INCIDENT-BASED DATA AS AN ANALYTICAL TOOL TO ADDRESS POLICY
Background

• South Carolina has a documented history of disproportionate minority contact in juvenile justice.

• We didn’t know much about DMC beyond measuring the degree to which racial disproportionality existed at various decision points in the process.

• The decision point at which disproportionality was greatest was arrest.
Data Sources

- Census data – Detailed population estimates for 2008 and 2009 were provided by the Office of Research and Statistics.

- SCIBRS – NIBRS compatible, 100% reporting. Juvenile arrests and offenses for the same years. Provided by the State Law Enforcement Division.
Defining Racial/Ethnicity Categories

For both census estimates and SCIBRS data, a combined racial/ethnic category was created. Ethnicity was used to categorize Hispanics, race was used to categorize Non-Hispanics.
SC Juvenile Population

• Slightly more than a million juveniles (age <= 16) in South Carolina.

• Racial/ethnic distribution - 57.8% White, 32.7% Black, 7.4% Hispanic, 1.6% Asian/Pacific Islander, 0.5% Native American.
Measuring Disproportionality

• Used Relative Rate Index (RRI) which is calculated by dividing the arrest or offense rate of a group of interest by the rate for the comparison group.

• Used White juveniles as the comparison group.

• RRI scores: an RRI score < 1 signifies a lower arrest rate than White juveniles, an RRI score > 1 signifies a higher arrest rate than White juveniles.
Operational Definition of Arrest

Arrest reports must be completed any time law enforcement takes a juvenile into custody, \textbf{regardless} of whether the juvenile was warned and released or actually charged/referred. The only exception is when a juvenile is taken into custody for their own protection.
## Arrest Disproportionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>RRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>288.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: all rates are expressed per 10,000 juveniles
# Disproportionality by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>RRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>151.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>324.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Offense Categories

Created seven hierarchical offense categories:

- Serious Violent: 5.9%
- Weapons Offenses: 3.4%
- Lesser Violent: 19.2%
- Property Offenses: 25.9%
- Drug Offenses: 8.7%
- Status Offenses: 4.0%
- All Other Offenses: 32.8%
## Disproportionality by Offense Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>Black RRI</th>
<th>Hispanic RRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious Violent</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Offenses</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Violent</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Offenses</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offenses</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Offenses</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Offenses</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Type of Arrest by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>On-site</th>
<th>Ticket</th>
<th>Warrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Type of Referral by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Juvenile Offenders by Premise Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premise</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway/Streets</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lots</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residences</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Disproportionality by Premise Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premise</th>
<th>Black RRI</th>
<th>Hispanic RRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway/Streets</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lots</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residences</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disproportionality by County

• Two of forty-six counties had an annual RRI of 1 or less for Black juveniles.

• Forty-two counties had an annual RRI of 2 or greater for Black juveniles.

• Annual RRIs among counties for Black juveniles ranged from 0.6 to 12.7.
Key Findings

• SCIBRS provides no support for officer discretion as a factor in disproportionate arrest rates.

• Geographic variation is limited, disproportionality is not concentrated in any county or region.

• Disproportionality is a problem among Black juveniles but not among Hispanic juveniles.
Key Findings Continued

- Gender is not a moderating factor for racial/ethnic disproportionality.

- Disproportionality was highest among arrests for violent offenses (both categories) and lowest among arrests for drug and status offenses.

- More than half of juvenile arrests were for all other (33%) or property (26%) offenses.
Key Findings Continued

- Nearly two-thirds of juvenile crime occurred at private residences (39%) or schools (25%).
- Disproportionality was greatest for offenses at residences and at schools.
Implications

• Important to verify law enforcement is adhering to juvenile arrest reporting requirements.

• More detailed analysis needs to be done looking at disproportionality within offense categories.

• Additional analysis needs to be done concerning disproportionality and juvenile crime at schools.
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• Introduction & Background

• Research Methods

• Analysis of domestic violence using key NIBRS variables

• Policy analysis of domestic violence arrest patterns
  ◦ Arrest type
  ◦ Clearance rates: victim refusals
  ◦ Regression analysis: predictors of physical arrest
INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

• Funded by JRSA -- IBR Resource Center Grant

• Collaborative initiative with Vermont Domestic Violence Community:
  ◦ Data for prevention programs
  ◦ Analysis of arrest policies

• Vermont is a 100% NIBRS state pursuant to statute

• Certified since 1994 – 85 agencies reporting
INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

• Access to NIBRS data:
  ◦ Vermont Crime On-Line (Beyond 20/20)
  ◦ Data is analyzed using VCON
  ◦ Data can be downloaded in a .csv file

![Graph showing number of victimizations by age group and victim-offender relationship, with specific numbers listed for each category.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Assault Offenses</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 20</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 29</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>37.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>24.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH METHODS

• Analysis focuses on NIBRS victim, arrestee, and crime circumstance data

• Assault offenses

• Intimate or family victim/offender relationship

• 10,048 incidents

• 2007 - 2011
JURISDICTION: COUNTY

Chart 5: Number of Incidents by County

- Addison
- Bennington
- Caledonia
- Chittenden
- Essex
- Franklin
- Grand Isle
- Lamoille
- Orange
- Orleans
- Rutland

Counts:
- Addison: 882
- Bennington: 233
- Caledonia: 841
- Chittenden: 669
- Essex: 878
- Franklin: 880
- Grand Isle: 240
- Lamoille: 680
- Orange: 987
- Orleans: 91
- Rutland: 2711

Total: 9,359
VICTIM & OFFENDER CHARACTERISTICS

**VICTIMS**
- Mean Age = 31
- Median Age = 29
- 71% female
- 93% white
- 2.4% African American
- 12% under 18

**OFFENDERS**
- Mean Age = 32
- Median = 30
- 72% male
- 92% white
- 5% African Americans
VICTIM OFFENDER RELATIONSHIP

Chart 1: Victim Offender Relationship

- Intimate: 7768
- Child: 1132
- Immediate Family: 2133
- Extended Family: 644
TIME OF DAY AND DAY OF WEEK

Chart 4: Number of Incidents by Day of Week and Time

Number of Incidents

Sunday  Monday  Tuesday  Wednesday  Thursday  Friday  Saturday

Early Morning  Morning  Midday  Afternoon  Evening  Night
INJURY

Chart 3: Type of Injury by Victim/Offender Relationship

- None
- Minor
- Serious

- Blue: Intimate
- Red: Child
- Green: Family
- Purple: Extended Family
WEAPON & TYPE OF INJURY

Chart 2: Type of Weapon and Type of Injury Caused

- Firearm
- Deadly Weapon
- Body
- Drugs
- Other
- None

- None
- Minor
- Serious
POLICY ANALYSIS: ARREST TYPE
ARREST TYPE BY AGENCY

Chart 9: Type of Agency by Type of Arrest

- **Local Police**
  - Arrest on a Warrant: 54%
  - Arrest Without Warrant: 10%
  - Citation to Appear: 37%

- **Sheriff’s Agency**
  - Arrest on a Warrant: 41%
  - Arrest Without Warrant: 3%
  - Citation to Appear: 41%

- **State Police**
  - Arrest on a Warrant: 49%
  - Arrest Without Warrant: 7%
  - Citation to Appear: 40%
Domestic Violence Using NIBRS Data

ARREST TYPE BY COUNTY

Chart 10: Type of Arrest by County

- Addison
- Bennington
- Caledonia
- Chittenden
- Essex
- Franklin
- Grand Isle
- Lamoille
- Orange
- Orleans
- Rutland
- Washington
- Windham
- Windsor

Legend:
- Blue: Arrest on Warrant
- Red: Arrest Without Warrant
- Green: Citation
POLICY ANALYSIS: VICTIM REFUSALS
CLEARANCE: VICTIM REFUSED TO COOPERATE
CLEARANCE: VICTIM REFUSED TO COOPERATE
POLICY ANALYSIS:
REGRESSION ANALYSIS –
PREDICTORS OF PHYSICAL ARREST
PREDICTORS OF PHYSICAL ARREST

- Population density (Rural)
- Seriousness of offense
- Use of alcohol by defendant
- Age of the defendant (older defendants)
- Relationship (Intimate)
- Sex of victim (Female)
- Sex of offender (Male)
- Time of day (nighttime)
- Model predicted arrest 84% of the time
Questions

Contact Information

Rob McManus
RobertMcManus@scdps.gov
(803) 896-8717

Max Schlueter
mschlueter@vcjr.org
(802) 485-4250

The reports featured in today’s webinar can be found on the Incident-Based Reporting Resource Center

http://www.jrsa.org/ibrrc/background-status/state_reports.shtml
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