

SECTION 4: Plan for Compliance with DMC Core Requirement

- Item I A: Identification—RRI Explanations and Matrices (Full Matrices/Data are attached)
- B: Systematic Analysis of RRI Values and Tracking Sheets (Full Jurisdictional Comparison attached)
- Item II: Assessment/Diagnosis
- Item III: Intervention and DMC Reduction Activity Goals
- Item IV: Evaluation of DMC Reduction Activities
- Item V: Monitoring of DMC

Item I A: Identification—RRI Explanations and Matrices

RRI Explanations of Statewide and County Relative Rate Indexes

Relative Rate Indexes (RRI's) for calendar years 2014-2016 were calculated statewide and for the three counties with the highest minority populations. The United States Census provided population estimates that were used for statewide population counts as well as for determining county populations. Easy Access to Juvenile Populations was used to provide additional information in determining county populations. The three counties identified as having the highest minority population rates are Berkeley, Kanawha, and Monongalia Counties. West Virginia only calculates the RRIs every three years.

Contact Points and Data Sources:

In calculating the Relative Rate Indexes, nine juvenile justice contact points have been identified. These contact points as identified by OJJDP include arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petition/charges filed, delinquency findings, probation, confinement in secure correctional facilities, and transferred to adult court. It should be noted that West Virginia collects data in only 8 of these 9 contact points. Arrest and Referral in West Virginia will be combined and any referral to the juvenile justice system will be considered an arrest. The combining of these two juvenile contact points was necessary for several reasons. The arrest data in the state is lower at times than the number of referrals, which makes it difficult to calculate the relative rate index for other contact points. In West Virginia, entry into the juvenile system is not always constituted by an arrest because juvenile petitions can also be filed by parents, school officials, the Department of Health and Human Resources and other relevant parties. The Juvenile Probation Database is used to collect data and the date that a petition was signed against a child, is considered an arrest/referral.

Diversion in West Virginia aligns with the OJJDP definition of diversion which “includes all youth referred for legal processing but handled without the filing of formal charges” (DMC Technical Assistance Manual, 4th Edition, 2009, p. 1-7). In obtaining data for this contact point, the Juvenile Probation Database was used, more specifically, informal disposition codes.

Detention is defined as a “youth held in secure detention facilities at some point during court processing of delinquency cases” (DMC Technical Assistance Manual, 4th Edition, 2009, p. 1-7). The Division of Juvenile Services provided information concerning detention rates for each county.

Petition/Charges filed according to OJJDP can be defined as “formally charged (petitioned) delinquency cases that appear on a court

calendar in response to the filing of a petition, complaint, or other legal instrument requesting the court to adjudicate a youth as a delinquent or status offender or to waive jurisdiction and transfer a youth to criminal court”. This information is obtained from the using formal disposition codes.

Delinquency findings are defined as “youth [who] are judged or found to be delinquent during adjudicatory hearings in juvenile court” (DMC Technical Assistance Manual, 4th Edition, 2009, p. 1-7). The Juvenile Probation Database adjudication codes are used to obtain data for this contact point.

OJJDP recommends that probation include cases “in which a youth is placed on formal or court-ordered supervision following a juvenile court disposition”. The Juvenile Probation Database is used to obtain this information. Formal disposition codes related to probation are used to gather data.

Confinement in secure facilities include all cases “in which, following a court disposition, youth are placed in secure residential or correctional facilities for delinquent offenders” DMC Technical Assistance Manual, 4th Edition, 2009, p. 1-7). The Division of Juvenile Services provides data for this contact point.

The final contact point, transferred to adult court, includes those youths who are transferred to criminal court as a result of a judicial finding in juvenile court. The Juvenile Probation Database provides information for this contact point.

It should be noted that the Juvenile Justice Database did not collect data for ethnicity for all of data year 2010. Therefore, cases involving Hispanic or Latino youth are dispersed across race categories in the database. Though youth in this population do meet the one percent rule,

the only data collected concerning ethnicity include state and county populations, detention rates and secure confinement rates. In October of 2010, the Juvenile Justice Database was updated and revised to allow for the collection of both race and ethnicity. Therefore, both race and ethnicity data were fully available beginning with data from 2011. Full data has been collected for 2012-2016.

The RRI method involves comparing the relative volume (rate) of activity for each major stage of the juvenile justice system for minority youth with the volume of that activity for white (majority) youth. The method of comparison provides a single index number which tells us the extent to which the volume of that form of contact or activity is different for minority youth from white youth.

Statewide: Figure 1 shows the RRI information for all minorities that meet the one percent rule. Populations currently included are Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Other/mixed youth. On a comparison basis, when looking at 2015 and 2016 data, West Virginia has had increases in the arrest/referral rates, secure detention rates, delinquent findings, and secure confinement for all minorities. Additional analysis of statewide data will be examined in the systematic tracking of RRI.

Figure 1: Relative Rate Index Comparisons Statewide Data

Data Items	WV 2014 RRI's	WV 2015 RRI's	WV 2016 RRI's
Arrest	N/A	3.49	4.93
Arrest/Referral	3.74	0.68	0.45

Cases Diverted	**	0.69	.62
Secure Detention	**	2.39	2.42
Cases Petitioned	**	1.34	1.72
Delinquent Findings	**	1.15	1.28
Probation Placement	**	0.83	0.76
Secure Confinement	**	1.45	1.96
Transfer to Adult Court	**	**	**

Data is statistically significant at the .05 level and is indicated by **Red Bold**

**Indicates an insufficient number of cases for analysis

Berkeley County: In calculating the Relative Rate Indexes for Berkeley County, it should be noted that White, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and Mixed youth constitute at least one percent each of the youth population between the ages 10 and 17. However, due to limitations in data collection and an insufficient number of cases at certain contact points for some races and ethnicities, the RRI's are not calculated for all contact points. Figure 2 shows a comparison of the RRI's for 2014, 2015, and 2016. The table displays an increase in arrest/referrals for all minorities. For cases diverted, secure detention, and delinquent findings, the contact points are not statistically significant.

Figure 2: Relative Rate Index Comparisons Berkeley County Data

6 | West Virginia DMC Plan

Data Items	WV 2014 RRI's	WV 2015 RRI's	WV 2016 RRI's
Arrest	N/A	4.02	2.75
Arrest/Referral	2.39	1.10	1.23
Cases Diverted	**	0.82	.67
Secure Detention	**	0.68	1.00
Cases Petitioned	**	1.01	.73
Delinquent Findings	**	0.75	1.01
Probation Placement	**	0.56	**
Secure Confinement	**	**	**

Data is statistically significant at the .05 level and is indicated by **Red Bold**

**Indicates an insufficient number of cases for analysis

--Indicates missing data

Kanawha County: Statistically significant results were obtained at the following points of contact for all minorities: arrest/referral, diversion, secure detention, cases resulting in delinquent findings, and confinement to secure facilities. This means that rate differences between minority youth and white youth are unlikely to have occurred by chance.

At the arrest/referral stage, RRI's indicate that the rate of arrest for minority youth is higher than it is white youth. In comparing the current 2016 data to previous years, Kanawha County had an increase in the arrest/referral rate and an increase in secure detention. "Delinquent findings" is statistically significant and indicates that more minority youth are being found delinquent. Probation placement has decreased, though it is not statistically significant.

Figure 3: Relative Rate Index Comparisons Kanawha County Data

Data Items	WV 2014 RRI's	WV 2015 RRI's	WV 2016 RRI's
Arrest	NA	3.30	6.56
Arrest/Referral	4.31	1.34	0.54
Cases Diverted	**	0.89	0.52
Secure Detention	**	1.29	2.92
Cases Petitioned	**	0.99	1.40

Delinquent Findings	**	1.08	2.92
Probation Placement	**	0.96	0.80
Secure Confinement	**	1.36	1.75
Transfer to Adult Court	**	**	**

Data is statistically significant at the .05 level and is indicated by **Red Bold**

**Indicates an insufficient number of cases for analysis

Monongalia County: Statistically significant results were obtained at the arrest/referral, cases diverted, and cases petitioned contact points. This means that the rate differences between minority youth and white youth are unlikely to have occurred by chance. At the arrest/referral stage, the rate of minority youth contact continues to be almost three times the rate of rate of contact for white youth and twice as much at the referral. There was also an increase in cases petitioned for all minority youth.

Figure 4: Relative Rate Index Comparisons for Monongalia County Data

Data Items	WV 2014 RRI's	WV 2015 RRI's	WV 2016 RRI's
Arrest	N/A	5.48	2.75
Arrest/Referral	2.79	0.29	**
Cases Diverted	**	0.87	0.94
Secure Detention	**	**	**
Cases Petitioned	**	1.21	2.60
Delinquent Findings	**	**	**
Probation Placement	**	**	**

Secure Confinement	**	**	**
Transfer to Adult Court	**	**	**

Data is statistically significant at the .05 level and is indicated by **Red Bold**

**Indicates an insufficient number of cases for analysis

--Indicates missing data

Item I B: Systematic Analysis of RRI Values and Tracking Sheets

In completing the systematic analysis of the relative rate indexes, five steps are involved that are helpful in guiding the decision-making process for reducing DMC. This process, developed by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is outlined in the DMC Technical Assistance Manual Volume 4. It should be noted that the sources of data are the Juvenile Probation Database and the Division of Juvenile Services. Data provided by the Juvenile Probation Database is **UNDUPLICATED** while the data provided by the Division of Juvenile Services is **DUPLICATED**. Therefore, when completing the data analysis, a combination of both duplicated and unduplicated data is used.

Listed below are the 5 steps as described in the manual.

1. Identifying those RRI values that are statistically significant.
2. From the RRI values that are statistically significant, identifying those with the greatest magnitude, that is, those that reflect the greatest degree of disproportionate contact.
3. From the statistically significant RRI values, identifying those that involve the greatest volume of activity, that is, the largest number of minority youth who potentially may be affected.
4. Comparing the RRI values noted in step 2 or 3 with the range of RRI values across other jurisdictions and noting which jurisdictions may be particularly different from the others.
5. Examining the local context for each of the RRI values identified in steps 1–4 to consider which jurisdictions may be the more feasible target populations for activities designed to reduce disproportionate minority contact.

Step 1: Identification of Statistically Significant Values

Statistical significance is determined using a .05 confidence level. Values are determined when data is entered into the DMC Web Based Entry System. All statistically significant numbers are in **red bold** and will be further analyzed for magnitude, volume, and jurisdictional comparison. Please see Figures 5-8 to examine relative rate indexes that are statistically significant.

Step 2: Examining Magnitude

Among those RRI values that are statistically significant, some will appear to be more important than others. Of the statistically significant RRI values identified, magnitude was examined for each. In determining this value, a guide provided by OJJDP was used. The purpose of identifying magnitude is to identify contact points that represent an area of concern. For the following contact points, if there is an RRI higher than one, it indicates an area of concern: arrest, referrals to juvenile court, cases involving secure detention, cases petitioned, cases resulting in delinquent findings, confinement in secure juvenile facilities, and cases transferred to adult courts. If cases diverted and cases resulting in probation placement have an RRI of less than one, then it indicates an area of concern.

Statewide Magnitude: *(see attached – WV Statewide RRI Analysis and Tracking sheet.pdf)*

Black or African American- Overall, African American youth rated higher than a one in the areas of arrest/referral, secure detention, cases petitioned resulting in delinquent findings, and secure confinement. For these contact points, the magnitude should be at one or less. The areas identified here are areas of concern. For cases diverted from the system and for probation placement, the magnitude was less than one. This indicates areas of concern as these numbers should be at one or higher.

Hispanic or Latino- The RRI indicates an area of concern at the cases petitioned. For these contact points, the magnitude should be one or less. The areas identified here are areas of concern. For cases diverted from the system the magnitude was less than one. This indicates areas of concern as these numbers should be at one or higher

All Minorities- For all minorities, the arrest/referral, secure detention, cases petitioned, delinquent findings, and secure confinement

had a magnitude above one. The areas identified here are areas of concern. Cases diverted and probation placement shows that there is an RRI value of less than one. This indicates that minority youth are diverted at a rate less than that for white youth.

Berkeley County Magnitude: *(see attached – Berkeley County RRI Analysis and Tracking sheet.pdf)*

Black or African American- For this population, the magnitude for arrest/referrals and cases resulting in delinquent findings is above one. This indicates an area of concern. Black or African American youth are less likely to be securely detained in Berkeley County because the magnitude of below one.

All Minorities- The magnitude is above one at both the arrest/referral, secure detention contact points. The magnitude at this contact point should be at a one or below and indicates an area of concern. Based on the RRIs for Berkeley county, minority youth are more likely to be arrested and securely detained than white youth however, there is an increase of cases being diverted.

Kanawha County Magnitude: *(see attached Kanawha County RRI Analysis and Tracking sheet.pdf)*

Black or African American- For this population, the magnitude was higher than one at the arrest/referral, secure detention, delinquent findings, and secure confinement contact points. For cases diverted, the RRI was below one. The contact points listed above are all areas of concern in Kanawha county.

All Minorities- At the contact point of arrest/referral, secure detention, cases resulting in delinquent findings, and secure confinement,

the magnitude was above one. The cases diverted, and probation placement were at a rate lower than one, which indicates an area of concern.

Monongalia County Magnitude: *(see Attachment –Monongalia County RRI Analysis and Tracking sheet.pdf)*

Black or African American- For this population, the magnitude is greater than one at the arrest/referral, and cases petitioned contact points. The RRI is less than one at the cases diverted contact point. These magnitudes indicate areas for concern.

*All Minorities-*The “All minorities” population has a magnitude above one at the arrest/referral and cases petitioned which are areas of concern. According to diverted magnitude, minority youth are not likely to be diverted in Monongalia county and this is considered an area of concern.

Step 3: Volume of Activity

For each of the RRI values determined to be statistically significant, volume was also determined. Please see the Relative Rate Index Tracking Sheets (Figures 5 through 8) for specific volume.

Step 4: Jurisdictional Comparison of RRI Data (Full Jurisdictional Comparisons are attached)

Statewide Comparison:

On a statewide level, a comparison of the data was made with data obtained from the DMC National Data book. Using the Excel format of the OJJDP comparison tool, it was determined that for all minorities statewide, WV ranked in the 84th percentile for Arrest/Referral Rate, 20th percentile for Diversion Rate, 26st percentile for Detention Rate, 59th percentile for Cases Petitioned Rate, and 51st percentile for Probation Rate. Based on statewide comparisons, West Virginia has an RRI score for all minorities in the state that is numerically higher than the indicated percentage of the jurisdictions that may be available through the OJJDP website.

Step 5: Examining the Local Context

The systematic analysis of the Relative Rate Indices yielded results that will guide the statewide assessment. Additionally, the information was also being used to help guide the local DMC committees by providing areas that must be addressed. The three counties identified as targeted DMC reduction sites are Berkeley County, Kanawha County, and Monongalia County. Data is collected on the statewide level as well. The DMC Technical Assistance Manual suggests examining several points to determine if a community is ready to address DMC. The key points are as follows:

1. Is the agency involved in that decision point amenable to change?
2. Have there been recent events (public relations issues) that make a change in DMC patterns more or less likely?
3. Are funds or resources available that might assist (or hinder, if lacking) the DMC effort at this decision point?

4. Is strong leadership available that is committed to addressing DMC issues?
5. Are best practices models for this decision point available and applicable?
6. Is there support for DMC reduction within the affected minority group and within the political leadership of that group?
7. Are there issues with the affected minority group regarding media attention at this decision point (e.g., potentially high visibility events that could generate support or resistance for DMC)

Statewide: On a statewide level, the DMC workgroup has been working and utilizing the statewide assessment. Through this assessment, recommendations were provided on how best to proceed with reduction efforts on a local level. At this time, specific funding has been allocated to address reduction initiatives. The JJDP Title II funding was allocated to cover the cost of the statewide assessment. Most recently, the West Virginia State Advisory Group has provided funding to four DMC Pilot Projects in two of the three targeted counties. This initiative is anticipated to be an ongoing effort but is contingent on the annual receipt of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Title II grant funds.

Berkeley County: The statewide assessment targeted this county for review to identify contributing factors of DMC. Currently, the county has been included as one of the highest disparities. The WV DJCS has identified key stakeholders and sent out a Request for Proposal to several county and city officials as well as non-profits in Berkeley County. To date, the Division has not received any successful applicants who demonstrated a tentative plan to further address DMC in WV, consistent with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's DMC Reduction Model. The SAG and WV Division of Justice will continue to formulate a plan to collaborate with local stakeholders to stress the importance of reduction efforts and reform initiatives.

Kanawha County: Currently the ability to establish a local DMC subcommittee in this county is in the planning phase. The Division has identified key local leaders that are willing to participate and continue addressing the overrepresentation of minority youth in the juvenile system. The State Advisory Group continues to work with the Partnership of African American Churches (DMC Program) to implement intervention strategies for reducing minority overrepresentation. The PACC Program hosts community events to raise public awareness of DMC. The Program provides law enforcement trainings on cultural competency, Anti-Racism, and youth engagement. The SAG continues to provide oversight of this program and has participated in meetings to engaged local stakeholders in the DMC reduction process, including law enforcement, schools, local probation, courts, mental health services and local community and faith-based organizations. The SAG continues to encourage all DMC Programs throughout the state to collaborate on events and incorporate youth to have a voice in reducing DMC.

Monongalia County: The SAG has identified and continues to provide funding for two DMC Projects in this county. The Mountaineer Boy and Girls Club has formulated a program that engages Law Enforcement Officers and minority youth in team building activities in order to improve their relationships. The Club has also created a Career Path Program where they collaborate with the local workforce and companies provide job training and secure employment. The club is opened on weekends and holidays and provides a safe place for youth. The Morgantown Area Youth Services Project(MAYSP) collects and analyzes data in the county to help address the root of the DMC issue. The Project's second component is providing intervention and alternatives for at-risk youth. The program received referrals from the Court and Health and Human Services to work with youth in areas of truancy, mental health and behavioral issues.

Item II: Assessment/Diagnosis

The Office of Research and Strategic Planning (ORSP) has completed the statewide assessment. The primary researcher was Dr. Stephen Haas, PhD and the Research Analyst/Assistant was Jessica Napier, MS. The goal of the assessment was to identify contributing factors to DMC with the results of the assessment to guide the recommendations and interventions for future reduction efforts. Through the use of these recommendations and the identification of contributing mechanisms, the SAG has become more knowledgeable about how to use various intervention strategies and funding to maximize reduction efforts.

The following results were identified from the summary of research findings and recommendations to address disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system for West Virginia.

Conclusions from DMC/Racial Disparity Studies in the state:

DMC is present at multiple stages of the juvenile justice process, even after controlling for legal (i.e., seriousness of current offense and prior records) and demographic characteristics.

Stakeholder perceptions of differences between cases involving minority youth and factors which influence key decision-making contribute to racial disparity.

Racial disparity appears to be ever-present and stable at earlier stages of the juvenile process when discretion is high (referral, predisposition detention decision, etc.) This contributes to indirect effects of race at later stages of the juvenile justice system.

Minority youth placed in detention prior to adjudication are significantly more likely to receive harsher punishments upon sentencing. More data is needed to account for all of the factors that may influence the decision-making of court actors.

Both the minority youth population and DMC varies substantially across WV counties, with five counties (Kanawha, Raleigh,

Berkeley, Cabell and Monongalia) having both high minority populations and significant RRI's at multiple stages of the process, especially in early stages.

Implications/Recommendation:

- Raise awareness of DMC, what it is and how to reduce it.
- Compiling information on programs/services that are target and assist at-risk minority youth in the state and across counties, including minority youth than are referred to the system.
- Increase availability of community-based programs that seek to divert minority away from the system offering a larger continuum of alternatives, offer programmatic services that address “criminogenic” factors, and develop programs to improve reentry in the community.
- Increase objectivity at earliest stages of the process and greater scrutiny of cases receiving formal/informal/ dispositions.
- Examine and potentially revise eligibility criteria for detention admissions and educate referral sources on new criteria.
- Study how “source of referral” and race interplay, and how referral types (e.g., police, schools, etc.) influence early decision-making in the juvenile justice process.
- Improve the validity and reliability of data collected on race/ethnicity, as well as factors that may contribute to disparate decisions. Conduct regular analysis of these data, and distribute the results widely to policymakers, court actors, and field personnel as a manner of increasing education on the issue.
- Examine how and/or whether supervision/treatment practices vary by race and type of supervision (i.e., formal and informal probation supervision), and what factors predict a youth's return to the system (including probation violations)

- Adopt “Best Practices” as described in Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiatives (JDAI) and Reduction Models for Change and consider becoming an Annie E. Casey replication site.

The following chart indicates what steps were developed to complete the statewide assessment. It also reveals what means was used in the formulation of the assessment. This assessment was used to implement the DMC activity in 2013 to 2015 and will continue to be utilized for the current three-year plan.

Objective	Description	Timeframe
Literature Review	Review Data, review literature concerning DMC at national level and conducted by other states, review promising practices by other states, contact members of workgroup if needed, contact other researchers on their assessment work	April 2012-June 2012
IRB Review	Complete and submit application	April 2012-June 2012
Develop data Collection Tools	Develop questions for focus groups and interviews	May 2012-July 2012
Select Study Participants	Develop a list of participants for each county to be interviewed, DMC workgroup assistance requested	May 2012-June 2012

Collection of Materials	Develop list of services in counties that identify nonprofit community programs	June 2012-July 2012
First quarterly report		End of June 2012
Schedule and conduct focus groups and interviews	Conduct focus groups and interviews	July 2012-September 2012
Second Quarterly Report		End of September 2012
Qualitative Data	Compile and review data Conduct follow up interviews if necessary	September 2012-Novmeber 2012
Develop preliminary findings	Preliminary findings made available to DMC workgroup	November 2012-Decemeber 2012
Third quarterly report		End of December 2012
Final Report	Full report, presentation, and Recommendations	End of March 2013

Item III: Intervention and DMC Reduction Activity Goals and Funding Sources

West Virginia has identified five targeted counties for DMC reduction activities. New goals have been identified to assist in starting local DMC committees in Berkeley, Kanawha, Raleigh, Cabell and Monongalia counties. The DMC workgroup of the SAG fully supports the development of these local committees as a way to involve the community and local stakeholders and increase public awareness of DMC. The SAG along with the WV DJCS decided to take DMC into a new direction by requesting proposals that seek to further the statewide DMC efforts through developing a Pilot Program(s) in Berkeley, Kanawha, Cabell, Raleigh, and Monongalia Counties. The selected DMC Pilot Projects are working closely with the WV State Advisory Group (SAG) and are required to report to the SAG on a quarterly basis. The goal of this Initiative is to implement the DMC Reduction Cycle, which is designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate numbers of juvenile members of minority groups who come in contact with the juvenile justice system throughout the state. The objectives are as follows:

- Identify where minority overrepresentation exists within the eight points of contact in juvenile justice system as indicated by relative rate indexes (RRI's).
- Examine the statewide assessment identifying the mechanisms that contribute to minority overrepresentation and carry out recommendations.
- Develop and implement intervention strategies for reducing minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system based on the identification of mechanisms contributing to DMC.

- Increase public awareness of DMC through trainings, presentations, and other resources to encourage community participation and greater understanding of DMC issues.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the various interventions.
- Establish community commitment with court partners, social services, mental health, police, DHHR, community and faith based organization, and parents, etc.

This initiative is anticipated to be an ongoing effort but is contingent on the annual receipt of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Title II grant funds. The “one size fits all” approach is not effective in West Virginia due to the rural nature and demographics of the state. The SAG, WVDJCS, and the DMC workgroup will work diligently to find ways to ensure equal and fair treatment for every youth (regardless of membership in a minority or majority population group) involved in the juvenile justice system.

3-year plan in 2015-2017 verse 2018-2020

In the previous 3-year plan the identification phase was solely to identify a DMC reduction effort and to fund Pilot programs. During 2015, the SAG has decided to make a change in the strategy put forth for addressing the DMC issues in West Virginia. A decision was made to seek grant proposals for pilot projects addressing DMC within the pre-determined identified target counties. In West Virginia, DMC is an issue and it varies from county to county. This variation is due to the small population of minorities in a large number of WV counties. West Virginia's goal of DMC reduction occurs through awareness and as multiple parts of the juvenile justice system and key stakeholders continue to work together. Currently, West Virginia has continued to fund three DMC Programs in two of the targeted counties. During this Three-Year Plan, WV will focus more on utilizing the RRI data. By presenting the data through RRI's the judgements could take the subjectivity and emotion out of a difficult subject.

Phase III: Intervention

Kanawha County: Currently the ability to establish a local DMC subcommittee in this county is in the planning phase. The Division has identified key local leaders that are willing to participate and continue addressing the overrepresentation of minority youth in the juvenile system. The State Advisory Group continues to work with one of the DMC Programs to develop and implement intervention strategies for reducing minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system. The SAG will continue to seek proposals for additional projects. The SAG has tasked the current DMC Program with engaging more stakeholders in the DMC reduction process, increasing DMC awareness and some reduction efforts.

Berkeley County: The statewide assessment targeted this county for review to identify contributing factors of DMC. The SAG and WV Division of Justice will continue to formulate a plan to collaborate with local stakeholders to stress the importance of reduction efforts and reform initiatives. Data will continue to be collected as it is crucial, and awareness is needed through this county.

Monongalia County: The WV DJCS and SAG has identified key stakeholders and will continue to provide funding for two DMC Projects in this county. Both Programs have been tasked with collaborating and implement intervention strategies for reducing minority overrepresentation. Currently, both Pilot projects are starting to collaborate have successfully intervened and was diverted minority youth away from the juvenile justice system. Both projects are having been and will continue receiving referrals and working with families, teachers, law enforcement, probation officers and mental health agencies to provide alternatives to involvement with the juvenile justice system. The Programs provide the following: Academics help, Individual & Parent Counseling, Substance Abuse Counseling, Underage Drinking and Driving Diversion, Life Management, Theft diversion, and Expungement of Offence from Criminal Record.

Statewide: On a statewide level, the DMC workgroup has been working and utilizing the statewide assessment. Through this assessment, recommendations were provided on how best to proceed with reduction efforts on a local level. At this time, specific

funding has been allocated to address reduction initiatives. After the completion of the RRI's for 2013-2016, the state utilized this data to assess the possible explanations and factors that contribute to the issue, to help implement more programs in affected counties, and initiate policy and system change. West Virginia will continue to Collaborate with of agencies, on-profits, law enforcement and the communities to reduce DMC. It takes multiple people, working together to make a difference. The SAG will continue to fund prevention, intervention or diversion, programming and to make DMVC reduction a long-term priority.

Current Success

The most recent action on taken in West Virginia to address DMC involved the passage of Senate Bill 393 in 2015. The bill was created based on recommendations by the bipartisan West Virginia Intergovernmental Task Force. The Task Force was created because, from 2006 to 2011, the committed juvenile population in the state increased by five percent even though there was a decline in crime, statewide. The new law made several changes, including requiring that at least half of program expenditures by state agencies and contracted service providers to fund evidence-based practices by 2017, allows for the diversion of status and nonviolent misdemeanants to restorative justice programs, and prevents first time status and nonviolent misdemeanors offenders form being placed in residential facilities expect for some specific exceptions.

Goals and Objectives:

Goal I: Improve data collection and analysis

Outcome Measure:

Data entered into OJJDP's Web-Based Entry System will accurately reflect the rates of activity for youth (ages 10-17) at each point of contact in the Juvenile Justice System according to race and ethnicity. Race and ethnicity categories will be captured according to OJJDP standards including White, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders, American Indian or Alaska Native or Other/Mixed.

Objective Number 1:

The Juvenile Justice Database will contain improved data representing rates of activity for youth at the nine points of contact in the WV Juvenile Justice System.

Objective Number 2:

Data validity and reliability of data collected on race and ethnicity will be monitored for accuracy

Goal II: Increase public awareness of disparity within the target counties.

Outcome Measure: The establishment of the local DMC stakeholder committees, the completion of training and/or educational presentations as well as the distribution of DMC educational materials within the three target counties will demonstrate an overall increase in public awareness.

Objective Number 1:

Establishment of local DMC stakeholder committee at each of the identified target counties

Objective Number 3:

The continuing distributing information on DMC to policymakers, court actors and field personnel to increase their knowledge on the racial/ethnicity disparity within this local juvenile justice system.

Objective Number 4:

Increase public awareness of DMC through trainings, presentations, and other resources to encourage community participation and greater understanding of DMC issues.

Objective Number 5:

Provide training to relevant groups and/or organizations explaining OJJDP requirements, national and state DMC trends, mechanisms contributing to DMC, DMC Reduction Model, and best practices for reducing DMC.

Goal III: Establishment of Pilot Program for implementation on the Model for DMC Reduction

Outcome Measure: The establishment of a DMC pilot project that has adopted the “Best Practice” Model for Reduction of Disparity.

Objective Number 1:

Establish community commitment with court partners, social services, mental health, police, DHHR, community and faith based organization and parents etc.

Objective Number 2: Through data analysis, identify the mechanisms within the nine points of contact contributing to disparity in the local juvenile justice system.

Objective Number 3: Begin the identification process of evidenced-based practices/programs for implementation within the pilot service area.

Item IV: Evaluation of DMC Reduction Activities

West Virginia has and will continue to use the performance measures developed by OJJDP to examine DMC. The output measures will be used to identify the implementation of activities while the outcome measures will utilize data to help determine program/intervention effectiveness. Both output and outcome measures incorporate all mandatory reporting items as well as two non-mandatory reporting items as required by OJJDP. Bold items indicate mandatory reporting items.

Title II Formula Grant Program PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PA 10: Disproportionate Minority Contact (State Level)

OUTPUT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

#	Output Measure	Definition
3	Number and percent of program staff trained.	The number and percent of program staff that are trained during reporting period.
4	Number of hours of program staff training provided	The number of training hours that program staff are provided during the reporting period. Training includes in-house and external trainings.
5	Number of non-program personnel trained.	The number of non-program people who are trained on DMC-related issues such as improving understanding of cultural differences, cultural context, cultural diversity, cultural awareness, bias, multicultural workplaces, etc. during the reporting period.
8	Number of program youth served	An unduplicated count of the number of youth served by the program during the reporting period.
1 1	Number of planning activities conducted	The number of planning activities undertaken during the reporting period. Planning activities include meetings held, needs assessments undertaken.
1 2	Number of assessment studies conducted	The number of DMC assessment studies undertaken during the reporting period to determine factors contributing to DMC.
1 3	Number of data improvement projects implemented	The number of data improvement projects funded at the state or local levels specifically to improve the quality and completeness of DMC data.

1 4	Number of objective decision-making tools developed	Report whether any objective decision-making tools were developed, such as detention risk, risk assessment, needs assessment, mental health assessment were developed to determine the supervision needs of the youth.
1 5	Number of program/agency policies or procedures created, amended or rescinded.	The number of program/agency policies or procedures created, amended, or rescinded during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific course of action that guides the general goals and directives of the program or agency. Include policies that are either relevant to the topic area of the program or policies that affect program operations.

**Title II Formula Grant Program PERFORMANCE MEASURES
PA 10: Disproportionate Minority Contact (State Level)
OUTCOME PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

#	Outcome Measure	Definition
1 6	Number and percent of program youth who OFFEND during the reporting period (short term)	The number and percent of participating program youth who were arrested or seen at a juvenile court for a delinquent offense during the reporting period. Appropriate for any youth-serving program.
1 7	Number and percent of program youth who offend during the reporting period (Long Term)	The number and percent of participating program youth who were arrested or seen at a juvenile court for a delinquent offense during the reporting period. Appropriate for any youth-serving program. Official records (police, juvenile court) are the preferred data source

1 8	Number and percent of program youth who re-offend during the reporting period (Short Term)	The number and percent of participating program youth who were arrested or seen at a juvenile court for a new delinquent offense during the reporting period.
1 9	Number and percent of program youth who RE-OFFEND (Long Term)	The number and percent of participating program youth who were arrested or seen at a juvenile court for a new delinquent offense during the reporting period. Appropriate for any youth-serving program. Official records (police, juvenile court) are the preferred data source.
2 5 A	Substance use (Short term)	The number and percent of program youth who have exhibited a decrease in substance abuse during the reporting period. Self-report or staff ratings are most likely data sources.
5 A	Substance use (Long Term)	Number and percent of program youth who exhibited a decrease in substance use 6 months to 1 year after exiting the program.
2 5 B	School attendance (Short Term)	The number of program youth who have exhibited an increase in school attendance during the reporting period. Self-report or staff rating are most likely data sources.
2 5 B	School attendance (Long Term)	Number and percent of program youth who exhibited an increase in school attendance 6 months to 1 year after exiting the program.
2 5 C	Family relationships (Short Term)	Number and percent of program youth who exhibited an improvement in family relationships during the reporting period. Self-report, staff rating are most likely data sources.

2 5 C	Family relationships (Long Term)	Number and percent of program youth who exhibited an improvement in family relationships 6 months to 1 year after exiting the program.
2 5 d	Antisocial behavior (Short Term)	The number and percent of youth who have exhibited a decrease in antisocial behavior during the reporting period. Self-report or staff ratings are the preferred data source. Anti-social behavior: A pervasive pattern of behavior that displays disregard for and violation of the rights of others, societal mores, or the law (such as deceitfulness, irritability, consistent irresponsibility, lack of remorse, failure to conform to social norms).
2 5 d	Antisocial behavior (Long Term)	Number and percent of program youth who exhibited a decrease in antisocial behavior 6 months to 1 year after exiting the program. Anti-social behavior: A pervasive pattern of behavior that displays disregard for and violation of the rights of others, societal mores, or the law (such as deceitfulness, irritability, consistent irresponsibility, lack of remorse, failure to conform to social norms).
3 2	Number of contact points reporting reduction in disproportional at the state level (Long Term)	Number of contact points reporting significant disproportional at the state level during the reporting period compared with the last reporting period. Contact points include arrest, referral to juvenile court, diversion, detention, petition filed, found delinquent, probation, secure confinement, and transfer/waiver to adult court.
3 4	Number and percent of recommendations from assessment studies implemented. (long term)	Assessment studies contain multiple recommendations. Count the total number of those chosen for implementation.

Item V: Monitoring of DMC

West Virginia will continue to monitor the trends of DMC through the completion of annual RRI tracking sheets as well as the completion of trend charts. These trend charts will demonstrate the fluctuation of the RRI for the identified jurisdictions within the state. Furthermore, when major interventions and strategies are implemented, then the RRI will also be closely examined to determine if the implemented activity has had the desired effect at that specified contact point. RRIs will be completed every three years but the RRIs tracking sheets will be submitted annually to OJJDP.