

Plan for Compliance with the Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Core Requirement Applicable to Category 2

2019 Title II Solicitation

Oklahoma's Overall Approach

Pursuant to Section 223(a) (22) of the Federal JJDP Act, as amended in 2002, the States are required to address juvenile delinquency prevention and system improvement efforts designed to reduce the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system. In order to meet this requirement, the SAG through the Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs, continues to solicit the development of programs that are designed to meet the needs of minority youth and specifically provide alternatives to reduce the proportion of minority juveniles who come in contact with the juvenile justice system. The Office of Juvenile Affairs Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Unit provides the SAG and the DMC subcommittee with DMC statistics to be monitored annually and analyzed for significant trends for use in determining policy and grant decisions. The State Advisory Group has a long history of interest in Disproportionate Minority Contact and places this issue as a priority in their efforts to positively impact youth in Oklahoma.

DMC Data Discussion

In Oklahoma, the identification phase of the DMC Reduction Cycle is continuous. This phase is vital, allowing us to determine if DMC exists, at what contact points it exists, with what minority population the disproportionality exists, and to what extent. Oklahoma gathers data annually to calculate the percent of population data and the Relative Rate Index (RRI). It is important to note, that Oklahoma collects contact point data for each of the 77 counties in the state. The percentage of population data and RRI with technical assistance is made available to communities throughout the year.

Oklahoma is able to gather data from each of the contact points in the Juvenile Justice System from the Juvenile Online Tracking System (JOLTS). Arrests, not eligible for municipal court jurisdiction, are required by state statute to have a formal intake and to be entered into the online system. Throughout the duration of the case, data is entered and updated. This process allows state officials and researchers to track the outcome of each individual case. Referrals to the intake departments come primarily from law enforcement agencies. Communities receive a smaller number of referrals directly from the schools and from parents.

Oklahoma's plan for compliance with the DMC core requirement uses a three-pronged, research driven, outcomes-based strategy for DMC work:

- 1) Identify statewide data at research-based points of potential disparity. In Oklahoma, data collection occurs for each of the five data points prescribed by OJJDP (See Table I: Identifying the Problem Data Preparation Worksheet-Attached).

Table I: Identifying the Problem Utilizing the Percent of the Population

Data Source: Oklahoma Juvenile Online Tracking System (SFY 2018 Data), OJJDP Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (<https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/>)

		White	Black	American Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Other/Multi	Total
	Population Data	251,314	43,115	52,462	10,996	68,756		426,643
Arrest	Number	5,603	2,419	1,791	94	1,074		10,981
	Percentage	2.23%	5.61%	3.41%	0.85%	1.56%		13.66%
Diversion	Number	2,149	691	679	40	345		3,904
	Percentage	0.86%	1.60%	1.29%	0.36%	0.50%		4.61%
Pretrial Detention	Number	1,110	854	447	18	337		2,766
	Percentage	0.44%	1.98%	0.85%	0.16%	0.49%		3.92%
Secure Confinement	Number	53	56	22	0	10		141
	Percentage	0.02%	0.13%	0.04%	0	0.01%		0.20%
Transfer to Adult Court	Number	18	11	5	0	5		39
	Percentage	0.01%	0.03%	0.01%	0	0.01%		0.06%

Table II: Statewide Relative Rate Indices

Data Source: Oklahoma Juvenile Online Tracking System (JOLTS), OJJDP Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (<https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/>)

Statewide Relative Rate Indices (July 2017-June 2018)						
	White	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	All Minorities
2. Juvenile Arrests	1.00	2.52	0.70	0.38	1.53	1.38
3. Refer to Juvenile Court	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
4. Cases Diverted	1.00	0.74	0.84	1.11	0.99	0.85
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.00	1.78	1.58	0.97	1.26	1.55
6. Cases Petitioned	1.00	1.38	1.31	0.98	1.12	1.27
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.00	1.03	1.12	0.94	1.14	1.08
8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	1.00	0.88	0.88	**	0.89	0.88
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	1.00	1.73	0.67	**	1.01	1.26
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	1.00	1.03	**	**	**	0.95

Statewide

Based upon the percentage of the population, the statistical significance, volume of activity, and the magnitude of the indices, the greatest disparity occurs with Black or African American youth. This can be seen at the following stages: Arrest, Diversion, Secure Detention, Secure Confinement, and Transfer to Adult Court.

***Arrest (Priority 1)**

Based on the percentage of the population and the magnitude of the Relative Rate Index (RRI), the arrest point of contact has the highest percentage indicating disparity. Black or African American youth were 5.61% of the population compared to 3.41% for Native American youth, 2.23% White youth, 1.56% Hispanic youth, and 0.85% Hispanic youth.

Diversion

The percentage of population at the Diversion point of contact may reflect underutilization of Diversion Opportunities. 4.61% of the population were diverted from the juvenile justice system. Based on the statistical significance and the magnitude of the RRI, all minority youth were diverted less often than White youth. This contact point must be examined closer in local jurisdictions to determine the extent of the disparity.

***Pre-Trial Detention (Priority 2)**

Nearly two percent (1.98) of the Black or African American population were held in secure detention. This disparity is seen in RRI as well. Black or African American youth were held nearly twice the rate of White youth (1.78). Based on the RRI, all minority youth were detained more often than White youth (1.55).

***Secure Confinement (Priority 3)**

The racial group with the highest percentage of youth securely held (compared to overall population) was Black or African American youth (0.13%) 56 of the 141 youth placed in secure confinement were African American, 53 White, 22 Native American, and 10 Hispanic.

Transfer to Adult Court

Thirty-nine youth were transferred to adult court. Black or African American youth were transferred at a higher percentage (0.03%) compared to White, Native American, Hispanic, and (0.01%) youth.

2) Plan of Action

Based on the data, arrest continues to be the point of contact with the greatest disparity. Oklahoma strategic planning will continue to focus on partnering with law enforcement agencies to ensure both protection of the public and evidence based training for new officers working with juveniles.

The Oklahoma SAG is committed to address DMC at every contact point. Ongoing success would include extending law enforcement training to officers statewide, engaging officers to assist with compliance needs (cross training them), and strengthening positive youth development activities among police officers and youth.

Oklahoma will continue to educate stakeholders on the appropriate use of detention. This conversation will include cultural sensitivity and implicit bias training. Ideally, the SAG DMC sub-committee, Compliance Monitor, and Juvenile Justice Specialist/DMC Coordinator will lead this effort. Having the DMC sub-committee lead the effort would be a significant strength in the

process. The SAG sub-committee will look at youthful offender cases, data surrounding secure confinement, and develop recommendations to address DMC at the secure confinement point of contact.

Oklahoma has made significant strides in reducing disparity at prioritized contact points over the past decade. Oklahoma would like to see both the RRI and the percentage of the population lower at arrest, secure detention, and secure confinement for all minority youth. It is a priority of the state, to keep communities safe while restoring the youth we serve back to the community. Prevention and intervention efforts must include the expertise and input from stakeholders throughout the system. Oklahoma will continue to use the OJJDP Community Strategic Planning model to engage communities in problem solving and responding to their local data.

Oklahoma would like to mitigate racial disparity at every decision point, however this is not a reasonable goal to accomplish in one year. Oklahoma will strive to reduce the percentages at arrest, detention, and secure confinement by one half percent (.50%).

Utilization of the RRI to identify targeted strategies to reduce DMC has been utilized in Oklahoma since 2002. Shifting from this tool is challenging and uncertain. It is difficult to project how much a jurisdiction is able to reduce DMC through this new method. Ongoing technical assistance from OJJDP to support local jurisdictions and statewide leaders in this area is and will be critical to our success. Historically, OJJDP and technical assistance providers have been instrumental in reducing the RRI in local jurisdictions. Oklahoma will continue to use the RRI and will adapt to the new method of calculating disparity as required by OJJDP.