Facilities, 2018

	Bivariate		Multivariate
	Not Placed on Probation	Placed on Probation	Sig.
Prior Referral			0.000
No Priors	87.2%	12.8%	
Priors	69.0%	31.0%	
Sex			0.380
Female	85.7%	14.3%	
Male	78.2%	21.8%	
Contempt Status			0.000
Not Held in Contempt	82.1%	17.9%	
Held in Contempt	58.6%	41.4%	
Race			0.099
White	83.7%	16.3%	
Black	78.2%	21.8%	
Mean Number of Offenses Per Case	1.53	2.41	0.000
Mean Age	15.02	15.30	0.121
Mean Severity Score	1.85	2.65	0.000

Bold Font: Statistically significant

Transfer to Adult Court

Bivariate analyses of cases in 2018 showed a significant relationship between several predictor variables and certification to adult court (see Table 10). Males (0.5%), older individuals (16.5), and individuals with prior offenses (0.9%) were more likely to be certified to adult court. Those with a higher number of offenses committed per case (2.65) and those with higher severity scores (3.00) were more likely to be certified to adult court. Contempt of court status and race were not significant predictors at the bivariate level. Multivariate logistic regression analysis reveals the same results as the bivariate analysis.

Table 10. Differences in Rates of Certification, 2018

	Bivariate		Multivariate
	Not Certified	Certified	Sig.
Prior Referral			0.000
No Priors	99.9%	0.1%	
Priors	99.1%	0.9%	
Sex			0.045
Female	100.0%	0.1%	
Male	99.5%	0.5%	
Contempt Status			0.205
Not Held in Contempt	99.7%	0.3%	
Held in Contempt	99.8%	0.2%	
Race			0.464
White	99.8%	0.2%	
Black	99.6%	0.4%	
Mean Number of Offenses Per Case	1.37	2.65	0.001
Mean Age	15.04	16.50	0.000
Mean Severity Score	1.81	3.00	0.000

Bold Font: Statistically significant

Conclusion

The second phase of this report used MYCIDS data to answer the following question: If there are observed differences, do the racial disparities remain when controlling for offender characteristics and other legal factors?

Bivariate analyses suggest that there were several points of contact in which Black and White youth were moved through the juvenile justice system at disproportionate rates. Black youth were more likely to be referred to youth court, less likely to be diverted, more likely to be held in pretrial detention, and more likely to be held in confinement in a secure correctional facility.

When we controlled for offender characteristics (gender, age, race, offense severity, prior referrals, referral for contempt of court, and number of offenses per case), we found that race was not a significant factor at any of the points of contact following referral to court. While this finding indicates that youth are being processed through the juvenile justice system in an equitable manner, Black youth are still entering the system at a disproportionately higher rate.

Efforts should be made to understand who is referring youth (e.g. police, family, school officials) and research and implement effective policies and/or procedures to reduce disproportionality at this point of contact.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Total Youth Court Referrals by County

	2017			2018		
	Youth	Cases	Referrals	Youth	Cases	Referrals
Adams	166	232	355	109	137	170
Alcorn	58	69	122	51	55	77
Amite	11	15	20	23	24	24
Attala	48	67	103	35	39	49
Benton	25	27	27	22	24	25
Bolivar	126	197	249	97	118	132
Calhoun	25	29	37	13	14	19
Carroll	20	26	35	3	4	9
Chickasaw	40	49	92	34	37	40
Choctaw	12	12	15	2	2	2
Claiborne	40	52	73	13	14	21
Clarke	15	15	24	11	11	16
Clay	39	40	47	40	42	50
Coahoma	150	198	236	93	130	134
Copiah	108	138	164	91	119	123
Covington	61	70	72	56	76	79
Desoto	872	1,011	1,738	721	830	1,161
Forrest	193	278	341	150	227	263
Franklin	34	37	45	16	22	26
George	41	47	66	47	74	77
Greene	9	14	32	2	2	5
Grenada	94	123	194	56	79	107
Hancock	186	234	276	113	136	152
Harrison	731	1,008	1,589	502	619	832
Hinds	603	766	904	428	521	572
Holmes	59	83	117	41	52	67
Humphreys	20	31	32	25	31	32
Issaquena	2	2	3	0	0	0
Itawamba	64	83	94	59	76	90
Jackson	392	555	772	293	438	507
Jasper	26	39	43	34	40	43
Jefferson	31	39	46	34	38	40
Jefferson Davis	10	16	17	17	20	20
Jones	323	458	637	260	348	472
Kemper	0	0	0	1	4	4
Lafayette	107	130	169	66	71	96
Lamar	252	319	454	154	185	230
Lauderdale	280	400	620	241	339	428

	2017			2018		
	Youth	Cases	Referrals	Youth	Cases	Referrals
Lawrence	28	37	42	27	37	44
Leake	16	21	30	21	26	29
Lee	576	765	1,141	422	509	623
Leflore	160	235	278	111	139	154
Lincoln	73	88	103	67	84	87
Lowndes	186	215	270	169	189	215
Madison	218	266	300	146	177	212
Marion	77	106	142	57	77	96
Marshall	108	128	162	91	102	118
Monroe	52	72	88	40	54	65
Montgomery	43	58	77	43	53	63
Neshoba	103	113	145	84	92	110
Newton	46	58	83	52	61	71
Noxubee	13	17	17	1	1	1
Oktibbeha	32	45	83	29	36	40
Panola	113	125	189	83	87	116
Pearl River	133	160	431	124	139	162
Perry	24	27	33	26	33	40
Pike	200	273	356	205	287	339
Pontotoc	90	103	111	78	85	102
Prentiss	72	92	138	42	56	68
Quitman	19	23	32	20	35	39
Rankin	641	898	1,052	572	802	869
Scott	75	95	150	62	74	96
Sharkey	15	18	19	12	33	38
Simpson	81	93	101	69	79	79
Smith	36	38	39	29	35	35
Stone	28	35	52	25	28	29
Sunflower	114	155	205	92	138	181
Tallahatchie	30	36	41	35	46	59
Tate	76	90	116	73	81	115
Tippah	56	62	79	37	40	50
Tishomingo	46	52	66	62	69	82
Tunica	103	159	191	90	116	142
Union	43	45	49	44	47	58
Walthall	70	88	103	59	68	82
Warren	322	452	507	248	309	343
Washington	365	651	803	274	440	537
Wayne	54	59	104	37	42	53

	2017			2018		
	Youth	Cases	Referrals	Youth	Cases	Referrals
Webster	15	17	23	10	13	14
Wilkinson	42	54	78	19	21	25
Winston	35	46	59	32	37	48
Yalobusha	24	31	51	17	18	21
Yazoo	111	136	205	72	77	86
The Municipality of Pearl	112	184	210			
Total	10,037	13,246	18,204	7,861	9,970	12,030

* All Data entered into MYCIDS in 2017 and 2018

Appendix B

Number and Reason for Referral to Youth Court by Race and Gender, 2018

	N	Avg. Referrals per Case (SD)	Range	Top 3 Reasons for Referral	%
White	3,948	1.36 (0.935)	1 - 20	CHINS/Run Away	28.5%
				Simple Assault	9.5%
				Drug Offenses	8.8%
Male	2,571	1.42 (1.051)	1 - 20	CHINS/Run Away	22.8%
				Simple Assault	9.8%
				Drug Offenses	9.3%
Female	1,371	1.24 (0.634)	1 - 8	CHINS/Run Away	39.2%
				Simple Assault	9.0%
				Petit Larceny	9.0%
Black	7,288	1.39 (1.050)	1 - 24	CHINS/Run Away	19.7%
				Disorderly Conduct	14.4%
				Simple Assault	14.4%
Male	4,834	1.43 (1.154)	1 - 24	CHINS/Run Away	15.7%
				Simple Assault	13.2%
				Disorderly Conduct	11.9%
Female	2,428	1.31 (0.805)	1 - 15	CHINS/Run Away	27.5%
				Disorderly Conduct	19.4%
				Simple Assault	16.8%
Other	364	1.40 (0.980)	1 - 9	CHINS/Run Away	31.9%
				Drug Offenses	10.2%
				Simple Assault	9.3%
Male	258	1.48 (1.151)	1 - 9	CHINS/Run Away	27.9%
				Drug Offenses	10.5%
				Simple Assault	10.1%
Female	105	1.21 (0.567)	1 - 4	CHINS/Run Away	41.9%
				Disorderly Conduct	13.3%
				Domestic Violence	9.5%

Appendix C

Race of Youth Court Cases by County, 2018

	White	Black	American Indian	Asian	Other	Hispanic	Subtotal	Missing	Total
Adams	27	139	0	0	4	0	170	0	170
Alcorn	52	24	0	0	1	0	77	0	77
Amite	14	10	0	0	0	0	24	0	24
Attala	9	40	0	0	0	0	49	0	49
Benton	10	11	0	0	0	2	23	2	25
Bolivar	3	127	0	0	1	0	131	1	132
Calhoun	10	7	0	0	0	2	19	0	19
Carroll	4	5	0	0	0	0	9	0	9
Chickasaw	12	20	0	0	0	4	36	4	40
Choctaw	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Claiborne	0	21	0	0	0	0	21	0	21
Clarke	10	5	0	0	1	0	16	0	16
Clay	2	42	0	0	0	0	44	6	50
Coahoma	5	128	0	0	0	1	134	0	134
Copiah	24	85	0	0	0	8	117	6	123
Covington	22	51	0	0	0	0	73	6	79
Desoto	423	679	0	3	10	39	1154	7	1161
Forrest	49	199	0	2	2	1	253	10	263
Franklin	7	10	0	0	0	0	17	9	26
George	51	18	0	0	1	0	70	7	77
Greene	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	5
Grenada	24	81	0	0	1	0	106	1	107
Hancock	116	18	1	0	5	2	142	10	152
Harrison	324	472	0	2	3	31	832	0	832
Hinds	31	532	0	0	3	2	568	4	572
Holmes	1	66	0	0	0	0	67	0	67
Humphreys	0	30	0	0	0	0	30	2	32
Itawamba	79	10	0	0	0	0	89	1	90
Jackson	276	214	0	2	0	15	507	0	507
Jasper	17	24	0	0	0	1	42	1	43
Jefferson	0	40	0	0	0	0	40	0	40
Jefferson Davis	7	9	0	0	0	0	16	4	20
Jones	150	292	1	0	6	19	468	4	472
Kemper	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Lafayette	33	54	1	0	0	8	96	0	96
Lamar	91	126	2	1	1	5	226	4	230
Lauderdale	90	331	0	0	4	0	425	3	428

	White	Black	American Indian	Asian	Other	Hispanic	Subtotal	Missing	Total
Lawrence	27	17	0	0	0	0	44	0	44
Leake	6	19	1	0	1	0	27	2	29
Lee	268	333	2	3	2	13	621	2	623
Leflore	19	132	0	0	1	2	154	0	154
Lincoln	35	52	0	0	0	0	87	0	87
Lowndes	55	157	0	0	1	0	213	2	215
Madison	58	143	0	0	3	7	211	1	212
Marion	53	42	0	0	1	0	96	0	96
Marshall	37	70	0	0	1	7	115	3	118
Monroe	20	39	0	0	0	0	59	6	65
Montgomery	17	46	0	0	0	0	63	0	63
Neshoba	49	39	11	0	11	0	110	0	110
Newton	35	31	5	0	0	0	71	0	71
Noxubee	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Oktibbeha	7	32	0	0	0	0	39	1	40
Panola	32	80	0	0	0	2	114	2	116
Pearl River	110	43	0	0	0	7	160	2	162
Perry	29	10	0	0	0	1	40	0	40
Pike	53	286	0	0	0	0	339	0	339
Pontotoc	64	22	1	0	1	4	92	10	102
Prentiss	36	29	0	0	0	1	66	2	68
Quitman	1	36	0	0	0	1	38	1	39
Rankin	558	230	0	9	17	17	831	38	869
Scott	31	49	0	0	0	16	96	0	96
Sharkey	1	37	0	0	0	0	38	0	38
Simpson	30	48	0	0	0	0	78	1	79
Smith	26	8	0	0	0	1	35	0	35
Stone	18	8	0	0	0	0	26	3	29
Sunflower	5	174	0	0	1	1	181	0	181
Tallahatchie	7	47	0	1	0	0	55	4	59
Tate	42	72	0	0	0	1	115	0	115
Tippah	31	15	0	0	1	1	48	2	50
Tishomingo	76	1	1	0	1	2	81	1	82
Tunica	3	137	0	0	0	2	142	0	142
Union	34	19	0	0	1	3	57	1	58
Walthall	23	57	0	0	0	1	81	1	82
Warren	77	258	0	0	0	2	337	6	343
Washington	33	495	0	0	0	0	528	9	537

	White	Black	American Indian	Asian	Other	Hispanic	Subtotal	Missing	Total
Wayne	22	29	0	0	0	0	51	2	53
Webster	3	11	0	0	0	0	14	0	14
Wilkinson	0	25	0	0	0	0	25	0	25
Winston	12	33	2	0	1	0	48	0	48
Yalobusha	5	14	0	0	1	0	20	1	21
Yazoo	10	74	0	0	0	0	84	2	86
Total	4034	7426	28	23	88	232	11831	199	12030

* Includes only the most serious offense for each case and cases where the youth is between the ages of 10 and 17.

Appendix D

Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (EZAPOP)

	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		American Indian		Total
State	167,273	50.9%	142,170	43.3%	13,158	4.0%	3,837	1.2%	2,140	0.7%	328,578
Adams	832	28.9%	1,972	68.6%	48	1.7%	12	0.4%	11	0.4%	2,875
Alcorn	3,331	81.0%	584	14.2%	175	4.3%	14	0.3%	8	0.2%	4,112
Amite	599	50.8%	555	47.1%	19	1.6%	3	0.3%	2	0.2%	1,178
Attala	1,042	48.4%	1,023	47.5%	74	3.4%	15	0.7%	1	0.0%	2,155
Benton	470	56.0%	330	39.3%	37	4.4%	-	0.0%	2	0.2%	839
Bolivar	857	25.5%	2,405	71.4%	82	2.4%	19	0.6%	4	0.1%	3,367
Calhoun	968	59.1%	506	30.9%	151	9.2%	8	0.5%	5	0.3%	1,638
Carrol	613	62.2%	346	35.1%	23	2.3%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	985
Chickasaw	752	40.2%	949	50.7%	164	8.8%	4	0.2%	3	0.2%	1,872
Choctaw	534	64.0%	279	33.5%	18	2.2%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	834
Claiborne	57	6.7%	778	91.0%	11	1.3%	7	0.8%	2	0.2%	855
Clarke	976	56.0%	722	41.4%	30	1.7%	5	0.3%	11	0.6%	1,744
Clay	648	30.2%	1,448	67.4%	43	2.0%	7	0.3%	1	0.0%	2,147
Coahoma	331	12.6%	2,223	84.9%	53	2.0%	9	0.3%	1	0.0%	2,617
Copiah	1,124	36.8%	1,818	59.5%	102	3.3%	6	0.2%	6	0.2%	3,056
Covington	1,162	54.3%	900	42.1%	61	2.9%	13	0.6%	3	0.1%	2,139
Desoto	13,318	58.5%	7,546	33.1%	1,503	6.6%	355	1.6%	45	0.2%	22,767
Forrest	3,658	48.8%	3,406	45.5%	308	4.1%	85	1.1%	36	0.5%	7,493
Franklin	563	61.5%	334	36.5%	16	1.7%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	915
George	2,371	86.2%	219	8.0%	92	3.3%	56	2.0%	11	0.4%	2,749
Greene	1,056	80.5%	236	18.0%	14	1.1%	5	0.4%	1	0.1%	1,312
Grenada	1,180	51.5%	1,045	45.6%	44	1.9%	16	0.7%	6	0.3%	2,291
Hancock	3,941	81.1%	575	11.8%	243	5.0%	81	1.7%	18	0.4%	4,858
Harrison	12,490	57.2%	7,242	33.2%	1,323	6.1%	680	3.1%	93	0.4%	21,828
Hinds	4,471	16.8%	21,441	80.5%	534	2.0%	158	0.6%	33	0.1%	26,637
Holmes	179	8.5%	1,909	90.2%	20	0.9%	4	0.2%	4	0.2%	2,116
Humphreys	121	11.7%	878	84.6%	35	3.4%	2	0.2%	2	0.2%	1,038
Issaquena	25	31.3%	52	65.0%	2	2.5%	-	0.0%	1	1.3%	80
Itawamba	2,209	90.1%	168	6.9%	63	2.6%	8	0.3%	4	0.2%	2,452
Jackson	10,173	63.1%	4,018	24.9%	1,436	8.9%	437	2.7%	59	0.4%	16,123
Jasper	637	38.9%	963	58.8%	32	2.0%	3	0.2%	4	0.2%	1,639
Jefferson	47	6.6%	648	91.7%	10	1.4%	-	0.0%	2	0.3%	707
Jeff Davis	275	27.9%	676	68.6%	26	2.6%	4	0.4%	5	0.5%	986
Jones	4,458	57.6%	2,653	34.3%	510	6.6%	55	0.7%	57	0.7%	7,733
Kemper	196	21.2%	652	70.5%	11	1.2%	2	0.2%	64	6.9%	925

	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		American Indian		Total
Lafayette	2,731	62.6%	1,388	31.8%	136	3.1%	99	2.3%	12	0.3%	4,366
Lamar	4,916	70.0%	1,678	23.9%	274	3.9%	135	1.9%	18	0.3%	7,021
Lauderdale	3,777	45.7%	4,206	50.9%	206	2.5%	61	0.7%	15	0.2%	8,265
Lawrence	832	59.9%	529	38.1%	20	1.4%	6	0.4%	1	0.1%	1,388
Leake	1,035	34.7%	1,575	52.8%	183	6.1%	10	0.3%	178	6.0%	2,981
Lee	5,915	59.9%	3,487	35.3%	375	3.8%	81	0.8%	14	0.1%	9,872
Leflore	549	15.5%	2,849	80.2%	124	3.5%	24	0.7%	6	0.2%	3,552
Lincoln	2,446	66.1%	1,175	31.8%	47	1.3%	26	0.7%	6	0.2%	3,700
Lowndes	2,764	44.0%	3,289	52.4%	174	2.8%	43	0.7%	12	0.2%	6,282
Madison	6,239	50.0%	5,349	42.9%	533	4.3%	339	2.7%	21	0.2%	12,481
Marion	1,699	62.2%	954	34.9%	55	2.0%	15	0.5%	10	0.4%	2,733
Marshall	1,493	43.3%	1,709	49.6%	217	6.3%	18	0.5%	11	0.3%	3,448
Monroe	2,462	62.4%	1,391	35.3%	73	1.9%	9	0.2%	10	0.3%	3,945
Montgomery	467	44.5%	559	53.3%	17	1.6%	3	0.3%	3	0.3%	1,049
Neshoba	1,945	49.6%	958	24.4%	96	2.4%	29	0.7%	895	22.8%	3,923
Newton	1,410	56.7%	800	32.2%	62	2.5%	10	0.4%	203	8.2%	2,485
Noxubee	223	18.8%	943	79.6%	13	1.1%	4	0.3%	1	0.1%	1,184
Oktibbeha	1,534	40.2%	2,099	55.0%	83	2.2%	94	2.5%	4	0.1%	3,814
Panola	1,437	38.0%	2,237	59.2%	86	2.3%	13	0.3%	8	0.2%	3,781
Pearl River	4,735	80.3%	856	14.5%	239	4.1%	43	0.7%	22	0.4%	5,895
Perry	943	74.1%	290	22.8%	33	2.6%	3	0.2%	4	0.3%	1,273
Pike	1,829	38.1%	2,837	59.2%	80	1.7%	35	0.7%	14	0.3%	4,795
Pontotoc	2,843	72.9%	662	17.0%	374	9.6%	17	0.4%	2	0.1%	3,898
Prentiss	2,082	81.1%	410	16.0%	61	2.4%	8	0.3%	6	0.2%	2,567
Quitman	147	18.8%	620	79.4%	10	1.3%	2	0.3%	2	0.3%	781
Rankin	11,881	71.2%	3,950	23.7%	601	3.6%	239	1.4%	25	0.1%	16,696
Scott	1,476	45.5%	1,375	42.4%	363	11.2%	12	0.4%	18	0.6%	3,244
Sharkey	104	20.8%	383	76.6%	11	2.2%	2	0.4%	-	0.0%	500
Simpson	1,755	56.3%	1,227	39.4%	75	2.4%	54	1.7%	6	0.2%	3,117
Smith	1,269	71.5%	462	26.0%	41	2.3%	4	0.2%	-	0.0%	1,776
Stone	1,382	75.0%	390	21.2%	47	2.6%	11	0.6%	12	0.7%	1,842
Sunflower	399	14.6%	2,266	82.7%	56	2.0%	12	0.4%	8	0.3%	2,741
Tallahatchie	351	28.6%	853	69.5%	16	1.3%	4	0.3%	3	0.2%	1,227
Tate	1,972	61.0%	1,112	34.4%	131	4.1%	9	0.3%	9	0.3%	3,233
Tippah	1,860	72.7%	515	20.1%	171	6.7%	12	0.5%	1	0.0%	2,559
Tishomingo	1,841	91.6%	65	3.2%	98	4.9%	3	0.1%	2	0.1%	2,009
Tunica	130	10.6%	1,058	86.0%	34	2.8%	6	0.5%	2	0.2%	1,230

	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		American Indian		Total
Union	2,480	75.2%	482	14.6%	193	5.9%	139	4.2%	2	0.1%	3,296
Walthall	751	46.6%	801	49.7%	46	2.9%	5	0.3%	9	0.6%	1,612
Warren	2,002	38.4%	3,025	58.0%	131	2.5%	50	1.0%	8	0.2%	5,216
Washington	927	17.7%	4,172	79.8%	97	1.9%	31	0.6%	2	0.0%	5,229
Wayne	1,123	50.0%	1,070	47.6%	39	1.7%	10	0.4%	6	0.3%	2,248
Webster	842	75.2%	260	23.2%	12	1.1%	3	0.3%	3	0.3%	1,120
Wilkinson	177	20.5%	675	78.1%	12	1.4%	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	864
Winston	869	41.6%	1,147	55.0%	31	1.5%	7	0.3%	33	1.6%	2,087
Yalobusha	658	51.1%	592	46.0%	29	2.3%	8	0.6%	-	0.0%	1,287
Yazoo	907	31.2%	1,941	66.8%	40	1.4%	13	0.4%	3	0.1%	2,904

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (2017)

http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/asp/profile_selection.asp

Appendix E

		Total Youth	White	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other/ Mixed	All Minorities
State	1. Population at risk (age 10 through 17)	328,578	167,273	142,170	13,158	3,837	0	2,140	0	161,305
	2. Juvenile Arrests									
	3. Refer to Juvenile Court	11,831	4,034	7,426	232	23		28	88	7,797
	4. Cases Diverted	4,558	1,626	2,800	86	15		4	27	2,932
	5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	2,887	929	1,876	44	7		3	28	1,958
	6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	6,132	2,051	3,882	120	6		23	50	4,081
	7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	2,387	779	1,530	41	1		10	26	1,608
	8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	2,144	715	1,352	37	1		11	28	1,429
	9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	640	181	436	16	0		0	7	459
	10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	39	9	27	3	0		0	0	30
Meets 1% rule for group to be assessed?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
Desoto	1. Population at risk (age 10 through 17)	22,767	13,318	7,546	1,503	355	0	45	0	9,449
	2. Juvenile Arrests									
	3. Refer to Juvenile Court	1,154	423	679	39	3	0	0	10	731
	4. Cases Diverted	538	206	312	16	1	0	0	3	332
	5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	27	6	20	1	0	0	0	0	21
	6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	414	151	243	14	2	0	0	4	263
	7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	214	70	134	8	0	0	0	2	144
	8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	233	85	138	8	0	0	0	2	148
	9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	157	47	101	7	0	0	0	2	110
	10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Meets 1% rule for group to be assessed?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	

		Total Youth	White	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other/ Mixed	All Minorities	
Harrison	1. Population at risk (age 10 through 17)	21,828	12,490	7,242	1,323	680	0	93	0	9,338	
	2. Juvenile Arrests										
	3. Refer to Juvenile Court	832	324	472	31	2	0	0	3	508	
	4. Cases Diverted	334	152	163	19	0	0	0	0	182	
	5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	126	38	86	2	0	0	0	0	88	
	6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	438	144	286	6	1	0	0	1	294	
	7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	115	31	82	2	0	0	0	0	84	
	8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	87	16	70	1	0	0	0	0	71	
	9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	28	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	17	
	10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	Meets 1% rule for group to be assessed?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No		
Hinds	1. Population at risk (age 10 through 17)	26,637	4,471	21,441	534	158	0	33	0	22,166	
	2. Juvenile Arrests										
	3. Refer to Juvenile Court	568	31	532	2	0	0	0	3	537	
	4. Cases Diverted	149	6	143	0	0	0	0	0	143	
	5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	384	19	361	2	0	0	0	2	365	
	6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	178	11	165	0	0	0	0	2	167	
	7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	24	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	24	
	8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	16	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	16	
	9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Meets 1% rule for group to be assessed?		Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No		

		Total Youth	White	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other/ Mixed	All Minorities
Jackson	1. Population at risk (age 10 through 17)	16,123	10,173	4,018	1,436	437	0	59	0	5,950
	2. Juvenile Arrests									
	3. Refer to Juvenile Court	507	276	214	15	2	0	0	0	231
	4. Cases Diverted	267	125	132	8	2	0	0	0	142
	5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	113	76	36	1	0	0	0	0	37
	6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	178	122	54	2	0	0	0	0	56
	7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	80	65	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
	8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	42	36	5	1	0	0	0	0	6
	9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	17	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Meets 1% rule for group to be assessed?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
Jones	1. Population at risk (age 10 through 17)	7,733	4,458	2,653	510	55	0	57	0	3,275
	2. Juvenile Arrests									
	3. Refer to Juvenile Court	468	150	292	19	0	0	1	6	318
	4. Cases Diverted	123	39	78	4	0	0	0	2	84
	5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	224	87	126	8	0	0	0	3	137
	6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	321	102	199	15	0	0	0	4	218
	7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	159	61	89	4	0	0	1	4	98
	8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	167	66	93	3	0	0	1	4	101
	9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	58	23	31	2	0	0	0	2	35
	10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Meets 1% rule for group to be assessed?		Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	

		Total Youth	White	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other/ Mixed	All Minorities
Lauderdale	1. Population at risk (age 10 through 17)	8,265	3,777	4,206	206	61	0	15	0	4,488
	2. Juvenile Arrests									
	3. Refer to Juvenile Court	425	90	331	0	0	0	0	4	335
	4. Cases Diverted	179	56	121	0	0	0	0	2	123
	5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	251	52	198	0	0	0	0	1	199
	6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	237	31	204	0	0	0	0	2	206
	7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	71	8	63	0	0	0	0	0	63
	8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	101	11	89	0	0	0	0	1	90
	9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
	10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Meets 1% rule for group to be assessed?		Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Lee	1. Population at risk (age 10 through 17)	9,872	5,915	3,487	375	81	0	14	0	3,957
	2. Juvenile Arrests									
	3. Refer to Juvenile Court	621	268	333	13	3	0	2	2	353
	4. Cases Diverted	388	157	220	5	3	0	2	1	231
	5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	226	84	134	6	0	0	1	1	142
	6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	159	82	69	7	0	0	0	1	77
	7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	77	39	33	4	0	0	0	1	38
	8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	76	39	32	4	0	0	0	1	37
	9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	47	21	21	4	0	0	0	1	26
	10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	6	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
	Meets 1% rule for group to be assessed?		Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	

		Total Youth	White	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other/ Mixed	All Minorities
Rankin	1. Population at risk (age 10 through 17)	16,696	11,881	3,950	601	239	0	25	0	4,815
	2. Juvenile Arrests									
	3. Refer to Juvenile Court	831	558	230	17	9	0	0	17	273
	4. Cases Diverted	497	337	135	10	6	0	0	9	160
	5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	458	306	126	7	7	0	0	12	152
	6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	279	188	75	7	2	0	0	7	91
	7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	108	81	23	0	1	0	0	3	27
	8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	56	39	13	0	1	0	0	3	17
	9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	15	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
	10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Meets 1% rule for group to be assessed?		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
Washington	1. Population at risk (age 10 through 17)	5,229	927	4,172	97	31	0	2	0	4,302
	2. Juvenile Arrests									
	3. Refer to Juvenile Court	528	33	495	0	0	0	0	0	495
	4. Cases Diverted	325	21	304	0	0	0	0	0	304
	5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	126	9	117	0	0	0	0	0	117
	6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	189	11	178	0	0	0	0	0	178
	7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	84	3	81	0	0	0	0	0	81
	8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	81	2	79	0	0	0	0	0	79
	9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	39	1	38	0	0	0	0	0	38
	10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Meets 1% rule for group to be assessed?		Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	

Appendix F

		Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Asian	All Minorities
State	Youth Population (<i>White 50.9%</i>)	43.3%	4.0%	1.2%	49.1%
	Juvenile Arrests	**	**	*	**
	Refer to Juvenile Court	2.17	0.73	0.25	2.00
	Cases Diverted	0.94	0.92	**	0.93
	Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.10	0.82	**	1.09
	Cases Petitioned	1.03	1.02	**	1.03
	Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.04	0.90	**	1.04
	Cases resulting in Probation Placement	0.96	0.98	**	0.97
	Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	1.23	1.68	**	1.23
	Cases Transferred to Adult Court	1.59	**	**	1.68
	Group meets 1% threshold?	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Desoto	Youth Population (<i>White 58.8%</i>)	33.1%	6.6%	1.6%	41.5%
	Juvenile Arrests	**	**	*	**
	Refer to Juvenile Court	2.83	0.82	**	2.44
	Cases Diverted	0.94	0.84	**	0.93
	Cases Involving Secure Detention	2.08	**	**	2.03
	Cases Petitioned	1.00	1.01	**	1.01
	Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.19	**	**	1.18
	Cases resulting in Probation Placement	0.85	**	**	0.85
	Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	1.12	**	**	1.14
	Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	**	**
	Group meets 1% threshold?	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Harrison	Youth Population (<i>White 57.2%</i>)	33.2%	6.1%	3.1%	42.8%
	Juvenile Arrests	**	**	*	**
	Refer to Juvenile Court	2.51	0.90	**	2.10
	Cases Diverted	0.74	1.31	**	0.76
	Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.55	**	**	1.48
	Cases Petitioned	1.36	0.44	**	1.30
	Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.33	**	**	1.33
	Cases resulting in Probation Placement	1.65	**	**	1.64
	Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	0.58	**	**	0.57
	Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	**	**
	Group meets 1% threshold?	Yes	Yes	Yes	

		Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Asian	All Minorities
Hinds	Youth Population (<i>White 16.8%</i>)	80.5%	2.0%	0.6%	83.2%
	Juvenile Arrests	**	**	*	**
	Refer to Juvenile Court	3.58	**	*	3.49
	Cases Diverted	1.39	**	*	1.38
	Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.11	**	*	1.11
	Cases Petitioned	0.87	**	*	0.88
	Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	**	**	*	**
	Cases resulting in Probation Placement	**	**	*	**
	Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	**	**	*	**
	Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	*	**
	Group meets 1% threshold?	Yes	Yes	No	
Jackson	Youth Population (<i>White 63.1%</i>)	24.9%	8.9%	2.7%	36.9%
	Juvenile Arrests				
	Refer to Juvenile Court	1.96	0.39	**	1.43
	Cases Diverted	1.36	**	**	1.36
	Cases Involving Secure Detention	0.61	**	**	0.58
	Cases Petitioned	0.57	**	**	0.55
	Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	0.52	**	**	0.50
	Cases resulting in Probation Placement	**	**	**	**
	Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	**	**	**	**
	Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	**	**
	Group meets 1% threshold?	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Jones	Youth Population (<i>White 57.6%</i>)	34.3%	6.6%	0.7%	42.4%
	Juvenile Arrests				
	Refer to Juvenile Court	3.27	1.11	*	2.89
	Cases Diverted	1.03	**	*	1.02
	Cases Involving Secure Detention	0.74	**	*	0.74
	Cases Petitioned	1.00	**	*	1.01
	Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	0.75	**	*	0.75
	Cases resulting in Probation Placement	0.97	**	*	0.95
	Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	0.92	**	*	0.95
	Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	*	**
	Group meets 1% threshold?	Yes	Yes	No	

		Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Asian	All Minorities
Lauderdale	Youth Population (<i>White 45.7%</i>)	50.9%	2.5%	0.7%	54.3%
	Juvenile Arrests	**	**	*	**
	Refer to Juvenile Court	3.30	**	*	3.13
	Cases Diverted	0.59	**	*	0.59
	Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.04	**	*	1.03
	Cases Petitioned	1.79	**	*	1.79
	Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.20	**	*	1.19
	Cases resulting in Probation Placement	**	**	*	**
	Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	**	**	*	**
	Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	*	**
	Group meets 1% threshold?	Yes	Yes	No	
Lee	Youth Population (<i>White 59.9%</i>)	35.3%	3.8%	0.8%	40.1%
	Juvenile Arrests	**	**	*	**
	Refer to Juvenile Court	2.11	0.77	*	1.97
	Cases Diverted	1.13	**	*	1.12
	Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.28	**	*	1.28
	Cases Petitioned	0.68	**	*	0.71
	Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.01	**	*	1.04
	Cases resulting in Probation Placement	0.97	**	*	0.97
	Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	1.18	**	*	1.27
	Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	*	**
	Group meets 1% threshold?	Yes	Yes	No	
Rankin	Youth Population (<i>White 71.2%</i>)	23.7%	3.6%	1.4%	28.8%
	Juvenile Arrests	**	**	*	**
	Refer to Juvenile Court	1.24	0.60	0.80	1.21
	Cases Diverted	0.97	**	**	0.97
	Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.00	**	**	1.02
	Cases Petitioned	0.97	**	**	0.99
	Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	0.71	**	**	0.69
	Cases resulting in Probation Placement	**	**	**	**
	Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	**	**	**	**
	Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	**	**
	Group meets 1% threshold?	Yes	Yes	Yes	

		Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Asian	All Minorities
Washington	Youth Population (<i>White 17.7%</i>)	79.8%	1.9%	0.6%	82.3%
	Juvenile Arrests				
	Refer to Juvenile Court	3.33	**	*	3.23
	Cases Diverted	0.97	**	*	0.97
	Cases Involving Secure Detention	0.87	**	*	0.87
	Cases Petitioned	1.08	**	*	1.08
	Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	**	**	*	**
	Cases resulting in Probation Placement	**	**	*	**
	Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	**	**	*	**
	Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	*	**
	Group meets 1% threshold?	Yes	Yes	No	