

Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification Report

10th Judicial Circuit
Monroe & Ralls Counties

11th Judicial Circuit
St. Charles County

19th Judicial Circuit
Cole County

20th Judicial Circuit
Osage, Gasconade, & Franklin Counties

41st Judicial Circuit
Macon & Shelby Counties

5 Circuit Summary

Office of State Courts Administrator
State of Missouri

Annual 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	24
REFERRALS	2	Behavior Problems	25
Total Number of Referrals by Circuit	2	Attitude	26
Offense Types	3	Interpersonal Skills	26
Source of Referrals	4	Peer Relationships	27
Total Number of Juveniles		History of Child Abuse	
by Gender	4	Or Neglect	28
Number of Juveniles Referred		Mental Health	29
by Race	5	Substance Abuse	30
DISPOSITIONS	6	School Attendance/Disciplinary	31
RISK ASSESSMENT	7	Academic Performance	32
Age at 1 st Referral	8	Learning Disorder	32
Prior Referrals	8	Employment	33
Assault Referrals	9	Parental Responsibility	34
History of Placement	10	Health/Handicaps	35
Peer Relationships	11	Parental Management Style	35
History of Child Abuse		Parental Mental Health	36
or Neglect	12	Parental Substance Abuse	36
Substance Abuse	13	Social Support System	37
School Attendance/Disciplinary		APPENDIX 1 : Summary of Abuse-	
Problems	14	Neglect and Custody Related	
Parental Management Style	15	Referrals	38
History Parental Incarceration	15	APPENDIX 2 : Summary of Offender	
RISK LEVEL	16	Risk Factors	41
ACTION TAKEN	18	APPENDIX 3 : Summary of Offender	43
DISPOSITIONS	19	APPENDIX 4 : Application of Sanctions	
CLASSIFICATION MATRIX	21	Consistent with the Matrix	45
Distribution of Referral			
across the Matrix	22		
Sanctions Used	22		
Sanctions Inside and Outside			
the Matrix	23		
Services Used	23		

INTRODUCTION

Missouri Juvenile Offender Risk & Needs Assessment and Classification System

In 1995 the Missouri General Assembly passed the Juvenile Crime and Crime Prevention Bill. The bill was aimed at reshaping Missouri's juvenile justice system through the development of a comprehensive juvenile justice strategy. As part of the strategy, the Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA) was charged with designing and implementing a statewide juvenile offender assessment and classification system. Specific provisions of the legislation as they apply to the assessment and classification system include:

RSMo. Supp 1995 - Section 211.326 Subsection 5: Develop a standardized assessment form for classifying juvenile offenders...

RSMo. Supp 1995 - Section 211.141 - Subsection 4: In any matter referred to the juvenile court...the juvenile officer shall make an assessment of the child and, before the disposition of the matter, shall report the results of the assessment to the juvenile court. The assessment shall be written on a standardized form...

Pursuant to the legislative initiative, OSCA formed a Risk Assessment Committee (RAC). The members of the RAC were instrumental in developing a consensus-based classification model; a model that was refined through two (1998/2001) risk assessment validation studies. For the Calendar year 2003, the following circuits used the JTRAC classification system:

Circuit 10 - Marion, Monroe and Ralls Counties
Circuit 11 - St. Charles County
Circuit 19 - Cole County
Circuit 20 - Franklin, Gasconade and Osage Counties
Circuit 41 - Macon and Shelby Counties

Four other circuits that were JTRAC users for the past several years are now JIS equipped courts and report their classification information in that database. These circuits include:

Circuit 12 - Audrain, Montgomery and Warren Counties
Circuit 14 - Randolph and Howard Counties
Circuit 22 - St. Louis City
Circuit 45 - Lincoln and Pike Counties

Since its implementation, the classification system has been used to support Missouri's juvenile justice professionals in their effort to address public safety concerns, estimate workload requirements, and promote statewide consistency in the classification and supervision of youthful offenders.

The current report presents assessment and classification information entered by juvenile court personnel in the five remaining JTRAC circuits for the YEAR 2003. The information for the report was extracted from an automated system developed by OSCA. The Juvenile Tracking Referral Assessment and Classification system (J-TRAC) is an automated system for collecting and storing demographic, referral, assessment, classification, and disposition information on juvenile offenders.

REFERRALS

Missouri statutes identify three types of referrals over which the juvenile courts have jurisdiction:

1. Child abuse/neglect (CAN) and custody (CUS)
2. Status offenses (STAT)
3. Law (LAW) violations


The principal aim of the current report is to present information on status offenses and law violations. However, abbreviated CAN/CUS related data are reported in Appendix 1. From January 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003, there were 4927 referrals to the five juvenile courts that entered data into J-TRAC. *

**Excludes allegations associated with another, primary allegation.*

■ Total Number of Referrals by Circuit

Approximately forty three percent of the status and law referrals originated from Circuit 11 (St. Charles County), the largest of the five participating circuits. The remaining circuits accounted for the following percent of total referrals: 17.9%, Circuit 10; 15.1%, Circuit 19; 17.6%, Circuit 20; and 6% in Circuit 41 (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Referrals by Circuit



■ Offense Types


Approximately 19% of all referrals were for status offenses. Habitually Absent from Home was the most frequently cited status offenses constituting 40% of this type offense, followed by Behavior Injurious (30%), Truancy (20%), Beyond Parental Control (9%), and Other (<1%). In 2003, Assault was the most common law violation, constituting 22% of all law referrals. Stealing followed closely as the second most common law violation, representing 20% of all law referrals. The distribution of referrals by offense type is presented in Table 1.

The majority of referrals (70%) were for misdemeanors and lower level felonies (Class C and D). Only about 2% of referrals were for serious felonies (Class A or B). Status offenses and other minor violations accounted for approximately 29% of all referrals (Figure 2).

Table 1: Referrals by Offense Type

Offense Type	Frequency	Percent
Homicide	4	.1
Sexual Assault	42	.9
Robbery	7	.1
Assault	868	17.6
Burglary	122	2.5
Stealing	800	16.2
Kidnapping	1	.0
Arson	44	.9
Forgery	14	.3
Fraud	4	.1
Prostitution	0	0
Sex Offenses	80	1.6
Property Damage (includes tampering)	506	10.3
Stolen Property	26	.5
Obscenity	1	.0
Family Offenses	2	.0
Obstructing Police	24	.5
Flight/Escape	3	.1
Obstructing Judicial Process	11	.2
Weapons	47	1.0
Dangerous Drugs	318	6.5
Liquor Laws	146	2.9
Peace Disturbance	408	8.3
Health and Safety (includes tobacco violations)	5	.1
Conservation	6	.1
Truancy (misdemeanor)	9	.2
Status Offenses	952	19.3
Municipal Offenses (includes curfew)	398	8.1
Motor Vehicle Violations	23	.5
Hazardous Driving	22	.4
Violation of Valid Court Order	15	.3
Probation Violation (misdemeanor & felony)	19	.4
Total	4927	100

Figure 2: Offense Severity



■ Source of Referrals

Referrals are made to juvenile courts from a variety of sources. Approximately 83% of the referrals originated from some type of law enforcement agency, with the remainder coming from schools (11%), family members including parents (3%), juvenile court personnel (1%), and other sources (Table 2).

Nationally, law enforcement accounts for 85% of all delinquency cases referred to juvenile courts.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/cha/pter6.pdf

■ Total Number of Juveniles by Gender

A total of 3641 juveniles were referred to the nine participating circuits, with males assuming the majority. Of all youth referred, 1188 (67%) were male and 1188 (33%) were female (Table 3).

The ratio of male/female juveniles referred in the participating circuits is similar to national level data in this area, 70% for male youth versus 30% for female youth. However, the same national data suggests the increase in juvenile arrest rates since 1981 has been greater for females than for males, particularly for assault and weapons related offenses.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/cha/pter6.pdf

Table 2: Source of Referrals

Referral Source	Frequency	Percent
Schools	518	10.5
Department of Mental Health	4	.1
Division of Family Services	46	.9
Private Social Agency	5	.1
Public Social Agency	2	.0
Juvenile Court Personnel	54	1.1
Other Juvenile Court	36	.7
Victim or Self Referral	16	.3
Parent	154	3.1
Relative Other Than Parent	11	.2
Highway Patrol	33	.7
County Sheriff	551	11.2
Municipal Police	3443	69.9
Other Law Enforcement Agency	43	.9
Other	11	.2
Total	4927	100

Table 3: Juveniles Referred by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	1188	32.6
Male	2453	67.4
Total	3641	100

■ Number of Juveniles Referred by Race

Of youth referred to juvenile courts, 2957 (81%) were white and (17%) were non-white. The exact distribution for race is presented in Table 4.

Nationally, black youth are referred to juvenile court at a rate more than double that for white youth.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/cha/pter6.pdf

Table 4: Juveniles Referred by Race

Race	Frequency	Percent
White	2957	81.2
Black	515	14.1
Hispanic	21	.6
American Indian	4	.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	.1
Unknown	89	2.4
Missing	50	1.4
Total	3641	100

DISPOSITIONS

Juvenile courts can dispose cases in a number of ways. Table 5 depicts the various outcomes for a referral. In about 7% of cases was a disposition unavailable either because the case was pending disposition or because disposition information had not been entered into the J-TRAC system.

Informal Adjustment without Supervision (24%) was the most commonly reported disposition for referrals overall. A risk assessment is required when using this disposition.

The second most frequently reported disposition was Informal Adjustment, with Supervision (16%). Typically in these cases, youth receive a verbal warning and the case is closed. This informal adjustment disposition is commonly used for very low risk, first time offenders who have committed minor law violations or status offenses. A risk assessment is also required when using this disposition.

Approximately 15% of cases were transferred either to another juvenile court or private/public agency.

In 8% of the referrals, Informal Adjustment, No Conference was the disposition applied. Normally, in these circumstances a youth receives a verbal or written warning, but an official informal adjustment conference is not held and therefore, a risk assessment is not completed.

In 6% of cases, youth received formal court supervision, reflected in the disposition of Allegation Found True, Youth Receives In-home Services.

In 5% of the cases a subordinate allegation was logically associated with a “parent” referral/disposition.

Only 2% of the referrals led to an out-of-home placement for the youth.

Table 5: Dispositions

Disposition	Frequency	Percent
Allegation found true w/ petition, juvenile received out of home placement	122	2.3
Allegation true with petition, juvenile received in-home services	320	6.1
Allegation true with petition, juvenile receives no services	8	.2
Allegation found not true w/ petition	3	.1
Sustain motion to dismiss w/ petition	19	.4
Sustain motion to dismiss for cert. w/ petition	3	.1
Informal adjustment conference w/o supervision	1503	28.9
Informal adjustment conference w/ supervision	826	15.9
Informal adjustment, no conference	422	8.1
Transfer to other juvenile court	361	6.9
Transfer to court residential care, DFS, DMH, DYS, private/public agency	407	7.8
Referral rejected	557	10.7
Associated Referral/Disposition	278	5.3
Missing	376	7.2
Total	5205	100

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk assessment is a process that requires youthful offenders and their parent(s) to be interviewed regarding a set of risk factors that are associated with the juvenile's delinquency history and life circumstances. Information obtained via the interview is used to derive a risk scale score and risk category that represents the relative probability that the youth will re-offend. The youth's risk category is used in conjunction with the severity of the present offense to identify the appropriate sanctions.

Officers are required to complete risk assessments on all cases in which **“a status or delinquency referral meets the definition of legal sufficiency and the juvenile and parent or primary caretaker have attended an informal adjustment conference.”**

Of the 4927 referrals that were made to the juvenile courts 3006 (61%) led to the completion of a risk assessment by juvenile court personnel. In developing the report on the risk scale information for the participating circuits, the most recent risk assessment was included in the analysis. The most recent assessment was selected because it represents the most current information that is available on a youth. Using this criterion as the unit of analysis, risk assessments for 2440 youth were included in the analysis.

There is disparity in the total number of referrals and the number of referrals for which risk assessments were completed. This disparity is readily accounted for through referrals that were rejected (11%), transferred to another juvenile court or agency (16%), disposed through the use of a formal written or verbal “warning” without an informal conference (9%), or dismissed for reasons that included certification (1%). Under any of these circumstances, the completion of a risk

assessment is either unnecessary or impossible because an interview was not conducted.

In addition, 8% of referrals were missing dispositions, making it unclear whether a risk assessment was necessary. *

A summary of risk information for the five participating circuits is presented in Appendix 2.

*** A number of risk assessments were performed unnecessarily (i.e., on disposition exclusions described above) or miscoded in JTRAC. This explains why the total percent of referrals receiving risk assessments, disposition exclusions, or missing dispositions is greater than the possible (100%).**

■ Age at 1st Referral

Early involvement in delinquent activity has been associated with future offending. The most frequently used measure of early involvement is the age at which a youth is first referred to the juvenile justice system. This factor is generally recognized as one of the best predictors of recidivism and is typically represented in some fashion on most risk scales.

In the five participating circuits, 32% of youth were first referred to the juvenile court by the age of 12. The age at first referral for the remaining youth was fairly evenly distributed (Table 6).

National Level Data: According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), approximately 21% of 16-year olds who have ever been arrested, were first arrested by age 12.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/cha/pter3.pdf

■ Prior Referrals

A strong predictor of future offending is a record of past offending. The prior referral(s) risk factor is measured by the extent to which youth have prior involvement in delinquent behavior represented through prior referrals. In assessing this factor, juvenile court staff identifies whether a youth has previously received one or more status or delinquency referrals to the juvenile court.

A small majority of youth (51%) had one or more prior referrals at the time of the presenting referral (Table 7).

National Level Data: OJJDP data indicates that only 8% of all youth aged 12-16 self-report having ever been arrested. However, of that 8% having ever been arrested, 40% report having had two or more arrests.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/cha/pter3.pdf

Table 6: Age at 1st Referral

Age	Frequency	Percent
16	398	16.3
15	422	17.3
14	449	18.4
13	401	16.4
12	770	31.6
Total	2440	100

Table 7: Prior Referrals

Prior Referrals	Frequency	Percent
None	1201	49.2
One or more prior referrals	1239	50.8
Total	2440	100

■ Assault Referrals

The early onset of involvement in violence, including assault, has been associated with future offending, particularly serious violence. In assessing a youth's risk to the community, it is important to examine the history of assault or violent behavior. The most commonly used measure for determining the presence of this risk factor is the number of assault referrals youth have received. When assessing this factor, juvenile court officers identify the presence of any prior or **current** referrals for either misdemeanor or felony assaults.

Thirty-one percent of the youth receiving risk assessments had received one or more referrals for misdemeanor assault. Approximately 4% had a previous or current referral for felony assault (Table 8).

National Level Data: Eighteen percent of all juveniles aged 12-16 report having ever committed an assault. Twelve percent of the youth surveyed reported committing an assault within the last 12 months.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/cha/pter3.pdf

Table 8: Assault Referrals

Assault Referrals	Frequency	Percent
No Prior or present referral for assault	1598	65.5
One or more prior or present referral(s) for <i>misdemeanor</i> assault	757	31.0
One or more prior or present referral(s) for <i>felony</i> assault	85	3.5
Total	2440	100

■ History of Placement

Out-of-home placement includes court detention, foster care, hospitalization for mental illness or substance abuse treatment, voluntary placement in respite care, and commitment to the Division of Youth Services or other government-operated or private residential facilities. It also includes placement in a boarding/military school or with a relative other than a parent or primary caretaker for more than three months for intractable behavior. In assessing this risk factor, juvenile court staff identifies and score whether or not there has been an out-of-home placement as defined above.

Slightly less than 21% of the youth in the participating circuits had a prior out-of-home placement at the time of the referral (Table 9).

National Level Data: National level data directly comparable with that derived from the History of Placement variable on the Missouri risk scale are not available. However, OJJDP estimates that in 1996, in 2% of informally processed cases the juvenile and family agreed to an out-of-home placement. In 28% of adjudicated delinquency cases, the juvenile court ordered the youth to residential placement such as a training school, camp, ranch, drug treatment, private placement facility, or group home.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/cha/cha6.pdf

Further, data from a National Survey of State Prison Inmates indicates that 17% of prison inmates report having lived in a foster home, agency, or other institution at some time during their childhood.

www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/sospi91.pdf

Table 9: History of Placement

History of Placement	Frequency	Percent
No prior out-of-home placement	1937	79.4
Prior out-of-home placement	503	20.6
Total	2440	100

■ Peer Relationships

During adolescence, peers play an important role in the socialization process, influencing the values and beliefs of youth. Attachments to peers who engage in negative behavior, particularly peers who demonstrate antisocial behavior, has been directly associated with juvenile delinquency. In assessing this risk factor, juvenile court personnel examine the extent to which a youth's peer group includes youth that are a negative influence, have been referred to the Court, or are gang involved.

Forty-five percent of the youth referred had peers who were negative influences on their lives. Four percent had peers with strong negative influence, indicating gang affiliation (Table 10).

National Level Data: According to the OJJDP, the proportion of youth age 12-16 self-reporting having ever belonged to a gang was 5%.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/chapter3.pdf

Six percent of state prison inmates report having been a gang member prior to incarceration.

www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/sospi91.pdf

State Level Data: Survey data on negative peer affiliation collected on juveniles incarcerated prior to adjudication in 18 Virginia detention centers revealed that 23% of the youth reported gang membership. An additional 18% reported involvement with a negative peer group such as a "crew, clique, posse, or mob."

www.curry.edschool.virginia.edu/curry/centers/youthvio/home.html

Table 10: Peer Relationships

Peer Relationships	Frequency	Percent
Neutral influence	1256	51.5
Negative influence	1097	45.0
Strong negative influence	87	3.6
Total	2440	100

■ History of Child Abuse or Neglect

Research has demonstrated that youth that have been victims of abuse and neglect are more likely to commit delinquent acts. A relationship also has been demonstrated between the frequency of neglect and delinquency self-reporting, even when controlling for gender, race, and socioeconomic status.

Officers examine Division of Family Services records for a probable cause finding or juvenile court records for petitions filed to determine if there is history of child abuse and neglect.

Slightly more than 11% of the youth referred in the nine circuits had a history of child abuse or neglect as defined above (Table 11).

National level data: US Department of Justice statistics estimate that approximately 12% of male state prison inmates self-reported having experienced physical or sexual abuse before age 18. For female inmates, the percentage reporting such abuse was close to 31%. Overall, the study found that 19% of state prison inmates, 10% of federal prison inmates, and 16% of inmates in jail or on probation report experiencing physical or sexual abuse before their current sentence.

www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/sospi91.pdf

Using cross-sectional methodology, researchers have also found significant abuse among the histories of delinquents. Sixty-six percent reported having been beaten with a belt or extension cord; 32% reported having received repeated beatings; and 20% reported being threatened with a knife or gun. Thirty-three percent reported having bruises from the beatings, while 29% reported bleeding and 8% required hospitalization.

www.gahsc.org/jcarter/litreview.htm

Table 11: History of Child Abuse and Neglect

History of Child and Abuse	Frequency	Percent
No history of child abuse and neglect	2162	88.6
Prior history of child abuse and neglect	278	11.4
Total	2440	100

■ Substance Abuse

Although the strength of the association between substance abuse and delinquency varies across states and localities, substance abuse is frequently documented as a problem among youth referred to juvenile courts.

In assessing the presence of this risk factor in a youth's life, officers use the following criteria:

- For *moderate abuse* there must be strong parental suspicion based on reliable physical evidence, at least one but no more than one previous referral to the court for substance abuse, possession or distribution, or disciplinary action taken by school authorities for at least one but no more than one substance abuse related matter; and
- For *severe abuse* there must be evidence of a pattern of regular abuse as evidenced by a diagnosis of chemical dependency, more than one court referral, or more than one disciplinary action taken by school authorities for substance abuse behavior.

For 73% of the youth referred in the five classification circuits, substance abuse did not appear to be a problem. Twenty-five percent were identified with a moderate substance abuse problem, and 2% were identified as having severe alcohol and/or drug abuse problems (Table 12).

Table 12: Substance Abuse

Substance Abuse	Frequency	Percent
No apparent problem	1786	73.2
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	602	24.7
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse/dependence	52	2.1
Total	2440	100

National Level Data: Information from the Monitoring the Future Study indicates that 54% of all high school seniors have tried illicit drugs sometime during their lifetime. The results of the study also suggest that 52% of seniors have used alcohol, 23% have used marijuana, and nearly 5% have used stimulants in the last 30 days.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/cha-pter3.pdf

Data from the National Institute of Justice Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program (ADAM) annual report estimates the percent of positive drug tests for any drug among male juvenile arrestees in 13 major US cities ranged from a low of 40.3% in St. Louis, Missouri, to a high of 68.7% in Phoenix, Arizona. Marijuana was overwhelmingly the primary drug of choice.

www.adam-nij.net/files/juvefind.pdf

■ School Attendance/Disciplinary Problems

The school community exerts great influence in the lives of youth. The importance of making a commitment to education and forming attachments to school has been well established. Youth who do not bond to school and have poor academic achievement often have high rates of school-related behavior problems. In particular, youth with high truancy rates have been found to engage in violence and other forms of delinquency more frequently than youth that do not. Youth with *moderate* problems are those youth that are currently enrolled and attending but have at least one out-of-school suspension, expulsion, or referral for truancy. OR, the youth is 16-years old and there is no evidence of satisfactory progress in GED classes, vocational training or other educational program. Youth with *severe* problems are those youth who are currently suspended or expelled or has dropped out. OR, the youth is 16 years old and the youth is not pursuing any educational goals.

Thirty-nine percent of the referred youth were reported to have moderate school behavior problems and about 11% had severe school behavior problems (Table 13).

Table 13: School Attendance/Disciplinary Problems

School Behavior Problems	Frequency	Percent
No or only minor problems	1227	50.3
Moderate school behavior problems	958	39.3
Severe school behavior problems	255	10.5
Total	2440	100

National Level Data: There is a dearth of information describing the relative dropout rate for delinquent youth. However, data from the National Center for Education Statistics indicate that approximately 11% of all persons aged 16-24 had dropped out of school before earning a high school diploma and was not currently enrolled in school. The difference in dropout rate between male and female students was negligible. Black (12.6%) and Hispanic (28.6%) students were at far greater risk of dropping out than their white counterparts (7.3%).

www.nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=16

Truancy also presents a national problem particularly in urban areas. Daily absentee rates range from ten to thirty percent in some cities, including Detroit, Los Angeles, and New York.

www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/163928.pdf

■ Parental Management Style

The family is generally accepted as the most important influence in the lives of children and dysfunctional or ineffective parenting styles have consistently been linked to delinquent outcomes. In assessing parental management style, juvenile court staff determines the extent to which parents of referred youth are using parenting strategies that provide structure, support, and supervision.

More than 30% of the referred youth had parents that demonstrated moderately ineffective management styles, with 7% demonstrating severely ineffective parental management styles (Table 14).

■ History of Parental Incarceration

Exposure to antisocial and criminal behavior (e.g., drug use) in the family setting is believed to increase opportunities for delinquency and decrease opportunities for pro-social interactions and involvement. Research has demonstrated that youth growing up in families in which one or both parents have a history of criminal behavior are predisposed to delinquency. In assessing this risk factor, juvenile officers determined whether or not a youth's parent or adult functioning as primary caretaker had been sentenced to a period of incarceration in a county jail, state, or federal prison.

Fourteen percent of the referred youth had at least one parent or primary caretaker who had been incarcerated in a county jail, state, or federal prison (Table 15).

Table 14: Parental Management Style

Parental Management Style	Frequency	Percent
Effective management style	1534	62.9
Moderately ineffective management style	738	30.2
Severely ineffective management style	168	6.9
Total	2440	100

National Level Data: Despite a sizable literature linking dysfunctional parenting styles with delinquent and other negative behavioral outcomes there is little national or state level data on this issue. However, numerous programs are showing promise in assisting families in this area. These programs are described under the needs assessment variable of the same name.

Table 15: History of Parental Incarceration

History of Parental Incarceration	Frequency	Percent
No prior incarceration	2102	86.1
Prior incarceration	338	13.9
Total	2440	100

National Level Data: According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2.1% of the nation's 72 million minor children had a parent in state or federal prison in 1999. The Bureau further estimates that approximately 37% of all juveniles in custody have a father, mother, or close relative in jail or prison.

www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/sospi91.pdf

State Level Data: A 1998 California study produced similar results to the national data described above. Of the 1,000 females in detention participating in the study, 54% had mothers and 46% had fathers with a history of incarceration.

RISK LEVEL

Consistent with the design of the risk assessment instrument and the study validating its design, all youth are assigned a risk level based on their total risk scores from the risk factors described above. The total risk score is the sum of the scores on each of the ten risk factors (see Appendix 1) included on the risk scale. The risk levels of the population are presented below, using the cutoff points developed for Missouri. Youth who score in the range of -3 to 0 are designated as Low-Risk youth. Youth who score in the range of 1 to 7 are designated as Moderate-Risk youth. Youth who have a risk score of 8 and above are designated as High-Risk youth.

Twenty-eight percent of the referred youth were designated low risk, 63% moderate risk, and 9% high risk (Figure 3).

Table 16 presents a breakdown of risk levels by gender.

Figure 4 illustrates that female youth (32%) were more likely male youth (26%) to be assessed low risk. Male youth (9%) were slightly more likely than female youth (8%) to be assessed as high risk or as moderate risk, (65%) vs. (60%) respectively.

Figure 3: Referred Youth by Risk Level




Table 16: Risk Level by Gender

Risk Level	Gender		Total
	Female	Male	
Low Risk	249	442	691
	32.4%	26.5%	28.3%
Moderate Risk	460	1081	1541
	59.8%	64.7%	63.2%
High Risk	60	148	208
	7.8%	8.9%	8.5%
Total	769	1671	2440
	100%	100%	100%

Figure 4: Risk Level by Gender





Table 17 and Figure 5 illustrate the level of risk by race. Approximately 18% of the non-white youth were assessed high risk compared with 7% of white youth.

White youth (30%) were more likely than nonwhite youth (17%) to be assessed low risk.

Table 17: Risk Level by Race

Risk Level	Racial Distribution			Total
	White	Non-white	Unknown	
Low Risk	614	52	20	686
	30.0%	16.7%	32.8%	28.4%
Moderate Risk	1289	203	36	1528
	63.0%	65.3%	59.0%	63.2%
High Risk	144	56	5	205
	7.0%	18.0%	8.2%	8.5%
Total	2047	311	61	2419
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Figure 5: Risk Level by Race



ACTION TAKEN


Juvenile courts may respond to a referral either through a formal or informal process. In formal cases, a juvenile officer files a petition with the juvenile court, and a judge hears the case. In informal cases, the juvenile will likely participate in an informal conference in which he or she will receive a warning, or informal supervision.

The vast majority of cases were handled informally. Nearly eighty-two percent of the referrals in which a risk assessment was completed received an informal adjustment as opposed to 13% that were formally processed. The remaining 5% of referrals were either rejected, transferred, or were missing dispositions (Figure 6).

Nationally, approximately 44% of all juvenile cases are processed informally, half of which are dismissed. Approximately 56% of the cases are handled formally.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/chafter6.pdf

Figure 6: Formal vs. Informal Processing



Dispositions

The most frequent disposition for referrals in which a risk assessment was completed was an Informal Adjustment Conference without Supervision. Forty-nine percent of referrals were handled in this manner. The second most frequent disposition was Informal Adjustment Conference with Supervision. Slightly over 27% of the referrals were handled in this manner. In about 11% of the referrals, the Allegation was found true and the youth received in-home services, typically in the form of court supervision. In approximately 4% of the cases, the Allegation Was Found True and the youth received an out-of-home placement. Three percent of cases were missing dispositions (Table 18).

■ Offense Severity

Missouri's classification system categorizes the severity of current offenses into three groups. Group 3 offenses are Class A and B felonies. Less than 2% of the referrals were for Group 3 offenses. Group 2 offenses consist of Class C and D felonies and all misdemeanors. These offenses constituted the vast majority of referrals (76%). Group 1 offenses consist of status offenses, municipal charges, and infractions. Approximately 22% of referrals were for Group 1 offenses. The numbers of youth with current offenses that fall into the three groups of offense severity are broken down by gender and race (Table 19 and 20).

Table 18: Dispositions

Disposition	Frequency	Percent
Allegation found true w/ petition, juvenile received out of home placement	114	3.8
Allegation true with petition, juvenile received in-home services	318	10.6
Allegation true with petition, juvenile received no services	8	.3
Allegation found not true w/ petition	1	.0
Sustain motion to dismiss w/ petition	11	.4
Sustain motion to dismiss for cert. w/ petition	0	0
Informal adjustment conference w/o supervision	1474	49.0
Informal adjustment conference w/ supervision	814	27.1
Informal adjustment, no conference	92	3.1
Transfer to other juvenile court	13	.4
Transfer to court residential care, DFS, DMH, DYS, private/public agency	40	1.3
Referral rejected	45	1.5
Missing	76	2.5
Total	3006	100

Table 19: Offense Severity by Gender

Offense Severity	Gender		Total
	Female	Male	
Status, Municipal Ordinance, Infraction	264 28.1%	394 19.1%	658 21.9%
A, B,C Misdemeanor and C, D Felony	672 71.6%	1619 78.3%	2291 76.2%
A, B Felony	3 .3%	54 2.6%	57 1.9%
Total	939 100%	2067 100%	3006 100%

Figure 7 illustrates that proportionately; males are more likely to commit serious felonies than females. Three percent of male referrals were for A or B felonies as contrasted less than % for females. Slightly more than 28% of female referrals were for minor law violations compared with 19% for males.

Table 20 provides a breakdown of offense severity by race.

Non-white youth were slightly more likely than white youth to be referred for serious felonies. Three percent of referrals for non-white youth were for A or B felonies. Two percent of referrals for white youth were of this offense nature (Figure 8). Offense severity by race was otherwise unremarkable.

Figure 7: Offense Severity by Gender





Table 20: Offense Severity by Racial Distribution

Offense Severity	Racial Distribution			
	White	Non-white	Unknown	Total
Status, Municipal Ordinance, Infraction	541 21.8%	89 21.5%	24 29.6%	654 21.9%
A, B,C Misdemeanor and C, D Felony	1905 76.6%	311 75.3%	55 67.9%	2271 76.2%
A, B Felony	40 1.6%	13 3.1%	2 2.5%	55 1.8%
Total	2486 100%	413 100%	81 100%	2980 100%

Figure 8: Offense Severity by Racial Distribution



Classification Matrix

Missouri's classification system incorporates a matrix that is designed to match the sanction with the level of control necessary to manage risk. The purpose of the classification matrix is to suggest the presumptive sanction(s) for youth entering the juvenile justice system based on the seriousness of the present offense and the risk of continued delinquent behavior. For example, a youth who committed a Class C felony (Group 2) and who scored as High Risk on the risk scale should have different sanctions imposed than a High Risk youth who committed a Class A or B felony.

Because it incorporates a dimension that focuses on offense severity, Missouri's matrix is based on factors that reflect public safety concerns. Like the risk assessment instrument, it was designed from a consensus-building process involving wide representation from juvenile court personnel. Use of the classification matrix requires a two-step process. The first step is the completion of the risk assessment scale that measures the likelihood of re-offense. The second step involves cross-indexing the level of risk with the nature of the current offense.

The matrix approach offers several advantages. First, offense severity and risk are treated as two separate dimensions, eliminating confusion about the meaning of risk assessment. Second, the matrix approach gives a more accurate measure of recidivism than the use of a risk assessment only. Finally, a greater number of classifications are created, which can result in greater precision in terms of the levels of security needed in placement. Missouri's classification matrix offers extensive flexibility and increased placement options.

■ Distribution of Referrals across the Matrix

The distribution of *referrals* across each of the Risk X Offense Group is presented in Table 21 below.

Noticeably, 64% of the cases fell within the Moderate Risk/Group 2 cell of the matrix. In addition, moderate risk youth accounted for 72% of all A & B felonies.

■ Sanctions Used

The most frequently applied sanction was Warn & Counsel. This sanction was used in approximately 60% of the cases. The second most frequently reported sanction was Fees and Assessments (42%), followed by Supervision (36%). The number and percentages of sanctions used is listed in Table 22.

Table 21: Risk Level by Offense Severity

	Status, Municipal Ordinance, Infraction (Group 1)	A,B,C Misdemeanor and C,D Felony (Group 2)	A,B Felony (Group 3)	Total
Low Risk	96	644	5	745
	14.6%	28.1%	8.8%	24.8%
Moderate Risk	454	1425	41	1920
	69.0%	62.2%	71.9%	63.9%
High Risk	108	222	11	341
	16.4%	9.7%	19.3%	11.3%
Total	658	2291	57	3006
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 22: Sanctions Used

Sanctions Used	Total Frequency	Percent
Commitment to DYS	85	2.8
Court Residential Placement	22	.7
Intensive Supervision	55	1.8
Day Treatment	12	.4
Fees and Assessments	1273	42.3
Community Service	271	9.0
Restitution	210	7.0
Supervision	1067	35.5
Warn & Counsel	1764	58.7
Other Sanctions	89	3.0
No Sanction Applied	89	3.0
No Sanction (<i>pending disposition</i>)	76	2.5

■ Sanctions Inside and Outside the Matrix

Appendix 4 provides a review of the extent to which sanctions were applied to cases consistent with those recommended in the matrix.

■ Services Used

The capacity to identify service needs and then respond with appropriate services is a key principle of the juvenile justice system. Missouri's classification system enables juvenile court personnel to indicate the services that were used in responding to the case management needs of youthful offenders. Services used are displayed in Table 23. The most frequently used services were counseling (individual/family) (25%), education based programming (mentoring, tutoring, GED classes, vocational training, alternative school) (14%), and substance abuse programming (6%). In 61% of cases, no services were assigned. In 3% of the cases, information regarding services was not entered into J-TRAC, presumably because the case had not been disposed.

Table 23: Services Used

Services	Frequency	Percent
GED Classes	7	.2
Tutoring	22	.7
Other Education & Prevention Program	368	12.2
Vocational Training	8	.3
Mentoring	30	1.0
Shoplifters Program	0	0
Drug & Alcohol Program	56	1.9
Substance Abuse Counseling	135	4.5
Family Counseling	251	8.3
Individual Counseling	505	16.8
Sex Offender Program	15	.5
Other Intervention Program	93	3.1
DFS Residential Placement	10	.3
DFS Foster Care	18	.6
DMH Residential Care	4	.1
DMH In-home Services	14	.5
DMH (<i>other</i>)	3	.1
No Service	1832	61.0
No Service (<i>pending disposition</i>)	78	2.6

Needs Assessment

Missouri juvenile court personnel use needs assessment to assist them with their case management decisions that are related to offender treatment needs. By assessing treatment needs as part of the entire classification process, juvenile officers are able to equally consider both the relative threat of the offender to the community and the competency needs of the offender. Missouri's formalized needs assessment process has several specific objectives, which include:

- Ensuring that certain types of problems considered the most important in determining the outcome of a case are always considered relative to the placement options.
- Providing an added measure for judging the amount of time to be expended on an individual case.
- Assisting in developing case plans in the community setting. Youth with high needs scores generally require more resources or more staff contact.

In the five circuits using the classification system, needs assessments must be completed on all juveniles proceeding to an adjudication hearing. Officers also are encouraged to complete needs assessments on any juvenile thought to be in need of such an assessment.

Needs assessment information for 539 youth in the nine participating circuits is presented below. The most recent needs assessment for a youth was selected for analysis. A summary of the needs assessment information is presented in Appendix 3.

■ Behavior Problems

In assessing behavior problems, officers obtain information related to significant behavior problems at home or school. Officers determine whether a youth has received disciplinary action at home or school resulting from fighting, lying, or persistent defiance. They are also responsible for determining if a youth has previous referrals to the juvenile court, particularly for assault.

Sixty-two percent of the youth assessed were identified as having some form of behavior problem, with 47% demonstrating moderate and 15% severe behavior problems (conduct disorder) (Table 24).

National Level Data: In the general juvenile population, the prevalence of conduct disorder is between 2% and 7% (DSM -IV). Preliminary findings from a collaborative research effort between OJJDP, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Cook County Detention Center, suggest that as many as 42% of the 1,800 juveniles participating in the study may qualify for a disruptive behavior diagnosis, including oppositional defiant disorder or conduct disorder.

www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/about/spch991021.html

Promising programs in this area:

- Brief Strategic Family Therapy
www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jjbul2000_04_3/contents.html
 - Interpersonal Cognitive Problem Solving (ICPS) www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/172847.pdf
 - Mentoring
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/164834.pdf
 - Multisystemic Therapy
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/165151.pdf
 - Promoting Alternative Thinking Patterns
www.prevention.psu.edu/PATHS
-

Table 24: Behavior Problems

Behavior Problems	Frequency	Percent
No significant behavioral problems	208	38.6
Moderate behavioral problems	252	46.8
Severe behavioral problems	79	14.7
Total	539	100

■ Attitude

When assessing youth on this variable, officers attempt to identify antisocial thinking patterns and behavior and a willingness to change these patterns. Officers also determine whether a youth recognizes his or her responsibility in the presenting offense.

Thirty percent of the youth were assessed as generally uncooperative with limited motivation to change, and 8% demonstrated very negative attitudes and were resistant to changing (Table 25).

■ Interpersonal Skills

Interpersonal skills are competencies that are necessary to initiate, maintain, and terminate interpersonal relationships. These skills include the ability to appropriately disclose personal thoughts and feelings, offer emotional support to others, and resolve interpersonal conflict. In assessing this need, officers explore the extent that deficits exist in these areas.

Forty percent of youth receiving needs assessments demonstrated moderately impaired and 5% severely impaired interpersonal skills (Table 26).

National Level Data: There are no national level data on the prevalence of juvenile offenders with interpersonal skill problems with which to compare juvenile court data. However, data from the participating circuits suggest many juveniles experience problems in this area.

Promising programs in this area:

- Mentoring
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/164834.pdf
- Multi-systemic Therapy
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/165151.pdf
- Interpersonal Cognitive Problem Solving (ICPS) www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/172847.pdf
- Promoting Alternative Thinking Patterns
www.prevention.psu.edu/PATHS

Table 25: Attitude

Attitude	Frequency	Percent
Motivated to change; accepts responsibility	335	62.2
Generally uncooperative; not motivated to change	162	30.1
Very negative attitude; resistant to change	42	7.8
Total	539	100

Table 26: Interpersonal Skills

Interpersonal Skills	Frequency	Percent
Good interpersonal skills	296	54.9
Moderately impaired interpersonal skills	215	39.9
Severely impaired interpersonal skills	28	5.2
Total	539	100

■ Peer Relationships

In assessing peer relationships, juvenile court staff examines the extent to which a youth's peer group acts as a negative influence and whether they have been referred to the court or are gang affiliated.

For youth receiving a needs assessment, 51% were determined to associate with peers that exert a negative influence. Nearly 7% had a strong negative peer influence, indicating gang affiliation (Table 27).

National Level Data: According to national survey data, the proportion of all youth aged 12-16 self-reporting having ever belonged to a gang is 5%.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/

Six percent of state prison inmates report having been a gang member prior to incarceration.

www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/sospi91.pdf

State Level Data: Survey data on negative peer affiliation collected on juveniles incarcerated prior to adjudication in 18 Virginia detention centers revealed that 23% of the youth reported gang membership. An additional 18% reported involvement with a negative peer group such as a "crew, clique, posse, or mob".

www.curry.edschool.virginia.edu/curry/centers/youthvio/home.html

Promising programs in this area:

- Prevention, intervention, and suppression programs

www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/171154.pdf

Table 27: Peer Relationships

Peer Relationships	Frequency	Percent
Neutral peer group influence	229	42.5
Negative peer group influence	274	50.8
Strong negative peer group influence	36	6.7
Total	539	100

■ History of Child Abuse or Neglect

In assessing a history of abuse and neglect, officers verify that a youth has been a victim of abuse or neglect by a parent or primary caretaker through official records. The record must be a petition filed in juvenile or family court or a finding of probable cause from the Division of Family Services.

Twenty-six percent of the youth assessed had a history of abuse or neglect (Table 28).

National level data: A 1999 study by the US Department of Justice indicates that 14% of male state prison inmates report experiencing physical or sexual abuse before age 18. For female inmates, the percentage reporting such abuse was close to 37%. Overall, the study found that 19% of state prison inmates, 10% of federal prison inmates, and 16% of those in jail or on probation report experiencing physical or sexual abuse before their current sentence.

www.casanet.org/library/abuse/abuse-stats98.htm#Costs%20of%20Abuse

Using a cross-sectional approach, researchers have also found significant abuse among the histories of delinquents. Sixty-six percent reported being beaten with a belt or extension cord, 32% reported repeated beatings, and 20% reported being threatened with a knife or gun. Thirty-three percent reported bruises from the beatings, while 29% reported bleeding, and 8% required hospitalization.

www.gahsc.org/jcarter/litreview.htm

Promising programs in this area:

- Nurturing Parents Programs
www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/2000_11_1/contents.html
-

Table 28: History of Child Abuse and Neglect

History of Child Abuse and Neglect	Frequency	Percent
No history of abuse or neglect	397	73.7
History of abuse and/or neglect	142	26.3
Total	539	100

■ Mental Health

A youth diagnosed with a mental health disorder, including attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, is considered to have mental health needs for the purpose of scoring this variable. By definition, mental disorders do not include learning disabilities, conduct disorder, or chemical dependency. When assessing this area, court personnel determine whether or not youth with mental health needs have received treatment or are compliant with treatment recommendations.

Fifteen percent of youth in the participating circuits were diagnosed with a mental health disorder, only 1% of which had received or were receiving treatment (Table 29).

National Level Data: Currently, there is an absence of national level information on the prevalence of mental health disorders in the juvenile justice population, however several small studies offer insight into the extent of the problem. On the bases of these studies, OJJDP has estimated the rate of mental disorder in the juvenile justice population at approximately 20%, significantly higher than in the general juvenile population.
www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/about/spch991021.html

State Level Data: Data from Georgia, South Carolina, Maryland, California, and Virginia have found prevalence rates for the following specific mental disorders: anxiety disorders were found in 30-58%, mood disorders in 17-24%, and disruptive behavior disorders including attention deficit disorder in 35-52% of youth in the juvenile justice system. Post-traumatic stress disorder was found in 32-49% and psychotic disorders in 32-45% of incarcerated youth (Juvenile Justice Update, Oct/Nov 2000).

Promising programs in this area:

- Multi-systemic therapy
www.aypf.org/mendel/
 - Functional Family Therapy
www.aypf.org/mendel/
 - Improved Assessment Strategies
www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jjnl_2000_4/you th_3.html
 - www.nomanagedcare.org/childreport.htm
-

Table 29: Mental Health

Mental Health	Frequency	Percent
No mental health disorder	457	84.8
Mental health disorder with treatment	76	14.1
Mental health disorder with no treatment	6	1.1
Total	539	100

■ Substance Abuse

The substance abuse factor on the needs assessment assesses a youth's overall pattern of substance abuse. Officers attempt to determine whether there is reliable physical evidence that drug or alcohol abuse is a problem.

For youth receiving a needs assessment, approximately 22% were determined to have a *moderate* alcohol or substance abuse problem, and 5% were assessed with a *severe* problem (Table 30).

National Level Data: Information from the Monitoring the Future Study indicates that 54% of all high school seniors have tried illicit drugs sometime during their lifetime. The results of the study also suggest that 52% of seniors have used alcohol, 23% have used marijuana, and nearly 5% have used stimulants in the last 30 days.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/

Data from the National Institute of Justice Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program (ADAM) annual report indicates the percent of positive drug tests for **any drug** among juvenile arrests (male) in 13 major US cities ranged from a low of 40.3% in St. Louis, Missouri, to a high of 68.7% in Phoenix, Arizona. Marijuana was overwhelmingly the primary drug of choice.

www.adam-nij.net/files/juvefind.pdf

Promising programs in this area:

- Juvenile Drug Courts
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/184744.pdf
 - Mentoring
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/164834.pdf
 - Brief Strategic Family Therapy
www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jjbul2000_04_3/contents.html
-

Table 30: Substance Abuse

Substance Abuse	Frequency	Percent
No substance abuse problem	394	73.1
Moderate alcohol and/or substance abuse problem	121	22.4
Severe alcohol and/or substance abuse or dependence	24	4.5
Total	539	100

■ School Attendance/Disciplinary

The school attendance/disciplinary relates to attendance and school disciplinary issues of school aged youth. This needs factor is measured through referrals for truancy, out-of-school suspensions, expulsions, or multiple unexcused absences.

For youth receiving a needs assessment, the school attendance/disciplinary factor registered as a significant problem area. Approximately 35% of the youth had moderate problems and 19% had severe problems in this area (Table 31).

National Level Data: Data from the National Center for Education Statistics indicates that approximately 11% of all persons aged 16-24 had dropped out of school before earning a high school diploma and currently were not enrolled in school. The difference in drop out rate between male and female students was negligible. However, black (12.6%) and Hispanic (28.6%) students were at far greater risk of dropping out than their white counterparts (7.3%).

www.nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=16

Forty percent of youth under age 18 entering adult prisons have completed less than 11th grade.

www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/truncy.pdf

Truancy also presents a national problem, with daily absentee rates ranging from 10% to 30% in some cities (Detroit, Los Angeles, New York).

www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/truncy.pdf

In terms of expulsions and suspensions, Wisconsin schools expelled about 70% more students than in the previous school year; Colorado recorded 66,000 suspensions, and one Oregon school district expelled nearly one student per day for the first three months after implementing a zero tolerance policy on weapons.

www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojdp/176343.pdf

Table 31: School Behavior

School Behavior	Frequency	Percent
No or minor school behavior problems	245	45.5
Moderate school behavior problems	191	35.4
Severe school behavior problems	103	19.1
Total	539	100

Promising programs in this area:

- Communities in Schools (CIS) Alternative Schools www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/dropout.pdf
 - Truancy Centers www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/dropout.pdf
 - Community Assessment Centers www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/dropout.pdf
 - School-to-Work Programs www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/dropout.pdf
-

■ Academic Performance

An additional school related variable on which youth are assessed is academic performance. Approximately 39% of youth were functioning with a D average and another 14% were failing academically (Table 32). Educational deficits of this type indicate a major area of need for court-involved youth. Without remediation, these youth are likely to face lifelong problems with employment and self-support.

National Level Data: According to the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 25% of the adolescent population is at risk for academic failure and another 25% are considered moderately at risk (University of Wisconsin-Extension, 1992).

■ Learning Disorder

Learning disorders are defined via DSM-IV diagnoses. For the purpose of scoring the learning disorder variable, an officer is to determine if a youth has received either a reading or mathematics disorder, or disorder of written expression diagnosis. ADHD is not considered a learning disorder in this variable.

Nearly eighteen percent of youth receiving a needs assessment were identified as having been diagnosed with a learning disorder (Table 33).

National Level Data: Data from the US Department of Education indicate that approximately 5% to 10% of youth in the general population has been diagnosed with a **specific** learning disorder. As much as 45% of the juvenile correctional population carry a specific learning disorder diagnosis.

www.edjj.org/Publications/pub05_01_00.html

Promising programs in this area:

- Individualized Education Programs
www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/OSEP/IEP_Guide/
-

Table 32: Academic Performance

Academic Performance	Frequency	Percent
Passing (or 16 years old and not enrolled)	256	47.5
Functioning below average	210	39.0
Failing	73	13.5
Total	539	100

Promising programs in this area:

- Mentoring
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/164834.pdf
 - Tutoring
www.nwrel.org/mentoring/peer.html
 - Alternative Schools
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/dropout.pdf
 - School-to-Work Programs
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/dropout.pdf
-

Table 33: Learning Disorder

Learning Disorder	Frequency	Percent
No diagnosed learning disorder	442	82.0
Diagnosed learning disorder	97	18.0
Total	539	100

■ Employment

The connection between crime and employment is well established in national studies, particularly in adult populations. Gainful employment in a legitimate job provides youth with an opportunity to benefit from a pro-social lifestyle that includes employment versus a deviant lifestyle that involves crimes committed for economic gain.

Information on employment was obtained for those youth that are not enrolled in school, vocational training, or other educational programming AND are 16 years of age.

Of the 136 adjudicated youth meeting these criteria, 9% were employed full-time and 35% were employed part-time. The remaining (57%) were unemployed (Table 34).

National Level Data: According to a recent national level study, approximately 63% of high school dropouts were unemployed.

www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/163928.pdf

Promising programs in this area:

- Communities in Schools (CIS) Alternative Schools www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/dropout.pdf
 - Truancy Centers www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/dropout.pdf
 - Community Assessment Centers www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/dropout.pdf
 - School-to-Work Programs www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/dropout.pdf
-

Table 34: Employment

Employment	Frequency	Percent
Full-time employment	12	8.8
Part-time employment	47	34.6
Unemployed	77	56.6
Total	136	100

■ Parental Responsibility

In addition to facing the challenges posed by late adolescence, youth with child rearing responsibilities are faced with increased challenges. Often juvenile court personnel must not only identify services to address the needs of youth, but must also help these youth identify services for their children.

While the vast majority (98%) of youth does not have children, 2% of youth receiving needs assessments in the participating circuits had at least one child for whom they were responsible ¹ (Table 35).

National Level Data:

Females: Data from the National Center for Health Statistics indicate that the live birth rate for females aged 15-19 is 55 per 1,000. Missouri's live birth rate for these teenage females is 54.

www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr48/nvsr48_6.pdf
www.uvm.edu/~nnfruvn/robnhood.html

Males: National survey information indicates that between (2-7%) of male teenagers are fathers with higher rates among inner city and African-American youth. The rate of teen fatherhood grew substantially between 1986 and 1996 when the National Center for Health Statistics indicated that 23 of every 1,000 males between 15 and 19 were fathers. OJJDP researchers concluded that early delinquency is one of the most significant risk factors for becoming a teen father.

www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/178899.pdf

¹ Data reported for this variable may not be reliable. Although the definition contained in the classification manual is clear, several officers reported in quality assurance training sessions that during the early implementation stages of the system they were scoring this item based on the youth's parents' parental responsibility (which refers to the number of children, including siblings, by the youth's parents) as opposed to the youth's parental responsibility (which refers to the number of children by the referred youth).

Table 35: Parental Responsibility

Parental Responsibility	Frequency	Percent
No children	530	98.3
One child	2	.4
Two children	3	.6
Three or more children	4	.7
Total	539	100

Key factors associated with having a baby before the age of 20 include early school failure, early behavioral problems, family dysfunction, and poverty. Studies indicate that educational success plays a role in averting subsequent teen births.

www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/nationalreport99/chapter1.pdf

Promising programs in this area:

- Map and Track Fathers
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/fs-9773.pdf
 - National Based Strategies
aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/teenp/activity.htm
 - Mentoring
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/164834.pdf
 - Tutoring
www.nwrel.org/mentoring/peer.html
-

■ Health/Handicaps

This needs variable refers to the nature of a youth's physical health and whether they have a physical handicap or condition such as pregnancy that impede their daily functioning.

Four percent of assessed youth reported health problems, physical handicaps, or pregnancy at the time of assessment (Table 36).

National Level Data: The US Office of Technology Assessment reports that approximately 7% of adolescents aged 10-18 are without any health insurance coverage (OTA, 1993).

■ Parental Management Style

The family is generally accepted as the most important influence in the lives of children and dysfunctional or ineffective parenting styles have consistently been linked to delinquent outcomes. In assessing parental management style, juvenile court staff determines the extent to which parents of referred youth are using parenting strategies that provide structure, support, and supervision.

The data generated by this factor represents a high need area among the majority of assessed youth. Nearly 46% of these youth experienced some problems with parental control or moderate family disruption. Nineteen percent experienced severe family disruption and poor parental control (Table 37).

National Level Data: Despite a sizable literature linking dysfunctional parenting styles with delinquent and other negative behavioral outcomes there is a dearth of national or state level data on this issue. However, numerous programs are showing promise in assisting families in this area.

Table 36: Health/Handicaps

Health/Handicaps	Frequency	Percent
No health problems or physical handicaps	519	96.3
No health problems/handicaps, limited access to health care	6	1.1
Mild physical handicap or medical condition	13	2.4
Pregnancy	1	.2
Serious physical handicap or medical condition	0	0
Total	539	100

Table 37: Parental Management Style

Parental Management Style	Frequency	Percent
Effective management	190	35.3
Moderately ineffective management	245	45.5
Severely ineffective management	104	19.3
Total	539	100

Promising programs in this area:

- Brief Strategic Family Therapy
www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jbul2000_04_3/contents.html
 - Multisystemic Therapy
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/165151.pdf
 - Functional Family Therapy
www.aypf.org/mendel/
 - Nurturing Parents Programs
www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/2000_11_1/contents.html
 - Family Skills Training for Parents and Children
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/180140.pdf
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/171121.pdf
-

■ Parental Mental Health

An area related to parental management style is the nature and extent of any parental mental health problems. A parent's capacity to provide a constructive and positive home environment may be limited by their ability to function as a primary caretaker as a result of a mental disorder. When assessing this need area, juvenile court personnel determine whether a parent has been diagnosed with a DSM-IV mental disorder (excluding chemical dependency and personality disorders) by a mental health professional.

Slightly more than 12% of the youth have at least one parent with a history of mental illness (Table 38).

■ Parental Substance Abuse

While studies specifically linking parental substance abuse to delinquency are limited, its relationship to family dynamics and a parent's ability to provide for a safe and nurturing home environment merit the inclusion of this factor on the needs scale. Substance abuse is clearly a factor that contributes to marital and family discord and persistent conflict.

Juvenile court personnel examining this factor attempt to ascertain whether or not a youth's parent currently abuses alcohol or drugs in a manner that creates disruption in the home. They look for the presence of conflict and attempt to determine whether or not they are receiving treatment or have been diagnosed as chemically dependent.

Approximately 23% of youth resided in a family where there was substance abuse by at least one parent (Table 39).

Table 38: Parental Mental Health

Parental Mental Health	Frequency	Percent
No parental history of mental disorder	475	88.1
Parental history of mental disorder	64	11.9
Total	539	100

National Level Data: National data that would permit any meaningful comparison with the results generated by the needs instrument on this variable is unavailable. However, current prevalence estimates suggest that about 20% of the US adult population are affected by mental disorders during a given year. Three percent have both mental and addictive disorders.

http://phs.os.dhhs.gov/Library/MentalHealth/chapter2/sec2_1.html

Promising programs in this area:

- Multi-systemic Therapy
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/165151.pdf

Table 39: Parental Substance Abuse

Parental Substance Abuse	Frequency	Percent
No parental substance abuse	415	77.0
Parental substance abuse	124	23.0
Total	539	100

National Level Data: A US Department of Justice survey gathered from prison inmates indicates 26% reported their parents or guardians had used alcohol and 4% reported that they had used drugs. Thirty-six percent of white inmates and 19% of black inmates reported parental alcohol abuse. Six percent of white inmates and 3% of black inmates reported their parents using drugs.

www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/sospi91.pdf

Promising programs in this area:

- Multi-systemic Therapy
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/165151.pdf

■ Social Support System

Youth who grow up in a highly disorganized family or community where there is low neighborhood attachment, high availability of drugs and firearms, exposure to criminal lifestyles and attitudes favorable to crime are more likely to be involved in delinquency than those who grow up in a family or community where there are strong ties to pro-social forces.

A youth's social support system includes the immediate family, but also includes extended family, friends of family, teachers, or other community members who may be active in a youth's life. In assessing this needs area, officers look for the presence of strong and stable role models that are able to positively influence a youth.

This needs area represents an area of concern for juvenile court personnel. Forty-nine percent of youth had a limited support system, 14% had a weak support system with no positive role model, and 2% lived in a support system with a strong negative or criminal influence (Table 40).

National Level Data: National data that would permit any meaningful comparison with the results generated by the needs instrument on this variable is unavailable.

Promising programs in this area:

- Mentoring
www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/164834.pdf
<http://www.nwrel.org/mentoring/>
-

Table 40: Social Support System

Social Support System	Frequency	Percent
Strong social support	186	34.5
Limited support system with one positive role model	265	49.2
Weak support system with no positive role model	76	14.1
Strong negative or criminal influence in support system	12	2.2
Total	539	100

APPENDIX 1

SUMMARY OF ABUSE-NEGLECT AND CUSTODY RELATED REFERRALS

In the five active J-TRAC sites, 13% (749) of all referrals were for abuse and neglect (CAN) or custody related (CUS) cases. These referrals involved 667 youth.

Source of CAN/CUS Referrals

CAN/CUS referrals are made to juvenile courts from a variety of sources. Nearly 66% of the referrals originated from the Division of Family Services. The second most frequent source of CAN/CUS referrals was Municipal Police (7%), with the remainder originating from Schools (6%), and various other sources (Table 1).

Table 1: Source of Referrals

Referral Source	Frequency	Percent
Schools	45	6.0
Department of Mental Health	0	0
Division of Family Services	493	65.8
Private Social Agency	2	.3
Public Social Agency	0	0
Juvenile Court Personnel	11	1.5
Other Juvenile Court	6	.8
Victim or Self Referral	3	.4
Parent	16	2.1
Relative Other Than Parent	7	.9
Highway Patrol	3	.4
County Sheriff	27	3.6
Municipal Police	52	6.9
Other Law Enforcement Agency	7	.9
Other	77	10.3
Total	749	100

Nature of Referral

Table 2 presents a summary of the data on the nature of CAN/CUS referrals for youth in the participating circuits. Approximately 73% (550) of the referrals were for neglect; 24% (180) were for abuse, and 3% (19) were for custody related referrals.

Table 2: Nature of Referral

Nature of Referral	Frequency	Percent
Abuse Emotional	15	2.0
Abuse – Incest	15	2.0
Abuse – Other Sexual	38	5.1
Abuse – Physical	112	15.0
Abandonment	0	0
Abduction	0	0
Protective Custody	7	.9
Transfer of Custody	1	.1
Termination of Parental Rights	11	1.5
Relief of Custody	0	0
Neglect – Education	42	5.6
Neglect Improper Care/Supervision	431	57.5
Neglect – Medical Care	16	2.1
Neglect – Surgical Care	0	0
Neglect – Other	61	8.1
Total	749	100

CAN/CUS Referrals by Gender

Of total number of youth referred for CAN/CUS matters, 328 (49%) were female and 339 (51%) were male (Table 3).

Table 3: CAN/CUS Referrals by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	328	49.2
Male	339	50.8
Total	667	100

CAN/CUS Referrals by Race

Of total youth referred for CAN/CUS matters, 69% (459) were white and 28% (186) were non-white. Twenty-two (3%) referrals were missing race information. The exact distribution for race is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: CAN/CUS Referrals by Race

Race	Frequency	Percent
White	459	68.8
Black	123	18.4
Hispanic	4	.6
American Indian	1	.1
Oriental	0	0
Other	58	8.7
Missing	22	3.3
Total	667	100

Number of Days in Protective Custody

If a juvenile is held or placed in any type of non-secure placement prior to disposition, officers are to indicate the total number of days spent in pre-hearing placement for the present referral. **Once a disposition is reached, the count should cease.** Table 5 presents the number of days spent in protective custody for the 127 youth that were in placement longer than 24 hours. The range for the number of days these youth spent in protective custody was 1- 420 days.

Table 5: Number of Days in Protective Custody

Days in Custody	Frequency	Percent
1-30 days	40	31.4
31-60 days	44	34.6
61-90 days	6	4.7
91-120 days	7	5.5
Over 120 days	30	23.6
Total	127	100

Protective Custody Placement

As Table 6 illustrates, 263 youth referred for CAN/CUS matters were assigned to protective custody status. For those youth receiving protective custody, Group Home/Residential was the overwhelming placement choice (91%) (Table 6).

Table 6: Protective Custody Placement

Protective Custody Placement	Frequency	Percent
Foster Home	11	4.1
Group Home/Residential	240	91.2
Relative	3	1.1
Other	9	3.4
Total	263	100

Dispositions

The most frequently occurring disposition for CAN/CUS referrals that were disposed was Allegation True with petition, juvenile receives out-of-home placement (27%). The second most frequently reported disposition was Transfer to DFS. Nearly 20% of the referrals with dispositions were disposed in this manner. Only 28% of all CAN/CUS referrals were missing dispositions, reflecting a continuation in the improvement of reporting; down from 36% missing in Year 2001 and 50% in Year 2000 (Table 7).

Table 7: Dispositions

Disposition	Frequency	Percent
Allegation true w/petition, juvenile receives in-home services	42	5.6
Allegation true w/petition, juvenile receives out-of-home placement	170	22.7
Allegation true w/petition, juvenile receives no services	0	0
Sustain motion to dismiss w/petition	18	2.4
Allegation found not true w/ petition	0	0
Informal adjustment conference w/ supervision	104	13.9
Informal adjustment conference w/o supervision	37	4.9
Informal adjustment, no conference	79	10.5
Transfer to other juvenile court	20	2.7
Referral rejected, allegation not true	28	3.7
Referral rejected, insufficient evidence	49	6.5
Transfer to DFS	43	5.7
Transfer to DMH	0	0
Transfer to DYS	1	.1
Transfer to private agency	0	0
Transfer to public agency	0	0
Transfer to other	2	.3
Associated Referral	1	.1
Missing	155	20.7
Total	749	100

APPENDIX 2

SUMMARY OF OFFENDER RISK FACTORS 2440 youth assessed from Jan 1, 2003 – December 31, 2003

	<u># of Youth</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>Age at 1st Referral</u>		
16	398	16.3
15	422	17.3
14	449	18.4
13	401	16.4
12 and under	770	31.6
<u>Prior Referrals</u>		
None	1201	49.2
One or more prior referrals	1239	50.8
<u>Assault Referrals</u>		
No prior or present referral for assault	1598	65.5
One or more prior or presents referrals for misdemeanor assault	757	31.0
One or more prior or present referrals for felony assault	85	3.5
<u>History of Placement</u>		
No prior out-of-home placement	1937	79.4
Prior out-of-home placement	503	20.6
<u>Peer Relationships</u>		
Neutral influence	1256	51.5
Negative influence	1097	45.0
Strong negative influence	87	3.6
<u>History of Child Abuse or Neglect</u>		
No prior child abuse or neglect	2162	88.6
Prior child abuse or neglect	278	11.4
<u>Substance Abuse</u>		
No apparent problem	1786	73.2
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	602	24.7
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse/dependence	52	2.1
<u>School Attendance/Disciplinary</u>		
No or only minor problems	1227	50.3
Moderate problems	958	39.3
Severe problems	255	10.5
<u>Parental Management Style</u>		
Positive management	1534	62.9
Moderately ineffective management	738	30.2
Severely ineffective management	168	6.9

Parental Incarceration History

No prior incarceration	2102	86.1
Prior incarceration	338	13.9

Risk Level

Low Risk = -3-0	691	28.3
Moderate Risk = 1-7	1541	63.2
High Risk = 8 & above	208	8.5

APPENDIX 3

SUMMARY OF OFFENDER NEEDS FACTORS 539 youth assessed January 1, 2003 – December 31, 2003

	<u># of Youth</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>Behavior Problems</u>		
No significant behavior problems	208	38.6
Moderate behavior problems	252	46.8
Severe behavior problems	79	14.7
<u>Attitude</u>		
Motivated to change/accepts responsibility	335	62.2
Generally uncooperative/not motivated to change	162	30.1
Very defensive, defiant, resistant to change	42	7.8
<u>Interpersonal Skills</u>		
Good interpersonal skills	296	54.9
Moderately impaired interpersonal skills	215	39.9
Severely impaired interpersonal skills	28	5.2
<u>Peer Relationships</u>		
Good peer group influence	229	42.5
Negative influence	274	50.8
Strong negative influence	36	6.7
<u>History of Child Abuse or Neglect</u>		
No history of abuse or neglect	397	73.7
History of abuse or neglect	142	26.3
<u>Mental Health</u>		
No mental health disorder	457	84.8
Mental health disorder with treatment	76	14.1
Mental health disorder with no treatment	6	1.1
<u>Substance Abuse</u>		
No problem	394	73.1
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	121	22.4
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse or dependence	24	4.5
<u>School Attendance/Disciplinary</u>		
No or only minor problems	245	45.5
Moderate behavior problems	191	35.4
Severe behavior	103	19.1
<u>Academic Performance</u>		
Passing without difficulty	256	47.5
Functioning below average	210	39.0
Failing	73	13.5

Learning Disorder (see DSM-IV diagnoses)

No diagnosed learning disorder	442	82.0
Diagnosed learning disorder	97	18.0

Employment

Full-time employment	12	8.8
Part-time employment	47	34.5
Unemployed	77	56.6

Parental Responsibility

No children	530	98.3
One child	2	.4
Two children	3	.6
Three or more children	4	.7

Health/Handicaps

No health problems or physical handicaps	519	96.3
No health problems/handicaps but limited access to health care	6	1.1
Mild physical handicap or medical condition	13	2.4
Pregnancy	1	.2
Serious physical handicap or medical condition	0	0

Parental Management Style

Effective management	190	35.3
Moderately ineffective management	245	45.5
Severely ineffective management	104	19.3

Parental Mental Health

No parental history of mental health disorder	475	88.1
Parental history of mental health disorder	64	11.9

Parental Substance Abuse

No parental substance abuse	415	77.0
Parental substance abuse	124	23.0

Social Support System

Strong support system	186	34.5
Limited support system with one positive role model	265	49.2
Weak support system with no positive role models	76	14.1
Strong negative or criminal influence	12	2.2

APPENDIX 4

Application of Sanctions Consistent with the Matrix

High Risk/A or B Felony Youth (Cell 9)

In 10 cases, youth that committed A or B felonies were classified as high risk. In all of these a sanction was reported. In 90% of these cases the presumptive sanction was applied.

Figure 1: Percentage of High Risk/A or B Felony Youth Receiving Presumptive Sanction




Table 1 indicates the sanctions applied for high risk youth that committed A or B felony offenses.

Table 1: Sanctions Applied to High Risk Youth Who Committed A or B Felony Offenses*

Sanctions Used	Frequency	Percent
<i>Commitment to DYS</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>80.0</i>
<i>Court Resident. Placement</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>10.0</i>
Intensive Supervision	0	0
Day Treatment	0	0
Fees and Assessments	2	20.0
Community Service	0	0
Restitution	0	0
Supervision	1	10.0
Warn & Counsel	1	10.0
Other Sanctions	1	10.0
No Sanctions Applied	0	0
Missing Sanction Information	0	0

*Note: Sanctions do not total 100% since more than one sanction was applied in some cases.

+ Indicates that option should never be used as a sole option for youths who score in that cell, but only in conjunction with other options.

Bolded and italicized sanctions denote the presumptive sanctions for this classification.

Results exclude referrals where youth received dispositions that would not require a corresponding sanction be applied (referral rejected, certification, transfer to other court, allegation found not true with petition, motion to dismiss, informal adjustment – no conference).

Moderate Risk/A or B Felony Youth (Cell 8)

In 36 cases, youth that committed A or B felonies were classified as moderate risk. In all of these cases sanction as sanction was reported. In 32 (89%) cases the presumptive sanction was applied. For the remaining 4 (11%) cases, youth did not receive the presumptive sanction.

Figure 2: Percentage of Moderate Risk/A or B Felony Youth Receiving Presumptive Sanction




Table 2 indicates the sanctions applied for moderate risk youth that committed A or B felony offenses.

Table 2: Sanctions Applied to Moderate Risk Youth Who Committed A or B Felony Offenses*

Sanctions Used	Frequency	Percent
<i>Commitment to DYS</i>	2	5.5
<i>Court Resident. Placement</i>	0	0
<i>Intensive Supervision</i>	0	0
<i>Day Treatment</i>	0	0
<i>Supervision</i>	30	83.3
Fees and Assessments +	21	58.3
Community Service +	2	5.5
Restitution +	4	11.0
Warn & Counsel	5	13.8
Other Sanctions	1	2.8
No Sanction Applied	0	0
Missing Sanction Information	0	0

*Note: Sanctions do not total 100% since more than one sanction was applied in some cases.

+ Indicates that option should never be used as a sole option for youths who score in that cell, but only in conjunction with other options.

Bolded and italicized sanctions denote the presumptive sanctions for this classification.

Results exclude referrals where youth received dispositions that would not require a corresponding sanction be applied (referral rejected, certification, transfer to other court, allegation found not true with petition, motion to dismiss, informal adjustment – no conference).

Low Risk/A or B Felony Youth (Cell 7)

In only 4 cases, youth that committed A or B felonies were classified as low risk. In 1 (25%) case, sanction information was missing. Of those cases where a sanction was indicated, 2 (67%) were inside the matrix. In 1 (33%) of the cases, a youth did not receive the presumptive sanction.

Figure 3: Percentage of Low Risk/A or B Felony Youth Receiving Presumptive Sanction




Table 3 indicates the sanctions applied for low risk youth that committed A or B felony offenses.

Table 3: Sanctions Applied to Low Risk Youth Who Committed A or B Felony Offenses*

Sanctions Used	Frequency	Percent
<i>Commitment to DYS</i>	0	0
<i>Court Resident. Placement</i>	0	0
<i>Intensive Supervision</i>	0	0
<i>Day Treatment</i>	1	25.0
<i>Supervision</i>	1	25.0
Fees and Assessments +	2	50.0
Community Service +	1	25.0
Restitution +	1	25.0
Warn & Counsel	2	50.0
Other Sanctions	0	0
No Sanction Applied	0	0
Missing Sanction Information	1	25.0

*Note: Sanctions do not total 100% since more than one sanction was applied in some cases.

+ Indicates that option should never be used as a sole option for youths who score in that cell, but only in conjunction with other options.

Bolded and italicized sanctions denote the presumptive sanctions for this classification.

Results exclude referrals where youth received dispositions that would not require a corresponding sanction be applied (referral rejected, certification, transfer to other court, allegation found not true with petition, motion to dismiss, informal adjustment – no conference).

High Risk/A, B, C Misdemeanor or C, D Felony Youth (Cell 6)

In 186 cases, youth that committed A/B/C misdemeanors, or C/D felonies were classified as high risk. In 9 (5%) cases, sanction information was missing. Of those cases in which a sanction was indicated, 155 (88%) were inside the matrix. In the remaining 22 (12%) cases, a youth did not receive the presumptive sanction.

Figure 4: Percentage of High Risk/ A, B, C Misdemeanor or C or D Felony Offense Receiving Presumptive Sanction




Table 4 indicates the sanctions applied for high risk youth that committed an A, B, C misdemeanor or C or D felony offense.

Table 4: Sanctions Applied to High Risk Youth Who Committed an A, B, C Misdemeanor or C or D Felony Offense*

Sanctions Used	Frequency	Percent
<i>Commitment to DYS</i>	29	15.6
<i>Court Resident. Placement</i>	3	1.6
<i>Intensive Supervision</i>	16	8.6
<i>Day Treatment</i>	3	1.6
<i>Supervision</i>	105	56.5
Fees and Assessments +	56	30.1
Community Service +	24	12.9
Restitution +	22	11.8
Warn & Counsel	31	16.7
Other Sanctions	3	1.6
No Sanctions Applied	1	.5
Missing Sanction Information	9	4.8

*Note: Sanctions do not total 100% since more than one sanction was applied in some cases.

+ Indicates that option should never be used as a sole option for youths who score in that cell, but only in conjunction with other options.

Bolded and italicized sanctions denote the presumptive sanctions for this classification.

Results exclude referrals where youth received dispositions that would not require a corresponding sanction be applied (referral rejected, certification, transfer to other court, allegation found not true with petition, motion to dismiss, informal adjustment – no conference).

Moderate Risk/A, B, C Misdemeanor or C, D Felony Youth (Cell 5)

In 1363 cases, youth that committed A/B/C misdemeanors, or C/D felonies were classified moderate risk. In 26 (2%) of the cases, sanction information was missing. Of those cases where a sanction was indicated, 1302 (97%) were inside the matrix. In 35 (3%) cases, a youth did not receive the presumptive sanction.

Figure 5: Percentage of Moderate Risk/ A, B, C Misdemeanor or C or D Felony Offense Receiving Presumptive Sanction




Table 5 indicates the sanctions applied for moderate risk youth that committed an A, B, C misdemeanor or C or D felony offense.

Table 5: Sanctions Applied to Moderate Risk Youth Who Committed an A, B, C Misdemeanor or C or D Felony Offense*

Sanctions Used	Frequency	Percent
Commitment to DYS	16	1.2
Court Resident. Placement	9	.7
Intensive Supervision	20	1.5
<i>Day Treatment</i>	3	.2
<i>Supervision</i>	607	44.5
Fees and Assessments +	707	51.9
Community Service +	163	12.0
<i>Restitution</i>	129	9.5
<i>Warn & Counsel</i>	749	55.0
Other Sanctions	28	2.0
No Sanction Applied	11	.8
Missing Sanction Information	26	1.9

*Note: Sanctions do not total 100% since more than one sanction was applied in some cases.

+ Indicates that option should never be used as a sole option for youths who score in that cell, but only in conjunction with other options.

Bolded and italicized sanctions denote the presumptive sanctions for this classification.

Results exclude referrals where youth received dispositions that would not require a corresponding sanction be applied (referral rejected, certification, transfer to other court, allegation found not true with petition, motion to dismiss, informal adjustment – no conference).

Low Risk/A, B, C Misdemeanor or C, D Felony Youth (Cell 4)

In 605 cases, youth that committed an A/B/C misdemeanor or C/D felonies were classified as low risk. In 5 (<1%) of the cases sanction information missing. Of those cases where a sanction was indicated, 593 (99%) were inside the matrix. In 7 (1%) cases, a youth did not receive the presumptive sanction.

Figure 6: Percentage of Low Risk/ A, B, C Misdemeanor or C or D Felony Offense Receiving Presumptive Sanction




Table 6 indicates the sanctions applied for low risk youth that committed an A, B, C misdemeanor or C or D felony offense.

Table 6: Sanctions Applied to Low Risk Youth Who Committed an A, B, C Misdemeanor or C or D Felony Offense*

Sanctions Used	Frequency	Percent
Commitment to DYS	1	.2
Court Resident. Placement	0	0
Intensive Supervision	0	0
Day Treatment	1	.2
<i>Supervision</i>	96	15.9
Fees and Assessments +	330	54.5
<i>Community Service</i>	59	9.8
<i>Restitution</i>	49	8.1
<i>Warn & Counsel</i>	508	84.0
Other Sanctions	4	.7
No Sanctions Applied	7	1.2
Missing Sanction Information	5	.7

*Note: Sanctions do not total 100% since more than one sanction was applied in some cases.

+ Indicates that option should never be used as a sole option for youths who score in that cell, but only in conjunction with other options.

Bolded and italicized sanctions denote the presumptive sanctions for this classification.

Results exclude referrals where youth received dispositions that would not require a corresponding sanction be applied (referral rejected, certification, transfer to other court, allegation found not true with petition, motion to dismiss, informal adjustment – no conference).

High Risk/Status, Municipal Ordinance, Infraction (Cell 3)

In 91 cases, youth that committed a status offense, municipal ordinance violation or infraction were classified as high risk. In 3 (3%) of the cases, sanction information was missing. Of those cases where a sanction was indicated, 76 (86%) received the presumptive sanction. In 12 (14%) cases, youth did not receive the presumptive sanction.

Figure 7: Percentage of High Risk/Status Offenses, Municipal Ordinance Violation, Infraction Youth Receiving Presumptive Sanction




Table 7 indicates the sanctions applied for high risk youth that committed a status offense, municipal ordinance violation or infraction.

Table 7: Sanctions Applied to High Risk Youth Who Committed Status Offense, Municipal Ordinance Violation or Infraction*

Sanctions Used	Frequency	Percent
Commitment to DYS	6	6.6
Court Resident. Placement	1	1.1
Intensive Supervision	5	5.5
Day Treatment	0	0
<i>Supervision</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>56.0</i>
<i>Fees and Assessments</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>17.6</i>
<i>Community Service</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3.3</i>
<i>Restitution</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.1</i>
<i>Warn & Counsel</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>41.8</i>
Other Sanctions	3	3.3
No Sanctions Applied	1	1.1
Missing Sanction Information	3	3.3

*Note: Sanctions do not total 100% since more than one sanction was applied in some cases.

Bolded and italicized sanctions denote the presumptive sanctions for this classification.

Results exclude referrals where youth received dispositions that would not require a corresponding sanction be applied (referral rejected, certification, transfer to other court, allegation found not true with petition, motion to dismiss, informal adjustment – no conference).

Moderate Risk/Status, Municipal Ordinance, Infraction (Cell 2)

In 424 cases, youth that committed a status offense, municipal ordinance violation or infraction were classified as moderate risk. In 30 (7%) of the cases, sanction information was missing. Of those cases where a sanction was indicated, 373 (95%) were inside the matrix. In 21 (5%) of the cases, a youth did not receive the presumptive sanction.

Figure 8: Percentage of Moderate Risk/Status Offenses, Municipal Ordinance Violation, Infraction Youth Receiving Presumptive Sanction




Table 8 indicates the sanctions applied for moderate risk youth that committed a status offense, municipal ordinance violation or infraction.

Table 8: Sanctions Applied to Moderate Risk Youth Who Committed Status Offense, Municipal Ordinance Violation or Infraction*

Sanctions Used	Frequency	Percent
Commitment to DYS	6	1.4
Court Resident. Placement	4	.9
Intensive Supervision	8	1.9
Day Treatment	3	.7
<i>Supervision</i>	<i>152</i>	<i>35.8</i>
<i>Fees and Assessments</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>25.9</i>
<i>Community Service</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>3.8</i>
<i>Restitution</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>.7</i>
<i>Warn & Counsel</i>	<i>255</i>	<i>60.1</i>
Other Sanctions	11	2.5
No Sanctions Applied	7	1.7
Missing Sanction Information	30	7.1

*Note: Sanctions do not total 100% since more than one sanction was applied in some cases.

Bolded and italicized sanctions denote the presumptive sanctions for this classification.

Results exclude referrals where youth received dispositions that would not require a corresponding sanction be applied (referral rejected, certification, transfer to other court, allegation found not true with petition, motion to dismiss, informal adjustment – no conference).

Low Risk/Status, Municipal Ordinance, Infraction (Cell 1)

In 85 cases, youth that committed a status offense, municipal ordinance violation or infraction were classified as low risk. In 2 (2%) of the cases, sanction information was missing. Of those cases where a sanction was indicated, 81 (98%) were inside the matrix. In 2 (2%) of the cases, a youth did not receive the presumptive sanction.

Figure 9: Percentage of Low Risk/Status Offenses, Municipal Ordinance Violation, Infraction Youth Receiving Presumptive Sanction




Table 9 indicates the sanctions applied for low risk youth that committed a status offense, municipal ordinance violation or infraction.

Table 9: Sanctions Applied to Low Risk Youth Who Committed Status Offense, Municipal Ordinance Violation or Infraction*

Sanctions Used	Frequency	Percent
Commitment to DYS	0	0
Court Resident. Placement	1	1.2
Intensive Supervision	0	0
Day Treatment	0	0
<i>Supervision</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11.8</i>
<i>Fees and Assessments</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>32.9</i>
<i>Community Service</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3.5</i>
<i>Restitution</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.2</i>
<i>Warn & Counsel</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>84.7</i>
Other Sanctions	0	0
No Sanctions Applied	2	2.4
Missing Sanction Information	2	2.4

*Note: Sanctions do not total 100% since more than one sanction was applied in some cases.

Bolded and italicized sanctions denote the presumptive sanctions for this classification.

Results exclude referrals where youth received dispositions that would not require a corresponding sanction be applied (referral rejected, certification, transfer to other court, allegation found not true with petition, motion to dismiss, informal adjustment – no conference).