

**Interim Project Report: A Review of the Status of Disproportionate Minority
Contact (DMC) Efforts in Iowa and Virginia**

October 2008

**Mary E. Poulin
Janice Iwama
Stan Orchowsky**



**Justice Research and Statistics Association
777 North Capitol St., NE
Suite 801
Washington, DC 20002**

Acknowledgments

A number of people have provided valuable insight and support for this project thus far. In Virginia, we have worked with many individuals at the Department of Juvenile Justice and Department of Criminal Justice Services as well as the cities of Newport News and Norfolk. In Iowa, employees of the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and the DMC Resource Center as well as many others around the state have worked closely with us. Ashley Nellis, a former employee of JRSA, helped conceive the project. Our project advisory group, including Michael Leiber, Francisco Villaruel, and Phil Stevenson, helped direct the project at the outset. Finally, from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Heidi Hsia and our grant manager Michael Shader have provided helpful input throughout the project.

This report was prepared under Grant Number 2006-JE-FX-0002 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table of Contents

Project Overview	1
Introduction	1
Placing DMC in Context: A Comparison of Overrepresentation Statistics	2
A Review of the Status of Disproportionate Minority Contact Efforts in Iowa	4
A Review of the Status of Disproportionate Minority Contact Efforts in Virginia	14
Report Summary and Next Steps	22
References	23
Appendices	
A: History of Disproportionate Minority Contact Reduction Activities	26
B: Examining Disproportionate Minority Contact Interventions in Iowa and Virginia: Telephone Interview	36

Project Overview

In 2007, the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) began an 18-month project funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to evaluate the strategies that have been implemented in Iowa and Virginia to reduce disproportionate minority contact (DMC) in the states' juvenile justice systems. The project has two components: (1) documenting the DMC problem(s), the steps taken to assess DMC, interventions implemented in the two states, how these interventions were carried out, and the outcomes of these efforts; and (2) examining interventions in two localities in each state to determine how data can be used to assess their effectiveness, and analyzing these data where available. To address the first component we are using multiple methods of data collection: qualitative interviews, document review, and meeting observations. To address the second component we are using the material collected to identify interventions, and are requesting official juvenile justice system data from the states tracking cases from the point of arrest to disposition.

Introduction

This report provides information on the status of DMC efforts in Iowa and Virginia that have been implemented over the past several years. Data sources include reports published on the topic of DMC or minority involvement in the juvenile justice system and interviews with individuals involved in DMC efforts in Iowa and Virginia. Published reports include those produced by state or local governments, by consultants at the request of state or local governments, or by stakeholders with an interest in juvenile justice. The purpose of the interviews, which were conducted from the fall of 2007 to the spring of 2008, was to obtain opinions on DMC issues in the state or locality in which efforts are focused and to gather information on DMC efforts not available in published reports. Interview respondents included state and local juvenile justice system staff, other state staff involved in justice issues, and representatives of community efforts focused on DMC. A snowball sampling technique was used to identify potential participants.

The purpose of this report is to assess whether one can evaluate the effectiveness of each state's approaches to reducing DMC and, if so, how to go about doing it. Efforts to reduce DMC can be reasonably evaluated if DMC problems and their causes have been identified, solutions are appropriately linked to causes and problems, all substantial DMC efforts are known, and appropriate data are available. A subsequent report will assess whether it is reasonable to expect DMC reduction based on the efforts being implemented and will discuss what is effective in reducing DMC.

Placing DMC in Context: A Comparison of Overrepresentation Statistics

OJJDP's measure of DMC is the Relative Rate Index (RRI).¹ To provide context for how Iowa and Virginia compare to other states in terms of DMC occurrence, the most recent national RRI data comparing minority youths to white youths are provided in Table 1. An RRI greater than 1.0 indicates minority overrepresentation. Comparable RRI data for Iowa and Virginia are provided in Tables 2 and 3. These tables provide information on how much decisions at each point contribute to disparity, but do not account for why the disparities exist.

National data from 2005 indicate that minority overrepresentation was greatest at the stages of arrest and detention. Overrepresentation at arrest was even greater for black youths than for the entire minority population. Minority youths were more likely to receive a formal court petition and less likely to be processed informally (i.e., diverted) in the system. Minority youths were less likely than white youths to be adjudicated. Minority youths were more likely to receive the more severe disposition of placement outside the home and less likely to receive the less severe disposition of probation than whites. Finally, minority youths were more likely to be transferred from juvenile to adult court than whites.

Table 1
National 2005 RRI Data for Delinquency Offenses Compared with White Juveniles²

	All Minority	Black	Asian, Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	American Indian or Alaskan Native
Arrest rate	1.7	2.1	0.3	1.1
Court referral rate	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1
Diversion rate	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.9
Detention rate	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.1
Petitioned rate	1.2	1.2	1.1	1
Adjudicated rate	0.9	0.9	1	1.1
Probation rate	0.9	0.9	1.1	1
Placement rate	1.2	1.2	1	1.2
Waiver rate	1.1	1.1	0.6	1.9

Data Source: *National Disproportionate Minority Contact Databook, 2008.*

When the national RRI data from 2005 are compared to those for the same time frame from Iowa, several differences in minority overrepresentation are apparent (see Table 2). In Iowa, overrepresentation of minority youths is greater at the arrest, referral, detention, and placement stages when compared to the rest of the country. Minority youths are underrepresented at the waiver stage in Iowa, but national statistics show slight overrepresentation of minority youths at this stage. Differences in Iowa are most pronounced for black or African American and American Indian or Alaskan Native youths.

¹ More information about the RRI can be found in the National DMC Databook available at: <http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/dmcd/index.html>.

² Due to the way that some states collect race and ethnicity data, it is not possible to distinguish Hispanics or separate Asian/Pacific Islander into distinct groups.

Table 2
Iowa Calendar Year 2005 RRI Data for Delinquency Offenses

	All Minority	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other/ Mixed
Arrest rate	2.33	4.05	1.39	0.61	---	2.15	---
Court referral rate	2.61	4.53	1.35	0.62	---	2.23	---
Diversion rate	0.73	0.68	0.85	0.84	---	0.43	0.94
Detention rate	1.64	1.71	1.67	1.45	---	2.77	0.03
Petitioned rate	1.38	1.63	1.04	1.10	---	0.69	0.75
Adjudicated rate	0.98	0.96	1.00	0.80	---	1.64	1.10
Probation rate	0.88	0.93	0.79	0.57	---	0.79	0.69
Placement rate	1.40	1.08	2.12	---	---	4.18	2.44
Waiver rate	0.66	0.57	1.00	0.21	---	1.26	0.87

Data Source: Iowa's 2007 State of Iowa Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Formula Grant Update.

Comparison of the Virginia fiscal year 2005 data to national data from calendar year 2005 also shows variation between Virginia and the rest of the country (see Table 3). In Virginia, African American youths are more overrepresented at the points of referral and placement and less overrepresented at petition than African American youths in the rest of the country. Asian youths in Virginia are more overrepresented at the points of diversion and placement and less overrepresented at referral than Asian, Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander youths in the rest of the country.

Table 3
Virginia Fiscal Year 2005 RRI Data for Delinquency Offenses

	All Minority	African American	Hispanic	Asian	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders
Arrest rate	No Data				---
Court referral rate	Not reported	2.59	1.11	0.28	---
Diversion rate	Not reported	.91	.79	1.29	---
Detention rate	Not reported	1.31	1.49	.98	---
Petitioned rate	Not reported	1.03	1.09	.91	---
Adjudicated rate	No Data				---
Probation rate	No Data				---
Placement rate	Not reported	2.49	1.27	2.00	---
Waiver rate	No Data				---

Data Source: Derived from <http://www.dcjs.virginia.gov/juvenile/dmc/showdatasummary.cfm> (accessed August 1, 2008).

A Review of the Status of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Efforts in Iowa

DMC Programs and Strategies

Since the early 1990s Iowa has implemented a wide variety of programs and strategies to address DMC. A number of studies were undertaken to assess and identify the problems and their causes, and efforts were made to improve official system data in order to track the DMC problem. The DMC Resource Center, which has been in operation since 2002, is responsible for carrying out a wide variety of DMC projects, including an annual conference and technical assistance, and for providing general information on DMC to localities. Iowa has a state DMC Committee as well as a number of local committees. A standard intake assessment tool is being implemented in the judicial districts across the state, and three counties in Iowa have recently become Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) sites. Further information on these and other efforts in Iowa are available in “Iowa: Timeline of DMC Activities” in Appendix A.

Key Players in DMC Activities

Iowa has many key players with a long history of involvement in identifying DMC problems and contributing to their resolution. These individuals include university researchers, state agency employees, local juvenile justice system employees, consultants, and community-based program managers.

The DMC Resource Center of the National Resource Center of Family-Centered Practice at the University of Iowa has been involved in DMC activities in Iowa since 2002 and serves state and local efforts to reduce overrepresentation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system.

Several players are involved in improving and using data to assess the DMC problem. Mike Leiber, formerly of the University of Northern Iowa and now with Virginia Commonwealth University, has been conducting research on DMC in Iowa since the early 1990s. Other researchers, including William Feyerherm of Portland State University, have conducted studies for the state. The Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP) of the Department of Human Rights is responsible for managing federal monies for DMC efforts and developing and maintaining the statewide database of official criminal justice data used in various analyses of the DMC problem (the Justice Data Warehouse; JDW). CJJP has been involved in a variety of activities aimed at improving the content and quality of data maintained in the JDW.

There are several DMC Committees in Iowa. The state DMC Committee, which has been meeting regularly since 2000, is responsible for helping to identify DMC efforts that should receive funding. Woodbury, Black Hawk, and Polk counties also have DMC Committees. Woodbury County has had an annual DMC conference since 2002.

Community-based programs such as the U-CARE program of Urban Dreams have been delivering services directly to youths and working with the state and local communities to reduce DMC since 2005.

In 2007 the Governor's Taskforce on Youth, Race, and Detention began its efforts focusing on public safety and the use of detention. The Taskforce is particularly concerned with minority overrepresentation in secure detention. Members of the Taskforce include individuals involved in state and local juvenile justice systems and others with interest and knowledge of juvenile justice in Iowa.

History of DMC Studies

There have been several studies of DMC in Iowa dating back to 1993. These studies are:

- "The Disproportionate Overrepresentation of Minority Youth in Secure Facilities: A Survey of Decision Makers and Delinquents" (Leiber, 1993);
- "A Description and Discussion of Minority Overrepresentation in Iowa's Juvenile Justice System" (Moore and Kuker, 1993);
- "An Examination of the Factors that Influence Juvenile Justice Decision Making in The Jurisdictions of Black Hawk, Johnson, Linn and Scott, Iowa: An Assessment Study" (Leiber et al., 2006);
- "Race and Detention Decision Making and the Impact on Juvenile Court Outcomes in Black Hawk County, Iowa, Technical Full Report" (Leiber et al., 2007);
- "An Analysis of Detention Decision-Making in Three Iowa Counties" (Feyerherm, 2007);
- "Juvenile Detention and Alternatives: Perspectives from Three Counties, Report to the Governor's Youth Race and Detention Task Force" (Richardson et al., 2008).

Impetus for DMC Programs/Projects

Forces internal and external to the juvenile justice system have played roles in DMC programs and projects initiated in Iowa. One of the earliest DMC efforts in Iowa, the state DMC Committee, was formed in response to OJJDP requirements to address DMC. Recommendations from the State Advisory Group resulted in the two 1993 studies noted above, as well as the establishment of the DMC Resource Center. Reports published by Leiber in 1993 and Leiber and his colleagues in 2006 and 2007 appear to have spurred various changes regarding the operation of the juvenile justice system, such as detention decision making and training of system employees, as well as programming available to youths. Awareness of DMC problems led to the formation of local DMC Committees and the Court Community Liaison in Linn County. A desire to focus on the counties with the highest minority populations resulted in the 2002 decision to focus on Black Hawk, Hamilton/Humboldt/Wright, Muscatine, Polk, Scott, and Woodbury Counties. The demonstrated effectiveness of the Annie E. Casey Foundation JDAI work resulted in the decision to engage in detention reform. A demonstration project showed that communities can have an impact on DMC; this led to the use of local planning grants for DMC. A 2007 report by The Sentencing Project called *Uneven Justice: State Rates of Incarceration by Race and Ethnicity* spurred the formation of the Governor's Taskforce on Youth, Race, and Detention.

DMC Problems and Causes

Problems

Race problems in Iowa's juvenile justice system have been examined for the last 15 years. Though examination of problems has occurred on the state level, studies have primarily focused on those counties with the highest minority populations. While problems vary somewhat across counties and over time, overrepresentation of African Americans at the intake and detention stages appears to be the most persistent problem. Relative Rate Index (RRI) data are available statewide for all decision points for the past several years.

State Level

The findings of the studies listed on the previous page suggest that state-level overrepresentation at arrest, detention, and secure corrections has occurred for at least a decade. Based on the RRI, court referral (i.e., intake) rates for African American, Native American, and Hispanic youth are higher than for Caucasian youth for the calendar years 2004–2007. Further, court referral rates for African American and Native American youth increased during these years. During this same time, the average diversion rates for Native American and African American youth were approximately half the average rates for Asian and Caucasian youth. Diversion rates for African American youth decreased slightly, while diversion rates for Hispanic, Asian, and Caucasian youth increased slightly or remained level from 2004–2007. During calendar years 2004–2007, the average rate of detention for African American and Native American youth was approximately 2–2 ½ times higher than for Caucasian youth.

County Level

Leiber's 1993 study found overrepresentation at intake in Black Hawk, Johnson, Woodbury, and Polk Counties. Specifically, more African Americans were detained and stayed longer in detention than whites in these counties. Further, variations existed at other stages in the justice system across counties. In a similar study published by Leiber et al. in 2006 "race effects" were found to be operating in Black Hawk, Johnson, Linn, and Scott counties. These were most consistently found at juvenile court intake, with African American youth more likely to be referred for further court proceedings than similarly situated white youth.

Leiber et al.'s 2007 study of Black Hawk County provided information not only on the stages at which overrepresentation existed, but also the contextual factors that influenced decision making at those stages. African American youth were overrepresented at detention, and the overrepresentation rate remained relatively stable from 1990 through 2004. A racial gap existed at detention for between African American and White youths charged with drug offending. When held in detention for a court violation, African Americans were overrepresented in the early 1990s and again from the late 1990s through 2003. Individually and in combination, race and detention, as well as other factors such as gender, family structure, school problems, and crime severity, influenced decision making at various stages. Being detained did not contribute to minority overrepresentation throughout the process (i.e., no negative cumulative impact). Rather, legal factors, such as crime severity, predicted case outcomes. Typically, case outcome went in the expected direction (e.g., more severe crime, more serious outcome). Of the

extralegal factors, being female influenced intake and petition decisions and worked with race to affect adjudication and judicial disposition decisions.

In a study of the detention decision only, Feyerherm (2007) found that of the youths placed in detention in Black Hawk, Woodbury, and Scott Counties, African American youth comprised 23% of the group with offense allegations only, 35% of the group that had both new offense and probation violation allegations, and 39% of the group that had only probation violation allegations. This suggests that African American youth fare worse than their white counterparts when the circumstances surrounding the detention decision involve more discretion on the part of system decision makers.

Suggested Causes

In their studies, Leiber and his colleagues identified many potential causes for DMC in Iowa, and these causes were reported in the DMC reduction plans produced by the state. Similar to the variation found in the DMC problems, there is some variation over time and across counties in the causes for DMC, and there is no single cause for DMC in a particular county. Put simply, causes for DMC in Iowa identified by Leiber and his colleagues include:

- Subtle, inadvertent racial bias;
- Legal factors such as disproportionate involvement in crime and offense characteristics;
- Use of extralegal factors in decision making;
- Desire to act in the best interest of the youth;
- Community characteristics;
- Court culture and organization.

In 1993 Leiber produced a study examining minority involvement in multiple counties in Iowa. He reported that in Polk County reliance on prior record contributed to the increased likelihood of African American youth moving further into the system. History with the juvenile justice system, structural characteristics of the community, and organizational features of the court, as well as ideas and perceptions of decision makers concerning race, crime, family, and respect for authority, had an impact on decision making and the treatment of youth to varying degrees across counties. Finally, two other factors were reported to cause DMC: subtle, inadvertent racial bias and disproportionate involvement in crime. In 2006 Leiber and his colleagues studied some of the same counties included in the 1993 study and found that offending characteristics and racial bias appeared to be contributing to African American overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system.

In a recent study of Black Hawk County published by Leiber and colleagues in 2007, legal and extralegal factors, as well as the court culture and organization, resulted in minority overrepresentation. These factors are listed below.

- A change in the detention facility superintendent as well as new staff may have accounted for the increase in the number of youth in detention in 2006–2007.
- Legal factors, including involvement in person offenses, and extralegal factors, such as a single-parent household, may account for some of the African American overrepresentation in both detention and the juvenile court, but much is left unexplained.

- Being African American and from a single parent household, under court authority, or involved in drug offending resulted in differential treatment that usually involved more severe outcomes than those experienced by similarly situated white youths. Leiber suggests that this may be due to racial stereotyping of African American youth by decision makers, and application of “*parens patriae*,” with decisionmakers simply “doing their job” by attempting to do what is in the best interests of the youth.
- “Loose coupling” of the juvenile justice system, which refers to the idea that components of the system are only loosely linked with each other, resulting in inconsistent practices.
- There appear to be efforts by the judiciary to correct earlier errors and compensate for earlier injustices in processing. Evidence of this includes 1) African Americans with school problems and those detained after adjudication pending disposition were found to be less likely to receive an out-of-home placement at judicial disposition; and 2) while African American youth were more likely to be detained, which in turn affected intake decision making, detention did not affect petition or adjudication decision making.

Reports Documenting the Implementation of DMC Initiatives

A few sources document the implementation of DMC initiatives in Iowa. As part of its three-year plan³ (and annual updates) to OJJDP, the state notes whether proposed activities were implemented as planned. As discussed earlier, Leiber conducted studies in 1993 and, with his colleagues, 2006 to assess the DMC problem and identify causes. The 2006 report describes all of the DMC efforts undertaken from 1993 to 2005. Both reports also provide recommendations for how to address the DMC problems. Leiber et al.’s 2007 study of Black Hawk County identifies problems and causes and provides recommendations. Finally, the Governor’s Taskforce on Youth, Race and Detention, formed in 2007, reported on expected DMC activities and their outputs.

Connection Between DMC Problems and Projects/Programs

One of the challenges of assessing DMC work in the states is connecting projects and programs that have been implemented to address DMC to the identified problems and causes of DMC. A related issue to consider for Iowa is whether the projects and programs match the recommendations made by external consultants including Leiber, Feyerherm, and Richardson. Although there are some connections between initiatives and recommendations, certain topics, such as cultural sensitivity training, research on DMC, intake and detention decision making, and prevention programs for youths, are repeated in reports published between 1993 and 2007. This suggests that, for whatever reason, these recommendations were not addressed during this period. Also of note are those recommendations made by Leiber in 1993 that do not appear in subsequent lists of recommendations: 1) recognition and acceptance of the existence of overt and subtle racism; and 2) improvements in the relationships and contact between court personnel and the community. Though these two issues are not discussed explicitly in any subsequent reports, we learned through conversations with Leiber (personal communication, September 2008) and Kuker (personal communication, October 2008) that improvements in these areas have occurred, but the exclusion of these recommendations was an oversight.

³ In order to receive federal funds, OJJDP requires a three-year plan from each state that discusses how the state will address requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. These plans are updated annually.

Activities/Strategies and Relation to Problem or Recommendation

A number of the DMC activities and strategies implemented in Iowa are related to more than one identified problem or recommendation. In order to simplify the review of the relationship between activities/strategies and the problem or recommendation they are designed to address, this section lists each activity/strategy and follows it with a statement indicating to which, if any, recommendation(s) the activities or strategies appear to be related. State Plans indicate how projects and programs relate to study recommendations.

State-Level Activities/Strategies

1. DMC Resource Center
 - a. Annual DMC Conference: Topics covered at these conferences appear to be directly related to recommendations in reports. The 2003 three-year plan reports that the conference has helped mobilize DMC efforts, heightened community awareness of DMC issues, and provided best practices information for programming and policies for minority youth.
 - b. Technical Assistance to Localities: Leiber's and Feyerherm's studies note differences across counties that suggest a need for locality-specific efforts, and the 2003 three-year plan indicates a need for this as well.
 - c. DMC website: Not related to an explicitly identified problem, but in the three-year plan CJJP notes that the website is viewed as a vehicle to share information and increase awareness of select audiences to the issue of DMC.
2. DMC Committee (includes members of the minority community, a broad base of juvenile justice system-related staff, local planners, researchers, community activists): The committee provides oversight and planning of DMC activities. This committee is a tool for ensuring that programs/interventions match problems.
3. Committee to dialogue with DECATS⁴ (local DECAT communities): Leiber's and Feyerherm's studies note differences across counties indicating a need for locality-specific efforts.
4. Provide DMC Funding to Localities (local conferences, substance abuse prevention activities, after school or summer school programs, specialized curricula, tracking and monitoring, school-based liaisons, day treatment, aftercare): Leiber's and Feyerherm's studies note differences across counties indicating a need for locality-specific efforts. According to the 2003 three-year plan, early demonstration efforts showed that communities can plan for and have an impact on DMC.
5. Governor's Taskforce on Youth, Race, and Detention: This fits with various recommendations for more research.
6. Structured Decisionmaking Tool at Intake (Detention Risk Assessment): Fits with recommendations of Leiber's and Feyerherm's studies.
7. Improvements to data: Fits with Leiber et al.'s 2006 recommendations and enables reporting to OJJDP.

⁴ DECAT refers to decategorization, an initiative designed to redirect child welfare and juvenile justice funding to services that are more preventive, family-centered, and community-based in order to reduce use of more restrictive approaches.

- a. JDW enhancements (e.g., procedures for data entry, data reconciliation, adding data, producing reports).
- b. Compliance monitoring data available by race.
8. Provide DMC information to the media: Not related to an explicitly identified problem.
9. Minority Youth and Families Initiative: This effort is intended to address needs of youth of color in the child welfare system. Reports from two demonstration projects assessed by the National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice in Iowa indicate minority overrepresentation exists in child welfare and efforts should focus on increasing capacity among those agencies serving the minority community.

Local-Level Activities

1. Court Community Liaison: This fits with Leiber (1993) recommendation.
2. Local DMC Conference: Topics covered at these conferences appear to be directly related to recommendations in reports.
3. JDAI: This relates to Leiber's and Feyerherm's recommendations.
4. County DMC Committee: Studies by Leiber and Feyerherm note differences across counties that indicate a need for locality-specific efforts. County committees develop local efforts.
5. School Suspension Alternative Program: This does not relate to any recommendations in assessment reports, but other data analyses indicate that school suspension and expulsion policies in some localities may be disproportionately affecting African American youths.
6. Community Program(s) for Youth (U-CARE: operates on local level, considered a state activity; after school or summer programs; substance abuse prevention; specialized curricula; tracking and monitoring; Jane Boyd Community House): Community programs for youths relate to Leiber's (1993), Leiber et al.'s (2006), and (2007) recommendations. However, there is little information on whether all of these particular programs are directly related to the problem. It is notable that funding of the Jane Boyd Community House in 1993 occurred in a county not included in Leiber's 1993 study.
7. Substance abuse prevention activities: There are no apparent problems or recommendations to which this is related.
8. School-based liaisons: This does not directly relate to any recommendations in assessment reports, but other data analyses indicate that school suspension and expulsion policies in some localities may be disproportionately affecting African American youths.
9. Families First (has a diversion program called Developing Minority Youth): This fits with various studies carried out by Leiber.
10. Cultural Sensitivity training: This relates to recommendations in Leiber's 1993, 2006, and 2007 studies.

Implementation of DMC Projects/Programs

The 2006 and 2008 state plans report that all planned DMC activities were implemented. Factors that are likely helping implementation are the long-serving DMC Coordinator and a state-level group, the DMC Resource Center, which is devoted to furthering DMC work on the state and local levels.

Available Evidence Regarding Program/Project Success

Ultimately, the success of each program/project is defined by the reduction in DMC. The State Justice Data Warehouse (JDW) has official system data to track state and county DMC rates at each key point in the system. There are no reports on the effectiveness of particular programs released by DMC Resource Center or other state agencies. A 1996 report by Caliber Associates for OJJDP describes the results of a process evaluation of a demonstration project (activities included assessing the extent of overrepresentation and funding a pilot prevention and intervention program for youth, community planning grants, and a statewide cultural competency program). Data collection for the process evaluation included a series of interviews with state-level individuals working on DMC and interviews with individuals responsible for local DMC pilot programs. Among the findings was increased awareness of DMC and increased collaboration among agencies to address DMC. Richardson et al.'s 2008 report indicates that juvenile justice system officials and others working in youth-serving systems in three Iowa counties believe that progress has been made on raising awareness of DMC and that activities underway will lead to a reduction in DMC, but that there are few measurable outcomes. Finally, the DMC Resource Center produced a report on a promising approach to effectively providing DMC technical assistance. Though not formally evaluated, this approach is based on previous research. This report is entitled, "Effective DMC Technical Assistance" (Richardson and Thomas 2005).

Key Informant Perspectives on DMC

From the fall of 2007 to the spring of 2008, JRSA conducted structured telephone interviews with individuals across Iowa participating in DMC reduction efforts. The purpose of the interviews was to gain stakeholders' opinions on DMC issues in the state or locality in which efforts are focused and to gather information on DMC efforts not available in published reports. Respondents included state and local juvenile justice system staff, other state staff involved in justice issues, and representatives of community efforts focused on DMC. A snowball sampling technique was used to identify potential participants. A copy of the interview form is available in Appendix B.

In Iowa, 12 of 17 individuals contacted participated in the interview. On average, respondents had held their current positions for 5.6 years and had worked in the juvenile justice field for 18.3 years.

We asked participants a series of questions related to their perceptions of the seriousness of minority overrepresentation in the state or locality in which they work. When asked how serious they perceived minority overrepresentation to be, the average response was 4.4 on a scale of one to five, where five was the most serious response. The minority groups reported to be the most overrepresented were African Americans followed by Native Americans. For the six respondents who reported overrepresentation by Native Americans to be a problem, the average response regarding the seriousness of the problem was 4 (on a 5-point scale). The average response regarding the seriousness of minority overrepresentation for Hispanics was 3.3.

Respondents were provided with several possible reasons for why minority youths are overrepresented in the juvenile justice system and asked to indicate on a scale of one to five how strong of an explanation for DMC each reason is. The explanation with the highest average score, indicating that it is the strongest explanation for DMC, was, “Legislative and administrative policies such as zero tolerance policies can end up affecting minority youth differently than non-minority youth” (see Table 4). The explanation with the lowest average score, indicating that it is the weakest explanation for DMC was, “Minority youth commit more crime.” When Leiber asked Iowa juvenile justice system decisionmakers in 1993 why minorities were disproportionately represented in secure facilities, most indicated that the blame rested with the minorities themselves (either they were more likely to commit crime or they had an unstable family environment). Though the decision makers interviewed in 1993 were not the same individuals interviewed in 2007-2008 and the interview approaches differed between these two studies, it is notable that what was a very commonly cited reason in 1993 was the weakest explanation for DMC in 2007–2008.

Table 4
Interviews: Explanations for DMC in Iowa

	Average Score
Legislative and administrative policies... can end up affecting minority youth differently than non-minority youth.	4.25
Minority youth do not have same opportunities to participate in programs as non-minority youth.	4.08
Minority youth aren't treated the same as non-minority youth by...juvenile justice system actors.	4.02
Indirect effects in high-minority neighborhoods... place minority youth at a higher risk.	3.92
Minority youth commit more crime.	1.50

When asked if any other factors contributed to why minority youths were overrepresented, respondents provided a variety of responses. Among the most commonly cited factors were: racism, school discipline of minority youths (e.g., suspension), lack of support networks in minority families or communities, and lack of cultural awareness or competency in the justice system.

Though few participants provided responses regarding what factors contributed to or hindered project success, there were some notable comments. Having people concerned about DMC working on the projects, high visibility of the program, and participation of individuals across the justice system were all factors reported to contribute to success. On the other hand, problems with funding, or the lack of funding, were cited as obstacles to project success.

Conclusions

Iowa has well over a decade of history in identifying both statewide and county-specific DMC problems and causes and has implemented a wide range of DMC efforts designed to address the identified problems and causes. Available documentation regarding the implementation of these efforts varies, but, at a minimum, information on what, why, when, and where efforts were

carried out is available. For some of the larger, longer-term efforts, more information is available, but little evaluation information exists to document the success of efforts. The statewide integrated database, the Justice Data Warehouse, has been enhanced substantially over the last few years to permit tracking of cases by race from the point of complaint (i.e., referral to the juvenile court) to disposition. These enhancements permit analyses of changes in rates of minority involvement in the juvenile justice system and could facilitate the evaluation of DMC efforts.

A Review of the Status of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Efforts in Virginia

Work in the area of DMC reduction in Virginia appears to have begun in earnest in 2001. Since that time many of the efforts on the state level and in the cities of Newport News and Norfolk have focused on detention. This report focuses only on state-level DMC efforts and those in the cities of Newport News and Norfolk. Though DMC efforts have occurred in other localities in Virginia as well, we opted to focus on Newport News and Norfolk because they have been among the most active sites for DMC reduction activities in the state and have recently begun new efforts on DMC reduction with the Burns Institute.

DMC Programs and Strategies

Many of the DMC efforts in Virginia have focused on detention. In the past few years a risk assessment instrument was developed and implemented statewide to guide the detention decision. Legislation has been passed to regulate the circumstances under which the use of secure detention is permissible. Several localities across the state have become Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) sites in order to develop detention alternatives. Since 2005, in order to decrease the number of juveniles being detained predisposition, legislation was passed requiring counsel to be provided prior to an initial detention hearing. More recent efforts include: 1) the use of consultants from the Burns Institute to help identify and carry out projects to reduce DMC; and 2) a study on the juvenile justice system by the Virginia State Crime Commission. More information on programs and strategies in Virginia is available in Appendix A.

Key Players in DMC Activities

State agencies, local committees, and external consultants play key roles in developing and carrying out DMC efforts in Virginia. The Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) is the state agency responsible for monitoring OJJDP-funded DMC projects and therefore the state DMC Coordinator is employed by DCJS. From 2003 to 2007, the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), the state agency providing services to youths in the juvenile justice system, also had a DMC Coordinator. Since the DMC Coordinator left DJJ, the position has not been filled. DJJ reports that a reduction in the budget is the reason why the position has not been filled. The DJJ DMC Coordinator, along with the DJJ Division of Community Programs, had been responsible for monitoring the JDAI efforts in Norfolk and Newport News. The Annie E. Casey Foundation, responsible for the development of the JDAI, provides monetary support to JDAI sites for training, planning, and coordination as well as technical support, resource materials and tools, and opportunities to learn from other JDAI sites. Local DMC Committees are responsible for developing and managing local DMC efforts; these are primarily in the area of detention. The W. Haywood Burns Institute is working with Norfolk and Newport News to help identify their DMC problems and develop and carry out their efforts to reduce DMC.

History of DMC Studies

There are two apparent bursts of activity regarding DMC problem identification: one in the early 1990s and the other since 2000. These studies have examined DMC on the state and local levels. These studies include:

- “Minority Representation in Virginia’s Learning Centers” (Virginia Department of Youth and Family Services, 1992);
- “Minority Representation in the Intake Process of the Juvenile Justice System” (Virginia Department of Youth and Family Services, 1992);
- “The Influence of a Youth’s Race on Juvenile Justice System Decisions” (Virginia Department of Youth and Family Services, 1993);
- “Unequal Justice: African Americans in the Virginia Criminal Justice System” (Virginia Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, 2000);
- “Virginia: An Assessment of Access to Counsel and Quality of Representation in Delinquency Proceedings” (American Bar Association, Juvenile Justice Center and Mid-Atlantic Juvenile Defender Center, 2002);
- “Bias-Based Policing: A Study for the Commonwealth of Virginia” (Center for Government and Public Affairs, Auburn University Montgomery, 2004);
- “The Governor’s Preventing Crime in Virginia’s Minority Communities Task Force Report” (Task Force on Preventing Crime in Virginia’s Minority Communities, 2005);
- “Readiness Assessment Consultation (RAC) Report: [Norfolk, Virginia]” (Finley et al., 2006);
- “Readiness Assessment Consultation (RAC) Report: Newport News, Virginia” (Finley et al., 2007).

Not all of these studies arrived at similar conclusions regarding what the problems are and what causes these problems. Possible reasons for this include: studies did not focus on all aspects of the juvenile justice system, problems differ across localities, and official system data are not available at all stages of the system or were not used to assess problems. It is notable that a number of these studies relied exclusively on perceptions of juvenile justice system actors or community members to identify the DMC problems and causes (American Bar Association [ABA], Juvenile Justice Center and Mid-Atlantic Juvenile Defender Center [MJDC], 2002; Task Force on Preventing Crime in Virginia’s Minority Communities, 2005; Center for Government and Public Affairs, Auburn University Montgomery, 2004; Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, 2006).

Impetus for DMC Programs/Projects

Over the years DCJS has provided funding for various DMC efforts. Most recently, DJCS funded alternatives to detention efforts and Detention Expeditor⁵ positions. The ABA/MJDC report led to efforts to improve the quality of counsel for juveniles. Following the release of The Governor’s Preventing Crime in Minority Communities Task Force report, DCJS began annual review of training standards and policies on bias-based policing. Statewide implementation of the Detention Assessment Instrument (DAI) can be attributed to the state legislature’s mandate

⁵ A Detention Expeditor is tasked with improving the speed with which detention decisions are made and promote the use of detention alternatives.

for implementation and the support of DJJ. Availability of resources from the Annie E. Casey Foundation is likely responsible for some efforts in the area of detention reform. Interest from the local juvenile justice system in decreasing the number of minority youth in detention centers resulted in Newport News becoming a JDAI site as well as the city's involvement with the Burns Institute.

DMC Problems and Causes

A few studies were conducted in the early 1990s to identify whether minority overrepresentation exists. These studies concluded that overrepresentation existed across the system. Altogether, studies attempting to identify possible causes indicate that the structure and operation of the court system, racial bias, overrepresentation of African Americans at detention, lack of understanding of the causes of DMC, lack of connection between data and strategies, and insufficient community involvement all contribute to DMC.

Problems: State Overrepresentation Data

Minority overrepresentation is primarily a problem for African Americans on the state level, although Relative Rate Index (RRI) data for FY2005, the most recent year available, suggest a problem at some stages for Hispanic youth. Using these RRI data, overrepresentation exists for African Americans at court intake (i.e., referral), detention, petition, and juvenile corrections (i.e., placement) (Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, 2005). No data are available for the points of arrest, the finding of delinquency, probation placement, or cases waived to adult court.

Problems: Norfolk Overrepresentation Data

Minority overrepresentation is primarily a problem for African Americans in Norfolk, according to RRI data from 2003 to 2005 (Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, 2005). Based on these RRI data, overrepresentation exists for African Americans at court intake, detention, and juvenile corrections (no 2005 data are available for Norfolk for corrections). No data are available on the points of arrest, the finding of delinquency, probation placement, or cases transferred to adult court.

Locality-specific data for Norfolk show that the problem is worse at some stages for black/African American youths than for the state as a whole (see Table 5). For Hispanic/Latino youths from Norfolk, the problems are better at some stages and worse at others when compared to the whole state. The only stage where a sufficient number of cases are available to permit analysis for Asian youths is court referral; Asian youths are underrepresented at this stage when compared to the whole state.

Table 5
Norfolk, Virginia, FY 2005 RRI Data for Delinquency Offenses Compared with White Juveniles

	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other/Mixed	All Minorities
Arrest rate	No data			Group less than 1% of population			No data
Court referral rate	2.61	0.67	0.22				2.42
Diversion rate	0.90	2.05	Insufficient number of cases				0.93
Detention rate	1.51	1.20					1.50
Petitioned rate	1.05	0.76					1.04
Adjudicated rate	No data						No data
Probation rate	No data						No data
Placement rate	Insufficient number of cases						Insufficient number of cases
Waiver rate	No data						No data

Data Source: Derived from <http://www.dcjs.virginia.gov/juvenile/dmc/showdatasummary.cfm> (accessed August 1, 2008).

Problems: Newport News Overrepresentation Data

Overrepresentation in Newport News appears to be primarily an issue for black or African American youths, but different reports produce slightly different accounts. RRI data for FY 2005 from DCJS indicate that the only minority group with statistically significant overrepresentation is black or African American youths. Black youths were overrepresented at court intake, detention and petition to the juvenile court and underrepresented at diversion. Using these same data, Asian youths were underrepresented at court referral. When a different data source is used, a slightly different picture of overrepresentation is seen. A report published by the City of Newport News using Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) FY 2005 data indicates that minority overrepresentation exists at the following stages: intake, petition, probation, and detention. African American youths were the only minority group overrepresented at intake. At petition, Hispanic and Native American youth were overrepresented. At probation, Hispanic and Asian youth were overrepresented. At detention, African American and Asian youths were overrepresented and Hispanic youths were underrepresented (Newport News JDAI DMC Subcommittee, 2005).

In Newport News, comparison of local RRI data to state RRI data reveals some significant differences (see Table 6). Black/African American youths are overrepresented to a greater extent in Newport News at court referral, detention, and petition and underrepresented to a greater extent at diversion. There are no significant differences for Hispanic/Latino youths in Newport News when compared to the rest of the state. Like Asian youths across the state, those in Newport News are underrepresented, but not as underrepresented as they are for the state as a whole.

Table 6
Newport News Virginia FY 2005 RRI Data for Delinquency Offenses

	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other/Mixed	All Minorities
Arrest rate	No data			Group less than 1% of population			No data
Court referral rate	3.13	0.91	0.49				2.82
Diversion rate	0.74	0.74	Insufficient number of cases				0.74
Detention rate	1.19	0.58					1.17
Petitioned rate	1.10	1.11					1.10
Adjudicated rate	No data						No data
Probation rate	No data						No data
Placement rate	0.92	No data					0.87
Waiver rate	No data						No data

Data Source: Derived from <http://www.dcjs.virginia.gov/juvenile/dmc/showdatasummary.cfm> (accessed August 1, 2008).

Problems in Norfolk and Newport News: Summary

Based on a review of the reports cited earlier, the following are the DMC problems identified on the state level and in the localities of Newport News and Norfolk:

- Poor legal representation in juvenile justice system (poor youth are more likely to have inadequate legal representation, which disproportionately impacts minority youths);
- Racial bias in law enforcement and the judicial system;
- Lack of DMC awareness among state and local governments;
- Lack of understanding of what causes DMC;
- Lack of community communication with law enforcement/juvenile justice system;
- Overrepresentation of African Americans in secure detention, and African Americans remain in detention longer than whites;
- Data are not connected to developing specific strategies to reduce DMC;
- Tension within system regarding control over decisions;
- Alternatives to detention are not used efficiently and effectively;
- Overrepresentation of minorities at intake referral by police (although no data were cited to support this).

Suggested Causes

The Virginia reports on DMC reviewed for this study tend to focus on juvenile justice system issues as the causes for DMC-related problems. Causes of identified problems from the overrepresentation studies discussed earlier include weak training, lack of standard policies and practices, poor quality legal representation, paying little attention to the problem, fear of talking about DMC, lack of alternatives to detention, subjective decision making, and insufficient data/information to assess the problem.

Reports Documenting the Implementation of DMC Initiatives

Progress on state and local DMC activities is documented through the state's three-year plans, the most recent of which was published in 2005. The DMC Coordinator monitors the various DJCS grants that fund DMC efforts. Grantees provide quarterly progress reports detailing program activities and issues, work plan status, and evaluation plans (which contain a form/narrative for reporting data that have been collected so far as a part of the evaluation process).

The Casey Foundation's JDAI initiative documents its progress through various newsletters and reports. In February 2008, Casey published a report on the accomplishments of JDAI in Norfolk. A similar report has not been identified for Newport News. DJJ published a report in 2004 documenting the implementation of the DAI.

It is too early to expect reports on the accomplishments or progress of DMC efforts in Newport News and Norfolk that the Burns Institute is facilitating. To date, the only reports available are the Readiness Assessment Consultation (RAC) reports that document DMC problems. There are, however, internal working documents such as meeting notes that detail the work being performed.

Connection Between DMC Problems and Projects/Programs

According to reports by the Burns Institute, there is some question as to whether Newport News and Norfolk have an understanding of the causes of their DMC problem (Finley et al., 2006; Finley et al., 2007), but on the face of it projects/programs do appear to match identified problems. Some problems, such as overrepresentation at detention, seem to have been addressed to a far greater extent than other problems. Below is a list of the problems identified and the projects/programs implemented to address them.

- 1) Poor access to, and quality of, legal representation in the juvenile justice system
 - The Virginia State Crime Commission was directed to conduct a study with this problem as one of its focuses and to offer recommendations.
 - Legislative change was made effective July 2005 requiring counsel to be provided prior to an initial detention hearing, and prohibiting youths charged with felonies from waiving their right to counsel without consulting with an attorney first.
 - DCJS provided Challenge Grant funding for the Public Defender Commission in 2004 and for Juvenile Defender Summits in 2006 to train juvenile defenders to advocate for release from detention.
- 2) Bias in law enforcement and judicial system
 - DCJS is now reviewing policing training standards and model policy on biased-based policing annually.
 - DCJS' Juvenile Services Compliance Monitor is providing training and assistance to local officials and detention staff to ensure that they are aware of the necessity of addressing DMC.
 - Recommendations by Governor Warner based on his task force report to recruit and retain minority officers were shared with Virginia's Association of Commonwealth's

Attorneys, the Virginia Association of Chiefs of Police and the Virginia Sheriff's Association.

- 3) Awareness of DMC within juvenile justice system
 - Juvenile Services Section Fact Sheet was developed (2002).
 - Juvenile Services Section Demographics Web Page was created for easy access to DMC information (the most recent data posted is for 2005).
 - 2008 DCJS Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Conference to include workshops on DMC.
- 4) Family/Community Involvement
 - Governor Warner announced the appointment of a task force to meet with citizens around the state to address crime in minority communities and a final report, which included recommendations, was published in 2005.
- 5) Overrepresentation in secure detention
 - Development and implementation of Detention Assessment Instrument (2002).
 - Legislative change made by legislature in 2002 clarified criteria for detention of probation violators.
 - Participation in JDAI (several efforts began in 2003 and 2005).
 - Study of detention admissions data in Newport News (2007).

Implementation of DMC Projects/Programs

The list below summarizes various DMC projects implemented in Virginia:

- The Virginia State Crime Commission was asked to continue its study of Virginia's juvenile justice system, which includes examining DMC in Virginia.
- Detention Assessment Instrument (DAI)
 - Implemented statewide in December 2002.
 - Statewide regulation required all Court Services Units (CSUs) to use the instrument.
 - Data were collected evaluating DAI in 2003 and another study was completed in 2007, both recommending continued use and study of the instrument.
- JDAI Local Efforts:
 - Newport News
 - Project support ran from Oct 2003 – Nov 2007.
 - Norfolk JDAI DMC Subcommittee/Burns Institute:
 - JDAI began in August/September 2005.
 - The DMC committee in Norfolk has not developed any programs or interventions yet to address DMC problems.
 - Data are currently being collected and analyzed to identify the three leading areas of detention admissions for the most recent fiscal year.
 - The DMC committee is currently meeting on schedule as planned.
- Newport News DMC Subcommittee (post JDAI):
 - The DMC committee in Newport News has not developed any program or interventions yet to address DMC problems.
 - Data are currently being collected and analyzed to identify the three leading areas of detention admissions for the most recent fiscal year.

Available Evidence Regarding Program/Project Success

Ultimately, the success of each program/project is defined by the reduction in DMC. Data documenting the impact of interventions on DMC are not available. A 2007 assessment of the impact of the DAI examined whether it improved public safety and court appearances, but not whether it had an impact on DMC. Each JDAI site is currently trying to use detention data to measure success with the assistance of the Burns Institute. To date, the only indication of success has been through the JDAI efforts. JDAI has measured the decreasing number of youths in detention centers, and has published a list of Norfolk accomplishments from 2005–2008 (published in February 2008) that includes secure detention data.

Key Informant Perspectives on DMC

From the fall of 2007 to the spring of 2008 we conducted structured telephone interviews with individuals across the state participating in DMC reduction efforts (Newport News and Norfolk were the only localities represented; others worked on the state level). The purpose of the interview was to gather opinions on DMC issues in the state or locality in which efforts are focused and to gather information on DMC efforts not available in published reports. Respondents included state and local juvenile justice system staff, other state staff involved in justice issues, and representatives of community efforts focused on DMC. A snowball sampling technique was used to identify potential, voluntary participants.

In Virginia, 16 of 31 individuals contacted participated in the interviews. On average, respondents had held their current positions for 5.5 years and had worked in the juvenile justice field for 16.3 years.

We asked participants a series of questions related to their perceptions of the seriousness of minority overrepresentation in the state or locality in which they work. When asked how serious they perceived minority overrepresentation to be, the average response was 3.9 on a scale of one to five, where five was the most serious response. The minority groups reported to be the most overrepresented were African Americans. The average response regarding the seriousness of minority overrepresentation for Hispanics was 2.6.

Respondents were provided with several possible reasons for why minority youths are overrepresented in the juvenile justice system and asked to indicate on a scale of one to five how strong of an explanation for DMC it is. The explanation with the highest average score, indicating that it is the strongest explanation for DMC, was, “There are indirect effects in high-minority neighborhoods that place minority youth at a higher risk of involvement in crime than in other areas” (see Table 7). The explanation with the lowest average score, indicating that it is the weakest explanation for DMC was, “Minority youth commit more crime.”

Table 7
Interviews: Explanations for DMC in Virginia

	Average Score
Indirect effects in high-minority neighborhoods... place minority youth at a higher risk	4.69
Legislative and administrative policies... can end up affecting minority youth differently than non-minority youth	4.06
Minority youth do not have same opportunities to participate in programs as non-minority youth	4.06
Minority youth aren't treated the same as non-minority youth by...juvenile justice system actors	3.31
Minority youth commit more crime	2.31

When asked if any other factors contributed to why minority youths were overrepresented, respondents provided a variety of responses. The most commonly cited additional factor was the low socioeconomic status of minority youths.

Few participants provided responses regarding what factors contributed to or hindered project success. Notably, multiple respondents indicated that problems with funding, or lack of funding, were obstacles to project success.

Conclusions

In Virginia, the history of efforts to address DMC began in earnest around 2001. However, studies conducted prior to this date indicated the presence of minority overrepresentation. A wide range of problems and causes have been identified, but not all of these studies have arrived at similar conclusions. Though problems and causes may vary across jurisdictions and points in the system, gaps in available system data to document the problem and studies that do not include system data likely contribute to disparate conclusions. Many of the efforts in Virginia have focused on the detention decision. Available documentation regarding the implementation of DMC efforts varies, but, at a minimum, information is generally available on what, why, when, and where efforts were carried out. Finally, little information is available to assess the success of efforts.

Report Summary and Next Steps

This preliminary report has both provided answers and raised questions regarding why and how efforts, programs, and projects were carried out. The information provided here will help inform future analyses that will consider whether and how the effectiveness of each state's approaches to reducing DMC can be evaluated. Next steps for the project include detailed interviews with key players in Iowa and Virginia to answer the questions raised in the writing of this report. This report provides the needed background information to facilitate analyses linking DMC efforts to trends in minority involvement in the juvenile justice system, and to demonstrate how initiatives implemented at the local level can be evaluated. We have requested official system data from Iowa and Virginia to permit us, in the final stage of the project, to attempt to assess whether local efforts may have had an impact on minority overrepresentation.

References

- American Bar Association, Juvenile Justice Center and Mid-Atlantic Juvenile Defender Center. (2002). *Virginia: An Assessment of Access to Counsel and Quality of Representation in Delinquency Proceedings*. Chicago, IL: Author.
- Caliber Associates. (1996). *Evaluation of the Disproportionate Minority Confinement Initiative: Iowa Final Report*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Center for Government and Public Affairs, Auburn University, Montgomery. (2004). *Bias-Based Policing: A Study for the Commonwealth of Virginia*. Montgomery, AL: Author.
- Feyerherm, W. (2007). *An Analysis of Detention Decision-Making in Three Iowa Counties*. Portland, OR: Portland State University.
- Finley, M., Lacey, C., & Garry, L. (2006). *Readiness Assessment Consultation (RAC) Report: [Norfolk, Virginia]*. San Francisco, CA: W. Haywood Burns Institute.
- Finley, M., Lacey, C., & Garry, L. (2007). *Readiness Assessment Consultation (RAC) Report: Newport News, Virginia*. San Francisco, CA: W. Haywood Burns Institute.
- Iowa Department of Human Rights Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and Iowa's Juvenile Justice Advisory Council. (2006). *Serving Iowa Youth and Families With a Youth Development Approach: JJDP Act Formula Grant Application and Three-Year Plan*. Des Moines, IA: Author.
- Iowa Department of Human Rights Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and Iowa's Juvenile Justice Advisory Council. (2007). *DMC Section from Iowa's 2007 State of Iowa Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Formula Grant Update*. Des Moines, IA: Author.
- Iowa Department of Human Rights Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and Iowa's Juvenile Justice Advisory Council. (2008). *DMC Section from Iowa's 2008 State of Iowa Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Formula Grant Update*. Des Moines, IA: Author.
- Leiber, M. (1993). *The Disproportionate Overrepresentation of Minority Youth in Secure Facilities: A Survey of Decision Makers and Delinquents*. Des Moines, IA: Office of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning.
- Leiber, M., Johnson, J., & Fox, K. (2006). *An Examination of the Factors that Influence Juvenile Justice Decision Making In The Jurisdictions of Black Hawk, Johnson, Linn and Scott, Iowa: An Assessment Study*. Des Moines, IA: Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning.

Leiber, M., Fox, K., & Lacks, R. (2007). *Race and Detention Decision Making and the Impact on Juvenile Court Outcomes in Black Hawk County, Iowa, Technical Full Report*. IA: Black Hawk County Juvenile Court Services and Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning.

Mauer, M. & King, R. (2007). *Uneven Justice: State Rates of Incarceration by Race and Ethnicity*. Washington DC: The Sentencing Project.

Moore, R., & Kuker, D. (1993). *A Description and Discussion of Minority Overrepresentation in Iowa's Juvenile Justice System*. Des Moines, IA: Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and Statistical Analysis Center.

Newport News Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, Disproportionate Minority Contact Subcommittee. (2005). *Report to the Collaborative*. Newport News, VA: Corporation of Newport News.

Puzzanchera, C., & Adams, B. (2008). *National Disproportionate Minority Contact Databook*. Developed by the National Center for Juvenile Justice for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Online. Available: <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/dmcd/b/>.

Reiner, S., Miller, J.B., & Gangal, T. (2007). Public Safety Outcomes of Virginia's Detention Assessment Instrument. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 58(3), 31–41.

Richardson, B., & Thomas, R. (2005). *Effective DMC Technical Assistance*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice, DMC Resource Center.

Richardson, B., & Graf, N. (2006) *Minority Youth and Families Initiative (MYFI): Evaluation of the Polk County Demonstration Project*. Iowa City: IA. University of Iowa School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice.

Richardson, B., Graf, N., Kleinschmit-Rembert, J., & Gordon J. (2006) *Minority Youth and Families Initiative (MYFI): Evaluation of the Woodbury County Demonstration Project*. Iowa City: IA. University of Iowa School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice.

Richardson, B. et al. (2008). *Juvenile Detention and Alternatives: Perspectives from Three Counties, Report to the Governor's Youth Race and Detention Task Force*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice, DMC Resource Center.

Task Force on Preventing Crime in Virginia's Minority Communities. (2005). *The Governor's Preventing Crime in Virginia's Minority Communities Task Force Report*. VA: Author.

Virginia Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights. (2000). *Unequal Justice: African Americans in the Virginia Criminal Justice System*. VA: Author.

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. (2005). *Virginia's Three-Year Plan, 2006-2008*. Richmond, VA: Author.

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. (2006). *Blueprints for Change: Criminal Justice Policy Issues in Virginia: Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) with the Juvenile Justice System*. Richmond, VA: Author.

Virginia Department of Youth and Family Services. (1992). *Minority Representation in the Intake Process of the Juvenile Justice System*. Richmond, VA: Author.

Virginia Department of Youth and Family Services. (1992). *Minority Representation in Virginia's Learning Centers*. Richmond, VA: Author.

Virginia Department of Youth and Family Services. (1993). *The Influence of a Youth's Race on Juvenile Justice System Decisions*. Richmond, VA: Author.

Appendix A: History of DMC Reduction Activities

Iowa: Timeline of DMC Activities (Much of 1993 to 2005 derived from Leiber et al., 2006)

1993

- (January) Applied for Phase II OJJDP DMC Discretionary Grant.
 - DMC pilot community proposed that would allow for programmatic community effort to impact DMC.
 - Continued work with the Iowa Court Information System (ICIS).
- (Spring) DMC Phase I Assessment completed, including University of Northern Iowa studies, enhanced monitoring for DMC, town meetings, etc.
- (Summer) RFP released and funding provided for DMC Community - Jane Boyd Community House - funding is from Phase II Discretionary dollars.
- (Summer) Funding provided for planning initiatives in Black Hawk, Polk, Scott, & Woodbury Counties.
- Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) continues to make funding available for DMC programs with formula grant funds.
- Continued work of DMC Task Force - by the end of the year Task Force stops meeting.
- “The Disproportionate Overrepresentation of Minority Youth in Secure Facilities: A Survey of Decision Makers and Delinquents” (Leiber, 1993)
- “A Description and Discussion of Minority Overrepresentation in Iowa’s Juvenile Justice System” (Moore and Kuker, 1993)

1994

- DMC coordinator hired and begins work for CJJP. Coordinator provides intensive work with communities regarding specified DMC issues. Coordinator also provides DMC-related training to state and local officials.
- Continued work with State Court Administrators Office on ICIS.
- Continued funding provided for DMC Community - Jane Boyd Community House - funding is Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act formula grant funds.
- Special technical assistance provided to Jane Boyd through Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and its technical assistance providers.
- JJAC continues to make funding available for DMC programs with formula grant funds.

1995

- DMC coordinator continues work for CJJP.
- Continued work with State Court Administrators Office on ICIS.
- JJAC continues to make funding available for DMC programs with formula grant funds.
- Continued funding provided for DMC Community - Jane Boyd Community House - funding is JJDP Act formula grant funds.

1996

- DMC coordinator continues work for CJJP.
- Final year of funding provided for DMC Community - Jane Boyd Community House - funding is JJDP Act formula grant funds.
- CJJP requests technical assistance on effort with ICIS - National Center for Juvenile Justice provides assistance – ICIS and CJJP develop contract with McGladery and Pullen to create basic data collection formats.

- JJAC continues to make funding available for DMC programs with formula grant funds.

1997

- (Summer) DMC Coordinator resigns.
- Data formats completed with ICIS provider test runs initiated.
- JJAC continues to make funding available for DMC programs with formula grant funds.

1998

- JJAC continues to make funding available for DMC programs with formula grant funds.
- Limited statewide use of ICIS hinders implementation of statewide data collection initiative.

1999

- (Summer) JJAC enters into contract with Iowa State University (ISU) 4-H Extension - funding source JJDP Act formula grant. ISU Extension hired to provide assistance to state and local officials to further efforts of DMC.
- JJAC continues funding DMC programs with formula grant funds.
- CJJP begins work on justice data warehouse - blends DMC efforts with ICIS into a state justice data warehouse initiative.

2000

- (May) JJAC reinitiates a small subcommittee to deal with a variety of DMC issues related to its contract with ISU 4-H extension - subcommittee evolves into state DMC Committee.
- JJAC continues contract with ISU 4-H Extension.
- JJAC continues to make funding available for DMC programs with JJDP Act formula grant competitive process funds.
- (July) JJAC initiative allocates portion of JJDP Act formula grant to local community planning entities (Decategorization Governance Boards [DECATS]). Communities have option of utilizing allocated funds for DMC-related issues.
- (August) JJAC approves establishment of DMC Committee.

2001

- DMC Committee continues meeting every other month.
- (January) Contract terminated with ISU Extension.
- Allocation initiative with portion of JJDP Act formula grant to local community planning entities (DECATS) continues. Communities have option of utilizing allocated funds for DMC-related issues.
- (February) JJAC approves funding for technical support of state and local DMC effort.
- (October) RFA released for DMC Resource Center Concept that will assist with local planning, provide for statewide DMC Conference, allow for education and information provided to key decision makers, assist with program development, etc.
- (December) JJAC approves funding for DMC Resource Center with National Center for Family Centered Practice - University Of Iowa.
- (February) JJAC approves funding for DMC Diversion effort aimed development of pilot approaches to impact minority youth in secure settings.
 - (Summer) Project is approved for funding but withdraws its application because of issues related to complying with other (non-DMC) requirements of the JJDP Act.

- (Fall and early winter) DMC subcommittee meets to redesign RFA for DMC Diversion effort. Meetings held with chief Juvenile Court Officers for potential feedback on RFA design.
- (May) CJJP applies for and is approved for funding from Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) that will allow for development of standardized DMC reports for its justice data warehouse initiative.
 - (Summer) Meeting initiative with committee of Juvenile Court Services Staff (ICIS User Group) to begin process of standardized data input and cleaning of ICIS data.
 - (Fall and early winter) Meetings held with ICIS user group to begin development of standardized reports relative to DMC and ICIS.
- (November) JJAC approves funding for additional years funding for DMC Resource Center Concept and for support for DMC Diversion effort.

2002

- DMC Committee continues meeting every other month.
- Allocation initiative with portion of JJDP Act formula grant to local community planning entities (DECATS) continues. Communities have option of utilizing allocated funds for DMC-related issues.
- (January) Meetings held with Chief Juvenile Court Officers to finalize development of standardized reports relative to DMC and ICIS.
- (January) DMC Resource Center begins its efforts.
 - (January) CJJP shares data and other relevant information with Resource Center as it gather information to design its website.
 - Intensive technical assistance is initiated in a number of local sites.
 - DMC website is initiated (<http://www.uiowa.edu/~7Enrcfcp/dmrc/>).
- (July) DMC Diversion Effort with Polk County is initiated.
- (November) First State DMC Conference is held - planning provided by DMC Resource Center.

2003

- DMC Committee continues meeting every other month.
- Allocation initiative with portion of JJDP Act formula grant to local community planning entities (DECATS) continue. Communities have option of utilizing allocated funds for DMC-related issues.
- (Spring) Woodbury County holds first local DMC Conference.
- DMC Diversion effort in Polk County continues.
- DMC Resource Center continues intensive technical assistance in local sites.
- DMC website is maintained by Resource Center.
- (November) State DMC Conference is held - planning provided by DMC Resource Center.

2004

- DMC Committee continues meeting every other month.
- Allocation initiative with portion of JJDP Act formula grant to local community planning entities (DECATS) continues. Communities have option of utilizing allocated funds for DMC-related issues.
- DMC Diversion effort in Polk County enters third and final year.

- (March) Three-year plan update is submitted and includes select DMC data from ICIS.
- (Spring) Technical assistance is provided to Chief Juvenile Court Officers regarding risk assessment for juvenile detention screening tool- development of tool begins.
- (Summer) Planning data with information from Iowa Department of Human Services (Child Welfare Data) and CJJP's ICIS warehouse is provided to juvenile justice system officials.
- (Summer) Iowa Department of Human Services initiates DMC-related child welfare effort through contract with DMC Resource Center - efforts includes state planning and local site work.
- DMC Resource Center continues intensive technical assistance in local sites.
- DMC website is maintained by DMC Resource Center.
- (December) State DMC Conference is held - planning provided by DMC Resource Center.

2005

- DMC Committee continues meeting every other month.
- Allocation initiative with portion of JJDP Act formula grant to local community planning entities (DECATS) continues. Communities have option of utilizing allocated funds for DMC-related issues.
- (Spring) Planning data with information from Iowa Department of Human Services (Child Welfare Data) and CJJP's ICIS warehouse is provided for second year to juvenile justice system officials.
- (Summer) DMC Diversion effort in Polk County provides final reports to DMC Committee.
- Iowa Department of Human Services continues DMC-related child welfare effort through contract with DMC Resource Center - efforts include state planning and local site work.
- (Summer) Site work with U-CARE is coordinated with local efforts underway with DMC Resource Center.
- (Fall) CJJP works with Chief Juvenile Court Officers in select jurisdictions to pilot a juvenile detention screening tool.
- (December) State DMC Conference is held - planning provided by DMC Resource Center.

2006

- DMC Committee continues meeting every other month.
- (August) Leiber and colleagues release “An Examination of the Factors that Influence Juvenile Justice Decision Making In The Jurisdictions of Black Hawk, Johnson, Linn and Scott, Iowa: An Assessment Study”
- Technical assistance to three local Iowa Sites (Black Hawk, Polk and Woodbury) – planning assistance, data analysis, training, local event facilitation, etc.
- Black Hawk County conducts local-level DMC Conference.
- Black Hawk County continues efforts of local DMC Committee.
- Black Hawk County collects local data for use by Juvenile Court Services and the local DMC Committee analyzed data by the DMC Resource Center.
- Polk County: a local DMC Committee is active though other groups meet regularly about issues of disproportionality (DECAT, Urban Dreams/U-CARE etc.).
- Polk County Data Assistance – Polk County worked with the DMC Resource Center for assistance on the collection and analysis of data related to its implementation efforts and continues to provide data from the detention center for analysis.

- Polk County: Ongoing DMC Resource Center technical assistance on data analysis with the detention center and ongoing technical assistance with the Des Moines schools on suspensions and expulsions and linkages among educational issues and overrepresentation in juvenile justice.
- Polk County: Coordinated DMC efforts in Polk County with state-funded initiative to reduce disproportionality in child welfare (MYFI).
- Woodbury County conducts local-level DMC Conference. Utilized federal technical assistance provider to conduct site visit and serve as speaker at conference and for other local DMC issues.
- Woodbury County obtains staff support for local efforts through local initiatives.
- Woodbury County connects local community groups targeting overrepresentation in the juvenile justice and child welfare systems and U-CARE initiative.
- Woodbury County conducts local training through DMC Resource Center and Minority Youth and Families Initiative - Iowa Department of Human Services.
- Expanded ICIS Data - ICIS system updated to include a variety of new and expanded information.
- New ICIS Based Intake Assessment Tool - In the fall of 2006 Iowa Chief Juvenile Court Officers began training on an assessment tool that is being maintained on the ICIS system.
- Urban Children are Really Essential (U-CARE.) – Urban Dreams, a local youth serving agency, secured a federal grant that allows DMC-related efforts in a number of Iowa communities.
- (December) Representative from the Annie E. Casey Foundation visit Iowa to evaluate its potential as a Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative Site (JDAI).
- (December) State DMC Conference is held - planning provided by DMC Resource Center.
- United Action for Youth- Female Group “Circle” begins in Johnson County.

2007

- DMC Committee continues meeting every other month.
- (March) Committee to Dialogue With DECATS – the SAG forms a Committee to Dialogue With DECATS (CDWD). The JJAC utilized CDWD to learn from and share information with local DECATS.
- (May) First meeting of Governor’s Youth, Race and Detention Taskforce.
- (June) DMC Resource Center training for two counties (Linn and Johnson) on cultural competency.
- (October) Governor officially forms Youth, Race and Detention Taskforce.
- (Fall) Court Community Liaison program begins in Linn County.
- (Fall) Centralized intake begins in Johnson County.
- (Fall) Diversion program for low-level offenders begins in Johnson County.
- (November) Leiber and colleagues released a detailed study regarding race and juvenile detention in Black Hawk County entitled, “Race and Detention Decision Making and the Impact on Juvenile Court Outcomes in Black Hawk County, Iowa, Technical Full Report”
- (November) Annie E. Casey Foundation names Iowa a Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative Site (JDAI). In response to RFA, JJAC names Black Hawk, Polk, and Woodbury Counties as conditional sites (pending receipt of requested information) for funding and technical assistance.

- (November) William Feyerherm releases a study of race and the use of detention in Black Hawk, Scott, and Woodbury Counties entitled, “An Analysis of Detention Decision-Making in Three Iowa Counties.”
- (November) State DMC Conference is held - planning provided by DMC Resource Center.
- Technical assistance to three local Iowa sites (Black Hawk, Polk and Woodbury) – planning assistance, data analysis, training, local event facilitation, etc.
- CJJP has had initial discussions with the Juvenile Court Chiefs regarding potential reports to generate from the new information available (intake assessment data) in ICIS. CJJP secures funding and begins arranging for the transfer of the new ICIS data into JDW.
- Black Hawk County participates with state DMC Coordinator in Public Television-sponsored television program on disproportionality.
- Black Hawk County continues efforts of local DMC Committee.
- Polk County receives ongoing DMC Resource Center technical assistance with the Des Moines schools on suspensions and expulsions and linkages among schools, child welfare, and overrepresentation in juvenile justice.
- Polk County coordinates DMC effort with state-funded initiative to reduce disproportionality in child welfare (MYFI).
- Polk County provides Global Appraisal of Individual Needs (GAIN) training to school staff.
- Polk County provides OJJDP DMC training to local DMC coordinators.
- Woodbury County conducts 5th annual County DMC Conference with national participation.
- Woodbury County utilizes federal technical assistance to conduct site visit and serve as speaker at conference and for other local DMC issues.
- Woodbury County obtains staff support for local efforts through local initiatives.
- Woodbury County connects local community groups, national groups (e.g., Race Matters Consortium, Center for Study of Social Policy, Casey Family Alliance) targeting overrepresentation in the juvenile justice and child welfare systems and local Community Initiative for Native Communities and Families.
- Woodbury County conducts local training and meetings through DMC Resource Center and Minority Youth and Families Initiative, First Nations, Community Initiative for Native Families and Children (CINCF) and national organizations including Iowa Department of Human Services and a variety of other state agencies

Virginia: Timeline of DMC Activities

State Level

1992

- “Minority Representation in Virginia’s Learning Centers” (Virginia Department of Youth and Family Services).
- “Minority Representation in the Intake Process of the Juvenile Justice System” (Virginia Department of Youth and Family Services).

1993

- “The Influence of a Youth’s Race on Juvenile Justice System Decisions” (Virginia Department of Youth and Family Services).

2001

- DCJS develops webpage to enable representatives from localities, grantees, and other interested persons to learn about minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system in Virginia and the federal requirements for monitoring disproportionate minority confinement.

2002

- (April) Virginia General Assembly, based on several concerns with the juvenile justice system including the overrepresentation of minority youth among detention populations, directs the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) to establish a uniform risk assessment instrument to be used when making detention decisions and recommendations to the court at a detention hearing.
- (July) Legislative change made by General Assembly clarifying criteria for detention of probation violations becomes effective (a juvenile probation or parole violator may be detained in a secure detention facility for violation of probation/parole only if the offense for which the juvenile was placed on probation or parole would have been a felony or Class 1 misdemeanor if committed by an adult).
- (July) Legislative change made by 2002 General Assembly becomes effective. This legislation required DCJS to produce a policy or guideline to expand the compulsory training standards for police officers to ensure awareness of cultural diversity and reduce the potential for biased policing.
- (December) Statewide use of the DJJ-developed Detention Assessment Instrument for use at intake begins.

2003

- New DMC Coordinator hired by DCJS.
- (July) Governor Mark R. Warner establishes Task Force on Preventing Crime in Virginia's Minority Communities (not explicitly a DMC strategy).
- (October) Virginia selects seven localities for JDAI.
- (November) Governor Warner's Task Force on Preventing Crime in Virginia's Minority Communities releases its final report and recommendations.

2005

- New DMC coordinator hired by DCJS.
- (July) new legislation is put into effect requiring counsel to be provided prior to an initial juvenile detention hearing.

2006

- House Joint Resolution 136 directs the Crime Commission to study Virginia's juvenile justice system (one of the items on the list is DMC).
- (August) DCJS convenes policy session on DMC.

2007

- (May) DJJ publishes article in *Juvenile and Family Court Journal* (Vol. 58, No. 3) on a study they conducted in 2005 evaluating the outcomes of Virginia's detention assessment instrument.

- DCJS DMC Coordinator responsibilities transferred from one person to another within DCJS.
- DJJ DMC Coordinator resigns.

2008

- (February/March) Virginia General Assembly granted the Virginia State Crime Commission another year to continue its study on Virginia's juvenile justice system (including examining DMC in Virginia); a final report is to be submitted by the end of 2008.

Newport News

2003

- (October) Newport News becomes a JDAI site.

2004

- (October) Newport News DMC subcommittee is created under JDAI collaborative.

2005

- (September) Newport News DMC subcommittee publishes report reviewing demographic and socioeconomic indicators on DMC.

2006

- (October) Burns Institute begins work with Newport News.

2007

- (January) Burns Institute publishes Readiness Assessment Consultation (RAC) report on Newport News.
- (July) Newport News begins to work with Burns Institute on DMC by prioritizing recommendations made in their RAC report and assigning to committee members.
- (October) DMC Committee agrees to provide Burns with detention admissions data for analysis.
- (November) DMC Committee chair resigns; JDAI grant ends and JDAI coordinator position terminates; DJJ representative on committee also resigns.

2008

- (February) DMC Committee is revitalized after no activity since November 2007 and Larry Robinson is announced as new chair of DMC Committee; Burns agrees to complete analysis of detention admission data by April 2008 once Committee provides data.
- (May/June) DMC Committee meetings cancelled.

Norfolk

2005

- (August/September) Norfolk is added as the 8th JDAI site.
- (October thru present) Norfolk JDAI Newsletters produced monthly (JDAI effort).

- (October thru present) Regular and ongoing data gathering and analysis by Detention Census Manager (Expeditor) (JDAI effort).
- (September/ October) Full use of Detention Assessment Instrument (DAI) by Intake. Completed in all detention eligible cases and required all overrides to be approved by supervisor (JDAI effort).
- (September/ October) December Court Services developed new policies and procedures regarding Violation of Probation and Parole (JDAI effort).
- (Fall) Improved information shared across system regarding detention (JDAI effort).
- (November/ December) Special Detention Population Report is developed (JDAI effort).

2006

- (Spring) Improved information shared across system regarding detention (JDAI effort).
- (March) Court Services develops new policies and procedures regarding Violation of Probation and Parole (JDAI effort).
- (March) Stops practice of routinely issuing Detention Orders on active runaways. Develops alternative services for runaways (JDAI effort).
- (June) Develops and implements parental notification of police-issued summons system to reduce incidence of Fail to Appear (JDAI effort).
- (July) Norfolk JDAI subcommittee is created under JDAI collaborative.
- (September) Burns Institute begins work with Norfolk.
- (December) Burns Institute hired and publishes Readiness Assessment Consultation (RAC) report on Norfolk.

2007

- (March) Full time Detention Expeditor position established by the City of Norfolk and filled (JDAI effort).
- (April) JDAI Steering Committee approves the document “The Purpose of Detention” after being developed by the four JDAI Subcommittees over the previous four months (JDAI effort).
- (July) Burns Institute begins to work with Norfolk on recommendations from RAC Report.
- (September) DMC Committee begins gathering detention admission data.

2008

- (February) DMC Committee focuses on three target offenses with disproportionate numbers of minority youth in order to find strategies to reform policies and practices.
- (April) Burns presents the results of the analysis of the targeted offenses to the DMC committee
- (April) DMC Committee hires Detention Management Analyst to gather DMC data.
- (May) Further information is requested by Burns including referral information and a timeline is set up for their plans to move forward for the next six months.

**Appendix B: Examining Disproportionate Minority Contact Interventions
in Iowa and Virginia: Telephone Interview**

**Examining Disproportionate Minority Contact Interventions
in Iowa and Virginia
TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

Informed Consent Statement

Thank you for agreeing to speak with me today. This interview will take about 30 to 45 minutes of your time and results will be used in a project we are doing on the topic of minority youths in the juvenile justice system. We would like to discuss several related matters with you today. Please ask questions along the way if anything needs further clarification. If at any time you would like to skip a question, a section, or terminate the interview, please let me know. Please be aware that there are no penalties for skipping questions or ending the interview early. In addition, your responses will be combined with those from other individuals we will be interviewing in your state, and our findings will be presented in such a way that no one person will be identifiable. Is it okay to interview you?

Please Circle One: **Yes** **No** **Date:** _____

Interviewer Name:

Section 1: Respondent's Background Information

1. What is your title?
2. How long (years, months) have you worked in this position?
3. How long (years, months) have you worked in the field of juvenile justice?

Section 2. Knowledge about DMC

4. What does "DMC" mean to you? (If they do not know, we'll define it for them according to the OJJDP definition: the overrepresentation of minorities, determined by a comparison of their rate in the system versus their rate in the population. Be sure to note if they say "confinement" or "contact")
5. Using a scale of 1 to 5, how serious do you think the issue of minority over-involvement in the juvenile justice system is in your state (city/jurisdiction)?

1 2 3 4 5

6. Are there particular minority groups who are especially overrepresented in the juvenile justice system?

- a. Yes
 - i. African-Americans
 - ii. Asian-Americans
 - iii. Hispanics
 - iv. Others: _____
- b. No

7. Using a scale of 1 to 5, how serious do you think the issue of minority over-involvement in the juvenile justice system is in your state (city/jurisdiction) for Hispanics?

1 2 3 4 5

8. Using a scale of 1 to 5, how serious do you think the issue of minority over-involvement in the juvenile justice system is in your state (city/jurisdiction) for any other specific minority groups?

1 2 3 4 5

9. There are many possible reasons why minority youths might be overrepresented in the juvenile justice system. I'll offer you a list of commonly cited reasons and ask you rank them from 1 to 5 where 1 means that it is a weak explanation for DMC in your area and 5 means that it is a strong explanation for DMC in your area

a. Minority youth commit more crime

1 2 3 4 5

b. Minority youth do not have the same opportunities to participate in delinquency prevention and early intervention programs as nonminority youth.

1 2 3 4 5

c. Minority youth aren't treated the same as nonminority youth by police, judges, and other juvenile justice system actors.

1 2 3 4 5

d. There are indirect effects in high-minority neighborhoods—such as reduced educational opportunities, low income, high unemployment, and drug-infested neighborhoods—that place minority youth at a higher risk of involvement in crime than in other areas.

1 2 3 4 5

e. Legislative and administrative policies such as “zero tolerance policies” can end up affecting minority youth differently than nonminority youth.

1 2 3 4 5

10. What other factors do you think contribute to a differential minority presence in the juvenile justice system in comparison to whites?

11. Have there been any significant changes (i.e., changes to local or state laws, administrative procedures, political changes, or shifts in the population) that you think might contribute to DMC in your jurisdiction?

Section 3: Perception of DMC Efforts

12. What strategies or programs are you aware of, if any, to reduce disparate minority involvement in the juvenile justice system in your state (city/jurisdiction)? (Please list any current *and/or* past efforts that you know of.)

For each intervention mentioned:

If yes, how did this program/intervention come about?

Are you involved in this intervention? If so, how?

What are its main activities?

How long will it/did it last?

What data are/were collected in association with this effort?

How are/were findings disseminated? Was a report produced, or is one planned?

How well or poorly do you think this intervention did or is doing to address minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system? Can you tell me what you think the main obstacles to its success were? What about its strengths?