

State of Ohio 2019 DMC/RED Action Plan

Data Collection Overview

Per previous OJJDP requirements, DYS has collected statewide data every three years so the statewide data in this report was collected in 2016 for CY 2015. Data was collected based on the RRI and includes data from law enforcement and juvenile courts in all 88 counties. The data was not entirely complete, but it provides an adequate picture of disparity in the state as a whole. Statewide data is currently being collected for CY 2018 and will be included in the 2020 plan.

Since the 2018 reauthorization of the JJDP Action requires annual data collection, DYS will collect data from all 88 county juvenile courts each year. Data will be requested for diversion, pre-trial detention, disposition commitments, and adult transfer per the 2019 requirements. Additionally, the number of youth referred to juvenile court and the number of youth adjudicated delinquent will be collected with the number of referred youth used as the baseline.

DYS will not collect statewide arrest data, but will collect arrest data from police agencies in Ohio’s “big six” counties. These six counties are home to 40 percent of Ohio’s youth population, ages 10 to 17, and 76 percent of the African American youth population. DYS has a long history of collecting data in the larger more populated counties and has always found the greatest point of disparity to be at the point of arrest. Therefore, we will continue to collect arrest data and track progress in these counties.

Statewide Data

Statewide data was collected for CY 2015 using the RRI method. DYS attempted to collect data from 88 county juvenile courts and approximately 1,100 police agencies. Of the 88 juvenile courts, only 41 submitted complete data by race across all decision point. Twenty-one juvenile courts submitted data that was missing at one or more data points and 25 juvenile courts submitted no data. Data provided by police agencies was not complete but initially appeared to be adequate. Counties juvenile courts with insufficient data were not included in the calculations nor were the police agencies in the corresponding counties. DYS attempted to remain as consistent as possible to avoid inconsistencies that would skew the rates. The following chart shows the resulting relative rates.

Relative Rate Index Compared with :	White				
	White	African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	All Minorities
2. Juvenile Arrests	1.00	5.80	0.37	0.20	4.54
3. Refer to Juvenile Court	1.00	0.59	1.38	0.83	0.57
4. Cases Diverted	1.00	0.76	0.81	1.13	0.76
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.00	1.17	1.45	0.56	1.18
6. Cases Petitioned	1.00	1.10	1.16	0.98	1.10
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.00	0.91	0.99	0.92	0.91
8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	1.00	0.69	1.04	0.49	0.70
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	1.00	1.21	1.03	**	1.20

1. What the Data Says

Black or African American Youth

When examining state data, which includes jurisdictions with varied population sizes and racial and ethnic composition, African American youth are nearly 6 times more likely to be arrested than white youth. Police data was thought to be sufficient at the time it was compiled, but further review showed that the number of arrests reported was far fewer than the number of youth referred to juvenile court. Although law enforcement is not the only source of referrals, the gap between the two numbers is too great. When arrest data is excluded and referrals are compared only to population, the rate shows that African-American youth are 3.44 times more likely to be referred to juvenile court. The successive rates did not change.

Juvenile court data shows slight disparity in decision points 4 through 10. African-American youth are diverted less, and held in detention more often compared to white youth which likely means they are not offered alternatives as frequently as White youth. The number of African-Americans charged has a slightly higher rate, but the number of youth found delinquent has a lower rate than White youth, which implies that more African-American youth are unnecessarily charged with a delinquent offense. Youth are underrepresented at the probation decision point but this could be positive or negative. A judge may determine that probation placement is not necessary, or may order probation rather than detention or commitment to state custody.

African-American youth are only slightly more likely than white youth to be committed to a secure facility after adjudication. While the relative rate calculates at 1.21 times more likely, the actual numbers are 943 White youth and 1,112 African-American youth commitments. Relative to the population, White youth outnumber African-American youth 5:1. Similarly, African-American youth are 9 times more likely to be transferred to adult court with the numbers showing 166 African-American youth and 16 White youth transferred.

Hispanic and Asian Youth

Based on the data that DYS has collected for at least the last 15 years, DYS will not focus reduction efforts on Hispanic and Asian youth, or other minorities. These youth populations are relatively low, and are arrested and enter the juvenile justice system at a much lower rate. Once in the system, there is a slight disparity, and the actual number of youth is small comparatively.

County Data

Since 2007, DYS has collected data from 13 Ohio counties with the largest minority youths population. It has consistently shown that the greatest points of disparity are at the point of arrest and transfer to the adult criminal system, which is consistent with much of the county data. However, review of police data has shown that oftentimes the number of arrests reported is far fewer than the number of youth referred to juvenile court due to a lack of reporting and insufficient reporting. When this occurs, the rate of referrals to juvenile court is completely inaccurate as in the chart that contains statewide data. Therefore, the county

data does not contain the number of arrests. Data from three of counties are included with this plan and as follows:

Relative Rate Index Compared with :	White				
2017 Cuyahoga County Data	White	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	All Minorities
2. Juvenile Arrests	**	**	**	**	**
3. Refer to Juvenile Court	1.00	4.17	0.89	0.08	3.12
4. Cases Diverted	1.00	1.03	1.20	**	1.04
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.00	1.61	1.52	**	1.60
6. Cases Petitioned	1.00	0.99	0.96	**	0.99
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.00	1.25	1.25	**	1.25
8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	1.00	0.86	0.97	**	0.87
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	1.00	4.25	6.33	**	4.35
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	**	**	**

Population = 56,623 White youth and 44,234 African-American youth.

Relative Rate Index Compared with :	White				
2017 Franklin County Data	White	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	All Minorities
2. Juvenile Arrests	**	**	**	**	**
3. Refer to Juvenile Court	1.00	3.24	0.91	0.21	2.43
4. Cases Diverted	1.00	0.58	0.66	**	0.58
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.00	2.55	2.22	**	2.53
6. Cases Petitioned	1.00	1.10	1.08	1.08	1.09
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.00	1.26	0.73	**	1.21
8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	1.00	1.25	1.47	**	1.25
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	**	**	**	**	**
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	**	**	**

Population = 67,983 White youth and 39,525 African-American youth.

Relative Rate Index Compared with :	White				
2017 Lucas County Data	White	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	All Minorities
2. Juvenile Arrests	**	**	**	*	**
3. Refer to Juvenile Court	1.00	3.86	0.39	*	2.66
4. Cases Diverted	1.00	0.74	0.83	*	0.75
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.00	1.41	1.18	*	1.40
6. Cases Petitioned	1.00	1.15	1.09	*	1.14
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.00	1.17	0.73	*	1.16
8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	1.00	0.84	**	*	0.88
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	**	**	**	*	**
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	**	**	**	*	**

Population = 26,683 White youth and 11,590 African-American youth.

Review of the data showed that oftentimes the number of arrest reported is far fewer than the number of youth referred to juvenile court. This is due lack of reporting or insufficient reporting. When this occurs, the rate of referrals to juvenile court is completely inaccurate as is the case in the chart containing statewide data. It was also noted that statewide data significantly increase the relative rate of African-American commitments and transfers to adult court. This is because the smaller counties/jurisdictions are predominately white and counted in the numbers, but they are not subsequently committed or transferred to adult court.

2. What Success Would Look Like

To achieve short-term success, the rate of African-American youth referred to juvenile court and held in pretrial detention would be reduced over a 6-24 month period. Long-term success, beyond two years, would be a small decline over each successive year.

3. Reductions in the Next Year

In the next year, the goal is to reduce disparity at the point of referrals to juvenile court and at pretrial detention. Although efforts to address disparity are occurring throughout the state and by many youth serving agencies, there are too many contributing factors and too many variables to expect large reductions over a short period. Therefore, the state will work to reduce disparity by .3 over the next 12 months.

4. Is That Reasonable

A reduction of .3 is reasonable given that DYS has worked with the counties with the largest minority youth populations since 2007. Programs and services are in place, with many funded by Title II. The state also provides funding to juvenile courts to keep youth in the community, and the state's JDAI initiative is active in 14 counties and working to reduce inappropriate detention

5. What Can OJJDP Do?

It would be helpful if OJJDP worked more closely with its partner agencies in the Department of Justice and the Office of Justice Programs to set a united policy direction for addressing disparity. It is difficult for states to promote equality and fair treatment when federal agencies are not unified in their message.

6. Safeguards

The focus of DYS will be on prevention and on inappropriate detention. DYS is currently funding prevention programs targeting African-American youth to reduce arrests and referrals to juvenile court. At-risk youth do not typically pose a threat to the community. These youth are provided with services that help to reduce negative behaviors and subsequent contact with the juvenile justices. At the county level, youth involved in the systems are given a risk assessment to determine whether they are a risk to themselves or others. Youth who pose a risk are not released back to the community but are detained and provided with needed services. Youth committed to state custody are provided with services and incentives that reduce negative behaviors, and have treatment plans prior to release. Youth deemed a risk to the community are not released until safety is no longer a concern.