

---

## How Do Certified Youth Compare to Eligible Non-Certified Youth: Descriptive Statistics

Certification Research Brief #1  
November 2012

---

Christine Patterson, Ph.D., Lead Analyst

### BACKGROUND

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has required each state to assess disproportionate minority contact within the juvenile justice system. In two previous studies, decision-making equity in the Missouri juvenile justice system was analyzed for five court contact points: detention, referral acceptance, formal processing, adjudication, and commitment to the Division of Youth Services (DYS) (Patterson, 2012; National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 2004). The current study extends this work by analyzing the court contact point of certification.

Certification occurs when a juvenile case is transferred to adult court and the youth is prosecuted in the adult system rather than the juvenile system.

The two *research questions* are:

- To what extent do racial/ethnic and gender *disproportionality* and *disparity* exist in certification decisions within Missouri's juvenile justice system?
- If *disproportionality* exists for minorities or females at the point of certification, what referral or youth characteristics are associated with race/ethnicity or gender that might contribute to *disparity*?

This brief compares **non-certified youth eligible for certification**<sup>1</sup> to **youth who were certified** using demographic (race, gender, age, and location) and juvenile justice information (level of offense, kind of offense, offense type, risk assessment data, and secure detention). The patterns resulting from these comparisons describe *disproportionality* or overrepresentation; not *disparity* or unequal outcomes/treatment. *Disproportionality* itself is not inherently good or bad. However, *disparity* is problematic because it indicates inequality. Further analysis is necessary to address the issue of whether *racial disproportionality* is also *racial disparity* in the certification court contact decision point. Please see Certification Research Brief #4 for a discussion of the multivariate analysis (inferential statistics) which addresses *racial disparity*.

### METHOD

The certification study uses data from Judicial Information System (JIS) from all 45 Missouri judicial circuits. All juvenile referrals with a **felony** allegation disposed between 2008 and 2011 were reviewed for potential inclusion in the study. Cases were excluded from the study for the following reasons: 1) if the referral was rejected by the juvenile office, if the referral was dismissed by the court, 2) if the major allegation on the referral was a supervision violation,<sup>2</sup> or 3) if the referral had incomplete information for case disposition, major allegation, race, or gender.<sup>3</sup>

Extraordinary efforts were made to verify the information of "potentially" certified youth.<sup>4</sup> All of the cases of the potentially certified youth were reviewed by the juvenile office to verify: 1) the finding of the case, 2) the major allegation of the case,<sup>5</sup> 3) the reason for certification, 4) the number of informally processed felonies, and 5) the number of previously adjudicated felonies<sup>6</sup> prior to the referral for certification.

Because a youth can only be certified as an adult once and because the goal was to find comparable youth who were not certified, only the most serious felony allegation per youth was included. Therefore, the study includes a total of 13,617 youth (13,614 who had a felony allegation not rejected by the juvenile court and 3 certified for a misdemeanor).<sup>7</sup>

Because a small number of cases were non-Caucasian and non-African American, all other racial/ethnic categories were combined into a generic “Other” category. Not all youth who had a felony allegation had a risk assessment completed; the risk assessment data were only available for 11,732 youth.

Chi square analyses were conducted to identify significant associations between race and all of the risk and juvenile justice characteristics. Only statistically significant findings at the level of ( $p < .001$ ) were reported. In other words, we were 99.9% confident that the findings were not due to chance alone. The chi square and  $p$  value were included at the bottom of each table.

## FINDINGS

### *Demographic Information*

- African American youth were over-represented in terms of felony allegations and being certified.
- Caucasian youth had 66 percent of the felony cases,<sup>8</sup> but they only made up 35 percent of the certified population.
- African American youth had 31 percent of the felonies but made up 61 percent of the certified population.<sup>9</sup>
  - Therefore, racial *disproportionality* is evident in the higher proportion of African American youth were certified compared to Caucasian youth.
- The majority of youth with a felony case were male (83%), but an even higher percentage of certified youth were male (96%).
  - Therefore, gender *disproportionality* also exists because a higher proportion of male youth were certified compared to female youth.

Referring to Table 1:

- A majority of the youth who had a felony allegation were 15 or 16 years old.
- Among youth who had a felony allegation, the percentage certified increased with age and about half of those 17 or older were certified.
- Caucasian youth who had a felony allegation tended to be slightly younger than African American youth, but the percentages by race were consistent, except for age 16 which showed a higher proportion of African Americans than Caucasians.
- Salient area of *disproportionality*: A higher percentage of African American youth who had a felony allegation were certified for all ages, indicating *disproportionality*. The vast majority of African American youth over the age of 17 who had a felony case were certified, whereas only a third of Caucasian youth who had a felony allegation were certified. Although the number of cases is relatively small, the almost 50 percentage point discrepancy is noteworthy and requires further study.

Location

- The number of felony cases was higher in urban circuits including the 11<sup>th</sup> (St. Charles County), 16<sup>th</sup> (Jackson County), 21<sup>st</sup> (St. Louis County), 22<sup>nd</sup> (St. Louis city) and 31<sup>st</sup> (Greene County) primarily because of the larger youth population.
- Thirty-seven percent of the felony allegations were processed in urban circuits, but a higher percentage (57%) of the certified youth had cases processed in urban circuits. See Table 1A in the appendix for a complete breakdown of felony allegations by circuit and race.<sup>10</sup> There are notable

differences among circuits in the percentage of Caucasian and African American youth with a felony case who were certified (See Table 1A).

**Table 1: Age at the Time of the Offense by Race/Ethnicity and Percent Certified for Youth with One or More Felonies  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011**

Age	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Youth	% of Age	% of Age Certified	Youth	% of Age	% of Age Certified	Youth	% of Age	% of Age Certified	Youth	% of Age	% of Age Certified
10 and under	414	4.6%	0.0%	111	2.6%	0.0%	17	4.3%	0.0%	542	4.0%	0.0%
11	268	3.0%	0.0%	93	2.2%	0.0%	9	2.3%	0.0%	370	2.7%	0.0%
12	493	5.5%	0.0%	204	4.8%	0.0%	18	4.5%	0.0%	715	5.3%	0.0%
13	983	11.0%	0.1%	362	8.5%	0.0%	39	9.8%	0.0%	1,384	10.2%	0.1%
14	1,572	17.5%	0.2%	676	15.9%	0.4%	79	19.9%	1.3%	2,327	17.1%	0.3%
15	2,119	23.6%	0.4%	1,058	24.9%	1.7%	95	23.9%	1.1%	3,272	24.0%	0.8%
16	2,796	31.2%	2.4%	1,621	38.1%	9.3%	132	33.2%	4.5%	4,549	33.4%	4.9%
17	251	2.8%	9.6%	110	2.6%	34.5%	5	1.3%	40.0%	366	2.7%	17.5%
Over 17	68	0.8%	38.2%	21	0.5%	85.7%	3	0.8%	0.0%	92	0.7%	48.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,964</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>4,256</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>397</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>13,617</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

Pearson Chi Square 141.819  $p < .001$

***Juvenile Justice Background Statistics  
Outcome of Referral (Referring to Table 2)***

**Descriptive Statistics**

- Of the 13,617 youth who had a felony case, a relatively small number of youth (368) were certified.
- Slightly less than half of the cases were informally processed (e.g., no court involvement) and half were formally processed.
- Informal supervision was the most common outcome for an informal felony case.
- The outcome for the highest percentage of formally processed felony cases was court monitored supervision, followed by a DYS commitment.

**Table 2: Outcome of the Felony Allegation by Race/Ethnicity  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011**

FINDING/OUTCOME	Caucasian		African American		Other		Total	
	Youth	Percent	Youth	Percent	Youth	Percent	Youth	Percent
<b>FORMAL COURT PROCESSING</b>								
Allegation Found True-Out-of-Home Placement (DYS)	1,067	11.9%	853	20.0%	67	16.9%	1,985	14.6%
Allegation Found True-In-Home Services (Court Monitored Supervision)	2,503	27.9%	1,703	40.0%	128	32.2%	4,334	31.8%
Allegation Found True-No Services	54	0.6%	103	2.4%	2	0.5%	159	1.2%
Sustain Motion to Dismiss for Certification	129	1.4%	228	5.4%	11	2.8%	368	2.7%
<b>INFORMAL PROCESSING</b>								
Informal Adjustment without Supervision	1,676	18.7%	390	9.2%	61	15.4%	2,127	15.6%
Informal Adjustment with Supervision	2,101	23.4%	516	12.1%	57	14.4%	2,672	19.6%
Informal Adjustment - No Action	1,074	12.0%	312	7.3%	52	13.1%	1,438	10.6%
<b>OTHER</b>								
Transfer to Other Agency (Transferred Back to DYS Custody)	360	4.0%	151	3.5%	21	5.3%	532	3.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,964</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,256</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>100.3%</b>	<b>13,617</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Pearson Chi Square 939.016  $p < .001$

Race Findings

- Salient area of *disproportionality*: More African American cases resulted in certification. Compared to Caucasian youth, African American youth had:

- a higher percentage of felony allegation cases (68%) *formally processed*.
- a higher percentage of court monitored supervision and a DYS commitment.

Compared to African American youth, Caucasian youth had:

- a higher percentage of cases (54%) handled *informally*.
- a higher percentage of all three informal outcomes.

*Level of Offense (Referring to Table 3)*

Descriptive Statistics

- More than half of the allegations were Felony C.
- Almost a quarter of all allegations were Felony D.
- Almost one-fifth of Felony A cases were certified.
- Ten percent of unclassified felonies were certified.

**Table 3: Type of Felony by Race/Ethnicity and Percent of Offenses Certified**  
OSCA Extract From JIS Data  
2008-2011

Type of Felony	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified
Unclassified Felony	300	3.3%	8.0%	238	5.6%	13.0%	17	4.3%	0.0%	555	4.1%	10.1%
Felony A	329	3.7%	<b>6.7%</b>	370	8.7%	<b>30.3%</b>	24	6.0%	4.2%	723	5.3%	19.4%
Felony B	806	9.0%	3.2%	636	14.9%	5.5%	40	10.1%	2.5%	1,482	10.9%	4.2%
Felony C	5,205	58.1%	0.9%	2,205	51.8%	2.0%	227	57.2%	0.4%	7,637	56.1%	1.2%
Felony D	2,321	25.9%	0.3%	807	19.0%	0.7%	89	22.4%	0.0%	3,217	23.6%	0.4%
Misdemeanor	3	0.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	3	0.0%	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,964</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>4,256</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>397</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>13,617</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

Pearson Chi Square 347.177 p<0.001

Race Findings

- A higher percentage of African Americans youth cases were unclassified Felony, Felony A and Felony B.
- A higher percentage of Caucasian youth cases were Felony C and Felony D.
- The three misdemeanor cases were Caucasian youth.<sup>11</sup>
- Salient area of *disproportionality*: A higher percentage of all felonies resulted in certification for African American youth, with an almost 25 percentage point discrepancy for Felony A.

*Kind of Offense (Referring to Table 4)*

Descriptive Statistics

- Almost half of the felony allegations were property offenses while 30 percent were person offenses.
- Less than one-fifth of the allegations were drug or miscellaneous offenses.
- The largest percentage of youth certified was for person offenses, followed by crimes using a weapon. This finding is consistent with state statute because it states that greater weight should be given to person offenses compared to property offenses.

**Table 4: Kind of Offense for Youth with One or More Felonies by Race/Ethnicity and Percent Certified**  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011

Kind of Offense	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Youth	% of Kind of Offense	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Kind of Offense	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Kind of Offense	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Kind of Offense	% of Offense Certified
Person	2,448	27.3%	2.9%	1,488	35.0%	11.6%	111	28.0%	4.0%	4,047	29.7%	6.2%
Property	4,245	47.4%	1.1%	2,025	47.6%	1.9%	182	46.3%	0.6%	6,452	47.4%	1.3%
Weapon	304	3.4%	0.7%	396	9.3%	3.0%	28	7.0%	2.0%	728	5.3%	2.1%
Drug/other	1,967	21.9%	0.5%	347	8.2%	1.7%	76	18.7%	0.0%	2,390	17.6%	0.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,964</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>4,256</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>397</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>13,617</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

Pearson Chi Square 561.766 p<0.001

Race Findings

- Compared to Caucasian youth, African American youth had a higher percentage of felony allegations against a person or used a weapon.
- One-fifth of the felony cases for Caucasian youth were drug offenses compared to less than 10 percent for African Americans.
- Salient area of *disproportionality*: A higher percentage of African Americans were certified for all categories, but the largest discrepancy was for crimes against a person.

*Offense Type (Referring to Table 5)*

Descriptive Statistics

- The most common offense type for youth with a felony offense was burglary, followed by assault.
- Less than 1 percent of the felony allegations were for homicides, but in over two-thirds of such cases, the youth was certified.
- Fifteen percent of the robbery cases and 7 percent of the sexual assault cases were certified.

**Table 5: Offense Type for Youth with One or More Felonies by Race/Ethnicity and Percent of Youth Certified**  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011

Offense Type	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified	Youth	% of Total Offenses	% of Offense Certified
Burglary	1,869	20.9%	1.4%	990	23.3%	2.8%	58	14.6%	1.7%	2,917	21.4%	1.9%
Assault	1,459	16.3%	1.0%	646	15.2%	5.9%	56	14.1%	0.0%	2,161	15.9%	2.4%
Dangerous Drugs	1,519	16.9%	0.5%	254	6.0%	1.6%	57	14.4%	0.0%	1,830	13.4%	0.7%
Property Damage	1,212	13.5%	0.7%	499	11.7%	0.8%	60	15.1%	0.0%	1,771	13.0%	0.7%
Stealing	793	8.8%	0.6%	418	9.8%	1.2%	36	9.1%	2.8%	1,247	9.2%	0.9%
Sexual Assault	485	5.4%	4.9%	236	5.5%	10.2%	24	6.0%	4.2%	745	5.5%	7.2%
Weapons	304	3.4%	0.7%	396	9.3%	3.0%	28	7.1%	3.6%	728	5.3%	2.1%
Robbery	90	1.0%	10.0%	477	11.2%	15.1%	19	4.8%	21.1%	586	4.3%	14.5%
Sex Offenses	373	4.2%	2.7%	71	1.7%	4.2%	7	1.8%	0.0%	451	3.3%	2.9%
Homicide	15	0.2%	66.7%	47	1.1%	72.3%	4	1.0%	75.0%	66	0.5%	71.2%
Other	845	9.4%	0.7%	222	5.2%	1.8%	48	12.1%	0.0%	1,115	8.2%	0.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,964</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>4,256</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>397</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>13,617</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

Pearson Chi Square 81.027 p<0.001

Race Findings

- A higher percentage of Caucasian youth had dangerous drug allegations.
- A higher percentage of African American youth had robbery allegations.
- Salient area of *disproportionality*: A higher percentage of African American youth were certified for all offense types, with the largest discrepancies for homicide, sexual assault, and robbery.

*Secure Detention (Referring to Table 6)<sup>12</sup>*

Descriptive Statistics

- Previous research has shown that secure detention is a gateway into the juvenile justice system, and if a youth is placed in secure detention, the odds increase of going deeper into the system.
- Less than a third of the youth with a felony case were held in secure detention.
- Six percent of the youth who were held in secured detention for a felony offense were certified.

**Table 6: Youth Held in Secure Detention Who Had One or More Felony Case by Race/Ethnicity and Percent of Youth Certified**  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011

Secure Detention	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Youth	% in Secure Detention	% of Certified	Youth	% in Secure Detention	% of Certified	Youth	% in Secure Detention	% Certified	Youth	% in Secure Detention	% Certified
No	6,623	74.2%	0.9%	2,314	54.4%	1.8%	271	68.4%	0.4%	9,208	67.8%	1.1%
Yes	2,302	25.8%	3.1%	1,940	45.6%	9.5%	125	31.6%	8.0%	4,367	32.2%	6.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,925</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>4,254</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>396</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>13,575</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

Pearson Chi Square 518.254 p<0.001

Race Findings:

- Almost half of African American youth who had a felony case were held in secure detention compared with a quarter of the Caucasian youth who had a felony case.
- Salient area of *disproportionality*: A higher percentage of African American youth held in secure detention were certified.

*Risk Assessment (Referring to Table 7)<sup>13</sup>*

- The majority of youth who had a felony allegation scored moderate on the risk assessment. One-fifth of youth scored at the high level.
- A higher percentage of high risk youth were certified compared to moderate and low risk youth.
- A higher percentage of African American youth scored at the high risk level.
- Salient area of *disproportionality*: A higher percentage of African American youth at all three risk levels were certified compared to Caucasian youth. More low risk African American youth were certified compared to moderate risk African American youth.

**Table 7: Risk Level for Youth With One or More Felonies by Race/Ethnicity and Percent of Youth Certified**  
OSCA Extract of JIS Data  
2008-2011

Risk Level	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Youth	% of Risk Level	% of Risk Level who are Certified	Youth	% of Risk Level	% of Risk Level who are Certified	Youth	% of Risk Level	% of Risk Level who are Certified	Youth	% of Risk Level	% of Risk Level who are Certified
Low	1,665	21.6%	1.0%	392	10.5%	3.8%	56	16.8%	1.8%	2,113	18.0%	1.5%
Moderate	4,713	61.2%	1.0%	2,322	62.4%	2.9%	199	65.2%	1.5%	7,234	61.7%	1.6%
High	1,318	17.1%	3.1%	1,009	27.1%	8.7%	58	18.0%	3.4%	2,385	20.3%	5.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,696</b>	<b>99.9%</b>		<b>3,723</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>313</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>11,732</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

Pearson Chi Square 295.883 p<0.001

## CONCLUSION

The findings of the study do indicate that African American youth had more felony allegations compared to their percentage of the population and had a higher percentage of more serious felonies, particularly person offenses. While these statistics may explain why more African American youth are certified, they *do not* explain the *disproportional* percentage of African American youth who are certified by level of offense, kind of offense, offense type, etc. Specifically, a higher percentage of African American youth at all felony levels were certified. A higher percentage of African American youth were certified for all kinds of offenses and the largest discrepancy was for crimes against a person. Even with the most serious allegation, homicide, African American youth were *disproportionately* certified. Further, a higher percentage of African Americans held in secure detention were certified. Finally, a higher percentage of African-American youth at all risk levels were certified. The totality of these findings *appears* to suggest that there *may be* more of an inclination to certify African American youth than Caucasian youth, possibly indicating racial *disparity* or unequal treatment. Certification Research Brief #4, the multivariate analysis, does address *racial disparity*. It provides an answer to whether *racial disproportionality* is in fact *racial disparity*.

However, the findings of this brief also point to the need for more research to understand what policies and procedures lead to a higher percentage of African American youth being formally processed. Is this one of the causal mechanisms that produces differential outcomes for African American youth? Other questions that need further study include: why are African American youth alleged to have committed a disproportionate number of robberies? Is there more of a police presence in the metros where most African American youth live? Given that robbery has the second highest percentage of cases certified, behind homicides, how does this contribute to the over-representation of African American certified youth? The seven mandatory allegations, of which robbery is one, will be the topic of Certification Research Brief #2.

---

## REFERENCES

- National Council on Crime and Delinquency. (2004). Ethnic and gender equity in Missouri juvenile court decisions: Preliminary findings. Retrived on July 1, 2011 from <http://www.courts.mo.gov/file.jsp?id=1740>
- Patterson, C. (2012). Racial and gender disproportionality in missouri’s juvenile justice system: a 2010 update. Missouri Office of State Courts Administrator. Division of Court Business Services.

## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Youth were eligible for certification if the youth had a felony allegation, and therefore, had the potential to be formally processed.
- <sup>2</sup> Supervision violations were not included because they are not a new law violation.
- <sup>3</sup> Cases with missing information for gender and race were retained if the youth had a mandatory allegation or was certified to insure all youth certified youth and mandatory youth were included in the descriptive statistics.
- <sup>4</sup> “Potentially” certified youth were identified by whether or not the youth had either the finding of the referral indicating “sustained motion to dismiss for certification” on COASITE in JIS and/or had the formal case code of DJVCA, indicating that the youth was certified.
- <sup>5</sup> Twenty percent of the major allegations of the “potentially” certified youth listed in JIS were inaccurate. One recommendation is more training for frontline juvenile staff is needed to ensure that the most serious allegation is included first on the referral. Periodic audits would help ensure the validity of the data.
- <sup>6</sup> The issue of whether the previous felonies need to be adjudicated or not needs clarification from the legislature to ensure that all youth are evaluated by one consistent standard across the state.
- <sup>7</sup> The vast majority of these youth were not certified, but they were eligible to be certified because they had a felony allegation.
- <sup>8</sup> This is an unduplicated count. Therefore, only one felony is counted for each youth.
- <sup>9</sup> African American youth age 10-16 make up 15 percent of the juvenile population and Caucasian youth make up 77 percent of the juvenile population
- <sup>10</sup> Six circuits which are 1<sup>st</sup> (Schuyler, Scotland and Clark counties), 2<sup>nd</sup> (Adair, Knox and Lewis counties), 4<sup>th</sup> (Atchison, Nodaway, Worth, Gentry and Holt counties), 27<sup>th</sup> (Bates, Henry and St. Clair counties), 40<sup>th</sup> (Newton and McDonald counties), and 44<sup>th</sup> (Wright, Douglas and Ozark counties) did not certify any youth between 2008 and 2011.
- <sup>11</sup> Youth should only be certified on felony allegations.
- <sup>12</sup> Forty-two of the cases had missing information for secured detention. Given the small number, it has no impact on the percentages.
- <sup>13</sup> Not all youth with a felony case had a risk assessment.

## APPENDIX

**Table 1A: Reporting Circuit for Youth with One or More Felonies by Race/Ethnicity and % of Youth Who Were Certified**  
**OSCA Extract of JIS Data**  
**2008-2011**

Reporting Circuit*	Caucasian			African American			Other			Total		
	Youth	% by Circuit	% Felonies Certified	Youth	% by Circuit	% Felonies Certified	Youth	% by Circuit	% Felonies Certified	Youth	% by Circuit	% Felonies Certified
1	27	0.3%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.3%	0.0%	28	0.2%	0.0%
2	50	0.6%	0.0%	5	0.1%	0.0%	4	1.0%	0.0%	59	0.4%	0.0%
3	48	0.5%	10.4%	0	0.0%	0.0%	2	0.5%	0.0%	50	0.4%	10.0%
4	41	0.5%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.3%	0.0%	42	0.3%	0.0%
5	139	1.6%	2.2%	27	0.6%	7.4%	8	2.0%	0.0%	174	1.3%	2.9%
6	62	0.7%	6.5%	18	0.4%	11.1%	2	0.5%	0.0%	82	0.6%	7.3%
7	350	3.9%	1.7%	62	1.5%	4.8%	30	7.6%	0.0%	442	3.2%	2.0%
8	91	1.0%	3.3%	1	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	92	0.7%	3.3%
9	54	0.6%	1.9%	2	0.0%	0.0%	5	1.3%	0.0%	61	0.4%	1.6%
10	103	1.1%	0.0%	18	0.4%	0.0%	4	1.0%	0.0%	125	0.9%	1.6%
11	405	4.5%	1.5%	102	2.4%	7.8%	3	0.8%	33.3%	510	3.7%	2.9%
12	207	2.3%	3.9%	30	0.7%	0.0%	7	1.8%	0.0%	244	1.8%	3.3%
13	250	2.8%	1.2%	203	4.8%	5.4%	12	3.0%	8.3%	465	3.4%	3.2%
14	80	0.9%	1.3%	16	0.4%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	96	0.7%	1.0%
15	208	2.3%	2.4%	23	0.5%	0.0%	12	3.0%	0.0%	243	1.8%	2.1%
16	264	2.9%	3.4%	757	17.8%	6.7%	70	17.6%	5.7%	1,091	8.0%	5.9%
17	292	3.3%	0.0%	45	1.1%	2.2%	13	3.3%	7.7%	350	2.6%	0.6%
18	184	2.1%	1.1%	38	0.9%	0.0%	18	4.5%	5.6%	240	1.8%	1.3%
19	82	0.9%	2.4%	83	2.0%	9.6%	0	0.0%	0.0%	165	1.2%	6.1%
20	216	2.4%	0.5%	4	0.1%	0.0%	4	1.0%	0.0%	224	1.6%	0.4%
21	684	7.6%	0.9%	1,448	34.0%	4.9%	23	5.8%	0.0%	2,155	15.8%	3.6%
22	26	0.3%	3.8%	871	20.5%	5.3%	12	3.0%	0.0%	909	6.7%	5.2%
23	685	7.6%	0.3%	20	0.5%	0.0%	8	2.0%	0.0%	713	5.2%	0.3%
24	300	3.3%	0.3%	8	0.2%	0.0%	4	1.0%	0.0%	312	2.3%	0.3%
25	260	2.9%	1.2%	28	0.7%	0.0%	10	2.5%	0.0%	298	2.2%	1.0%
26	218	2.4%	0.9%	3	0.1%	0.0%	7	1.8%	0.0%	228	1.7%	0.9%
27	120	1.3%	0.0%	5	0.1%	0.0%	2	0.5%	0.0%	127	0.9%	0.0%
28	244	2.7%	1.6%	8	0.2%	12.5%	2	0.5%	0.0%	254	1.9%	2.0%
29	271	3.0%	1.1%	18	0.4%	5.6%	29	7.3%	0.0%	318	2.3%	1.3%
30	355	4.0%	0.8%	2	0.0%	0.0%	2	0.5%	0.0%	359	2.6%	0.8%
31	380	4.2%	1.1%	70	1.6%	1.4%	25	6.3%	0.0%	475	3.5%	1.1%
32	151	1.7%	2.0%	85	2.0%	0.0%	4	1.0%	25.0%	240	1.8%	1.7%
33	172	1.9%	2.9%	83	2.0%	12.0%	5	1.3%	20.0%	260	1.9%	6.2%
34	21	0.2%	4.8%	21	0.5%	14.3%	0	0.0%	0.0%	42	0.3%	9.5%
35	171	1.9%	4.1%	50	1.2%	6.0%	11	2.8%	0.0%	232	1.7%	4.3%
36	158	1.8%	1.9%	27	0.6%	0.0%	3	0.8%	0.0%	188	1.4%	1.6%
37	136	1.5%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	9	2.3%	11.1%	145	1.1%	0.7%
38	345	3.8%	2.0%	5	0.1%	20.0%	5	1.3%	0.0%	355	2.6%	2.3%
39	172	1.9%	1.7%	2	0.0%	0.0%	12	3.0%	0.0%	186	1.4%	1.6%
40	186	2.1%	0.0%	2	0.0%	0.0%	14	3.5%	0.0%	202	1.5%	0.0%
41	98	1.1%	1.0%	14	0.3%	0.0%	1	0.3%	0.0%	113	0.8%	0.9%
42	200	2.2%	1.5%	6	0.1%	0.0%	4	1.0%	0.0%	210	1.5%	1.4%
43	211	2.4%	0.5%	16	0.4%	6.3%	4	1.0%	0.0%	231	1.7%	0.9%
44	92	1.0%	0.0%	3	0.1%	0.0%	1	0.3%	0.0%	96	0.7%	0.0%
45	155	1.7%	4.5%	27	0.6%	7.4%	4	1.0%	0.0%	186	1.4%	4.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,964</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>4,256</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>397</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>13,617</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

\* Six circuits (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup>, 40<sup>th</sup>, and 44<sup>th</sup>) did not certify any youth between 2008 and 2011.