An Assessment for Disproportionate Minority Contact among Juveniles in Bingham County, Idaho 2011-2015

Prepared for the Idaho
Department of Juvenile Corrections

by

Theodore W. McDonald
Sandina Begic
Lisa A. MacKenzie
Jessica J. Marshall
Tyrin J. Stevenson
Megan M. Hearn

Center for Health Policy
Boise State University

December 2018

Executive Summary

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Act of 2002 requires participating states to monitor and address Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC), a situation in which juveniles belonging to racial or ethnic minority groups are treated differently than White youth throughout the juvenile justice system. A Relative Rate Index (RRI) is used as a comparative measure to determine the presence or absence of DMC such that a value of 1.00 represents no DMC and a value markedly above or below a value of 1.00 represents the presence of DMC. Researchers at the Center for Health Policy (CHP) at Boise State University first began working with the Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections (IDJC) on assessments of DMC in 2009, when high arrest RRIs among Hispanic juveniles in Canyon County were systematically investigated. As described in a 2010 report (Lind, Miller, Carver, & McDonald, 2010), after investigation of multiple demographic and situational variables (including arrested juveniles' age, gender, gang affiliation, and crime level), it was determined that race/ethnicity no longer was associated with arrest outcomes after the variance in gang affiliation was controlled for. In short, it was found that Hispanic juveniles were more often coming into contact with the juvenile justice system, and penetrating deeper into the justice system, than Non-Hispanic White juveniles not because they were Hispanic, but rather because Hispanic juveniles arrested were nearly three times more likely than their Non-Hispanic White peers to be affiliated with a gang.

A second DMC assessment was performed in 2013, focusing on juvenile arrest records in Canyon and Twin Falls counties (ID) between 2009 and 2011. Specifically, juvenile arrest records were provided by personnel affiliated with the Canyon County Sheriff's Department, the police departments in the Canyon County cities of Nampa and Caldwell, and the City of Twin Falls Police Department. This assessment expanded considerably on the previous one conducted solely in Canyon County by evaluating each arresting agency separately and then combined, and also in its use of multiple methodologies, including individual surveys and focus group interviews of law enforcement officers. In a 2014 report (Healey, McDonald, Gazieva, Begic, & Toussaint, 2014), combined results were presented showing substantial decreases in RRI across the years; whereas Hispanic juveniles were 1.82 times more likely to be arrested than their Non-Hispanic White peers in 2009, the RRI dropped to 1.60 in 2010 before plunging to 1.08 in 2011. Similar to what was found in the 2009 assessment, arrested Hispanic juveniles were found to be more likely than their Non-Hispanic White peers to be affiliated with a gang, although the disparity in gang affiliation also fell across the three years; whereas arrested Hispanic juveniles were 10.0 times more likely than their Non-Hispanic White peers to be affiliated with a gang in 2009, they were only 4.50 times more likely to be affiliated with a gang in 2011. In the same report, law enforcement officers' interviews are detailed, revealing their belief that race/ethnicity is not even a factor they consider when deciding whether to arrest a juvenile; instead, their decisions were reported as being guided by factors such as criminal history, the type of crime committed, diversion resource availability, and whether a juvenile's parent or guardian seemed able and willing to discipline the juvenile and address any underlying factors related to his or her behavior.

The present study was an expansion on what was done in the first two DMC assessments, and it was also targeted in a culturally dissimilar area of Idaho with a new racial/ethnic minority added to the assessment. In this project, the CHP research team, working closely with IDJC personnel

and stakeholders in Bingham County, assessed: 1) whether there were differences in demographic and/or situational characteristics involved in arrest cases as a function of whether juveniles were Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, or Native American; 2) whether there were differences in arrest outcomes as a function of demographic and/or situational characteristics (including race/ethnicity); and 3) law enforcement officers', juvenile court administrators', and tribal members' perceptions of issues related to the juvenile arrests, including the arrest of juveniles of different racial/backgrounds. Using a mixed methodology including extracting information from the randomly selected juvenile arrest cases from the Bingham County Sheriff's Department (BCSD) and the City of Blackfoot Police Department (CBPD) databases from the years 2011 through 2015 and personal and focus group interviews of police officers and sheriff's deputies, juvenile probation officers, a juvenile court judge, a juvenile court prosecutor, and members of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe on the Fort Hall reservation, a wealth of information was collected and is presented in this report.

The key findings from each of the five years of study as well as the five years in aggregate are presented below.

2011

- The Bingham County RRI for juvenile arrests in 2011 was 2.00 for Hispanic juveniles and 3.71 for Native American juveniles, meaning that Hispanic juveniles were twice as likely and Native American juveniles 3.7 times more likely to be arrested than Non-Hispanic White juveniles
- A total of 212 arrest records were analyzed
    - 97 cases (46%) involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles, 76 (36%) involved Hispanic juveniles, and 36 (17%) involved Native American juveniles
    - 152 cases (72%) involved male juveniles, and the average age of all juveniles was 14.70 years
- The most common geographic location of arrest was listed as Other (46% of all cases; over half of these were sub-listed as Highway/Road/Alley), followed by schools (25%) and homes (21%)
- The largest numbers of arrests were between 12:00 p.m. and 5:59 p.m. (39%), followed by between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m. (26%)
- The most common crime types were property crimes (25%), crimes against persons (21%), and drug and alcohol offenses (21%). Cases involving an "Other" offense accounted for 21% of the sample (over half of these were noted as involving warrants, and one-fifth involved runaway)
- The most common crime level was misdemeanor (80%), followed by non-criminal offenses (10%) and felonies (10%)
- Nearly 63% of the arrest cases involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted
- Nearly 74% of cases were denoted has having been Handled within Department (in almost all cases, this meant juveniles being cited and released or released to parents), and over 26% were Referred to Other Authority (almost always to the 3B Juvenile Detention Center in Bonneville County)

- Statistically significant differences as a function of race/ethnicity were found for two arrest case variables: Crime level and whether or not arrested juveniles had a prior crime noted
    - The crime level result was partially accounted for by cases involving Native American juveniles (14%) more often being felonies than those involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles (8%), with felony cases involving Hispanic juveniles (11%) between the two; interestingly this same pattern existed for non-criminal offenses (22% involving Native American juveniles, 11% involving Hispanic juveniles, and 6% involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles)
    - The prior crime result was accounted for by greater percentages of cases involving Native American (78%) and Hispanic (72%) juveniles denoting at least one prior arrest than cases involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles (51%)
- Statistically significant differences in arrest outcomes were found as a function of crime type, crime level, and whether or not arrested juveniles had a prior crime noted. Arrest cases were more likely to be referred to an other authority when they:
    - Were noted as Other crimes (63%; over half of these cases involved a warrant) or crimes against persons (39%) rather than drug and alcohol offenses (8%) and traffic offenses (5%)
    - Involved felony (56%) rather than misdemeanor (21%) crimes
    - Involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted (34%) than those for whom no prior arrest was noted (15%)

2012

- The Bingham County RRI for juvenile arrests in 2012 was 2.02 for Hispanic juveniles and 2.81 for Native American juveniles, meaning that Hispanic juveniles were twice as likely and Native American juveniles 2.8 times more likely to be arrested than Non-Hispanic White juveniles
- A total of 204 arrest records were analyzed
    - 88 cases (44%) involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles, 69 (35%) involved Hispanic juveniles, and 42 (21%) involved Native American juveniles
    - 147 cases (72%) involved male juveniles, and the average age of all juveniles was 14.90 years
- The most common geographic location of arrest was listed as Other (42% of all cases; over half of these were sub-listed as Highway/Road/Alley), followed by schools (27%) and homes (18%)
- The largest numbers of arrests were between 12:00 p.m. and 5:59 p.m. (39%), followed by between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m. (27%)
- The most common crime types were crimes against persons (23%), property crimes (18%), and drug and alcohol offenses (18%). Cases involving an "Other" offense accounted for 27% of the sample (six in 10 of these were noted as involving warrants, and one-third involved runaway)
- The most common crime level was misdemeanor (77%), followed by non-criminal offenses (15%) and felonies (8%)
- Over 63% of the arrest cases involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted

- Over 69% of cases were denoted has having been Handled within Department, and nearly 31% were Referred to Other Authority (almost always to the 3B Juvenile Detention Center in Bonneville County)
- Statistically significant differences as a function of race/ethnicity were found for three arrest case variables: Gender, whether or not arrested juveniles had a prior crime noted, and prior crime type
    - The gender result was accounted for by arrest cases involving Hispanic (81%) and Non-Hispanic White (75%) juveniles overwhelmingly noting the juveniles as male, whereas cases involving Native American juveniles noted the juveniles as being much more gender-balanced (53% males and 47% females)
    - The prior crime result was accounted for by a greater percentage of cases denoting at least one prior arrest involving Native American juveniles (74%) than Hispanic (64%) and Non-Hispanic White (53%) juveniles
    - The prior crime type result was perhaps best accounted for by cases involving Native American and Hispanic juveniles (61% and 59%, respectively) most often noting crimes against person as the prior crime type, whereas cases involving White juveniles had a more distributed pattern of prior crime types (including crimes against persons at 43%, property crimes at 26%, and drug and alcohol offenses at 19%)
- Statistically significant differences in arrest outcomes were found as a function of crime type and whether or not arrested juveniles had a prior crime noted. Arrest cases were more likely to be referred to an other authority when they:
    - Were noted as Other crimes (62%; over half of these cases involved a warrant) or crimes against persons (34%) rather than drug and alcohol offenses (9%) and traffic offenses (8%)
    - Involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted (43%) than those for whom no prior arrest was noted (9%)

2013

- The Bingham County RRI for juvenile arrests in 2013 was 1.91 for Hispanic juveniles and 4.35 for Native American juveniles, meaning that Hispanic juveniles were nearly twice as likely and Native American juveniles nearly 4.4 times more likely to be arrested than Non-Hispanic White juveniles
- A total of 199 arrest records were analyzed
    - 97 cases (49%) involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles, 57 (29%) involved Hispanic juveniles, and 43 (22%) involved Native American juveniles
    - 152 cases (71%) involved male juveniles, and the average age of all juveniles was 15.23 years
- The most common geographic location of arrest was listed as Other (39% of all cases; nearly half of these were sub-listed as Highway/Road/Alley, and nearly one-fifth were sub-listed as “RTC”), followed by schools and homes (both 25%)
- The largest numbers of arrests were between 12:00 p.m. and 5:59 p.m. (35%), followed by between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m. (27%)
- The most common crime types were crimes against persons (23%), property crimes (18%), and drug and alcohol offenses (18%). Cases involving an “Other” offense

accounted for 33% of the sample (over half of these were noted as involving warrants, and one-third involved runaway)
- The most common crime level was misdemeanor (84%), followed by non-criminal offenses (10%) and felonies (6%)
- Nearly 63% of the arrest cases involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted
- Nearly 65% of cases were denoted has having been Handled within Department, and nearly 36% were Referred to Other Authority (almost always to the 3B Juvenile Detention Center in Bonneville County)
- Statistically significant differences as a function of race/ethnicity were found for two arrest case variables: Gender and whether or not arrested juveniles had a prior crime noted
    - The gender result was accounted for by arrest cases involving Hispanic juveniles (83%) overwhelmingly noting the juveniles as male, whereas cases involving Non-Hispanic White (69% male and 31% female) and Native American (61% male and 39% female) juveniles were more gender-balanced
    - The prior crime result was accounted for by a greater percentage of cases denoting at least one prior arrest involving Native American juveniles (77%) than Hispanic (65%) and Non-Hispanic White (55%) juveniles
- Statistically significant differences in arrest outcomes were found as a function of crime of five variables: Age, geographic location of arrest, time of arrest, crime type, and whether or not arrested juveniles had a prior crime noted. Arrest cases were more likely to be referred to an other authority when they:
    - Involved older juveniles (the average age of juveniles whose cases were handled within the department was 15.02 years, whereas the average age of juveniles whose cases were referred to an other authority was 15.54 years)
    - Took place at an "Other" location (45%), a home (37%) or a school (30%) rather than a store (8%) or a park (0%)
    - Occurred between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m. (50%) or 12:00 p.m. and 5:59 p.m. (43%) rather than between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m. (27%) or 12:00 a.m. and 5:59 a.m. (15%)
    - Were noted as Other crimes (36%; over half of these cases involved a warrant) or crimes against persons (31%) rather than drug and alcohol offenses (15%) and traffic offenses (12%)
    - Involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted (46%) than those for whom no prior arrest was noted (17%)

2014

- The Bingham County RRI for juvenile arrests in 2014 was 0.86 for Hispanic juveniles and 2.05 for Native American juveniles, meaning that Hispanic juveniles were somewhat less likely and Native American juveniles twice as likely to be arrested than Non-Hispanic White juveniles
- A total of 180 arrest records were analyzed
    - 107 cases (59%) involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles, 38 (21%) involved Native American juveniles, and 35 (19%) involved Hispanic juveniles

    - 147 cases (71%) involved male juveniles, and the average age of all juveniles was 14.90 years
- The most common geographic location of arrest was listed as Other (39% of all cases; over half of these were sub-listed as Highway/Road/Alley, and nearly one-fourth were sub-listed as "RTC"), followed by schools (26%) and homes (23%)
- The largest numbers of arrests were between 12:00 p.m. and 5:59 p.m. (41%), followed by between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m. (29%)
- The most common crime types were property crimes (21%), drug and alcohol offenses (19%), and crimes against persons (12%). Cases involving an "Other" offense accounted for 36% of the sample (over half of these were noted as involving warrants, and over one-third involved runaway)
- The most common crime level was misdemeanor (77%), followed by non-criminal offenses (16%) and felonies (7%)
- Over 63% of the arrest cases involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted
- Nearly 72% of cases were denoted has having been Handled within Department, and nearly 28% were Referred to Other Authority (almost always to the 3B Juvenile Detention Center in Bonneville County)
- A statistically significant difference as a function of race/ethnicity was found for one arrest case variable, namely, geographic location of arrest
    - The geographic location of arrest result was perhaps best accounted for by three patterns. First, arrest cases involving Native American (40%) and Non-Hispanic White (26%) juveniles were more common at schools than those involving Hispanic juveniles (11%). Second, arrest cases involving Hispanic (34%) and Non-Hispanic White (25%) were more common at homes than those involving Native American juveniles (5%). Third, arrest cases involving Native American (16%) and Hispanic (14%) juveniles were more common at stores than those involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles (8%)
- Statistically significant differences in arrest outcomes were found as a function of age, arresting agency, crime type and whether or not arrested juveniles had a prior crime noted. Arrest cases were more likely to be referred to an other authority when they:
    - Involved older juveniles (the average age of juveniles whose cases were handled within the department was 14.65 years, whereas the average age of juveniles whose cases were referred to an other authority was 15.49 years)
    - Involved juveniles who were arrested by police officers (35%) than those who were arrested by sheriff's deputies (12%)
    - Were noted as Other crimes (64%; no other crime type resulted in a referral to other authorities more than 20% of the time)
    - Involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted (39%) than those for whom no prior arrest was noted (8%)

2015

- The Bingham County RRI for juvenile arrests in 2015 was 0.93 for Hispanic juveniles and 1.98 for Native American juveniles, meaning that Hispanic juveniles were slightly less likely and Native American juveniles nearly twice as likely to be arrested than White juveniles

- A total of 173 arrest cases were analyzed
    - 109 cases (65%) involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles, 34 (20%) involved Hispanic juveniles, and 25 (15%) involved Native American juveniles
    - 119 cases (69%) involved male juveniles, and the average age was 15.20 years
- The most common geographic location of arrest was listed as Other (49% of all cases; over half of these were sub-listed as Highway/Road/Alley, and over one-fifth were sub-listed as "RTC"), followed by homes (23%) and schools (17%)
- The largest numbers of arrests were between 12:00 p.m. and 5:59 p.m. (41%), followed by between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m. (26%)
- The most common crime types were drug and alcohol offenses (20%), property crimes (18%), and crimes against persons (17%). Cases involving an "Other" offense accounted for 29% of the sample (six in 10 of these were noted as involving warrants, and over one-third involved runaway)
- The most common crime level was misdemeanor (90%), followed by felonies (8%) and non-criminal offenses (2%)
- Over 62% of the arrest cases involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted
- Nearly 76% of cases were denoted has having been Handled within Department, and over 24% were Referred to Other Authority (almost always to the 3B Juvenile Detention Center in Bonneville County)
- Statistically significant differences as a function of race/ethnicity were found for two arrest case variables: Arresting agency and prior crime type
    - The arresting agency result was accounted for by a higher percentage of arrest cases recorded by police officers involving juveniles who were Native American (92%) and Hispanic (82%) rather than Non-Hispanic White (69%); conversely, a higher percentage of cases recorded by sheriff's deputies involved juveniles who were Non-Hispanic White (31%) rather than Hispanic (18%) or Native American (8%)
    - The prior crime type result was perhaps best accounted for by several patterns. First, arrest cases containing crimes against persons as a prior crime type more often involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles (34%) than Hispanic (23%) and Native American (18%) juveniles. Second, arrest cases containing property crimes as a prior crime type more often involved Native American (41%) and Hispanic (36%) juveniles than Non-Hispanic White juveniles (12%)
- Statistically significant differences in arrest outcomes were found as a function of race/ethnicity, crime type, prior crime type, and whether or not arrested juveniles had a prior crime noted. Arrest cases were more likely to be referred to an other authority when they:
    - Involved Native American juveniles (48%) rather than Non-Hispanic White (21%) or Hispanic (15%) juveniles
    - Were noted as Other crimes (58%) or crimes against persons (33%) (no other crime type resulted in referral to an other authority more than 9% of the time)
    - Involved juveniles with prior crime types noted as sex crimes (100%) or property crimes (44%) rather than traffic offenses (0%) or Other crimes/offenses (15%)
    - Involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted (31%) than those for whom no prior arrest was noted (14%)

- Because the significant association between race/ethnicity and arrest outcome suggested that juveniles were possibly being treated differentially at the point of arrest as a function of race/ethnicity, a subsequent logistic regression analysis was performed, simultaneously entering all variables even marginally associated with arrest outcomes, to determine, after controlling for shared variance, which variables remained unique and independent predictors of arrest outcome. The results of this analysis showed that, after controlling for shared variance, only crime type and prior crime type remained statistically significant predictors of arrest outcome. Thus, it is concluded that juveniles were not treated differentially at the point of arrest because of their race/ethnicity, but rather because of factors (namely crime type and prior crime type) that were confounded with race/ethnicity (i.e., Native American juveniles had their cases referred to an other authority more often than Non-Hispanic White and Hispanic individuals because they had committed different types of crimes and prior crimes)

2011-2015: All Years in Aggregate

- A total of 969 arrest records were analyzed
    - 498 cases (52%) involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles, 271 (28%) involved Hispanic juveniles, and 184 (19%) involved Native American juveniles
    - 687 cases (71%) involved male juveniles, and the average age of all juveniles was 14.98 years
- Nearly 76% of the cases involved juveniles arrested by police officers, and over 24% involved juveniles arrested by sheriff's deputies
- The most common geographic location of arrest was listed as Other (49% of all cases; over half of these were sub-listed as Highway/Road/Alley, and one-fifth were sub-listed as "RTC"), followed by schools (24%) and homes (22%)
- The largest numbers of arrests were between 12:00 p.m. and 5:59 p.m. (39%), followed by between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m. (26%)
- The most common crime types were property crimes (21%), drug and alcohol offenses (20%), and crimes against persons (18%). Cases involving an "Other" offense accounted for 29% of the sample (over half of these were noted as involving warrants, and nearly one-third involved runaway)
- The most common crime level was misdemeanor (81%), followed by non-criminal offenses (11%) and felonies (8%)
- Exactly 63% of the arrest cases involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted
- Over 71% of cases were denoted has having been Handled within Department, and nearly 29% were Referred to Other Authority (almost always to the 3B Juvenile Detention Center in Bonneville County)
- Statistically significant differences as a function of race/ethnicity were found for six arrest case variables: Gender, age, arresting agency, geographic location of arrest, prior crime type, and whether or not arrested juveniles had a prior crime noted
    - The gender result was accounted for by arrest cases involving Hispanic juveniles (77%) overwhelmingly noting the juveniles as male, whereas cases involving Native American (63% male and 37% female) juveniles were more gender-balanced (Non-Hispanic White juveniles were in the middle of the two, at 71% male)

  - The age result was accounted for by arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles noting a significantly older juvenile age (15.11 years) than those involving Native American juveniles (14.63 years) (Hispanic juveniles were in the middle of the two, at 14.99 years)
  - The arresting agency result was accounted for by a higher percentage of arrest cases recorded by police officers involving juveniles who were Native American (83%) and Hispanic (78%) rather than Non-Hispanic White (71%); conversely, a higher percentage of cases recorded by sheriff's deputies involved juveniles who were Non-Hispanic White (29%) rather than Hispanic (22%) or Native American (17%)
  - The geographic location of arrest result was perhaps best accounted for by several patterns. First, arrest cases involving Native American juveniles more often took place at schools (34%) than cases involving Hispanic (26%) and Non-Hispanic White (21%) juveniles. Second, arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White and Hispanic juveniles more often took place at homes (both 24%) than cases involving Native American juveniles (15%)
  - The prior crime type result was perhaps best accounted for by arrest cases containing property crimes as a prior crime type more often involved Native American juveniles (36%) than Hispanic (26%) and Non-Hispanic White (25%) juveniles
  - The prior crime result was accounted for by a greater percentage of cases denoting at least one prior arrest involving Native American (72%) and Hispanic (69%) juveniles than Non-Hispanic White (56%) juveniles
- Statistically significant differences in arrest outcomes were found as a function of crime of seven variables: Age, race/ethnicity, geographic location of arrest, time of arrest, crime type, crime level, and whether or not arrested juveniles had a prior crime noted. Arrest cases were more likely to be referred to an other authority when they:
  - Involved older juveniles (the average age of juveniles whose cases were handled within the department was 14.88 years, whereas the average age of juveniles whose cases were referred to an other authority was 15.19 years)
  - Involved Native American juveniles (37%) rather than Hispanic (29%) or Non-Hispanic White (26%) juveniles
  - Took place at an "Other" location (36%), a home (31%) or a school (23%) rather than a park (12%) or a store (10%)
  - Occurred between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m. or 12:00 p.m. and 5:59 p.m. (both 32%) rather than between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m. (25%) or 12:00 a.m. and 5:59 a.m. (20%)
  - Were noted as Other crimes (63%; over half of these cases involved a warrant) or crimes against persons (33%) rather than drug and alcohol offenses (10%) and traffic offenses (7%)
  - Were noted as felonies (42%) rather than non-criminal offenses (34%) or misdemeanors (27%)
  - Involved juveniles for whom a prior arrest was noted (39%) than those for whom no prior arrest was noted (13%)
- Because the significant association between race/ethnicity and arrest outcome suggested that juveniles were possibly being treated differentially at the point of arrest as a function

of race/ethnicity in the 2011-2015 all-years aggregate data, a subsequent logistic regression analysis was performed, simultaneously entering all variables even marginally associated with arrest outcomes, to determine, after controlling for shared variance, which variables remained unique and independent predictors of arrest outcome. As was true in the 2015-only logistic regression analysis, the results of this analysis showed that, after controlling for shared variance, only crime type and prior crime type remained statistically significant predictors of arrest outcome. Thus, it is concluded that juveniles were not treated differentially at the point of arrest because of their race/ethnicity, but rather because of factors (namely crime type and prior crime type) that were confounded with race/ethnicity (i.e., Native American juveniles had their cases referred to another authority more often than Non-Hispanic White and Hispanic individuals because they had committed different types of crimes and prior crimes)

Comparison Across Years

- Types of prior crime differed significantly across the calendar years. Specifically, the percentage of arrest cases:
    - Involving juveniles with a sex crime as a prior crime type fell from 4% in years 2011-2012 to 2% in years 2014-2015
    - Involving juveniles with crimes against persons as a prior crime type gradually decreased from approximately 50% in years 2011-2012 to 31% in 2015
    - Involving juveniles with drug and alcohol offenses as a prior crime type increased from 10% in 2011 to 31% in 2015
- Percentages of arrest cases involving juveniles of the three racial/ethnic groups differed significantly across the calendar years. Specifically, the percentage of arrest cases:
    - Involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles increased markedly, from an average of approximately 45% in 2011-2013 to 59% in 2014 and 65% in 2015
    - Involving Hispanic juveniles decreased markedly, from an average of approximately 35% in 2011-2013 to approximately 20% in 2014-2015
    - Involving Native American juveniles fluctuated, but in no linear or systematic pattern (peaking at 22% in 2013 and at its lowest at 15% in 2015)
- Percentages of arrest cases of the three crime levels differed significantly across the calendar years. Specifically, arrest cases with crime levels coded as:
    - Felony crimes tended to decrease over time, from approximately 8.8% of the cases in 2011-2012 to approximately 6.9% of the cases in 2013-2015
    - Misdemeanor crimes tended to increase over time, from an average of approximately 77% in 2011-2012 to an average of approximately 84% in 2014-2015
    - Non-criminal offenses dropped markedly, from an average of approximately 13% the first four years to less than 3% in 2015 (as noted in the report, it is possible that this may have been due to better crime level documentation in the 2015 arrest reports or greater ability of the coders to correctly discern crime levels in the final batch of data)
- Percentages of arrest cases of the two prior crime levels differed significantly across the calendar years. This result was entirely accounted for by 23% of the arrest cases in 2011

involving juveniles who had a prior crime listed as a felony; no other year had a percentage of prior crimes listed as a felony over 5%

Interview Results

Law Enforcement Officers

A total of seven law enforcement officers participated in a focus group interview. These included CBPD officers, BCSD deputies, and school resource officers.

- The law enforcement officers were asked to describe what factors affected their decisions about whether or not to arrest or detain a juvenile. The following are some key themes that emerged:
    - Severity of the crime (more serious crimes were more likely to lead to an arrest)
    - Frequency of encounter with the juvenile (more frequent encounters led to higher likelihood of arrest)
    - Whether a victim was associated with a crime (and in many cases, the wishes of the victim)
    - Bed availability (particularly with respect to the 3B Juvenile Detention Center)
    - Ability to locate parents (if juveniles could not be returned to their parents, they sometimes ended up being detained when they ordinarily would not have been)
    - Limited alternatives (e.g., the closure of the Residential Treatment Center [or RTC] has resulted in some juveniles being detained when they ordinarily would have been delivered to that facility)
    - Availability of diversion options (when these were available, they were preferred to detention in many cases)
- The law enforcement officers were asked to describe differences in the type or nature of criminal behavior across different racial/ethnic groups. Some themes that emerged from this discussion included:
    - Native American youth
        - Strong gang-affiliation culture on the Fort Hall Reservation (particularly West Side Crip Villains)
        - Very close-knit community (which can be protective, but can also be problematic if a criminal culture exists)
        - Tribal laws often differ from county laws, which can make coordination and transfer difficult (e.g., intoxicated juveniles cannot be returned to the reservation because it is “dry”)
    - Hispanic youth
        - Machismo is prevalent among males, and strongly linked to gang culture
        - A language barrier often exists, and makes it difficult to communicate with some youth and many of their parents
        - Parents frequently difficult to locate due to long working hours, often in remote agricultural settings (long parent working hours can be a large problem when school if out of session, as many youth are unsupervised)
- The law enforcement officers were asked about their interaction with Native American juveniles and tribal law enforcement. The following are some key themes that emerged:

    - There is a generally good relationship with tribal patrol officers, or the "boots on the ground." They typically try to help as they are able (e.g., trying to contact a family member on the reservation to retrieve a juvenile arrested in Blackfoot)
    - The relationship and level of cooperation with the Tribal Council is variable due to changing composition of the Council
    - Juveniles are rather savvy and know how to navigate the jurisdictional issues between the tribe and the county. They often choose to speak to tribal officers but not city or county officers
    - There are few options or resources for Native American juveniles. There are deficits in family and cultural supports for positive behavior
- Several issues emerged during the officers' focus group that, although not something asked about in the protocol, seemed very important to them and warrant inclusion here. These included:
    - Concerns about the increasing use of infractions
        - The pathway for dealing with juvenile offenses used to be uniform and clear but no longer are
        - Arrest numbers may be skewed now due to use of infractions
        - Juveniles are not held accountable with infractions; instead of them having to do humbling community service, their parents are now the ones punished by having the pay the fine
    - Lack of public understanding about the nature of law enforcement work
        - There was a hope that the present study would help people understand law enforcement officers' perspectives and what they encounter in their work
        - Negative stigma toward officers due to lack of understanding of their circumstances in deciding whether or not to make an arrest
        - Poor parenting and unrealistic expectations for police resulting in inappropriate calls (e.g., to punish a four-year old for taking a soda out of the refrigerator)
        - Lack of support and resources for dealing with mental health and substance abuse problems, especially for juveniles
- The officers were asked for suggestions that could improve the problem areas they identified. Some of the themes that emerged from this discussion included:
    - More recreational or cultural programming for Native American youth on the reservation (e.g., parks, pools, an afterschool program)
    - Some mechanism to maintain consistency in relationships or cooperating procedures with the Tribal Council, given frequent changes in membership
    - A reintroduction of the Residential Treatment Center or a similar operation would allow for a "cooling off period" and reduce need for detention
    - It is important to promote well-functioning, intact families for Native Americans as an alternative to the lure of gang culture

Juvenile Probation Officers

A total of five juvenile probation officers (JPOs), including the chief juvenile probation officer, participated in a focus group interview.

- When asked to discuss factors affecting their work and ability to serve, they discussed partnerships and community resources at length. Some themes in this discussion included:
    - The value of assessment tools in gathering baseline information about juveniles and guiding treatment planning (e.g., in aligning referral organizations, coordinating mental health and substance use evaluations and services)
    - The working relationship with tribal personnel has improved slightly, but challenges still exist. The JPOs felt that when the two entities work together well, the outcomes for Native American juveniles tend to be better
    - The fairly new Tribal JDC was seen as benefit to all, as allows juveniles to be served in their community; plus, bed limits at the 3B JDC sometimes had previously led to Native American juveniles being denied access, which is now less of a problem
- The JPOs also identified a number of issues related to communication. Some themes that emerged from this discussion included:
    - A language barrier often exists with respect to Hispanic juveniles and (to a greater extent) their families. This often leads to problems completing lesson assignments and homework
    - The tribal court system sometimes does not share information about juveniles being served by the JPOs. This information can consist of important elements such as assessment results, context on each juvenile's unique situation and treatment plan; without access to such information in a timely manner, it is difficult to coordinate referrals and services
    - Lack of communication between tribal courts and county youth courts leads to lack of consistent punishment for Native American juvenile offenders. For example, the JPOs reported that sometimes juveniles who are graduating from tribal programs for substance use are still testing positive and in need of treatment
- Several JPOs noted that many Native American juveniles had poor home and family environments that placed them at risk for criminal behavior. Themes from this discussion included:
    - Youth from traditional, intact families tended to have greater levels of success than those from non-traditional family units (e.g., single parents, non-biological custodial arrangements, juveniles being raised by aunts, uncles, or grandparents)
    - Historical trauma continues to manifest through a lack of identity, sense of being torn between two worlds, and low self-esteem among young Native Americans
- When asked for suggestions about how to improve the problems they identified, several themes were shared, including:
    - Increasing the number of programs, resources, and outlets for the youth would help keep them out of trouble
    - More activities and community would allow for more positive community involvement
    - Continued use of the tribal JDC will for Native American youth will help with easier access to resources

Juvenile Court Judge Interview

Bingham County's lone juvenile court judge completed a personal interview, discussing such issues as program strengths/successes, community partnerships, weaknesses/challenges, parental involvement, and community resources.

- Thoughts on program strengths/successes included the following:
  - Court filings are down, and the judge reported feeling less busy
  - The tribal and youth courts share responsibility for juveniles in custody
  - Hispanic juveniles seem to have stronger family structures than other juveniles, and this may help keep these juveniles from repeated contact with the juvenile justice system
  - Juvenile court Rule 20-511A is helpful in allowing the court to order a full mental health screening based on GAIN-SS indications
  - Tribal youth have more resources available to them with respect to inpatient and outpatient substance abuse treatment through the Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Thoughts on community partnerships included the following:
  - There is a strong current partnership currently with tribal members, but this partnership can vary based on the composition of the Tribal Council
  - A challenge working with tribal courts is there is no independent judiciary, and judges on the reservation are placed at the discretion of the Tribal Council. This can be problematic when trying to serve juveniles that come through youth court but are related to members of Tribal Council
- Thoughts on weaknesses/challenges included the following:
  - Marijuana is an increasing challenge in youth court cases, largely due to recreational use being legalized in surrounding states
  - There are strong effects of historical trauma on the reservation, including from forced assimilation of Native Americans from the 1880s through the 1960s. Forced separation also destroyed the traditional family structure of Native Americans, leading to problems that are multigenerational
  - Machismo is a strong cultural influence among Hispanic juveniles, which tends to lead to problems with violence and feeling they "have something to prove"
- Thoughts on parental involvement included:
  - Parental structure is a challenge with Native American juveniles. Many do not have both parents present and are often being raised by grandparents, other family members, or even non-family members
  - Hispanic juveniles tend to have stronger family units, and this may reduce their level of contact with the law

Juvenile Court Prosecutor Interview

Bingham County's lone juvenile court prosecutor completed a personal interview, discussing such issues as program strengths/successes, community partnerships, weaknesses/challenges, parental involvement, and community resources.

- Thoughts on program strengths/successes included the following:
    - Diversion programs are a valuable resource for juvenile first time offenders, keeping them out of detention
- Thoughts on community partnerships included the following:
    - When a Native American juvenile's case is shared between the county and tribal courts, the two entities look to handle the situation together. If the county youth court has jurisdiction, it will always proceed with the case. If a juvenile falls under tribal jurisdiction, the county office waits for the Tribe to inform it
- Thoughts on weaknesses/challenges included the following:
    - Although diversion programs are intended for first time offenders, the prosecutor reported feeling that there should be more than one chance for offenders to utilize them; this would help to reduce recidivism
    - The prosecutor reported wishing programs were designed to identify why recidivism was higher for some groups compared to others
    - Juveniles aged eight to 12 years are often the most difficult to work with or serve, as are juveniles living on the reservation due to difficulties contacting them
    - Follow up with juveniles and their families is often difficult due to frequently changing address and/or phone numbers
- Thoughts on parent involvement included the following:
    - Most youth coming through the juvenile justice system do not have intact family structures. If society could provide all youth with stable, intact home environments, fewer youth would enter the juvenile justice system

Tribal Court Personnel Focus Group Interview

A total of three tribal court personnel, including a juvenile court administrator, public defender, and Tribal JPO, participated in a focus group interview. The opportunity to complete this interview was not anticipated and therefore there was no protocol developed for it. The tribal personnel were asked for their thoughts on the same issues as other stakeholders, namely, program strengths/successes, community partnerships, weaknesses/challenges, and parental involvement.

- Thoughts on program strengths/successes included the following:
    - The Controlled Substance Act gave tribal courts increased power to send Native American youth to the Idaho Youth Challenge Academy to address substance use issues
    - Tribal culture can be a way to help keep youth out of trouble, however it is the responsibility of elders to instill this culture in youth
- Thoughts on community partnerships included the following:
    - Tribal youth sent to the Idaho Youth Challenge Academy thrive in a structured environment
    - The Tribe is working to provide money management services to youth before they turn 18 and have access to trust funds from tribal enterprises
- Thoughts on weaknesses/challenges included the following:
    - Substance abuse is a problem on the reservation, as is suicide

    - Many youth are “lost” and without family support, so they turn to alcohol and drug use
    - The reservation has little affordable housing, and many residents struggle to access basic resources
    - Although there are many youth incidents on the reservation, very few result in consequences that help juveniles learn from poor decisions
- Thoughts on parental involvement included the following:
    - Intergenerational trauma from the forced separation of children to enroll in boarding schools (from the 1880s through the 1960s) remains. Youth are without mentors, and turn to alcohol and drugs as a result
    - Native youth succeed at the Idaho Youth Challenge Academy, but when they return to the reservation, they are without needed support and structure and end up in the same circumstances they started in

Background

Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) refers to a situation in which juveniles belonging to minority racial/ethnic groups are treated differently than Non-Hispanic White juveniles at one or more decision points (e.g., arrest, disposition of cases involving secure detention) of the case disposition process in the juvenile justice system. One key feature of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Act of 2002 is that participating states must investigate for DMC in their respective juvenile justice systems, and address the issue if DMC is found to exist (Howard & McDonald, 2013).

Determinations regarding whether or not DMC exists in a jurisdiction such as a city, county, or state ordinarily involve the calculation of a Relative Rate Index (RRI), which in a DMC context involving juvenile arrests can be expressed as follows: Arrest rate for Non-White juveniles per 1,000 / Arrest rate for White juveniles per 1,000 (Lind, Miller, Carver, & McDonald, 2010). If there is no evidence of DMC, the RRI would have a value at or very near 1.00 (Non-White and White juveniles would be equally likely to be arrested, given their proportion of the population). RRIs with positive numbers deviating markedly from 1.00 provide evidence for DMC (as Non-White juveniles would be more likely to be arrested than White juveniles, given their proportion of the population), whereas RRIs with negative numbers deviating markedly from 1.00 would provide evidence that White juveniles were more likely to be arrested than Non-White juveniles, given their proportion of the population.

In 2009, the Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections (IDJC) contracted with researchers at Boise State University's Center for Health Policy (CHP) to collect and analyze data to understand the extent to which DMC existed in Canyon County, Idaho. This assessment was conducted because Canyon County juvenile arrest RRIs suggested the possibility of DMC, in that it appeared that racial/ethnic minority juveniles—particularly Hispanic juveniles—were being arrested at a considerably higher rate than their Non-Hispanic White peers. The results of this assessment, documented in Lind et al.'s (2010 report) showed that, when all possible demographic and situational variables associated with juvenile arrests were analyzed using a logistic regression procedure (which controls for shared variance among variables so the unique, independent effects of each variable can be assessed alone), race/ethnicity was no longer a statistically significant predictor of case disposition; the only variable that remained a unique, independent significant predictor was gang affiliation. In short, it was found that Non-White juveniles were more often arrested than their Non-Hispanic White peers was that Non-White juveniles (and particularly Hispanic juveniles) were much more often affiliated with gangs.

In 2013, IDJC again contracted with researchers at the CHP to conduct an analysis of DMC; this time, the goal was to sample enough juvenile arrest cases to represent the entire state of Idaho. Following guidelines recommended by William Feyerherm ("Preparing for Assessment – Idaho", n.d.), a consultant working with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and a DMC expert, the joint research team chose to study factors associated with arrest of Hispanic and White youth in three Idaho counties with enough Hispanic youth to make appropriate comparisons; these counties included Bonneville County in South-eastern Idaho, Canyon County in South-western Idaho, and Twin Falls County in South-central Idaho. As described in their 2014 report (Healey, McDonald, Gazieva, Begic, & Toussaint, 2014), it

was not ultimately feasible to collect data from Bonneville County, however, a large amount of juvenile arrest data from 2009-2011 were collected from the City of Twin Falls Police Department (TFPD), City of Caldwell Police Department (CPD), City of Nampa Police Department (NPD), and Canyon County Sheriff's Department CCSD). In this DMC assessment, the researchers used a multimodal methodology, supplementing the quantitative juvenile arrest data with focus group interviews of law enforcement officers from TFPD, and web-based surveys of law enforcement officers from CPD, NPD, and CCSD. A major finding from that study showed that, similar to what was found by Lind et al. (2010) in their earlier report, after controlling for the shared variance among all demographic and situational variables, there was no evidence of DMC; in short, once again, even though juvenile arrest RRIs appeared to differ as a function of race/ethnicity, any disparities in arrest outcomes between Hispanic juveniles and Non-Hispanic White juveniles were accounted for by gang affiliation alone (Hispanic juveniles were found to be 6.1 times more likely to be affiliated with a gang across the three-year period than their Non-Hispanic White peers). A second key finding was that juvenile arrest RRIs for Hispanic juveniles fell dramatically across the three years, from 1.82 in 2009 to 1.60 in 2010, before plummeting to 1.08 in 2010. Lastly, results of the law enforcement officer surveys and focus groups revealed that law enforcement officers were adamant that they did not consider race/ethnicity at all when deciding whether to make juvenile arrests, but rather focused on other factors such as criminal history, the type of crime committed, diversion resource availability, and whether a juvenile's parent or guardian seemed able and willing to discipline the juvenile and address any underlying factors related to his or her behavior.

In late 2017, IDJC again contracted with research at the CHP to conduct an assessment of DMC, this time in Bingham County, Idaho, with a particular focus on juvenile arrest patterns among Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, and Native American juveniles. The methodology and results of this assessment are described in the remainder of this report.

Methodology

The methodology for this study was guided by several different sources of influence. One was the initial DMC in Canyon County (Lind et al., 2010). This effort was successful in gathering quantitative data and performing analysis sufficient to not only comment on factors related to DMC in Canyon County, but also to guide efforts to reduce DMC among Hispanic juveniles (in particular, those at risk for affiliation with gangs). Another was the "Preparing for Assessment – Idaho" report written by OJJDP consultant William Feyerherm, which had valuable guidelines for a statewide assessment of DMC. A third was the collaboration among key stakeholders, including Alan Miller, the statewide DMC Coordinator with IDJC, Lennart Nivegard, a former IDJC employee and liaison to the Bingham County stakeholders, advisory persons serving on the Idaho Juvenile Justice Commission, and law enforcement officers, juvenile court administrators, and members of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe who vetted materials and made suggestions for improving the data collection process.

Prior to the commencement of the study, Mr. Miller, through visits to Bingham County and conference calls (the latter with the first author of this report) with the various stakeholders, to discuss and refine the proposed study and invite participation. The reports (Lind et al., 2010; Healey et al., 2014) from the two previous DMC assessments were shared as an example of what the stakeholders (and their agencies or constituents, as appropriate) could expect from the project and of how the data would be reported. Interview protocols (see Appendix A) were developed for law enforcement officers, juvenile probation officers, and the juvenile court prosecutor and judge. After the methodology was developed, all procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board at Boise State University.

Quantitative Data

The primary data collected for this study included cases of juveniles who had been arrested by either the BCSD and CBPD during the years 2011-2015. The critical data elements were gleaned largely from those used in previous DMC assessments in Idaho, and included:

- Age at Time of Arrest
- Gender (Male; Female)
- Race (White; Black; Native American; Other; Unknown)
- Ethnicity (White; Hispanic)
- Gang Affiliation (No; Yes; Unknown)
- Arresting Agency (City; Sheriff; State; Other)
- Crime Type (Sex Offense; Persons; Property; Drug and Alcohol; Traffic; 'Other')
- Crime Level (Felony; Misdemeanor; Non-Criminal Offense)
- Whether a Weapon Was Involved (No; Yes)
- Geographic Location of Violation (School; Park; Home; Store; 'Other')
- Time of Day of Violation (12:00 a.m.-5:59 a.m.; 6:00 a.m.-11:59 a.m.; 12:00 p.m.-5:59 p.m.; 6:00 p.m.-11:59 p.m.)
- Indication of Prior Crime (No; Yes)
- Prior Crime Type (Sex Offense; Persons; Property; Drug and Alcohol; Traffic; 'Other')
- Prior Crime Level (Felony; Misdemeanor; Non-Criminal Offense)

- Arrest Outcome (Handled within Department; Referred to Other Authority)

The research team wanted to gather a large, representative sample of all juvenile arrests between 2011 and 2015. Mr. Miller from IDJC provided a list of the number of all juvenile arrest incidents during each calendar year, and the researchers, using an internet-based, open-access sample size calculator (Creative Research Systems, n.d.) generated sample sizes for each year, using both 3% and 5% confidence intervals (known more commonly as margins of error). For example, for 2011, there was a total of 479 juvenile arrests compiled by the law enforcement agencies in Bingham County (by far, the largest numbers of arrests were for the CBPD and BCSD, with much smaller numbers for the police departments in the cities of Aberdeen and Shelley). In order to collect a representative sample with a 3% confidence interval, the research team would need to collect information from 331 randomly selected arrest cases from the total of 479. In order to collect a representative sample with a 5% confidence interval, information from 213 randomly selected cases would be needed. Although the research team was initially hopeful to achieve the scientific "gold standard" of a 3% confidence interval, data collection was found to take longer than expected so the (still highly acceptable) 5% confidence interval was used.

Using an internet-based, open-access random number generator (random.org, n.d.), the research team generated the appropriate-sized sample for each year. For example, knowing that information on 213 cases would need to be collected for calendar year 2011, the research team randomly generated 213 numbers between 1 and 479 (the total number of arrest cases for 2011) and simply went through the arrest cases for that year, collecting information on, for example, the first, second, fifth, seventh, etc. arrest cases until the 213 threshold was reached. In most cases, several extra numbers were generated in the expectation that some cases would not have sufficient information to use. The data cases generated and collected for each year, and for all years together, with the appropriate final confidence interval, are shown below:

- 2011: 213 out of 479 cases (confidence interval = 5.0)
- 2012: 204 out of 396 cases (confidence interval = 4.8)
- 2013: 199 out of 371 cases (confidence interval = 4.7)
- 2014: 180 out of 293 cases (confidence interval = 4.5)
- 2015: 173 out of 273 cases (confidence interval = 4.6)
- Total: 969 out of 1,812 cases (confidence interval = 2.1)

Data collection was performed in a dedicated conference room in the Bingham County Courthouse Building, which houses, among many other entities, CBPD and BCSD. Prior to the arrival of the research team, BCSD Deputy Jeremy Kendall coordinated an effort to set up multiple data collection terminals, consisting of laptop computers and needed accessories. Deputy Kendall provided an introduction on how to access the juvenile arrest cases data, and during the course of five data collection days (three in June and two in August) was constantly available to troubleshoot technical difficulties, answer questions about how to locate key information (as pieces of information needed were not always stored in the same file or tab), and when necessary, to provide guidance on how to code certain information (for example, if a certain type of offense was non-criminal or a misdemeanor). Deputy Kendall, along with IDJC liaison Lennart Nivegard, also helped coordinate space and times for most focus group and individual interviews.

Qualitative Data

In recognition that arrest characteristics, juvenile demographics, and RRI calculations do not tell the complete story about how law enforcement personnel such as police officers and sheriff's deputies, as well as court personnel such as judges and prosecutors, interact with youth, the CHP research team, in consultation with Mr. Miller and members of the stakeholder groups, developed several short interview protocols with questions designed to be asked in a focus group interview format with small groups of law enforcement officers and juvenile probation officers, and several with questions designed to be asked in personal interviews with the Bingham County Juvenile Court's judge and prosecutor. All protocols and interview questions can be found in Appendix A.

A focus group interview with law enforcement officers was held during the research team's data collection site visit to Bingham County in June 2018. During that same site visit, personal interviews were held with the juvenile court judge and prosecutor. An unanticipated opportunity to interview key stakeholders on the Fort Hall Reservation arose just before the research team was to return to Boise, and an impromptu focus group interview was held, using a free-form approach but centered around the same types of questions asked of the other stakeholders, as appropriate. The second focus group interview, this time of juvenile probation officers (JPOs), including the chief JPO, was held when members of the research team returned to Bingham County to collect the remainder of the quantitative data in August 2018. During all interviews except the last, field notes were taken; in the final one, due to a lack of available note-takers, the interviewer, with the participants' consent, audio-taped the interview for later transcription. All field notes were also transcribed, and then a content analysis procedure was used to identify common or prominent themes.

Data from the Idaho Juvenile Offender System (IJOS)

An initial aim of this study was to use data from the Idaho Juvenile Offender System to track the disposition of cases at disposition points beyond the point of arrest. In particular, the researchers wanted to examine factors (including race/ethnicity) related to: 1) whether diversion was offered, and if so, was it accepted; 2) charges filed, as well as their findings; 3) the number of prior adjudications (guilty); 4) whether the juveniles were transferred to adult court; 5) the type and term of disposition; 6) Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) risk level (Low, Moderate, or High); 7) time spent in detention (pre- and post-adjudication, length of sentence, and length of stay); and 8) information about commitment, including the crime level of the adjudicated offense, the length of stay, and the custody level.

The IJOS database was not accessible to the members of the research team, so relevant information was extracted by an IDJC data specialist and sent to the research team. As discussed in Appendix A, the IJOS data were difficult to map onto the data collected onsite in Bingham County, primarily because information on the date of arrest was not collected onsite. Therefore, it was challenging to determine which arrest information from IJOS was linked to the specific arrest documented onsite, as many of the juveniles had multiple arrests in any given year. Because the researchers felt less confident about the quality of the data and the extent to which information can be linked between what was collected in Bingham County and what was

extracted from IJOS, the analyses using IJOS data are not presented in the main body of this report. Instead, they are presented separately as supplemental analyses in Appendix A.

Results

Quantitative Data

2011

Of the 211 cases for which gender information was documented, 152 (72.0%) involved males and 59 (28.0%) involved females.

Of the 212 cases for which age information was noted, the mean age was 14.70 years, with a median age of 15 years. The youngest juvenile was eight years old; 59 cases involved juveniles who were 17 years old (the oldest age, and the single-most common as well).

Of the 212 cases for which there was information about juveniles' race, 173 (81.6%) involved juveniles classified as White, 36 (17.0%) involved juveniles classified as Native American, and three (1.4%) involved juveniles classified as Black. Regarding ethnicity, among the same 212 cases, 80 (37.7%) involved juveniles classified as Hispanic, and 132 involved juveniles classified as Non-Hispanic. Of the 209 cases which could be coded into a combined race and ethnicity category, 97 (46.4%) involved Non-Hispanic Whites, 76 (36.4%) involved Hispanics who were not also Native American, and 36 (17.2%) involved Native Americans (whether they were Hispanic or Non-Hispanic).

Only one case (representing less than 1% of the year's sample) involved a juvenile who was identified as being affiliated with a gang.

One hundred sixty-nine (79.3%) of the cases involved juveniles arrested by city police and 44 (20.7%) involved juveniles arrested by sheriff's deputies.

The geographic location of the arrest cases was varied. Of the 210 cases for which geographic location of violations was noted, 53 (25.2%) were at schools, 43 (20.5%) were at homes, 11 (5.2%) were at stores, and six (2.9%) were in parks. Ninety-seven (46.2%) cases had geographic locations listed as "Other." Of these cases, 61 (or 62.9% of all Other locations) were documented as "Highway/Road/Alley," 15 (15.4%) were documented as "RTC," and eight (8.2%) were documented as "Government Building."

Of the 212 cases for which arrest time information was noted, the most common time block for arrest cases was 12:00 p.m. to 5:59 p.m.; 82 (38.7%) cases involved juveniles arrested during this period. Fifty-five cases (25.9%) involved juveniles arrested between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m., followed by 48 (22.6%) between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m., and 27 (12.7%) between 12:00 a.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The most common crime type among the arrest cases was property crime, which was noted in 53 (24.8%) of all cases. Other common crime types included crimes against persons and drug and alcohol offenses, each of which was noted in 44 cases (20.7%). Traffic offenses were noted in 25 cases (11.7%), and sex crimes in four (1.9%). Forty-three cases (20.7%) were documented as

"Other" crime types; of these, 23 (or 53.4% of all Other cases) were noted as involving warrants, and nine (20.9%) involving runaway.

Crime level (whether felony, misdemeanor, or non-criminal offense) was documented for 205 juvenile arrest cases. Misdemeanor crimes were the most common, and noted in 164 cases (80.0%); non-criminal offenses were noted in 21 cases (10.2%), followed by felony crimes in 20 cases (9.8%).

Of all 213 cases, 134 (62.9%) involved juveniles for whom a prior crime was also noted. As noted earlier in this report, if there were multiple prior arrests for a juvenile, the one considered most serious was the one documented. Of the 134 cases with prior crimes, the most common category was for crimes against persons, which was documented in 65 cases (48.5%). Thirty-six cases (26.9%) involved property crimes, 14 (10.4%) involved drug and alcohol offenses, six (4.5%) involved traffic offenses, and five (3.7%) involved sex crimes. Eight cases (6.0%) were coded as "Other."

The crime level of prior crimes was noted for 26 cases. Twenty (76.9%) of these were misdemeanors, and six (23.1%) were felonies.

Only four cases, constituting less than 2% of the entire sample, were denoted as having involved a weapon.

An arrest outcome was noted in 182 cases. Of these, 134 (73.6%) were noted as having been "Handled within Department" and 48 (26.4%) were noted as having been "Referred to Other Authority."

As a primary function of DMC assessments is to understand whether race/ethnicity is associated with juvenile arrest patterns, we performed a series of analyses to determine whether Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, and Native American juvenile arrest cases differed as a function of any demographic or situational characteristics. As seen below in Table 1, two statistically significant results were found (regarding crime level and prior crime history), as well as one result (regarding crime type) that represents what is commonly referred to in probabilistic analyses as a "non-significant trend" (i.e., a result that is very near the threshold of statistical significance, but does not quite reach that threshold). These results are explained further beneath the table.

Table 1: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity	
Demographic/Situational Characteristic	**Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value**
Gender	.73
Age	.12
Arresting Agency	.81
Geographic Location of Arrest	$.80^{L}$
Time of Arrest	$.24^{L}$
Crime Type	$*.06*^{L}$
Crime Level	**< .05**
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	**< .01**
Prior Crime Type	$.33^{L}$
Prior Crime Level	$.27^{L}$

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. ^{L} indicates the use of a Likelihood ratio due to low numbers.

As seen above in Table 1, the first statistically significant result involved whether or not juvenile arrest cases noted the existence of a prior crime; arrest cases involving juveniles belonging to the three different racial/ethnic groups were found to differ in how often a prior crime was noted, χ^2 (df = 2) = 12.71, $p < .01$. This result was accounted for by arrest cases involving Native American and Hispanic juveniles more often noting at least one prior arrest (at nearly 78% and over 72%, respectively) compared to arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles (at nearly 51%).

The second significant result involved crime level; arrest cases involving juveniles belonging to the three different racial/ethnic groups were found to differ in whether the crime was noted as a felony, a misdemeanor, or a non-criminal offense, χ^2 (df = 10) = 16.60, $p < .05$. As seen below in Table 2, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Regarding felony crimes, a higher percentage of arrest cases containing this crime level involved Native American juveniles (nearly 14%) than Hispanic juveniles (nearly 11%) and Non-Hispanic White juveniles (nearly 8%). This same pattern occurred for non-criminal offenses, although the percentage differences were starker; over 22% of cases involving Native American juveniles were for non-criminal offenses, compared to nearly 11% of cases involving Hispanic juveniles and less than 6% involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles. On the other hand, regarding misdemeanors, a much higher percentage of cases involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles (nearly 87%) were at this crime level, compared to those involving Hispanic (over 78%) and Native American (just under 64%) juveniles.

Table 2: Differences in Crime Level as a Function of Race/Ethnicity			
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping		
Crime Level	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**
Felony	7.7	10.8	13.9
Misdemeanor	86.8	78.4	63.9
Non-Criminal Offense	5.5	10.8	22.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and crime level information was available.

The last finding that seems important, although the result (at $p = .06$) fell just short of the threshold for statistical significance, involved crime type; types of crimes committed seemed to differ somewhat as a function of juveniles' racial/ethnic group. As seen below in Table 3, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Regarding crimes against persons, more arrest cases containing this crime involved Hispanic juveniles (over 26%), and to a lesser extent Non-Hispanic White juveniles (nearly 19%), than Native American juveniles (just over 11%). The pattern regarding traffic offenses was similar (with the percentages of these cases involving Hispanic, Non-Hispanic White, and Native American juveniles being at 16%, 11%, and 6% respectively). On the other hand, cases containing property crimes more often involved Native American juveniles (nearly 42%) than either Non-Hispanic White (nearly 23%) or Hispanic (over 18%) juveniles. Cases containing drug and alcohol offenses involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles (nearly 24%) somewhat more often than Hispanic juveniles (nearly 20%) and Native American juveniles (less than 17%), and it may be noteworthy that all four cases containing sex offenses involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles.

Table 3: Differences in Crime Type as a Function of Race/Ethnicity			
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping		
Crime Type	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**
Sex Offenses	4.1	0.0	0.0
Crimes Against Persons	18.6	26.3	11.1
Property Crimes	22.7	18.4	41.7
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	23.7	19.7	16.7
Traffic Offenses	11.3	15.8	5.6
Other Crimes/Offenses	19.6	19.5	25.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and crime level information was available.

After assessing for potential differences in demographic and situational characteristics as a function of race/ethnicity, we moved on to a systematic assessment of whether and how all demographic and situational characteristics, including race/ethnicity, were associated with arrest outcomes, namely, whether cases were handled within the department or referred to another

authority (which often, though not always, meant detention in the 3B JDC in Bonneville County). All situational and demographic characteristics were tested for association with arrest outcomes, and as seen below in Table 4, three characteristics (crime type, crime level, and whether or not the juvenile had committed a prior crime) emerged as significantly associated with arrest outcomes, and one (geographic location of arrest) was found to be associated at a level indicating a non-significant trend. Importantly for this assessment of DMC, race/ethnicity was not found to be associated with arrest outcome.

Table 4: Significance of Demographic and Situational Characteristics in Association with Arrest Outcomes

Demographic/Situational Characteristic	Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value
Gender	.43
Age	.90
Race/Ethnicity	.46
Arresting Agency	.80
Geographic Location of Arrest	*.09*
Time of Arrest	.31
Crime Type	**< .001**[L]
Crime Level	**< .01**
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	**< .01**[L]
Prior Crime Type	.61[L]
Prior Crime Level	.15

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. [L] indicates the use of a Likelihood ratio due to low numbers.

Crime type was found to be most strongly associated with arrest outcomes, χ^2 (df = 10) = 16.60, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 5, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Whereas cases with crimes such as drug and alcohol offenses and traffic offenses very rarely led to a referral to other authorities (less than 8% and less than 5%, respectively), cases with crimes such as sex offenses and crimes against persons were so referred at a much higher rate (25% and 39%, respectively). Cases involving Other crimes/offenses more often than not (nearly 63% of the time) led to a referral to other authorities, which is not surprising given that over half of all Other cases involved a warrant for arrest.

Table 5: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Crime Type		
Crime Type	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
Sex Offenses	75.0	25.0
Crimes Against Persons	61.0	39.0
Property Crimes	83.7	16.3
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	92.5	7.5
Traffic Offenses	95.5	4.5
Other Crimes/Offenses	37.5	62.5

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime level and arrest outcome information was available.

Crime level was also significantly associated with arrest outcome, χ^2 (df = 2) = 13.12, $p < .01$. As seen below in Table 6, this result is best accounted for by cases of juveniles who committed felony charges more often being referred to other authorities (nearly 56%) and cases of juveniles who committed non-criminal offenses and (especially) misdemeanor crimes being more often handled within the department (nearly 56% and over 79%, respectively).

Table 6: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Crime Level		
Crime Level	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
Felony	44.4	55.6
Misdemeanor	79.3	20.7
Non-Criminal Offenses	55.6	44.4

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime level and arrest outcome information was available.

The final statistically significant result showed an association between whether or not juveniles in the arrest cases had a prior arrest noted, χ^2 (df = 1) = 8.51, $p < .01$. This result was accounted for by cases of juveniles with no prior arrests noted being more often handled within the department (slightly more than 85% of the time) than cases of juveniles with prior arrests noted (less than 66%).

The last finding that seems important, although the result (at $p = .09$) fell short of the threshold for statistical significance, involved the geographic location of arrest; arrest outcomes seemed to differ somewhat as a function of where the arrests were made. As seen below in Table 7, this difference is perhaps best explained by cases involving juveniles arrested in schools, parks, and stores almost always being handled within the department, whereas much higher percentages of cases of juveniles arrested at homes (nearly 27%) and Other locations (nearly 41%) being referred to other authorities.

Table 7: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Geographic Location of Arrest		
Geographic Location	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
School	91.8	8.2
Park	100.0	0.0
Home	73.5	26.5
Store	90.9	9.1
Other	59.5	40.5

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom geographic location of arrest and arrest outcome information was available.

2012

Of the 204 cases for which gender information was documented, 147 (72.1%) involved males and 57 (27.9%) involved females.

Of the 204 cases for which age information was noted, the mean age was 14.90 years, with a median age of 15 years. The youngest juvenile was eight years old, and the oldest juveniles were 17 (there were 43 cases involving 17 year-olds). Fifty-five cases involved juveniles who were 16 years old (the single-most common age).

Of the 204 cases for which there was information about juveniles' race, 157 (77.0%) involved juveniles classified as White, 42 (20.6%) classified as Native American, and four (2.0%) classified as Black. Regarding ethnicity, among the same 212 cases, 74 (36.3%) involved juveniles classified as Hispanic, and 130 (63.7%) involved juveniles classified as Non-Hispanic. Of the 199 cases which could be coded into a combined race and ethnicity category, 88 (44.2%) involved Non-Hispanic Whites, 69 (34.7%) involved Hispanics who were not also Native American, and 42 (21.1%) involved Native Americans (whether they were Hispanic or Non-Hispanic).

No cases involved a juvenile who was identified as being affiliated with a gang.

One hundred fifty-four (75.5%) of the cases involved juveniles arrested by city police and 50 (24.5%) involved juveniles arrested by sheriff's deputies.

The geographic location of the arrest cases was varied. Of the 210 cases for which geographic location of violations was noted, 53 (26.5%) were at schools, 36 (18.0%) were at homes, 20 (10.0%) were at stores, and seven (3.5%) were in parks. Eighty-four (42.0%) cases had geographic locations listed as "Other." Of these cases, 48 (or 57.1% of all Other locations) were documented as "Highway/Road/Alley," 20 (23.8%) were documented as "RTC," and eight each (8.2%) were documented as "Government Building" and "Walmart."

Of the 204 cases for which arrest time information was noted, the most common time block for arrest cases was 12:00 p.m. to 5:59 p.m.; 80 (39.2%) of these cases involved juveniles arrested during this period. Fifty-five cases (27.0%) involved juveniles arrested between 6:00 p.m. and

11:59 p.m., followed by 50 (24.5%) between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m., and 19 (9.3%) between 12:00 a.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The most common crime type among the arrest cases was Other, which was noted in 55 (27.0%) of all cases; of these, 33 (or 60.0% of all Other cases) were noted as involving warrants, and 17 (30.9%) involved runaway. The next most common crime type was crimes against persons, which was noted in 46 cases (22.5%), followed by property crimes and drug and alcohol offenses, each of which were noted in 37 cases (18.1%). Traffic offenses were noted in 26 cases (12.7%), and sex offenses in three (1.5%).

Crime level (whether felony, misdemeanor, or non-criminal offense) was documented for 190 juvenile arrest cases. Misdemeanor crimes were most common, and noted in 146 cases (76.8%); non-criminal offenses were noted in 29 cases (15.3%), followed by felony crimes, which were noted in 15 cases (7.9%).

Of all 204 cases, 129 (63.2%) involved juveniles for whom a prior crime was also noted. As noted earlier in this report, if there were multiple prior arrests for a juvenile, the one considered most serious was the one documented. Of the 129 cases with prior crimes, the most common crime type was crimes against persons, which was documented in 69 cases (53.5%). Twenty-six prior crime cases (20.2%) involved property crimes, 21 (16.3%) involved drug and alcohol offenses, and five each (3.9%) involved traffic offenses and sex crimes. Three cases (2.3%) had prior crimes coded as Other.

The crime level of prior crimes was noted for 28 cases; all of these prior crimes were misdemeanors.

Only one case, constituting less than 1% of the entire sample, was denoted as having involved a weapon.

An arrest outcome was noted in 179 cases. Of these, 124 (69.3%) were noted as having been "Handled within Department" and 55 (30.7%) were noted as having been "Referred to Other Authority." More specific information on the cases revealed that 100 cases (55.9%) involved juveniles who were released to the custody of a parent/guardian and 54 (30.2%) involved juveniles placed in detention.

As a primary function of DMC assessments is to understand whether race/ethnicity is associated with juvenile arrest patterns, for the 2012 data we performed a series of analyses to determine whether Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, and Native American juvenile arrest cases differed as a function of any demographic or situational characteristics. As seen below in Table 8, three statistically significant results were found (regarding gender, prior crime type, and whether or not a prior arrest had been noted), as well as one result (regarding crime type) that represents a non-significant trend. These results are explained further beneath the table.

Table 8: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity	
Demographic/Situational Characteristic	**Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value**
Gender	**< .01**
Age	.33
Arresting Agency	.20
Geographic Location of Arrest	$.54^{L}$
Time of Arrest	$.98^{L}$
Crime Type	$*.08*^{L}$
Crime Level	$.44^{L}$
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	**< .05**
Prior Crime Type	**$< .05^{L}$**
Prior Crime Level	NA

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. ^{L} indicates the use of a Likelihood ratio due to low numbers. No analysis could be performed on Prior Crime Level, as all prior crimes documented were misdemeanors.

As seen above in Table 8, a strong statistically significant result involved whether or not the juvenile arrest cases involved boys or girls; arrest cases involving juveniles belonging to the three different racial/ethnic groups were found to differ as a function of gender, χ^2 (df = 2) = 11.36, $p < .01$. This result was accounted for by arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White and Hispanic juveniles being almost overwhelmingly boys (75% for cases involving Non-Hispanic Whites, and over 81% for cases involving Hispanic juveniles), whereas only a slight majority (approximately 53%) of cases involving Native American juveniles were boys.

The second statistically significant result involved whether or not juvenile arrest cases noted the existence of a prior crime; arrest cases involving juveniles belonging to the three different racial/ethnic groups were found to differ in how often a prior crime was noted, χ^2 (df = 2) = 7.01, $p < .05$. This result was accounted for by arrest cases involving Native American juveniles more often noting at least one prior arrest (at just under 74%) compared to arrest cases involving Hispanic juveniles (at over 64%), which in turn more often noted at least one prior arrest than arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles (at less than 54%).

The third and final statistically significant result involved prior crime type; types of prior crimes committed differed significantly as a function of juveniles' racial/ethnic group, χ^2 (df = 10) = 19.96, $p < .05$. As seen below in Table 9, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Regarding crimes against persons, more arrest cases containing this as a prior crime involved Hispanic juveniles (nearly 61%) and Native American juveniles (over 59%) than Non-Hispanic White juveniles (less than 43%). Cases documenting property crimes as the prior crime type were more often found for Native American (nearly 30%) and Non-Hispanic White (nearly 26%) juveniles than for Hispanic juveniles (less than 10%). Cases documenting drug and alcohol offenses as the prior crime type were more common for Hispanic (nearly 20%) and Non-Hispanic White (over 19%) juveniles than for Native American juveniles (less than 8%). Finally, cases documenting traffic offenses as the prior crime type were considerably more common for

Non-Hispanic White juveniles (nearly 9%) than for Hispanic (2%) and Native American (0%) juveniles.

Table 9: Differences in Prior Crime Type as a Function of Race/Ethnicity			
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping		
Crime Type	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**
Sex Offenses	2.1	7.8	0.0
Crimes Against Persons	42.6	60.8	59.3
Property Crimes	25.5	9.8	29.6
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	19.1	19.6	7.4
Traffic Offenses	8.5	2.0	0.0
Other Crimes/Offenses	2.1	0.0	3.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and prior crime type information was available.

The last finding that seems important, although the result (at $p = .08$) fell short of the threshold for statistical significance, involved crime type; types of crimes committed seemed to differ somewhat as a function of juveniles' racial/ethnic group. As seen below in Table 10, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Regarding crimes against persons, more arrest cases containing this crime involved Hispanic juveniles (over 30%) than Native American (19%) and Non-Hispanic White (17%) juveniles. With respect to property crimes, more arrest cases containing this crime involved Non-Hispanic White (nearly 22%) and Native American (19%) juveniles than Hispanic juveniles (less than 12%). Regarding both drug and alcohol offenses and traffic offenses, more arrest cases involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles (just over 26% and nearly 16%, respectively) than both Hispanic (nearly 12% for both types of offenses) and Native American (over 14% and nearly 10%, respectively) juveniles.

Table 10: Differences in Crime Type as a Function of Race/Ethnicity			
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping		
Crime Type	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**
Sex Offenses	1.1	1.4	2.4
Crimes Against Persons	17.0	30.4	19.0
Property Crimes	21.6	11.6	19.0
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	26.1	11.6	14.3
Traffic Offenses	15.9	11.6	9.5
Other Crimes/Offenses	18.2	33.3	35.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and crime level information was available.

After assessing for potential differences in demographic and situational characteristics as a function of race/ethnicity, we moved on to a systematic assessment of whether and how all

demographic and situational characteristics, including race/ethnicity, were associated with arrest outcomes, namely, whether cases were handled within the department or referred to another authority (which often, though not always, meant detention in the 3B JDC in Bonneville County). All situational and demographic characteristics were tested for association with arrest outcomes, and as seen below in Table 11, two characteristics (crime type and whether or not the juvenile had committed a prior crime) emerged as significantly associated with arrest outcomes. Importantly for this assessment of DMC, race/ethnicity was not found to be associated with arrest outcome.

Table 11: Significance of Demographic and Situational Characteristics in Association with Arrest Outcomes

Demographic/Situational Characteristic	Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value
Gender	.49
Age	.98
Race/Ethnicity	.40
Arresting Agency	.76
Geographic Location of Arrest	.71
Time of Arrest	.41
Crime Type	**< .001**[L]
Crime Level	.51
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	**< .001**
Prior Crime Type	.13[L]
Prior Crime Level	NA

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. No analysis could be performed on Prior Crime Level, as all prior crimes documented were misdemeanors.

Crime type was found to be strongly associated with arrest outcomes, χ^2 (df = 5) = 36.35, $p <$ .001. As seen below in Table 12, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Whereas cases with crime types such as drug and alcohol offenses and traffic offenses very rarely led to a referral to other authorities (both less than 9%), cases with crime types such as crimes against persons and property crimes were so referred at a considerably higher rate (just over 34% and just under 22%, respectively). Cases involving Other crimes/offenses more often than not (nearly 62% of the time) led to a referral to other authorities, which is not surprising given that over half of all Other cases involved a warrant for arrest. Only one arrest outcome was listed for a case involving a sex crime, so it seems unwise to make any generalizations on the basis of that single outcome.

Table 12: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Crime Type		
Crime Type	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
Sex Offenses	100.0	0.0
Crimes Against Persons	65.9	34.1
Property Crimes	78.1	21.9
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	91.2	8.8
Traffic Offenses	91.7	8.3
Other Crimes/Offenses	38.3	61.7

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime level and arrest outcome information was available.

The second statistically significant result showed an association between whether or not juveniles in the arrest cases had a prior arrest noted, χ^2 (df = 10) = 22.99, $p < .001$. This result was accounted for by cases of juveniles with no prior arrests noted being more often handled within the department (nearly 91% of the time) than cases of juveniles with prior arrests noted (less than 57%).

2013

Of the 199 cases for which gender information was documented, 152 (70.9%) involved males and 58 (29.1%) involved females.

Of the 198 cases for which age information was noted, the mean age was 15.23 years, with a median age of 15 years. The youngest juvenile was seven years old; 53 cases involved juveniles who were 17 years old (the oldest age, and the single-most common as well).

Of the 199 cases for which there was information about juveniles' race, 154 (77.4%) involved juveniles classified as White, 43 (21.6%) involved juveniles classified as Native American, and two (1.0%) involved juveniles classified as Black. Regarding ethnicity, among the same 199 cases, 66 (33.2%) involved juveniles classified as Hispanic, and 133 involved juveniles classified as Non-Hispanic. Of the 197 cases which could be coded into a combined race and ethnicity category, 97 (49.2%) involved Non-Hispanic Whites, 57 (28.9%) involved Hispanics who were not also Native American, and 43 (21.6%) involved Native Americans (whether they were Hispanic or Non-Hispanic).

No cases involved a juvenile who was identified as being affiliated with a gang.

Of the 198 cases for which arresting agency information was noted, 150 (75.8%) involved juveniles arrested by city police and 48 (24.2%) involved juveniles arrested by sheriff's deputies.

The geographic location of the arrest cases was varied. Of the 194 cases on which geographic location of violations was noted, 50 (25.8%) each were at schools and homes, 15 (7.7%) were at stores, and four (2.1%) were in parks. Seventy-five (38.7%) cases had geographic locations listed as "Other." Of these cases, 34 (or 45.3% of all Other locations) were documented as

"Highway/Road/Alley," 14 (18.7%) were documented as "RTC," and 13 (17.3%) were documented as "Government Building."

Of the 199 cases for which arrest time information was noted, the most common time block for arrest cases was 12:00 p.m. to 5:59 p.m.; 70 cases (35.2%) involved juveniles arrested during this period. Fifty-four cases (27.1%) involved juveniles arrested between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m., followed by 44 (22.1%) between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m., and 31 (15.6%) between 12:00 a.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The most common crime type among the arrest cases was drug and alcohol offenses, which was noted in 44 (22.1%) of all cases. Other common crime types included property crimes and crimes against persons, which were noted in 42 (41.1%) and 31 (15.6%) cases, respectively. Traffic offenses were noted in 17 cases (8.5%). Unlike the previous two years, no cases involved sex crimes. Sixty-five cases (32.7%) were documented as "Other" crime types; of these, 34 (or 52.3% of all Other cases) were noted as involving warrants, and 22 (33.8%) involving runaway.

Crime level (whether felony, misdemeanor, or non-criminal offense) was documented for 185 juvenile arrest cases. Misdemeanor crimes were the most common, and noted in 155 cases (83.8%); non-criminal offenses were noted in 19 cases (10.3%), followed by felony crimes noted in 11 cases (5.9%).

Of all 199 cases, 125 (62.8%) involved juveniles for whom a prior crime was also noted. As noted earlier in this report, if there were multiple prior arrests for a juvenile, the one considered most serious was the one documented. Of the 125 cases with prior crimes, the most common category was for crimes against persons, which was documented in 52 cases (41.6%). Forty-seven cases (37.6%) involved property crimes, 18 (14.4%) involved drug and alcohol offenses, three (2.4%) involved sex offenses, and one (less than 1%) involved a traffic offense. Four cases (3.2%) were coded as "Other."

The crime level of prior crimes was noted for 43 cases. Forty-one (95.3%) of these were misdemeanors, and two (4.7%) were felonies.

Only one case, constituting less than 1% of the entire sample, was denoted as having involved a weapon.

An arrest outcome was noted in 166 cases. Of these, 107 (64.5%) were noted as having been "Handled within Department" and 59 (35.5%) were noted as having been "Referred to Other Authority." More specific information on the cases revealed that 68 cases (41.0%) involved juveniles who were released to the custody of a parent/guardian, 56 (33.7%) involved juveniles placed in detention, and three (1.8%) involved juveniles referred to juvenile court.

As a primary function of DMC assessments is to understand whether race/ethnicity is associated with juvenile arrest patterns, for the 2013 data we performed a series of analyses to determine whether Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, and Native American juvenile arrest cases differed as a function of any demographic or situational characteristics. As seen below in Table 13, two

statistically significant results were found (regarding gender and prior crime history). These results are explained further beneath the table.

Table 13: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity	
Demographic/Situational Characteristic	**Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value**
Gender	**< .05**
Age	.17
Arresting Agency	.69
Geographic Location of Arrest	$.19^{L}$
Time of Arrest	$.14^{L}$
Crime Type	$.26^{L}$
Crime Level	.59
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	**< .05**
Prior Crime Type	$.72^{L}$
Prior Crime Level	$.52^{L}$

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. ^{L} indicates the use of a Likelihood Ratio due to low numbers.

As seen above in Table 13, one statistically significant result involved whether or not the juvenile arrest cases involved boys or girls; arrest cases involving juveniles belonging to the three different racial/ethnic groups were found to differ as a function of gender, χ^2 (df = 2) = 6.13, $p < .05$. This result was accounted for by arrest cases involving Hispanic juveniles significantly more often involving boys (nearly 83%) than cases involving both Non-Hispanic White (just over 69%) and Native American (less than 61%) juveniles.

The other statistically significant result involved whether or not juvenile arrest cases noted the existence of a prior crime; arrest cases involving juveniles belonging to the three different racial/ethnic groups were found to differ in how often a prior crime was noted, χ^2 (df = 2) = 6.42, $p < .05$. This result was accounted for by arrest cases involving Native American juveniles more often noting at least one prior arrest (at nearly 77%) compared to arrest cases involving Hispanic juveniles (at just under 65%), which in turn more often noted at least one prior arrest than for arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles (at less than 55%).

After assessing for potential differences in demographic and situational characteristics as a function of race/ethnicity, we moved on to a systematic assessment of whether and how all demographic and situational characteristics, including race/ethnicity, were associated with arrest outcomes, namely, whether cases were handled within the department or referred to another authority (which often, though not always, meant detention in the 3B JDC in Bonneville County). All situational and demographic characteristics were tested for association with arrest outcomes, and as seen below in Table 14, five characteristics (age, geographic location of arrest, time of arrest, crime type, and whether or not the juvenile had committed a prior crime) emerged as significantly associated with arrest outcomes, and one (prior crime type) was found to be

associated at a level indicating a non-significant trend. Importantly for this assessment of DMC, race/ethnicity was not found to be associated with arrest outcome.

Table 14: Significance of Demographic and Situational Characteristics in Association with Arrest Outcomes	
Demographic/Situational Characteristic	**Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value**
Gender	.88
Age	**< .05**
Race/Ethnicity	.42
Arresting Agency	.96
Geographic Location of Arrest	**< .05** [L]
Time of Arrest	**< .01** [L]
Crime Type	**< .001** [L]
Crime Level	.29
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	**< .001**
Prior Crime Type	*.06* [L]
Prior Crime Level	.97

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. [L] indicates the use of a Likelihood ratio due to low numbers.

Crime type was found to be strongly associated with arrest outcomes, χ^2 (df = 4) = 38.38, $p <$ .001. As seen below in Table 15, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Whereas cases with crimes such as drug and alcohol offenses and traffic offenses very rarely led to a referral to other authorities (15% and nearly 12%, respectively), cases with crimes such as crimes against persons and property were so referred at a much higher rate (nearly 31% and 25%, respectively). Cases involving Other crimes/offenses led to a referral to other authorities the most, at nearly 36%, which is not surprising given that over half of all Other cases involved a warrant for arrest.

Table 15: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Crime Type		
Crime Type	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
Sex Offenses	N/A	N/A
Crimes Against Persons	69.2	30.8
Property Crimes	75.0	25.0
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	85.0	15.0
Traffic Offenses	88.2	11.8
Other Crimes/Offenses	64.5	35.5

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime level and arrest outcome information was available.

Whether or not juveniles in the arrest cases had a prior arrest noted was also strongly and significantly associated with arrest outcome, χ^2 (df = 1) = 14.61, $p < .001$. This result was accounted for by cases of juveniles with no prior arrests noted being more often handled within the department (more than 83% of the time) than cases of juveniles with prior arrests noted (less than 54%).

The third significant finding involved time of arrest; when juveniles were arrested was significantly associated with arrest outcome, χ^2 (df = 3) = 11.96, $p < .01$. As seen below in Table 16, cases involving juveniles arrested between 12:00 a.m. and 5:59 a.m. (over 85%) and between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m. (over 73%) were more often handled within the department than cases involving juveniles arrested between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m. (50%) and between 12:00 p.m. and 5:59 p.m. (nearly 57%).

Table 16: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Time of Arrest

Time of Arrest	Percentage Handled Within Department	Percentage Referred to Other Authority
12:00 a.m. – 5:59 a.m.	85.2	14.8
6:00 a.m. – 11:59 a.m.	50.0	50.0
12:00 p.m. – 5:59 p.m.	56.7	43.3
6:00 p.m. – 11:59 p.m.	73.3	26.7

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom time of arrest and arrest outcome information was available.

The fourth significant finding involved the age of juveniles in arrest cases. It was found that juveniles whose cases were handled within the department were significantly younger (M = 15.02 years of age, SD = 1.79) than juveniles whose cases were referred to another authority (M = 15.54 years of age, SD = 1.26), t (163) = -1.98, $p < .05$.

The final significant finding involved the geographic location of arrest; arrest outcomes differed as a function of where the arrests were made, χ^2 (df = 4) = 10.49, $p < .05$. As seen below in Table 17, this difference is perhaps best explained by cases involving juveniles arrested in parks (100%) and stores (over 92%) almost always being handled within the department, whereas much higher percentages of cases of juveniles arrested at schools (30%), homes (over 37%) and Other locations (over 45%) were referred to other authorities.

Table 17: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Geographic Location of Arrest		
Geographic Location	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
School	70.0	30.0
Park	100.0	0.0
Home	62.8	37.2
Store	92.3	7.7
Other	54.7	45.3

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom geographic location of arrest and arrest outcome information was available.

The last finding that seems important, although the result (at $p < .06$) fell just short of the threshold for statistical significance, involved prior crime type; prior crime type was found to be suggestively associated with arrest outcomes, χ^2 (df = 4) = 9.28, $p < .06$. As seen below in Table 18, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Whereas cases with prior crimes such as drug and alcohol offenses (nearly 63%) and crimes against persons (over 55%) more often than not were handled within the department, more than half of the cases with property crime as the prior crime were referred to another authority, as were all cases in which the prior crime was listed as Other. No cases had a prior arrest for a traffic offense. Because there were only three cases in which the prior crime type was listed as a sex offense, the finding that 100% of these were handled within the department should probably be treated with caution.

Table 18: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Prior Crime Type		
Prior Crime Type	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
Sex Offenses	100.0	0.0
Crimes Against Persons	55.3	44.7
Property Crimes	48.6	51.4
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	62.5	37.5
Traffic Offenses	N/A	N/A
Other Crimes/Offenses	0.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime level and arrest outcome information was available.

2014

Of the 180 cases for which gender information was documented, 128 (71.1%) involved males and 52 (28.9%) involved females.

Of the 180 cases for which age information was noted, the mean age was 14.90 years, with a median age of 15 years. The youngest juvenile was nine years old; 42 cases involved juveniles who were 17 years old (the oldest age, and the second-most common; the most common age was 16 years, with 43 cases).

Of the 180 cases for which there was information about juveniles' race, 137 (76.0%) involved juveniles classified as White, 38 (21.1%) involved juveniles classified as Native American, and four (2.2%) involved juveniles classified as Black (one case, representing 0.6% of the sample, was listed as "Other"). Regarding ethnicity, among the same 180 cases, 42 (23.3%) involved juveniles classified as Hispanic, and 138 (76.6%) involved juveniles classified as Non-Hispanic. All of the cases could be coded into a combined race and ethnicity category, and 107 (59.4%) involved Non-Hispanic Whites, 35 (19.4%) involved Hispanics who were not also Native American, and 38 (21.1%) involved Native Americans (whether they were Hispanic or Non-Hispanic).

No cases involved a juvenile who was identified as being affiliated with a gang.

Of the 180 cases for which arresting agency information was noted, 127 (70.6%) involved juveniles arrested by city police and 53 (29.4%) involved juveniles arrested by sheriff's deputies.

The geographic location of the arrest cases was varied. Of the 180 cases on which geographic location of violations was noted, 47 (26.1%) were at schools, 41 (22.8%) were at homes, 19 (10.6%) were at stores, and three (1.7%) were in parks. Seventy cases (38.9%) had geographic locations listed as "Other." Of these cases, 40 (or 57.1% of all Other locations) were documented as "Highway/Road/Alley," 16 (22.9%) were documented as "RTC," and six (8.6%) were documented as "Government Building."

Of the 179 cases for which arrest time information was noted, the most common time block for arrest cases was 12:00 p.m. to 5:59 p.m.; 73 (40.8%) cases involved juveniles arrested during this period. Fifty-two cases (29.1%) involved juveniles arrested between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m., followed by 45 (25.1%) between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m., and nine (5.0%) between 12:00 a.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The most common crime type among the arrest cases was property crime, which was noted in 37 (20.6%) of all cases. Other common crime types included drug and alcohol offenses and crimes against persons, which were noted in 35 (19.4%) and 22 (12.2%) cases, respectively. Traffic offenses were noted in 18 cases (10.0%), and sex offenses were noted in four cases (2.2%). Sixty-four cases (35.6%) were documented as "Other" crime types; of these, 31 (or 53.1% of all Other cases) were noted as involving warrants, and 22 (34.4%) were noted as involving runaway.

Crime level (whether felony, misdemeanor, or non-criminal offense) was documented for 166 juvenile arrest cases. Misdemeanor crimes were the most common, and noted in 127 cases (76.5%); non-criminal offenses were noted in 27 cases (16.3%), followed by felony crimes in 12 cases (6.7%).

Of all 180 cases, 114 (63.3%) involved juveniles for whom a prior crime was also noted. As noted earlier in this report, if there were multiple prior arrests for a juvenile, the one considered most serious was the one documented. Of the 114 cases with prior crimes, the most common prior crime type was crimes against persons, which was documented in 46 cases (40.4%). Thirty-four cases (29.8%) involved property crimes, 18 (15.8%) involved drug and alcohol offenses, three (2.6%) involved traffic offenses, and two (1.8%) involved sex offenses. Eleven cases

(9.6%) were coded as "Other." Among these cases, five were for runaway, and three were for disturbing the peace.

The crime level of prior crimes was noted for 42 cases. Forty (95.2%) of these were misdemeanors, and two (4.8%) were felonies.

Three cases, constituting 1.7% of the entire sample, were denoted as having involved a weapon.

An arrest outcome was noted in 143 cases. Of these, 103 (71.5%) were noted as having been "Handled within Department" and 40 (27.8%) were noted as having been "Referred to Other Authority." More specific information on the cases revealed that 76 cases (53.1%) involved juveniles who were released to the custody of a parent/guardian, 39 (27.3%) involved juveniles placed in detention, and one (less than 1%) involved a juvenile referred to juvenile court.

As a primary function of DMC assessments is to understand whether race/ethnicity is associated with juvenile arrest patterns, for the 2014 data we performed a series of analyses to determine whether Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, and Native American juvenile arrest cases differed as a function of any demographic or situational characteristics. As seen below in Table 19, only one statistically significant result was found, in this case, regarding the geographic location of arrest. Two other results were found (regarding arresting agency and prior crime type) that did not meet the threshold for statistical significance ($p < .05$), but did show a suggestion of near-significant trend ($p < .10$). These results are explained further beneath the table.

Table 19: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

Demographic/Situational Characteristic	Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value
Gender	.28
Age	.61
Arresting Agency	*.09*
Geographic Location of Arrest	**< .01**^{L}
Time of Arrest	.30^{L}
Crime Type	.57^{L}
Crime Level	.38^{L}
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	.30
Prior Crime Type	*.07*^{L}
Prior Crime Level	.40^{L}

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. ^{L} indicates the use of a Likelihood Ratio due to low numbers.

As seen above in Table 19, a statistically significant result involved the geographic location of the arrest cases; arrest cases involving juveniles belonging to the three different racial/ethnic groups were found to differ as a function of geographic location of arrest, χ^2 (df = 8) = 20.88, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 20, this result is perhaps best accounted for by several interesting differences. For example, whereas the geographic location of arrest cases of Hispanic juveniles

was rarely in schools (less than 12%), it was much more common for Non-Hispanic White (over 26%) and Native American (nearly 40%) juvenile arrest cases. Similarly, whereas the geographic location of arrest cases of Native American juveniles was rarely at a home (less than 6%), it was much more common for Non-Hispanic White (over 25%) and Hispanic (over 34%) juvenile arrest cases. Finally, whereas the geographic location of arrest cases for Non-Hispanic White juveniles was rarely in a store (less than 8%), it was considerably more common for Hispanic (over 14%) and Native American (nearly 16%) juvenile arrest cases.

Table 20: Differences in Geographic Location of Arrest as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping		
Geographic Location of Arrest	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**
School	26.2	11.4	39.5
Park	2.8	0.0	0.0
Home	25.2	34.3	5.3
Store	7.5	14.3	15.8
Other	38.3	40.0	39.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and crime level information was available.

A second finding that seems important, although the result (at $p = .09$) fell short of the threshold for statistical significance, involved arresting agency; the type of agency recording arrest seemed to differ somewhat as a function of juveniles' racial/ethnic group. This finding was accounted for by a higher percentage of arrests cases recorded by city police officers involving Native American (nearly 82%) and Hispanic (just over 77%) juveniles than Non-Hispanic White juveniles (less than 65%); conversely, a higher percentage of arrest cases recorded by sheriff's deputies involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles (nearly 36%) than Hispanic (just under 23%) and Native American (approximately 18%) juveniles.

The final finding that seems important, although the result ($p = .07$) also fell short of the threshold for statistical significance, involved prior crime type; the type of prior crime recorded seemed to differ somewhat as a function of juveniles' racial/ethnic group. As seen below in Table 21, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Regarding crimes against persons, more arrest cases containing this as a prior crime involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles (nearly 47%) than Native American (37%) and Hispanic (just over 26%) juveniles. Cases documenting property crimes as the prior crime type were also somewhat more often found for Non-Hispanic White juveniles (nearly 33%) than for both Hispanic and Native American juveniles (both approximately 26%). Conversely, cases documenting drug and alcohol offenses as the prior crime type were considerably more common for Native American (nearly 30%) and Hispanic (nearly 22%) juveniles than for Non-Hispanic White juveniles (less than 8%).

Table 21: Differences in Prior Crime Type as a Function of Race/Ethnicity			
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping		
Crime Type	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**
Sex Offenses	0.0	8.7	0.0
Crimes Against Persons	46.9	26.1	37.0
Property Crimes	32.8	26.1	25.9
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	7.8	21.7	29.6
Traffic Offenses	3.1	4.3	0.0
Other Crimes/Offenses	9.4	13.0	7.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and prior crime type information was available.

After assessing for potential differences in demographic and situational characteristics as a function of race/ethnicity, we moved on to a systematic assessment of whether and how all demographic and situational characteristics, including race/ethnicity, were associated with arrest outcomes, namely, whether cases were handled within the department or referred to another authority (which often, though not always, meant detention in the 3B JDC in Bonneville County). All situational and demographic characteristics were tested for association with arrest outcomes, and as seen below in Table 22, four characteristics (age, arresting agency, crime type, and whether or not the juvenile had committed a prior crime) emerged as significantly associated with arrest outcomes, and two (geographic location of arrest and time) were found to be associated at a level indicating a non-significant trend. Importantly for this assessment of DMC, race/ethnicity was not found to be associated with arrest outcome.

Table 22: Significance of Demographic and Situational Characteristics in Association with Arrest Outcomes	
Demographic/Situational Characteristic	**Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value**
Gender	.62
Age	**< .05**
Race/Ethnicity	.59
Arresting Agency	**< .01**
Geographic Location of Arrest	*.09*[L]
Time of Arrest	*.06*[L]
Crime Type	**< .001**[L]
Crime Level	.37
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	**< .001**[L]
Prior Crime Type	.74[L]
Prior Crime Level	.56[L]

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. [L] indicates the use of a Likelihood ratio due to low numbers.

Crime type was found to be strongly associated with arrest outcomes, χ^2 (df = 5) = 45.82, $p <$ .001. As seen below in Table 23, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Whereas cases with most crimes were handled within the department (at a rate of 80% or higher), cases involving Other crimes/offenses led to a referral to other authorities nearly 64% of the time. As noted in previous years, this is not surprising given that over half of all Other cases involved a warrant for arrest.

Table 23: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Crime Type		
Crime Type	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
Sex Offenses	100.0	0.0
Crimes Against Persons	80.0	20.0
Property Crimes	90.6	9.4
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	93.3	6.7
Traffic Offenses	88.9	11.1
Other Crimes/Offenses	36.2	63.8

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime level and arrest outcome information was available.

Whether or not juveniles in the arrest cases had a prior arrest noted was also strongly and significantly associated with arrest outcome, χ^2 (df = 1) = 15.14, $p < .001$. This result was accounted for by cases of juveniles with no prior arrests noted being more often handled within the department (more than 92% of the time) than cases of juveniles with prior arrests noted (less than 61%).

The third significant finding involved arresting agency; whether juveniles were arrested by police officers or sheriff's deputies was associated with arrest outcome, χ^2 (df = 1) = 7.62, $p <$ .01. This result was accounted for by cases of juveniles arrested by sheriff's deputies (at over 88%) being more often being handled within the department than cases of juveniles arrested by police officers (over 65%).

The fourth significant finding involved the age of juveniles in arrest cases. It was found that juveniles whose cases were handled within the department were significantly younger (*M* = 14.65 years of age, *SD* = 2.05) than juveniles whose cases were referred to another authority (*M* = 15.49 years of age, *SD* = 1.55), *t* (140) = -2.64, $p < .05$.

A fifth finding that seems important, although the result (at $p = .06$) fell just short of the threshold for statistical significance, involved time of arrest; when juveniles were arrested seemed associated with arrest outcome. As seen below in Table 24, cases involving juveniles arrested between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m. (86%) were more often handled within the department than cases involving juveniles arrested between 12:00 a.m. and 5:59 a.m. (60%), between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m. (nearly 62%), and between 12:00 p.m. and 5:59 p.m. (just under 70%).

Table 24: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Time of Arrest

Time of Arrest	Percentage Handled Within Department	Percentage Referred to Other Authority
12:00 a.m. – 5:59 a.m.	60.0	40.0
6:00 a.m. – 11:59 a.m.	61.5	38.9
12:00 p.m. – 5:59 p.m.	69.6	30.4
6:00 p.m. – 11:59 p.m.	86.0	14.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom time of arrest and arrest outcome information was available.

The last finding that seems important, although the result (at $p = .09$) also fell slightly short of the threshold for statistical significance, involved the geographic location of arrest; arrest outcomes seemed to differ as a function of where the arrests were made. As seen below in Table 25, this difference is perhaps best explained by cases involving juveniles arrested in stores (over 94%) almost always being handled within the department, whereas much higher percentages of cases of juveniles arrested in other locations (ranging from over 26% in schools to over 42% in homes) being referred to other authorities.

Table 25: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Geographic Location of Arrest		
Geographic Location	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
School	73.7	26.3
Park	66.7	33.3
Home	57.7	42.3
Store	94.1	5.9
Other	71.2	28.8

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom geographic location of arrest and arrest outcome information was available.

2015

Of the 172 cases for which gender information was documented, 119 (69.2%) involved males and 53 (30.8%) involved females.

Of the 171 cases for which age information was noted, the mean age was 15.20 years, with a median age of 16 years. The youngest juvenile was eight years old; 45 cases involved juveniles who were 17 years old (the oldest age, and the most common).

Of the 172 cases for which there was information about juveniles' race, 143 (83.1%) involved juveniles classified as White, 25 (14.5%) involved juveniles classified as Native American, and four (2.3%) involved juveniles classified as Black. Regarding ethnicity, among the same 172 cases, 40 (23.3%) involved juveniles classified as Hispanic, and 132 (76.7%) involved juveniles classified as Non-Hispanic. One-hundred sixty-eight of the cases could be coded into a combined race and ethnicity category, and 109 (64.9%) involved Non-Hispanic Whites, 34 (20.2%) involved Hispanics who were not also Native American, and 25 (14.9%) involved Native Americans (whether they were Hispanic or Non-Hispanic).

No cases involved a juvenile who was identified as being affiliated with a gang.

Of the 170 cases for which arresting agency information was noted, 129 (75.9%) involved juveniles arrested by city police and 41 (24.1%) involved juveniles arrested by sheriff's deputies.

The geographic location of the arrest cases was varied. Of the 168 cases on which geographic location of violations was noted, 38 (22.6%) were at homes, 28 (16.7%) were at schools, 10 (6.0%) were at stores, and nine (5.4%) were in parks. Eighty-three cases (49.4%) had geographic locations listed as "Other." Of these, 79 had more specific information on what the other location was. Forty-seven (or 59.4% of all Other locations) were documented as "Highway/Road/Alley," 17 (21.5%) were documented as "RTC," and seven (8.9%) were documented as "Government Building."

Of the 172 cases for which arrest time information was noted, the most common time block for arrest cases was 12:00 p.m. to 5:59 p.m.; 70 (40.7%) cases involved juveniles arrested during this

period. Forty-five cases (26.2%) involved juveniles arrested between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m., followed by 36 (20.9%) between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m., and 21 (12.2%) between 12:00 a.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The most common crime type among the arrest cases was drug and alcohol offense, which was noted in 35 (20.2%) of all cases. Other common crime types included property crimes and crimes against persons, which were noted in 31 (17.9%) and 30 (17.3%) cases, respectively. Traffic offenses were noted in 25 cases (14.5%), and sex offenses were noted in two cases (1.2%). Fifty cases (28.9%) were documented as "Other" crime types. Of these 50 Other cases, 30 (or 60.0%) were noted as involving warrants, and 17 (34.0%) were noted as involving runaway.

Crime level (whether felony, misdemeanor, or non-criminal offense) was documented for 168 juvenile arrest cases. Misdemeanor crimes were the most common, and noted in 151 cases (89.9%); felony crimes were noted in 13 cases (7.7%), followed by non-criminal offenses in four cases (2.4%).

Of all 173 cases, 108 (62.4%) involved juveniles for whom a prior crime was also noted. As noted earlier in this report, if there were multiple prior arrests for a juvenile, the one considered most serious was the one documented. Of the 108 cases with prior crimes, the most common categories were for crimes against persons and drug and alcohol offenses, both of which were documented in 33 cases (30.6% each). Twenty-three cases (21.3%) involved property crimes, four (3.7%) involved traffic offenses, and two (1.9%) involved sex offenses. Thirteen cases (12.0%) were coded as "Other." Among these cases, nine were for runaway, and three were for warrants, and one was for resisting arrest.

The crime level of prior crimes was noted for 36 cases. Thirty-five (97.2%) of these were misdemeanors, and one (2.8%) was a felony.

Six cases, constituting 3.5% of the entire sample, were denoted as having involved a weapon.

An arrest outcome was noted in 173 cases. Of these, 131 (75.7%) were noted as having been "Handled within Department" and 42 (24.3%) were noted as having been "Referred to Other Authority."

As a primary function of DMC assessments is to understand whether race/ethnicity is associated with juvenile arrest patterns, for the 2015 data we performed a series of analyses to determine whether Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, and Native American juvenile arrest cases differed as a function of any demographic or situational characteristics. As seen below in Table 26, two statistically significant results were found, in this case, regarding the arresting agency and prior crime type. These results are explained further beneath the table.

Table 26: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity	
Demographic/Situational Characteristic	**Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value**
Gender	.48
Age	.62
Arresting Agency	**< .05**
Geographic Location of Arrest	.30[L]
Time of Arrest	.75[L]
Crime Type	.19[L]
Crime Level	.20[L]
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	.81
Prior Crime Type	**< .05**[L]
Prior Crime Level	.18[L]

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. [L] indicates the use of a Likelihood Ratio due to low numbers.

The first statistically significant result involved arresting agency; the type of agency recording arrest was found to differ as a function of juveniles' racial/ethnic group, χ^2 (df = 2) = 6.51, $p <$ .05. This finding was accounted for by a higher percentage of arrests cases recorded by city police officers involving Native American (nearly 92%) and Hispanic (over 82%) juveniles than Non-Hispanic White juveniles (just over 69%); conversely, a higher percentage of arrest cases recorded by sheriff's deputies involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles (nearly 31%) than Hispanic (less than 18%) and Native American (approximately 8%) juveniles.

The second statistically significant result involved prior crime type; the type of prior crime recorded was found to differ as a function of juveniles' racial/ethnic group, χ^2 (df = 2) = 17.22, p < .05. As seen below in Table 27, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Regarding crimes against persons, more arrest cases containing this as a prior crime involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles (over 34%) than Hispanic (nearly 23%) and Native American (less than 18%) juveniles. Cases documenting property crimes as the prior crime were considerably more common for Native American (over 41%) and Hispanic (over 36%) juveniles than Non-Hispanic White juveniles (less than 12%). Other crimes/offenses were also more common among Native American (nearly 18%) and Non-Hispanic White (nearly 15%) juveniles than Hispanic juveniles (no cases involving Hispanic juveniles documented this type of crime).

Table 27: Differences in Prior Crime Type as a Function of Race/Ethnicity			
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping		
Crime Type	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**
Sex Offenses	3.0	0.0	0.0
Crimes Against Persons	34.3	22.7	17.6
Property Crimes	11.9	36.4	41.2
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	32.8	31.8	23.5
Traffic Offenses	3.0	9.1	0.0
Other Crimes/Offenses	14.9	0.0	17.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and prior crime type information was available.

After assessing for potential differences in demographic and situational characteristics as a function of race/ethnicity, we moved on to a systematic assessment of whether and how all demographic and situational characteristics, including race/ethnicity, were associated with arrest outcomes, namely, whether cases were handled within the department or referred to another authority (which often, though not always, meant detention in the 3B JDC in Bonneville County). All situational and demographic characteristics were tested for association with arrest outcomes, and as seen below in Table 28, four characteristics (race/ethnicity, crime type, prior crime type, and whether or not the juvenile had committed a prior crime) emerged as significantly associated with arrest outcomes, and one (geographic location of arrest) was found to be associated at a level indicating a non-significant trend. Because this entire project is an assessment of causes and explanations of DMC, it is important to emphasize that in 2015 (unlike in the previous four years), race/ethnicity was found to be significantly associated with arrest outcomes. As a result, this finding was further explored with additional analyses and is discussed separately from the other findings below.

Table 28: Significance of Demographic and Situational Characteristics in Association with Arrest Outcomes	
Demographic/Situational Characteristic	**Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value**
Gender	.72
Age	.51
Race/Ethnicity	**< .01**
Arresting Agency	.78
Geographic Location of Arrest	*.05*^{L}
Time of Arrest	.42^{L}
Crime Type	**< .001**^{L}
Crime Level	.33^{L}
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	**< .05**^{L}
Prior Crime Type	**< .05**^{L}
Prior Crime Level	.15^{L}

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. ^{L} indicates the use of a Likelihood ratio due to low numbers.

Crime type was found to be strongly associated with arrest outcomes, χ^2 (df = 5) = 55.56, $p <$ .001. As seen below in Table 29, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Whereas cases involving most crimes were handled within the department (at a rate of 90% or higher), cases involving crimes against persons led to a referral to other authorities one-third of the time, and Other crimes/offenses led to a referral to other authorities 58% of the time. As noted in previous years, this is not surprising given that over half of all Other cases involved a warrant for arrest.

Table 29: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Crime Type		
Crime Type	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
Sex Offenses	100.0	0.0
Crimes Against Persons	66.7	33.3
Property Crimes	100.0	0.0
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	91.4	8.6
Traffic Offenses	100.0	0.0
Other Crimes/Offenses	42.0	58.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime level and arrest outcome information was available.

Whether or not juveniles in the arrest cases had a prior arrest noted was also significantly associated with arrest outcome, χ^2 (df = 1) = 6.16, $p < .05$. This result was accounted for by cases of juveniles with no prior arrests noted being more often handled within the department (86% of the time) than cases of juveniles with prior arrests noted (69%).

Prior crime type was also significantly associated with arrest outcomes, χ^2 (df = 5) = 9.69, $p <$ .05. As seen below in Table 30, this difference is likely attributable to several results. The most stark pattern is that 100% of cases involving a juvenile with a prior sex offense resulted in a referral to other authorities, whereas 100% of cases involving a juvenile with a prior traffic offense resulted in being handled within the department. This finding, however, is based upon very small numbers; there were only two cases with the prior crime documented as a sex offense, and only four cases with the prior crime being documented as traffic offense. Another pattern, which is based on larger numbers, shows that cases involving property crimes as the prior crime type more often led to a referral to other authority (at nearly 44%) than cases involving prior crimes documented as crimes against persons (at approximately 30%), drug and alcohol offenses (at over 27%), and Other crimes/offenses (at less than 16%).

Table 30: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Prior Crime Type

Prior Crime Type	Percentage Handled Within Department	Percentage Referred to Other Authority
Sex Offenses	0.0	100.0
Crimes Against Persons	69.7	30.3
Property Crimes	56.5	43.5
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	72.7	27.3
Traffic Offenses	100.0	0.0
Other Crimes/Offenses	84.6	15.4

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime level and arrest outcome information was available.

The last finding that seems important, although the result (at $p = .05$) fell slightly short of the threshold for statistical significance, involved the geographic location of arrest; arrest outcomes seemed to differ as a function of where the arrests were made. As seen below in Table 31, this difference is perhaps best explained by cases involving juveniles arrested in stores (100%) always being handled within the department, whereas higher percentages of cases of juveniles arrested in other locations (ranging from just over 11% in parks to over 31% in Other locations) being referred to other authorities.

Table 31: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Geographic Location of Arrest

Geographic Location	Percentage Handled Within Department	Percentage Referred to Other Authority
School	82.1	17.9
Park	88.9	11.1
Home	76.3	23.7
Store	100.0	0.0
Other	68.7	31.3

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom geographic location of arrest and arrest outcome information was available.

As noted earlier, in the analysis of the 2015 data, we found a result that we had not found in any other year's data; specifically, we found that among the juvenile arrest cases randomly sampled from 2015, arrest outcomes differed significantly as a function of race, χ^2 (df = 2) = 10.06, $p <$ .01. This result was accounted for by a greater percentage of arrest cases involving Native American juveniles (12 out of 25, or 48%) resulting in a referral to other authorities than cases involving Non-Hispanic White (23 out of 109, or just over 21%) and Hispanic (five out or 34, or less than 15%) juveniles. Findings such as this can be disconcerting, as at least on the surface, they suggest some evidence that race/ethnicity may a factor in how juvenile arrest cases are handled.

As discussed in previous DMC reports (e.g., Healy, McDonald, Gazieva, Begic, & Toussaint, 2014; Lind, Miller, Carver, & McDonald, 2010) conducted by the same group of researchers, whenever race/ethnicity is one of several variables that are associated with arrest outcome to a statistically significant degree, it becomes important to assess whether the association between race/ethnicity and arrest outcomes holds when the variance accounted for by the other variables is controlled for, or whether this association is confounded by another variable(s) that is also associated with arrest outcome. To assess this possibility, a logistic regression analysis was conducted, entering the four variables that emerged as statistically significantly associated with arrest outcomes (i.e., crime type, race/ethnicity, prior crime type, and whether or not a juvenile had been previously arrested) and the one that was marginally significantly associated with arrest outcomes to assess the unique ability of each possible predictor to significantly predict arrest outcomes, independent of shared variance with other possible predictors. The outcome of this analyses showed that whereas crime type (Wald = 14.47, $p < .001$) and prior crime type (Wald = 4.52, $p < .05$) remained as significant, independent predictors of arrest outcome, race/ethnicity, whether or not a juvenile had previously been arrested, and geographic location of arrest were no longer significantly associated with arrest outcome. This result suggests that, much like in years 2011-2014, there was also no evidence that juveniles' race/ethnicity was itself a factor predicting arrest outcomes in 2015. Instead, the DMC noted in the RRIs was likely because juveniles of certain racial/ethnic characteristics systematically differed from others in terms of the types of crimes they were arrested for and the types of prior crimes they had committed.

All Years in Aggregate

Of the 966 cases for which gender information was documented, 687 (71.1%) involved males and 279 (28.9%) involved females.

Of the 964 cases for which age information was noted, the mean age was 14.98 years, with a median age of 15 years. The youngest juvenile was seven years old; 242 cases involved juveniles who were 17 years old (the oldest age, and the most common).

Of the 967 cases for which there was information about juveniles' race, 764 (79.0%) involved juveniles classified as White, 184 (19.0%) involved juveniles classified as Native American, and 17 (1.8%) involved juveniles classified as Black. Regarding ethnicity, among the same 967 cases, 302 (31.2%) involved juveniles classified as Hispanic, and 665 (68.8%) involved juveniles classified as Non-Hispanic. Nine hundred fifty-three of the cases could be coded into a combined race and ethnicity category, and 498 (52.3%) involved Non-Hispanic Whites, 271 (28.4%)

involved Hispanics who were not also Native American, and 184 (19.3%) involved Native Americans (whether they were Hispanic or Non-Hispanic).

Only one juvenile case (representing .001% of the entire sample) involved a juvenile who was identified as being affiliated with a gang.

Of the 965 cases for which arresting agency information was noted, 729 (75.5%) of the cases involved juveniles arrested by police officers and 236 (24.5%) involved juveniles arrested by sheriff's deputies.

The geographic location of the arrest cases was varied. Of the 952 cases for which geographic location of violations was noted, 231 (24.3%) were at schools, 208 (21.8%) were at homes, 75 (7.9%) were at stores, and 29 (3.0%) were in parks. Four hundred nine (49.4%) cases had geographic locations listed as "Other." Two hundred thirty (or 56.2% of all Other locations) cases were documented as "Highway/Road/Alley," 82 (20.0%) were documented as "RTC," and 42 (10.2%) were documented as "Government Building."

Of the 966 cases for which arrest time information was noted, the most common time block for arrest cases was 12:00 p.m. to 5:59 p.m.; 375 cases (38.8%) involved juveniles arrested during this period. Two hundred fifty-four cases (26.3%) involved juveniles arrested between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m., followed by 230 (23.7%) between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m., and 107 (11.1%) between 12:00 a.m. and 5:59 a.m.

The most common crime type among the arrest cases was property crime, which was noted in 200 (20.6%) of all cases, followed closely by drug and alcohol offenses, which were noted in 195 cases (20.1%). Another common crime type was crimes against persons, which was noted in 173 cases (17.9%). Traffic offenses were noted in 111 cases (11.5%), and sex offenses were noted in 13 cases (1.3%). Two hundred seventy-seven cases (28.6%) were documented as "Other" crime types. Of these, 151 cases (or 51.5% of all Other cases) were noted as involving warrants, and 87 (31.4%) involving runaway. The next most common Other crime type was curfew violation, which with nine cases represented just less than 1% of all Other cases.

Crime level (whether felony, misdemeanor, or non-criminal offense) was documented for 916 juvenile arrest cases. Misdemeanor crimes were the most common, and noted in 743 cases (81.1%); non-criminal offenses were noted in 102 cases (11.1%), followed by felony crimes in 71 cases (7.8%).

Of all 969 cases, 610 (63.0%) involved juveniles for whom a prior crime was also noted. As noted earlier in this report, if there were multiple prior arrests for a juvenile, the one considered most serious was the one documented. Of the 610 cases with prior crimes, the most common crime types were crimes against persons with 265 cases (43.4%) and property crimes with 166 cases (27.2%). One hundred four cases (17.0%) involved drug and alcohol offenses, 19 (3.1%) involved traffic offenses, and 17 (2.8%) involved sex offenses. Thirty-nine cases (6.4%) were coded as "Other." Among these cases, 19 were for runaway, four each were for warrants and disturbing the peace.

The crime level of prior crimes was noted for 175 cases. One hundred sixty-four (93.7%) of these were misdemeanors, and 11 (6.3%) were felonies.

Fifteen cases, constituting 1.6% of the entire sample, were denoted as having involved a weapon.

An arrest outcome was noted in 843 cases. Of these, 599 (71.1%) were noted as having been "Handled within Department" and 244 (28.9%) were noted as having been "Referred to Other Authority."

As a primary function of DMC assessments is to understand whether race/ethnicity is associated with juvenile arrest patterns, for the all-years aggregate data we performed a series of analyses to determine whether Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, and Native American juvenile arrest cases differed as a function of any demographic or situational characteristics. As seen below in Table 32, six statistically significant results were found, in this case, regarding juvenile gender, age, the arresting agency, prior crime type, whether or not the juveniles had committed a prior crime, and the geographic location of the arrest. Crime type was found to be associated at a level indicating a non-significant trend. These results are explained further beneath the table.

Table 32: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

Demographic/Situational Characteristic	Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value
Gender	**< .01**
Age	**< .05**
Arresting Agency	**< .01**
Geographic Location of Arrest	**< .05**^{L}
Time of Arrest	.59^{L}
Crime Type	*.06*^{L}
Crime Level	.59
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	**< .001**^{L}
Prior Crime Type	**< .05**^{L}
Prior Crime Level	.96^{L}

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. ^{L} indicates the use of a Likelihood Ratio due to low numbers.

The first statistically significant result involved whether or not the juvenile arrest cases involved boys or girls; arrest cases involving juveniles belonging to the three different racial/ethnic groups were found to differ as a function of gender, χ^2 (df = 2) = 10.04, $p < .01$. This result was accounted for by arrest cases involving Hispanic juveniles significantly more often involving boys (nearly 77%) than cases involving both Non-Hispanic White (just over 71%) and (especially) Native American (63%) juveniles; conversely, arrest cases involving girls were significantly more common among Native American (37%) and (to a lesser extent) Non-Hispanic White (just under 29%) juveniles than Hispanic juveniles (just over 23%).

The second statistically significant result involved the age of juveniles in the arrest cases. It was found that Non-Hispanic White juveniles (M = 15.11, SD = 1.86) were significantly older at the time of arrest than Native American juveniles (M = 14.63, SD = 1.99), with Hispanic juveniles (M = 14.99, SD = 1.86) not differing from either group, F (2, 946) = 4.62, $p < .05$.

The third statistically significant result involved arresting agency; the type of agency recording arrest was found to differ as a function of juveniles' racial/ethnic group, χ^2 (df = 2) = 12.77, $p <$ .01. This finding was accounted for by a higher percentage of arrest cases recorded by police officers involving Native American (just over 83%) and Hispanic (over 78%) juveniles than Non-Hispanic White juveniles (less than 71%); conversely, a higher percentage of arrest cases recorded by sheriff's deputies involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles (over 29%) than Hispanic (less than 22%) and Native American (just under 17%) juveniles.

The fourth significant result involved the geographic location of arrest; geographical location of arrest differed as a function of juveniles' racial/ethnic group, χ^2 (df = 8) = 17.02, $p < .05$. As seen below in Table 33, this difference is perhaps best explained by arrest cases involving Native American juveniles (over 34%) more often taking place at schools than arrest cases involving Hispanic (less than 26%) and White (less than 21%) juveniles, and by arrest cases involving White and Hispanic juveniles (both approximately 24%) more often taking place at homes than arrest cases involving Native American juveniles (less than 15%).

Table 33: Differences in Geographic Location of Arrest as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping		
Geographic Location of Arrest	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**
School	20.6	25.5	34.4
Park	3.3	2.7	2.7
Home	24.1	23.6	14.8
Store	8.4	7.6	7.1
Other	43.7	40.7	41.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and prior crime type information was available.

The fifth statistically significant result involved whether or not juvenile arrest cases noted the existence of a prior crime; arrest cases involving juveniles belonging to the three different racial/ethnic groups were found to differ in how often a prior crime was noted, χ^2 (df = 2) = 21.34, $p < .001$. This result was accounted for by arrest cases involving Native American and Hispanic juveniles more often noting at least one prior arrest (at over 72% and over 69%, respectively) compared to arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles (at approximately 56%).

The sixth statistically significant result involved prior crime type; the type of prior crime recorded was found to differ as a function of juveniles' racial/ethnic group, χ^2 (df = 10) = 21.13, $p < .05$. As seen below in Table 34, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Cases documenting property crimes as the prior crime type were considerably more common for Native

American juveniles (nearly 36%) than for Non-Hispanic White and Hispanic juveniles (both approximately 25%). Although the numbers for both types of prior crimes were relatively small, both sex offenses and traffic offenses as prior crime types were higher for both Non-Hispanic White and Hispanic juveniles (less than 3% and approximately 5% respectively for sex offenses and nearly 4% for both for traffic offenses) than for Native American juveniles (0% for sex offenses and less than less than 1% for traffic offenses).

Table 34: Differences in Prior Crime Type as a Function of Race/Ethnicity			
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping		
Prior Crime Type	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**
Sex Offenses	2.5	5.3	0.0
Crimes Against Persons	44.3	41.5	42.4
Property Crimes	25.0	25.5	35.6
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	16.8	19.1	15.9
Traffic Offenses	3.9	3.7	0.8
Other Crimes/Offenses	7.5	4.8	5.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and prior crime type information was available.

The last finding that seems important, although the result (at $p = .06$) fell slightly short of the threshold for statistical significance, involved crime type; the type of crime recorded seemed to differ somewhat as a function of juveniles' racial/ethnic group. As seen below in Table 35, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Cases documenting property crimes as the crime type were somewhat more common for Native American juveniles (nearly 26%) than for Non-Hispanic White (just over 20%) and Hispanic (nearly 18%) juveniles. Traffic offenses as the crime type were more common for both Hispanic (14%) and Non-Hispanic White (12%) juveniles than for Native American juveniles (less than 7%). Finally, and although the numbers were quite small, sex offenses as the crime type were more common for Non-Hispanic White juveniles (over 2%) than for both Native American and Hispanic juveniles (both approximately 0.5%).

Table 35: Differences in Crime Type as a Function of Race/Ethnicity			
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping		
Crime Type	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Native American**
Sex Offenses	2.2	0.4	0.5
Crimes Against Persons	15.9	19.9	18.5
Property Crimes	20.1	17.7	25.5
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	21.1	19.9	19.0
Traffic Offenses	12.0	14.0	6.5
Other Crimes/Offenses	28.7	28.0	29.9
Total	100.0		100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and prior crime type information was available.

After assessing for potential differences in demographic and situational characteristics as a function of race/ethnicity, for the all-years aggregate data we moved on to a systematic assessment of whether and how all demographic and situational characteristics, including race/ethnicity, were associated with arrest outcomes, namely, whether cases were handled within the department or referred to another authority (which often, though not always, meant detention in the 3B JDC in Bonneville County). All situational and demographic characteristics were tested for association with arrest outcomes, and as seen below in Table 36, seven characteristics (age, race/ethnicity, geographic location of arrest, time of arrest, crime type, crime level, and whether or not the juvenile had committed a prior crime) emerged as significantly associated with arrest outcomes, and one (prior crime level) was found to be associated at a level indicating a non-significant trend. Because this entire project is an assessment of causes and explanations of DMC, it is important to emphasize that in the all-years aggregate data (as in 2015, but unlike in the prior four years), race/ethnicity was found to be significantly associated with arrest outcomes. As a result, this finding was further explored with additional analyses and is discussed separately from the other findings below.

Table 36: Significance of Demographic and Situational Characteristics in Association with Arrest Outcomes

Demographic/Situational Characteristic	Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value
Gender	.61
Age	**< .05**
Race/Ethnicity	**< .05**
Arresting Agency	.19
Geographic Location of Arrest	**< .001**
Time of Arrest	**< .05**
Crime Type	**< .001**
Crime Level	**< .05**
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	**< .001**
Prior Crime Type	.18
Prior Crime Level	*.09* [L]

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. *p* values that suggest a non-significant trend are in italics. [L] indicates the use of a Likelihood ratio due to low numbers.

The first statistically significant result showed that arrest outcomes differed as a function of age, t (836) = -2.21, $p < .05$. This finding was accounted for by juveniles in arrest cases resulting in a referral to other authority being significantly older (M = 15.19, SD = 1.74) than juveniles in arrest cases that were handled within the department (M = 14.88, SD = 1.92).

The second statistically significant result involved geographic location of arrest; arrest outcomes significantly differed as a function of where the arrests were made, χ^2 (df = 4) = 29.27, $p < .001$.

As seen below in Table 37, this difference is perhaps best explained by cases involving juveniles arrested in Other locations and homes (over 36% and 31%, respectively) more often resulting in a referral to an other authority than cases involving juveniles arrested in stores and parks (just over 10% and 12%, respectively).

Table 37: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Geographic Location of Arrest

Geographic Location	Percentage Handled Within Department	Percentage Referred to Other Authority
School	77.3	22.7
Park	88.0	12.0
Home	69.0	31.0
Store	89.9	10.1
Other	63.6	36.4

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom geographic location of arrest and arrest outcome information was available.

The third statistically significant result involved time of arrest; when juveniles were arrested was significantly associated with arrest outcome, χ^2 (df = 3) = 8.28, $p < .05$. As seen below in Table 38, cases involving juveniles arrested between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m. (80%) and between 6:00 p.m. and 11:59 p.m. (just over 75%) were more often handled within the department than cases involving juveniles arrested between 6:00 a.m. and 11:59 a.m. and between 12:00 p.m. and 5:59 p.m. (both approximately 68%).

Table 38: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Time of Arrest

Time of Arrest	Percentage Handled Within Department	Percentage Referred to Other Authority
12:00 a.m. – 5:59 a.m.	80.0	20.0
6:00 a.m. – 11:59 a.m.	68.0	32.0
12:00 p.m. – 5:59 p.m.	67.6	32.4
6:00 p.m. – 11:59 p.m.	75.1	24.9

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom time of arrest and arrest outcome information was available.

The fourth statistically significant result involved crime type; arrest outcomes significantly differed as a function of the type of crime reported, χ^2 (df = 5) = 205.86, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 39, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Whereas cases with most crimes were handled within the department (at a rate of 85% or higher), cases involving crimes against persons led to a referral to other authorities one-third of the time, and Other crimes/offenses led to a referral to other authorities 63% of the time. As noted earlier, this is not surprising given that over half of all Other cases involved a warrant for arrest.

Table 39: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Crime Type		
Crime Type	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
Sex Offenses	87.5	12.5
Crimes Against Persons	66.7	33.3
Property Crimes	85.3	14.7
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	90.5	9.5
Traffic Offenses	93.4	6.6
Other Crimes/Offenses	37.0	63.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime level and arrest outcome information was available.

The fifth statistically significant result involved crime level; arrest outcomes significantly differed by whether the crime was a felony, misdemeanor, or non-criminal offense, χ^2 (df = 2) = 7.09, $p < .05$. As seen below in Table 40, this result is best accounted for by arrest cases involving misdemeanor crimes (over 73%) being more often handled within the department than non-criminal offenses (over 66%), which in turn were more often handled in the department than felony crimes (over 58%).

Table 40: Differences in Arrest Outcomes as a Function of Crime Level		
Crime Level	**Percentage Handled Within Department**	**Percentage Referred to Other Authority**
Felony	58.3	41.7
Misdemeanor	73.2	26.8
Non-Criminal Offense	66.3	33.7

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime level and arrest outcome information was available.

The sixth statistically significant result involved whether or not juveniles in the arrest cases had a prior arrest noted; arrest outcomes significantly differed by whether or not juveniles had a prior arrest, χ^2 (df = 1) = 65.84, $p < .001$. This result was accounted for by cases of juveniles with no prior arrests noted being more often handled within the department (87% of the time) than cases of juveniles with prior arrests noted (61%).

Another finding that seems important, although the result (at $p = .09$) fell short of the threshold for statistical significance, involved prior crime level; arrest outcomes seemed to differ somewhat as a function of whether the prior crime noted was a felony or a misdemeanor. This result was accounted for by a much greater percentage of arrest cases involving juveniles who

had a misdemeanor prior arrest (62%) being handled within the department than arrest cases involving juveniles who had a felony prior arrest (36%).

As noted earlier, in the analysis of the all-years data, we found a result that was found in the 2015 data, but in no other year; specifically, we found that among the juvenile arrest cases randomly sampled from across all years, arrest outcomes differed significantly as a function of race, χ^2 (df = 2) = 6.15, $p < .05$. This result was accounted for by a greater percentage of arrest cases involving Native American juveniles (54 out of 148, or nearly 37%) resulting in a referral to other authorities than cases involving Hispanic (69 out of 241, or less than 29%) and Non-Hispanic White (114 out or 441, or just under 26%) juveniles. Findings such as this can be disconcerting, as at least on the surface, they suggest some evidence that race/ethnicity may a factor in how juvenile arrest cases are handled.

As we did with the 2015 data, we proceeded to assess whether the association between race/ethnicity and arrest outcomes held when the variance accounted for by the other variables was accounted for, or whether this association was confounded by another variable(s) that was also associated with arrest outcome. Again, a logistic regression analysis was conducted, entering the seven variables that emerged as statistically significantly associated with arrest outcomes (i.e., age, race/ethnicity, geographic location of arrest, time of arrest, crime type, crime level, and whether or not a juvenile had been previously arrested) and the one that was marginally significantly associated with arrest outcomes (prior crime level) to assess the unique ability of each possible predictor to significantly predict arrest outcomes, independent of shared variance with other possible predictors. The outcome of this analyses showed that whereas crime type (Wald = 4.22, $p < .05$) and prior crime level (Wald = 4.74, $p < .05$) continued as significant, independent predictors of arrest outcome, age, race/ethnicity, geographic location of arrest, arrest time, crime level, and whether or not a juvenile had previously been arrested were no longer significantly associated with arrest outcome. This result suggests that across all years, as within each individual year, there was also no evidence that juveniles' race/ethnicity was itself a factor predicting arrest outcomes in 2015. Instead, the DMC noted in the RRIs was likely because juveniles of certain racial/ethnic characteristics systematically differed from others in terms of the types of crimes they were arrested for and the levels of prior crimes they had committed.

Comparison Across Years

Although it was not a primary function of this DMC assessment, it seemed valuable to understand whether any differences in demographic and/or situational characteristics of juvenile crime cases existed as a function of calendar year. As seen below in Table 41, five statistically significant results were found, in this case, regarding the race/ethnicity, crime type, crime level, prior crime type, and prior crime level. These results are explained further beneath the table.

Table 41: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Calendar Year	
Demographic/Situational Characteristic	**Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value**
Gender	.97
Age	.62
Race/Ethnicity	**< .001**
Arresting Agency	.39
Geographic Location of Arrest	.15[L]
Time of Arrest	.24[L]
Crime Type	**< .05**[L]
Crime Level	**< .01**[L]
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	1.00
Prior Crime Type	**< .001**[L]
Prior Crime Level	**< .05**[L]
Arrest Outcome	.18

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font. [L] indicates the use of a Likelihood Ratio due to low numbers.

A strong statistically significant result involved prior crime type; the type of prior crime was found to differ as a function of the calendar year of arrest, χ^2 (df = 20) = 50.17, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 42, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Regarding sex offenses, the percentage of juvenile arrest cases with a sex offense noted as a previous crime generally decreased across the years, from highs near 4% in years 2011-2012 to lows beneath 2% in years 2014 and 2015. A similar pattern existed regarding crimes against persons; whereas the percentage of juvenile arrest cases with crimes against persons noted as a prior crime type was approximately 50% in years 2011 and 2012, the percentage of such cases dropped markedly to less than 31% in 2015. On the other hand, the percentage of juvenile arrest cases with drug and alcohol offenses noted as a prior crime type increased across the years, from a low of approximately 10% in 2011 to a high of nearly 31% in 2015. The percentages of juvenile arrest cases with property crimes, traffic offenses, and Other crimes/offenses fluctuated across the years in fairly non-systematic ways.

Table 42: Differences in Prior Crime Type as a Function of Calendar Year					
	Percentage of Cases Within Calendar Years				
Prior Crime Type	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Sex Offenses	3.7	3.9	2.4	1.8	1.9
Crimes Against Persons	48.5	53.5	41.6	40.4	30.6
Property Crimes	26.9	20.2	37.6	29.8	21.3
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	10.4	16.3	14.4	15.8	30.6
Traffic Offenses	4.5	3.9	0.8	2.6	3.7
Other Crimes/Offenses	6.0	2.3	3.2	9.6	12.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom prior crime type and calendar year information was available.

The second statistically significant result involved race/ethnicity category; the percentages of arrest cases involving juveniles of the three race/ethnicity categories were found to differ as a function of the calendar year of arrest, χ^2 (df = 8) = 30.99, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 43, this difference is accounted for by the percentage of juvenile arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles increasing across the years (from approximately 45% in years 2011-2013 to nearly 60% in 2014 and nearly 65% in 2015), whereas the percentage of juvenile arrest cases involving Hispanic juveniles decreased markedly across the same years (from approximately 35% in years 2011-2012 to approximately 20% in years 2014-2015). The percentage of juvenile arrest cases involving Native American juveniles fluctuated in a non-linear fashion, peaking at nearly 22% in 2013 and falling to a low of just under 15% in 2015.

Table 43: Differences in the Race/Ethnicity of Juvenile Arrest Cases as a Function of Calendar Year					
	Percentage of Cases Within Calendar Years				
Race/Ethnicity Category	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Non-Hispanic White	46.4	44.2	49.2	59.4	64.5
Hispanic	36.4	34.7	28.9	19.4	20.2
Native American	17.2	21.1	21.8	21.1	14.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and calendar year information was available.

The third statistically significant result involved crime level; the percentages of arrest cases involving cases of juveniles arrested for felony, misdemeanor, and non-criminal offenses were found to differ as a function of the calendar year of arrest, χ^2 (df = 8) = 23.04, $p < .01$. As seen below in Table 44, this difference seems best accounted for anomalies in the percentages of juvenile arrest cases denoting misdemeanors and non-criminal offenses in 2015. Whereas between 77-84% of cases were denoted as misdemeanors between 2011-2014, the percentage increased markedly to just under 90% in 2015. An even more marked change involved cases that were denoted as non-criminal offenses, which ranged between 10-16% in 2011-2014 and fell to less than 3% in 2015. Whether this drop is due to actual changes in law enforcement practices, or

merely a greater level of sophistication in the researchers coding the arrest cases (e.g., crimes level that were coded as non-criminal offenses in earlier years were later recognized to be misdemeanors) can only be speculated.

Table 44: Differences in Crime Level as a Function of Calendar Year					
	Percentage of Cases Within Calendar Years				
Crime Level	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Felony	9.7	7.9	5.9	7.2	7.7
Misdemeanor	79.2	76.8	83.8	76.5	89.9
Non-Criminal Offense	11.1	15.3	10.3	16.3	2.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and calendar year information was available.

The fourth statistically significant result involved prior crime level; the percentages of arrest cases involving cases of juveniles arrested for felony or misdemeanor crimes (non-criminal offenses were not denoted as prior crimes in the arrest case database) were found to differ as a function of the calendar year of arrest, χ^2 (df = 8) = 12.68, $p < .05$. As seen below in Table 45, this difference seems best accounted for by anomalies in the percentages of juvenile arrest cases denoting misdemeanors and felonies as prior crimes in 2011. Whereas between 95-100% of cases denoted prior crimes as misdemeanors between 2012-2015, in 2011, the percentage was approximately 77%. Conversely, whereas less than 5% of cases denoted prior crimes as felonies between 2012-2015, the percentage was just over 23% in 2011. It is important to note, however, that only six juvenile arrest cases in 2011 had prior crimes that were denoted as felonies.

Table 45: Differences in Prior Crime Level as a Function of Calendar Year					
	Percentage of Cases Within Calendar Years				
Prior Crime Level	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Felony	23.1	0.0	4.7	4.8	2.8
Misdemeanor	76.9	100.0	95.3	95.2	97.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity and calendar year information was available.

The final statistically significant result involved crime type; the type of crime was found to differ as a function of the calendar year of arrest, χ^2 (df = 20) = 30.57, $p < .05$. As seen below in Table 46, this difference is likely attributable to several results. Regarding crimes against persons, the percentage of juvenile arrest cases with this crime type decreased considerably from approximately 21-23% in 2011-2012 to just over 12% in 2014, before rising back to over 17% in 2015. On the other hand, the percentage of juvenile arrest cases denoting an Other crime/offense rose in a linear fashion from just over 20% in 2011 to nearly 36% in 2014, before slipping back to just under 29% in 2015. The percentages of juvenile arrest cases with property crimes, drug and alcohol offense, and traffic offenses fluctuated across the years in fairly non-systematic ways.

Table 46: Differences in Crime Type as a Function of Calendar Year					
	Percentage of Cases Within Calendar Years				
Crime Type	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**
Sex Offenses	1.9	1.5	0.0	2.2	1.3
Crimes Against Persons	20.7	22.5	15.6	12.2	17.3
Property Crimes	24.9	18.1	21.1	20.6	17.9
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	20.7	18.1	22.1	19.4	20.2
Traffic Offenses	11.7	12.7	8.5	10.0	14.5
Other Crimes/Offenses	20.2	27.0	32.7	35.6	28.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime type and calendar year information was available.

Qualitative Data

As noted earlier in the report, this project was a multimodal assessment of factors related to juvenile arrest patterns in Bingham County, and involved the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data were covered in the last section of the report. The qualitative data, which are presented next, are gleaned from the focus group interviews of seven law enforcement officers, the focus group interview of five JPOs, personal interviews of the Bingham County Juvenile Court's judge and prosecutor, and focus group interview of three tribal members involved in juvenile justice. The results of these interviews will be discussed sequentially.

Law Enforcement Officers Focus Group Interview

The focus group interview protocol for use with law enforcement personnel, which was developed in collaboration with Alan Miller and local stakeholders, consisted of 12 items (see Appendix X) that can be clustered into three general areas:

- factors impacting law enforcement officers' decision to arrest juveniles, release them to parents, detain them, or find alternatives to detention, including any factors that may explain fluctuations in the frequency of crimes and arrests,
- potential variations across juveniles of different racial/ethnic groups in terms of their characteristics and types of crimes, and
- law enforcement officers' levels of interaction with Native American juveniles and collaboration with tribal law enforcement.

A total of seven law enforcement officers participated in the focus group interview; these included five patrol officers and two school resource officers (SROs). Participants were assigned identification numbers according to their seating arrangement in the room in which the interview was conducted. The duration of the interview, which was completed on June 14th, 2018, was approximately 60 minutes. Upon explaining the purpose of the focus group interview to the participants and briefly outlining the interview protocol, the principal investigator followed the

general interview outline (see Appendix X) while allowing some flexibility in the responses to prevent any unnecessary disruption in the flow of the conversation. Two members of the evaluation team took notes throughout the interview session, which each of them later transcribing their notes sequentially (i.e., one note taker transcribed her notes first, and the other added his notes subsequently). The transcribed interviews were analyzed using content analysis. The emerging themes, clustered into the three areas described above, are presented below.

Factors associated with the decision about whether or not to arrest or detain a juvenile

The first cluster of questions was focused on identifying factors that may influence law enforcement officers' decision about the outcome of their interaction with juveniles. More specifically, these questions asked the law enforcement officers what factors impact their decision to either arrest a juvenile or release him to his parents, take a juvenile to a detention facility, or find alternatives to placement to detention. All law enforcement officers contributed to the discussion. Their responses are summarized below thematically. Some factors that law enforcement officers identified included:

- Severity of the crime
    - More serious crimes are more likely to result in an arrest, whereas juveniles committing less serious crimes are more likely to be released to parents. However, in some instances, parents can be either difficult to get in contact with or may want the juvenile placed in detention even if the juvenile committed only a minor crime that would normally not warrant placement in detention. As one patrol officer stated, "Some parents are not really involved or interested in working to improve the circumstances of the children"
- Frequency of encounter with the juvenile
    - Officers described that their decision about whether to arrest or not is determined by the number of "tags" (i.e., first encounter with a juvenile due to vandalism will likely lead to the juvenile being released to parents, whereas 30 vandalism encounter may lead to an arrest)
- Nature of the crime
    - Victimless crimes are more likely to result in a release to parents, whereas outcomes of crimes involving a victim are frequently dictated by the decision of the victim (or his or her family) about whether or not to press charges. In the words of one officer, "It often comes down to what the victim wants"
- Bed availability
    - Officers described the limited bed availability at the 3B JDC as a factor that can dictate the outcome. As one officer described, "First question in making an arrest is often whether or not 3B has space available. There are only seven beds at the facility." Another officer indicated that if they have a juvenile who committed a serious crime and there are no beds available at the 3B facility, they will work with the prosecutor on identifying and releasing a less serious offender to allow them to book a juvenile for a violent crime
- Ability to locate parents
    - In those instances, in which officers are not able to locate the juvenile's parents, they have to place the juvenile in detention. The inability to locate the parents was

most prevalent among Hispanic and Native American youth. In the case of the Hispanic youth, this was mostly due to the circumstances of their parents' employment, with many Hispanic parents being farm workers, and a language barrier. The family circumstances of Native American youth included the absence of the father in most Native American households, and sometimes the absence of both parents, with relatives or even nonrelatives known as "aunties" often serving as primary caregivers

- Geography and income
    - Geographical separation in the case of Native American youth was identified as a deciding factor in some cases. Due to administrative, cultural, and de facto separation between Bingham County and Fall Hall Reservation, finding a simple solution with Native American youth can be particularly challenging
    - Certain parts of Blackfoot are associated with greater number of incidents. More specifically, "south side," which has a substantial number of low income families, was associated with a higher rate of incidents and "north side," which is more affluent, was associated with a lower rate of incidents
- Time of year and community events
    - Summer months, including end of trimester, have been reported to be associated with a spike in the frequency or crimes and arrests because youth are out of school and tend to spend more time unsupervised
    - Community events, such as fair week, were also identified as a time when crimes (especially underage drinking) occur with greater frequency. Processing Native American juveniles who engage in underage drinking during this time can be especially challenging because juveniles cannot be drunk on the reservation due to the status of Fort Hall Reservation as a "dry reservation"
- Limited availability of alternative placement options
    - Residential Treatment Center (RTC) was a place that all officers valued greatly and utilized frequently as it was considered to be a place where they could take juveniles who could either not be taken home for various reasons (e.g., family disputes or inability to get in contact with parents) and whose severity of crime was not appropriate for detention. Several officers described RTC as a "good halfway between 3B facility and release," "a good middle point." The closure of RTC was experienced as a loss of "a great program" by all officers. One officer described the value of the RTC program by noting that "sometimes home is not a good place to be, but jail is not good either," and adding, "This area truly hurt when the center closed." Another officer elaborated, "RTC was a great program. The staff even brought [the juveniles] to school, they did homework with them, too... RTC was effective. We saw success within the program." Summarizing the effects of the closure of RTC, which was considered as a good place that gave juveniles "some consistency in life that they didn't have otherwise," one officer noted that now they "turn [juveniles] to their parents who are fighting. The option used to be take them to RTC, allow the situation to cool off, but now that option is not here. I used to have three options: release to parents, RTC, 3B. Now that midlevel is gone." Overall, the officers expressed a great sense of loss associated with the closure of RTC, voicing a desire for reintroduction of something similar

in their community because "a lot of parents are drug or alcohol users, so taking the kid to RTC was a good option"
    - SROs have the ability to use diversion options, especially with first-time offenders. One SRO noted that he typically cites juveniles for the first offence and then places them on in-house probation, "I give them one year and day to stay out of trouble. If they do, the record of offence is removed. Ninety percent stay out of trouble, and I don't need to refile. The other 10% do get in trouble within a short time, and then I refile both cases." This SRO, who noted that he is in constant communication with teachers and other school staff, explained his approach, "We know these kids. We have a huge background on who these kids are, where they are headed." Several patrol officers followed up by noting that they frequently contact SROs "to help aid in making a decision to either arrest or cite"

All law enforcement officers agreed that they try to practice what they described as "solution-based policing" with all youth that they come in contact, regardless of their race or ethnicity, but that finding a simple solution may be complicated due to the complex interplay of two or more factors identified above. They also wanted to see programs "to keep kids out of trouble" and promote "positive solutions" in their community. One officer nicely articulated this position by stating, "It breaks your heart to see some of these kids become serious offenders later on. You know he started just drinking. It could have been prevented."

Nature of crimes across juveniles of different racial/ethnic groups

The second cluster of questions was aimed at identifying any variations across juveniles of different racial/ethnic groups in terms of any characteristics that may be unique to specific racial/ethnic groups and any variations in the types of crimes across racial/ethnic groups. More specifically, the law enforcement officers were asked about any common characteristics of juveniles from different racial/ethnic groups that they think may impact their involvement in delinquent acts and whether they had noticed any systematic variations in the types of crimes committed by juveniles from specific racial/ethnic groups. In addition, they were also asked to identify any significant events from 2011-2015 that may have influenced the number of contacts with law enforcement. All law enforcement officers contributed to the discussion. Their responses are summarized below thematically.

- Native American youth
    - Strong gang affiliation culture was named as an important feature among youth from the Fort Hall Reservation; however, officers noted that they frequently struggle with gang affiliation documentation (or, lack thereof), even though they often learn about juveniles' gang affiliation from the juveniles themselves
    - Native American youth live in a close-knit community, which can be an asset; however, this can also be a challenge because they do everything together, "Even crimes are committed together"
    - Lack of any kind of programming content (be it cultural, educational, and recreational) was identified as an issue for youth from Fort Hall. In the words of one officer, "Native American juveniles come to our district...they hang out here

in Blackfoot because there is nothing at the reservation…no major stores, no recreational activities, nothing…no pool, no movie theater, nothing"
    - Tribal laws, which differ from the county laws, can be an obstacle. Fort Hall is a "dry reservation," meaning that alcohol is not allowed. This leads juveniles to cross into Blackfoot to consume alcohol, and the arresting officer from Blackfoot can experience difficulties when trying to take that juvenile home. Illustratively, one officer explained, "If I try to take [intoxicated Native American juveniles] home, I get stopped by the tribal police and asked what's my business there. They threaten to call the Tribal Council, threaten that I am trespassing, etc. This make my job very difficult"
- Hispanic youth
    - Machoism, in addition to gang affiliation, was identified as a distinguishing feature among Hispanic youth
    - Language barrier was identified as an obstacle when attempting to establish communication with parents
    - Parents of Hispanic youth can be difficult to reach due to their long working hours in the agricultural fields; this also leads to little supervision, particularly in the summer when school is out of session
- Significant events in the 2011-2015 period
    - Closing of RTC was identified as the most significant event that occurred in the 2011-2015 period. As discussed elsewhere, all officers experienced this as a major loss of an important "middle level" for those juveniles that needed extra support that they were not receiving at home but were not committing offences that were serious enough for placement in detention
    - Loss of a SRO in Snake River due to budgetary restrictions, which place added burden on other SROs and deprives patrol officer of an important resource
    - Mushrooming of charter schools, which do not have a SRO and generally do not have the same rules as regular schools. In addition, juveniles who are expelled from regular schools will often go to a charter school because there is no SRO there. This also deprives patrol officers of an important resource, "If something happens on the bus, I can report it to the SRO, but with charter schools, where there is no SRO, I don't have that prevention step"

In sum, although gang affiliation was listed as a challenge that is associated with both Hispanic and Native American youth, a clear differentiation was drawn between these two groups. More specifically, it was noted that whereas gang affiliation among Hispanic youth has a tendency to oscillate, West Side Crip Villains, a Native American gang, has been active for over a decade. The specific issue related to this gang highlighted by the officers was the gang initiation crimes such as stealing or beating someone up that are required of new members. Inevitably, such initiation rites lead to a higher crime rate among this population.

The importance of community programs and SROs cannot be overstated as they offer an invaluable added resource to the patrol officers when deciding "what to do" with the offending juvenile. SROs often intimately know the situation of the juveniles. In the words of one SRO, "You get to form relationship, build trust. It takes a while to gain the trust of families and kids with problems." The value of SROs, who were described as "the greatest thing in the world" by

the patrol officers, is well articulated in the following quote, "I have been able to resolve some more serious situations because of my previous relationship with [family x] that I've formed with them while they were in school. For example, I was able to quickly deescalate a domestic violence situation that was turning into a hostage situation because of the preexisting relationship."

Finally, in reference to race/ethnicity of juveniles, one officer was very clear about not arresting juveniles based on their race or ethnicity but rather the type of crime they commit, "I get the question, 'Why do you cite so many Hispanic or Native kids?' I don't look at it this way. I get referrals. Those are the kids who were committing the crimes that day. We don't have control of the crimes. For example, we can't [prevent] Hispanics [from] committing more crimes. Statistics don't represent the truth. We don't target people of color. There is more to those statistics…We have 10 Blacks, and we have contact with nine. So, statistically, we are not doing well, but that's what it is."

Interaction with Native American juveniles and Tribal law enforcement

The third and final cluster of questions was concerned with developing a better understanding of any unique circumstances surrounding Native American youth. More specifically, the law enforcement officers were asked about their working relationship with tribal law enforcement, whether and under which conditions they transfer Native American juveniles to tribal law enforcement, any dynamics that affect their ability to work with Native American youth, and what they would do if they had the power to change that dynamic. All law enforcement officers contributed to the discussion. Their responses are summarized below thematically.

- Tribal patrol officers
    - All officers agreed that their working relationship with tribal patrol officers, whom they referred to as "boots on the ground," was very good. They described them as "helpful" and doing "what they can to help." For example, if a patrol officer cannot get into contact with a parent of an intoxicated Native American juvenile, he will contact a patrol officer on Fort Hall and ask him to go to the juvenile's home and see if anyone is there
- Tribal Council
    - The relationship with the Tribal Council was described as variable due to frequent changes in the council membership, "Tribal Council members change every two years. We'll have a good relationship with a council member, he'll get voted off and then you have to start over again."
    - Getting any type of agreement signed was described as extremely difficult because it end up becoming "a rat race in terms of who has jurisdiction over the kids"
- Native American juveniles
    - There was a general perception that the Native American juveniles know about the jurisdiction issues across the two entities, and "they leverage them." For example, if they commit a crime in Blackfoot, they know they are protected when they cross the river into the reservation. As one officer

described, “If they cross into the reservation, we can’t even go over the line to talk to them.” Another officer noted that “a lot of times, juveniles will talk to tribal officer, but they won’t talk to us”

- Dynamics influencing work with Native American youth
    - Major factors that officers felt affected their work with Native American youth were similar to what might affect their work with other juveniles, such as family characteristic (e.g., whether the families were strong and involved, whether one or both parents were absent), whereas others were more unique to Native Americans living on a reservation. Examples of the following included jurisdiction issues and the hierarchical structure of the tribe, with some families having higher social standards and power than others. As one officer described, “You talk to the kids, and they know exactly how it is. Kids will say, “I know I’m screwed because I don’t belong into this family... They know they will be affected because maybe a certain family is involved/elected into the Tribal Council but their family is not in council or a family in council doesn’t like the kid or the kid’s family. A lot of it is who you know and are connected to for the tribe kids”
- Suggestion for positive change
    - More recreational and cultural programming should be made available on the reservation, such as an afterschool program and recreational areas such as pools and parks should be built “so that tribal kids don’t have to come over to town for entertainment”
    - Reintroduce a “halfway house were kids could cool off” such as RTC
    - Make more addiction services available on the reservation, both for youth and for adults
    - Change gang culture by promoting positive activities
    - Promote “intact family”

Overall, law enforcement officers drew a clear line between the quality of their working relationship with tribal patrol officers, which was perceived to be very good, and the quality of their working relationship with the Tribal Council, which was described as challenging. Jurisdiction that stops at the line between Blackfoot and Fort Hall can present great challenges for the patrol officer, both those in Blackfoot and those in Fort Hall. For instance, Blackfoot patrol officers are prohibited from pursuing Native American juveniles as soon as they cross into Fort Hall. Conversely, Fort Hall patrol officers are unable to turn over a Native American juvenile to Blackfoot authorities for breaking the tribal law by consuming alcohol because alcohol consumption is not considered a crime in Blackfoot. In the words of one officer, “Here we deal with unique circumstances with jurisdiction. This requires a special set of training issues.”

Infractions

Law enforcement officers dedicated a significant amount of time to discussing infractions. Although they were not directly asked about this topic, they named infractions as an important factor that has “skewed the numbers” of arrests in the recent years. As they explained, the pathway for each type of offence used to be clearly defined, with a certain type of offence

leading to a misdemeanor charge, which in turn meant that the juvenile had to go before the judge and the judge, in collaboration with the parents, decided the sentence. The juvenile usually had to perform some type of community service, such as cleaning the streets. With the move toward infraction and away from misdemeanor in recent years, there is more flexibility, but the sentence (i.e., amount of money that the parent has to pay) is fixed, and there are little to no consequences for the juveniles themselves. As one officer explained, "This just puts a burden on the mom, but it has no impact on the kid." Another officer elaborated, "I used to see [juveniles] picking up trash at McDonald's. It's humiliating, humbling. Now, they are not required to that anymore, just pay the fine...which is basically punishing the mom rather than the kid." He also noted, "Having kids do community service can have a positive effect." The officers clearly preferred the misdemeanor policy that was in place before, and they viewed the new infraction policy as not very beneficial because "the juvenile is not really punished," and "the only [entity] benefiting from the new infraction policy is the court because they are making money."

Being a law enforcement officer

Another significant area that the officers were not specifically asked about but many discussed is what it meant to be a law enforcement officer and the misperceptions they often encounter. Explaining the large turnout of law enforcement officers for participation in this evaluation project, one officer stated, "We want a better solution. We want something to come out of this study. If we can learn to do something better, then that is great." Reiterating this position, one SRO noted, "We don't like arresting people. [There is a] stigma that officers are bad, officers just want to arrest you. But, we really just want to help, and we really want to help the kids." Echoing these sentiments, another officer added, "I don't think the general public understands what we do...how we make decisions, the constraints [that we face]. It isn't like they see in the movies. The victim often decides what will happen. Is there a bed available [in the detention center]?...There is a misunderstanding of what we do."

In discussing the limitations they deal with in their work, one officer noted the absence of training that teaches how to deescalate a situation, to prevent a shooting from happening in the first place, "I recently completed the active shooter training. There was nothing in the training that taught me how to stop it. I know what to do when it happens, but I cannot really stop it."

Officers were in agreement regarding their ability to identify juveniles who are likely to go deeper into the system as adults, but they also were very clear about the lack of diversion possibilities for those juveniles. As one officer explained, "I can identify kids who will be a problem, but my options are limited in terms of what can be done."

Poor parenting, including parents with and parents of children with substance abuse and mental health problems, was identified as a major issue by nearly all officers, with parents calling the police and asking them to arrest their extremely young children. One officer described a "bizarre situation," when he "got called on a 4-year old for taking a Coke out of the fridge." This shift in "parenting culture" was perceived as problematic because "now parents call the police on a child instead of dealing with the child themselves." In the words of one officer, "We have to respond to a call, no matter how nonsensical the call is. We have to go there. Usually, we disperse it quickly, but we have to show up."

Officers noted that whereas there were some treatment options for adults with mental health problems in their community, no such options were available for juveniles. This was identified as particularly problematic in view of a perceived increase in mental health issues, “We see a rise in mental health issues. We don’t know what is causing it, but we see that it’s been going up.” Perhaps related to the perceived increase in mental health issues among children is the perceived change in severity of crimes committed by juveniles, “We see more severe crimes that younger kids are creating...You go talk to kids, young kids, their language is more ‘rich,’ there is sexual content. I mean, charging an 8-year old for sex crime. It’s crazy!”

Finally, in regard to race/ethnicity, officers were unyielding about their unbiased approach to policing, with one officer concisely summing his and his colleagues’ approach, “We are charging people [who] deserve to be charged or arrested. It doesn’t matter what their color or creed or anything like that is.”

Juvenile Probation Officers Interview

The primary purpose of the juvenile probation officer interviews was to document these key informants’ perspectives of the diversion options available and to identify any limitations/challenges, trends and/or differences that might impact a particular racial or ethnic group. In addition, perceived recommendations and suggestions for future program improvement and implementation.

Partnership and Community Resources

Probation officers indicated that the utilization of assessment tools was a strength for providing juvenile baseline information when considering treatment plans. They felt that using these assessment tools helped gain perspectives about beneficial services for the youth. The probation officers mentioned that the information gained from the assessments allowed for a “bigger picture of services needed and led to success in recognizing how to work with the juveniles.” Probation officers mentioned that utilization of the assessment tools led to proper alignment to referral organizations, in particular, for the drug and/or alcohol cases, and mental health evaluations.

Probation officers mentioned the working relationship with the Native American tribes has slightly improved, however challenges exist. These positive working relationships were noted as being related to a more robust collaboration between the youth court and the Tribal Council (e.g., an arrest of a juvenile that was related to a Tribal Council member). The probation officers mentioned that when the two entities work together this offers a more successful environment for the Native American youth. It was noted that working together and providing services at the Fort Hall Detention Center as opposed to the 3B Detention Facility was beneficial for Native American youth due to the proximity of available resources. In addition, when the 3B Detention Facility was low on beds and space, the Native American youth would be the first to be denied access, therefore starting at the Fort Hall Detention Center was favorable.

Communication

The probation officers indicated that language barriers exist when working with the Hispanic population. The Hispanic parents and youth both struggled with English, and they were unable to

complete lesson assignments and homework. The youth tended to understand more English than their parents, however, they both had difficulties with speaking English.

The probation officers mentioned communication barriers with the tribal court system as an ongoing challenge when dealing with the Native American youth. More specifically, these communication barriers with the tribal court system involved a lack of sharing information between the two systems. As mentioned earlier the assessment results and having information about each juvenile situation and treatment plan were a vital tool to the coordination of referrals and services. A major challenge for the probation officers was that they did not usually receive complete assessment results in a timely manner. Probation officers reported that information was not readily available, the "whole story" was not being shared with them, and trying to complete follow-up treatments without the proper information was difficult.

Probation officers reported that the lack of communication between the tribal courts and the youth courts created challenges for consistent punishment of the Native American youth. Probation officers indicated a lack of accountability from the tribal courts regarding the Native American youth punishments, which led to a lack of trust between the youth courts and tribal courts. It was noted that several Native American youth were graduating from the tribal programs, however the youth were still testing positive for substances and were therefore needing continued treatment.

Truancies were listed as a major challenge due to the location of the elementary school on the Bingham County side of the dividing line with the reservation. These truancy cases were noted as lacking a clear distinction regarding which agency should to handle these cases, which created extra communication barriers and work for prosecutors.

Relationships

Probation officers indicated that good communication was key to "getting things done" and that the ability to communicate sometimes varied as the membership of Tribal Council changed. It was mentioned that probation officers with good relationships were able to "bridge the communication gap," however those strong relationships were limited. Probation officers felt the environment was very political in nature, and an important issue was "who you know." Probation officers indicated that without a strong relationship with a tribal member, there was inadequate progress and typically a non-responsive environment. It was reported that often the tribal courts were quick to ask for help and did not offer help in return, especially when the personnel in "good standing" were not involved with the conversations.

Family Environment

Several probation officers reported that a lack of family involvement contributed to challenges for youth, and even more importantly, the individual's family composition was a critical factor. They believed that the more traditional the family structure, the higher the likelihood of a successful youth outcome. Conversely, the non-traditional families (e.g., single parent, younger parents, lack of biological parents in the home and youth being raised by aunts, uncles and grandparents, parents out of the country), contributed to more problems, higher criminality, and less successful youth. This youth upbringing, regardless of racial or ethnic background, was listed as a major challenge and presented very dysfunctional situations including a lack of

parental support, abusive home environments, multiple children under the same household in trouble, and a lack of consequence and accountability at home. It was noted that the more a family is involved, the more successful the youth. If the parents are lacking motivation, the youth typically has a "do not care" attitude as well.

The probation officers noted that Native American youth were faced with additional challenges relating to family and cultural pressures. Growing up on the reservation exposed juveniles to a cultural orientation or attitude that fighting and violence are a normal way of life. Many Native American youth are used to seeing fighting on a regular basis. In addition, the family attitudes and perception towards law enforcement are learned from older generations and therefore perceived as the cultural norm. Members of some older Native American generations were perceived to have a negative attitude and prejudice towards law enforcement. They were seen as believing that law enforcement has a lack of respect for the Native American culture, and as passing these perceptions to the members of younger Native American generations. Probation officers mentioned the Native American youth tend to have a lower self-esteem traditionally, due to confusion of their place with their traditions, historical trauma, and these can lead to a low sense of cultural pride. The probation officers reported that the Native American youth feel torn between the traditional ways and their current surroundings.

Suggestions/Recommendations

Probation officers indicated that increasing the amount of programs, resources and outlets for youth would help to keep them out of trouble. More activities and community offerings for youth would allow for more positive community involvement. In addition, the use of the reservation detention centers for the Native American children would help with easier access to resources.

Youth Court Judge Interview

The personal interview with the Youth Court judge was guided by a four-question interview protocol as seen in Appendix A. It asked questions about trends in characteristics (including race/ethnicity) of juveniles coming before the court, about gaps in services for juveniles, about what works and does not work with respect to services for youth, and about how to address disparities in justice system contact. The way the responses are presented in this section is intended to make the themes parallel those from other interviews.

Program Strengths/Successes

The youth court judge noted that court filings are down and he feels less busy. The youth court and tribal court share responsibility for youth in custody; there are fewer youth in custody than "fair share" requires. He felt that Hispanic families appear to have strong family structures and fewer Hispanic juveniles seem to be coming in contact with the justice system. Diversion programs appear to be working. Juvenile court Rule 20-511A allows the court to order a full mental health screening by the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare if the GAIN-SS indicates the need. The court already screens all youth using the GAIN-SS. Tribal youth have more resources available to them with respect to inpatient and outpatient substance abuse treatment programs through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Community Partnerships

The judge reported that there is a strong partnership currently with tribal members, but that this partnership can vary based upon the families in control of Tribal Council on the reservation. The judge reports a barrier to working together is that there is no independent judiciary, and the judges on the reservation are in place at the discretion of the Tribal Council. When a youth comes through the youth court system, but is a tribal member, it can be difficult to work with the tribal courts to conduct home visits and other probation-required elements. Although the relationship with the tribal courts is difficult, it is better today than it has been in the past.

Weaknesses/Challenges

In general, the youth court judge believed that marijuana is an increasing challenge when handling youth court cases, in particular because recreational use is legalized in surrounding states. The youth court judge felt the largest challenges in handling cases with Native American children lie with the political structure of the reservation and family dynamics of youth entering the justice system. As noted above, the lack of checks and balances on the reservation make it challenging to interact with the tribal courts. Relationships and communication change based upon the families leading the Tribal Council. The judge also feels that institutional trauma persists from federal government forced-assimilation of Native Americans in the 1880s-1960s. The judge felt that tribal families were forced apart and this lack of traditional family structure is multigenerational. The judge feels that the largest challenge when handling Hispanic youth cases is the element of violence. These youth appear to be driven by the *machismo* element in their culture and are more violent and feel they have something to prove. The closure of the Residential Treatment Center made housing challenging, as there are only seven beds for Bingham County juveniles at the 3B JDC.

Parental Involvement

The judge reported that parental structure is a challenge with tribal children. Most of the children do not live in a household with two parents, and are often being raised by grandparents or other family members. The judge felt that very few youth with a strong family unit enter the justice system. He reported that Hispanic youth seem to have stronger family units, and as a result he has seen fewer of them in court.

Community Resources

The youth court judge indicated that without a residential treatment system, there are increased challenges for Non-Native youth. There are only seven beds reserved for Bingham County juveniles at the 3B JDC, whereas the reservation has a 24-bed juvenile justice center for tribal youth.

Youth Court Prosecutor Interview

The personal interview with the Youth Court prosecutor was guided by the same four-question interview protocol used with the judge. The way the responses are presented in this section is intended to make the themes parallel those from other interviews.

Program Strengths/Successes

The juvenile prosecutor reported that diversion programs are a valuable resource for youth who are entering the justice system for the first time. They work to keep youth out of the 3B JDC if they are first time offenders.

Community Partnerships

If the case of a Native American youth is being shared between the juvenile prosecutor's office and the tribal office, the two will attempt to work together on the case as appropriate. The prosecutor stated that if a youth falls in the youth court's jurisdiction, the prosecutor's office will always exercise his right to jurisdiction. If a youth falls under tribal jurisdiction, then his office waits for the tribe to inform it about the case.

Weaknesses/Challenges

Although diversion programs are primarily intended for first time offenders, the juvenile prosecutor reported that there should be more than one chance for use of diversion programs. His office believes that it is not always appropriate to handle juveniles in court, but second time offenders are forced into it if they have utilized diversion previously. Diversion programs should also be more tailored to reduce recidivism. The juvenile prosecutor expressed wishing that programs were designed to identify why recidivism rates are so high for members of particular groups, and then worked to keep them from coming into contact with the juvenile justice system in the future. He believed that juveniles aged 8-12 years old were the most difficult cases to handle, as well as those cases of juveniles residing on the reservation. The prosecutor reported that addresses and telephone numbers change frequently, so making contact with families was often difficult.

Parental Involvement

The juvenile prosecutor reports that most of the youth coming through the justice system do not have intact family structures. The prosecutor feels that if they were able to provide all youth with stable, intact home environments, less youth would enter the system.

Tribal Personnel Interview

As noted earlier in the report, an opportunity to interview tribal personnel was unanticipated, so no unique interview protocol was developed for such an interview. However, the serendipitous encounter with the three tribal court personnel was acted upon, with ad-hoc questions asked about the same general issues asked of other stakeholders. The way the responses are presented in this section is intended to make the themes parallel those from other interviews.

Program Strengths/Successes

Tribal members reported that the Controlled Substance Act gave tribal courts increased power to send native youth to the Idaho Youth Challenge Academy to address their substance use issues. They believed that youth do well when in the Academy, but struggle when back on the reservation. Tribal culture is a way to keep youth out of trouble. The tribal members reported that is it the responsibility of elders to instill this culture in the youth.

Community Partnerships

The respondents believed that tribal youth sent to the Idaho Youth Challenge Academy thrive in the structured environment. They reported that the Tribe is also working to provide money management services to youth before they turn 18 years old. Upon turning 18, youth have access to funds from tribal enterprises. Tribal members felt youth need assistance in learning how to manage this amount before they receive it.

Weaknesses/Challenges

Tribal members reported challenges with substance and alcohol abuse on the reservation. There have been many suicides on the reservation, and Fort Hall has the highest rate of suicide among all the reservations in Idaho. The tribal members felt that youth are lost and without family support, so they turn to alcohol and drugs. The reservation has little affordable housing and many members struggle to access basic resources such as food and shelter.

Parental Involvement

Tribal members believed that there is still intergenerational trauma from tribal members being sent to government boarding schools from the 1880s through the 1960s. There are many blended families on the reservations, with grandparents—rather than the parents—raising grandchildren. The youth are without mentors, and instead turn to drugs and alcohol for support. The tribal members reported that youth succeed at the Idaho Youth Challenge Academy but when returning to the reservation, they are without proper support and structure, and wind up in the same circumstances that they started in.

Conclusion

The primary purpose of the 2017-2018 assessment documented in this report was to attempt to understand why ethnic/racial minority juveniles (in this case, namely Hispanic and Native American juveniles) were overrepresented at the point of arrest relative to their Non-Hispanic peers in Bingham County, Idaho. When such overrepresention is found, DMC is said to exist. DMC assessments such as this one are performed largely to understand the causes and potential explanations for it. In the current project, the research team relied on several pieces of evidence: 1) the juvenile arrest RRIs calculated by IDJC; 2) a large, representative sample of randomly selected juvenile arrest cases collected in Bingham County from the years 2011 to 2015; and 3) interviews of key stakeholders who are familiar with arrest patterns in Bingham County—namely, CBPD officers and BCSD deputies, JPOs, and highly involved juvenile court staff not only from Bingham County but also the Fort Hall Reservation. A secondary (though still extremely important) purpose of the assessment was to better understand factors differentially associated with juveniles of the three key racial/ethnic groups (i.e., Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, and Native American) who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

DMC assessments such as this one ask one primary question, largely, about whether members of racial/ethnic minority groups are systematically treated differently (e.g., targeted for arrest), and in an adverse way, compared to their Non-Hispanic White peers. If we were to consider only the RRIs (and no other contextual information) for the years 2011-2015, it would appear that yes, it is possible that such differential treatment exists. The juvenile arrest RRIs were markedly elevated for Native American juveniles for each evaluation year; it appeared that they were arrested at a rate between 2.0 times (in 2015) to 4.4 times (2013) greater (proportionately) than Non-Hispanic White juveniles. The juvenile arrest RRIs were also markedly elevated for Hispanic juveniles for three of the five evaluation years; between 2011 and 2013, it appeared they were arrested at a rate between 1.9 times (2013) and 2.0 times (2011 and 2012) greater (proportionately) than Non-Hispanic White juveniles (interestingly, Hispanic juveniles were slightly less likely, proportionately, to be arrested than Non-Hispanic White juveniles in 2014 and 2015). However, it is important to understand that RRIs tell only part of the story, and that without the consideration of contextual information, we cannot know whether racial/ethnic minority individuals are being arrested more often because they are racial/ethnic minorities, or because of other factors that are confounded with race/ethnicity. Trying to tease apart these issues was a major thrust of this assessment effort.

With respect to the quantitative data we gathered, the primary way to evaluate the causes of DMC (and to develop explanations of it) is the assessment of whether or not there is a difference in arrest outcomes (namely handled within the department or referred to an other authority) as a function of race/ethnicity. In four of the five evaluation years, there was no such difference; whether or not the juveniles were Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, or Native American was unrelated to arrest outcomes. Suggestive evidence for differential disposition of arrest cases was found in 2015, when a significantly greater percentage of juvenile arrest cases involving Native American juveniles were referred to other authorities compared to arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White and Hispanic juveniles. This result prompted use of the more sophisticated multivariate logistic regression analysis, which holds shared variance constant so the unique, independent effect of each variable can be assessed; when this analysis was conducted, race/ethnicity was no longer a significant predictor of arrest outcome. This made it clear that

race/ethnicity was confounded with some other variable or variables that were significant predictors of arrest outcome. As detailed in the report, the two variables that remained significant in the logistic regression analysis were crime type and prior crime type. What can be surmised from this information is that Native American juveniles were arrested more often in 2015 not because they were Native American, but rather because the types of crime they were arrested for, and the types of prior crimes they had been arrested for, were the types of crimes that more often led to referral to an other authority. A similar situation was found in the all-years aggregate data, and the results from a second multivariate logistic regression analysis were the same (i.e., race/ethnicity was no longer a significant predictor of arrest outcome once shared variance was accounted for, and only crime type and prior crime level remained significant predictors). In sum, we can conclude from the quantitative data that the presence of DMC in juvenile arrests between 2011 and 2015 was accounted for by factors other than race or ethnicity and that there was no evidence for race/ethnic bias within the system.

The quantitative data analyses did provide some valuable information about demographic and situational variables associated with race/ethnicity, and this information may be helpful to law enforcement officers, court personnel, service providers, and many others in Bingham County (and the Fort Hall Reservation) in the future. For example, in several individual years and across all years as a whole, a greater percentage of Native American juvenile arrest cases involved girls compared to arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White and Hispanic juveniles. This raises important questions about the experiences of Native American girls in Bingham County, and seems to suggest that targeted outreach to better understand these experiences and remediate risk factors associated with these girls is warranted. Another example involves geographic location of arrest; Native American juveniles were more often arrested at school than their Hispanic and Non-Hispanic White peers. Why might this be the case, and what might be done to address this issue? A third example was that Native American juveniles were significantly younger at time of arrest than their Hispanic and (especially) Non-Hispanic White peers. It seems community- and school-related outreach efforts to deter justice system involvement might be warranted earlier for Native American juveniles than for other juveniles. These are simply a few examples of how information detailed in this report might be useful to stakeholders in Bingham County and on the Fort Hall Reservation.

The qualitative data gathered through the stakeholder interviews are rich and also full of implications for outreach and service provision. For example, the law enforcement officers in particular were adamant that they do not treat Native American and/or Hispanic juveniles differently than Non-Hispanic White juveniles, but strongly felt there was a perception that they did so. The results of this report (showing no evidence of bias) provide support for their assertion. How might this be communicated to members of the Native American and Hispanic communities in a way that might increase trust and willingness to work together in more meaningful ways? Another example involves the pervasive sense, conveyed during nearly all stakeholder interviews, that a history of trauma, family separation, and cultural dislocation continues to burden members the Native American community in very real ways. What could be done—in a culturally sensitive way that is not perceived as “victim-blaming”—to encourage stable family environments and discourage involvement in gangs and reliance on drugs and/or alcohol to numb pain? As researchers, we believe that there is much in this report that can be used to improve lives among all juveniles in Bingham County, as well as the smaller

communities in which they reside. We are hopeful that our presentation of this information is valuable in guiding such efforts.

References

Creative Survey Systems (n.d.). *Sample size calculator*. Retrieved from https://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm

Feyerherm, W. H. (n.d.) *Preparing for assessment – Idaho*. Retrieved from http://www.ijjc.idaho.gov/Portals/0/Idaho%20-%20Preparing%20for%20Assessment.pdf

Healey, B. J., McDonald, T. W. Gazieva, K., Begic, S., & Toussaint, L. L. (2014). *An assessment for Disproportionate Minority Contact among juveniles in Idaho 2009-2011*. Boise, ID: Center for Health Policy, Boise State University.

Howard, E. K. M., & McDonald, T. W. (2013). *Stakeholders' perceptions of the Disproportionate Minority Contact project in Canyon County, Idaho*. Boise, ID: Center for Health Policy, Boise State University.

Lind, B. K., Miller, C. M., Carver, S. D., & McDonald, T. W. (2010). *Does race/ethnicity affect criminal case disposition of juveniles in Canyon County? Results of Disproportionate Minority Contact analysis*. Boise, ID: Center for Health Policy, Boise State University.

Random.org (n.d.). *True random number generator*. Retrieved from http://www.random.org

Appendix A

Law Enforcement Focus Group Interview Protocol

1. What factors impact your decision to arrest? Release to parents?
2. What factors impact your decision to take a juvenile to a detention facility?
3. What options do you have as alternatives to placement in detention?
4. Do you notice different types of crimes being committed by juveniles from specific racial/ethnic groups? (i.e. Native American, Hispanic, White – non-Hispanic)
5. Are the majority of arrests for local juveniles or do you encounter juveniles from other areas? Any difference by race/ethnicity?
6. Do you notice any trends in the times or locations of delinquent behavior by juveniles? Any difference by race/ethnicity?
7. Have there been any significant events from 2011 – 2015 that influenced the number of juvenile contacts with law enforcement? Are there annual events that increase contacts with one or more racial/ethnic groups?
8. Do you notice any common themes or characteristics of juveniles from various racial/ethnic groups that influence their exposure or involvement in delinquent acts?
9. How do you work with Tribal law enforcement?
10. Do you refer or transfer Native American juveniles to Tribal law enforcement if possible?
11. What dynamics impact your ability to work with Native American youth? (Jurisdiction, culture, families, etc.)
12. In some years, minority youth, primarily Native American, are overrepresented in the juvenile justice system. If you had a magic wand, what would you do to impact this dynamic?

Juvenile Probation Officers Interview Protocol:

1. What diversion options do you have available to you?
2. Are there any limitations to diversion options that might impact a racial or ethnic group differently (ex. Location)?
3. What instruments do you use to guide the assessment of risks and needs of juveniles? Are there certain instruments you use?
4. How do you use the results of these instruments to guide programming?
5. Do you notice any trends or differences with the characteristics of youth from various racial and ethnic groups? Are there differences in offences? Program completion?
6. In some years ethnic or racial minority youth, particularly Native American, appear to be overrepresented in the juvenile justice system. If you had a magic wand, what would you do to impact that dynamic or to address that issue.

Juvenile Court Interviews (Judge and Prosecutor):

1. Do you notice any trends in the characteristics of juveniles coming before the court? Are there differences between racial/ethnic groups?
2. Do you notice any gaps in services for juveniles? Any differences by race/ethnicity?
3. What type of interaction does the court have with Tribal courts or justice systems? Is there any information-sharing, referrals, etc.?
4. In some years, minority youth, primarily Native American, are overrepresented in the juvenile justice system. If you had a magic wand, what would you do to impact this dynamic?

References

Healey, B. J., McDonald, T. W., Gazieva, K., Begic, S., & Toussaint, L. L. (2014). *An assessment for Disproportionate Minority Contact among juveniles in Idaho 2009-2011*. Boise, ID: Center for Health Policy, Boise State University.

Howard, E. K. M, & McDonald, T. W. (2013). *Stakeholders' perceptions of the Disproportionate Minority Contact project in Canyon County, Idaho*. Boise, ID: Center for Health Policy, Boise State University.

Lind, B. K., Miller, C. M., Carver, S. D., & McDonald, T. W. (2010). *Does race/ethnicity affect criminal case disposition of juveniles in Canyon County? Results of Disproportionate Minority Contact analysis*. Boise, ID: Center for Health Policy, Boise State University.

Appendix A

Supplemental Analyses Utilizing IJOS data

With the aim of understanding what, if any, factors influence the outcome of juvenile arrests, we conducted further analyses utilizing IJOS data provided by the IDJC. IJOS data were extracted by the IDJC data specialist using unique individual incident identifiers created by the research team during the data collection efforts that occurred on site (utilizing juvenile arrest data compiled by the Bingham County Sheriff's Department and the City of Blackfoot Police Department in the 2011-2015 period). IJOS data were then mapped onto the data extracted on site to the best of the researchers' ability. This process was somewhat challenging because the date of arrest was not captured during the on-site data extraction efforts. As many juveniles had more than one arrest in any given year it was difficult to match the arrest extracted on site to the specific incident in IJOS data. Due to this limitation, findings of these additional analyses utilizing IJOS data should be interpreted with caution. If this project continues and the researchers are afforded with another opportunity to collect juvenile arrest data, it would be advisable to document the date of arrest when extracting data on site to ensure more accurate matching of IJOS data onto on-site data. In addition, probation data extracted from IJOS were extremely limited, possibly due to the extraction method, which included only those juveniles who were on probation at the time of data extraction (end of 2018) rather than all juveniles who were on probation at any time after arrest. Should this project continue, it would be desirable to include all juveniles who were on probation at any time during the timeframe of interest.

Petitions

Of the total of 969 arrest cases on which data were collected on site, 371 (or just over 38%) were petitioned (i.e., had a petition number in the IJOS data set). The remaining 598 (or nearly 62%) arrest cases did not have a petition number.

Of those who were petitioned, approximately one-quarter were petitioned in each 2011 (just over 25%), 2012 (over 24%), and 2015 (nearly 24%). The proportion of petitioned cases was somewhat lower in 2013 (over 18%) and significantly lower in 2014 (less than 9%) (see Table 2 below).

Table 1: IJOS: Petitioned Cases by Year

Crime Type	Count	Percentage
2011	93	*25.1*
2012	90	*24.3*
2013	68	*18.3*
2014	33	*8.9*
2015	87	*23.5*

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles who were petitioned.

As seen below in Table 2, no statistical differences between those juveniles who were petitioned and those who were not petitioned were found in terms of gender, age, race, ethnicity or

race/ethnicity, arresting agency, geographic location of arrest, or whether the juvenile had a prior crime. The three significant results involved time of arrest (AM or PM), crime type, and prior crime type.

Table 2: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Petition Status	
Demographic/Situational Characteristic	**Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value**
Gender	.37
Age	.66
Race	.36
Ethnicity	.18
Race/Ethnicity	.40
Arresting Agency	.48
Geographic Location of Arrest	.11
Time of Arrest	**< .01**
Crime Type	**< .01**
Prior Crime (Yes or No)	.31
Prior Crime Type	**< .05**

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font.

The first statistically significant result was related to the time of arrest. As seen below in Table 3, juveniles who were arrested in the afternoon hours were petitioned at a higher rate than those who were arrested in the morning hours, χ^2 (df = 1) = 8.35, $p < .01$. Whereas nearly 21% of those juveniles who were arrested in the afternoon hours were petitioned, less than 13% of those who were arrested in the morning hours were petitioned.

Table 3: Differences in Petition Status as a Function of Arrest Time		
Arrest Time	**Percentage of Cases**	
	Petitioned	**Not Petitioned**
A.M.	12.5	87.5
P.M.	20.8	79.2
Total	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom arrest time information was available.

The next, and strongest, significant result was related to the type of the crime committed by the juvenile, χ^2 (df = 5) = 19.50, $p < .01$. As seen below in Table 4, juveniles who were arrested for committing types of crimes classified as 'other' and those who committed drug and alcohol related crimes were petitioned at a lower rate (less than 13% and approximately 15%, respectively) than those who committed traffic violations (nearly 22%), sex offences (just over 23%), property crimes (25%), and crimes against persons (26%).

Table 4: Differences in Petition Status as a Function of Crime Type		
Crime Type	**Percentage of Cases**	
	Petitioned	**Not Petitioned**
Crimes Against Persons	26.0	74.0
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	15.4	84.6
Property Crimes	25.0	75.0
Sex Offenses	23.1	76.9
Traffic Offenses	21.6	78.4
Other Crimes/Offenses	12.6	87.4
Total	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom crime type information was available.

The third, and final, significant result was related to prior crime type, χ^2 (df = 5) = 13.9, $p < .05$. As seen below in table 5, juveniles who had committed sex offences and crime against persons in the past were petitioned at a greater rate (over 29% and over 25%, respectively) than juveniles who had committed other types of crimes in the past. Juveniles who had committed traffic offences (0.0%) and other types of crimes (approximately 10%) in the past were least likely to be petitioned.

Table 5: Differences in Petition Status as a Function of Prior Crime Type		
Prior Crime Type	**Percentage of Cases**	
	Petitioned	**Not Petitioned**
Crimes Against Persons	25.3	74.7
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	20.2	79.8
Property Crimes	16.3	83.7
Sex Offenses	29.4	70.6
Traffic Offenses	0.0	100.0
Other Crimes/Offenses	10.3	89.7
Total	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom information about prior crime type was available.

Diversions

Of the 371 cases that had a petition number in IJOS, half (approximately 50%) had a guilty charge. As seen below in Table 6, the outcome of the arrest was unknown in over 35% of arrest cases, nearly 7% were dismissed, 4% had an 'other' arrest outcome, just over 2% were diverted, approximately 1% were placed on probation, and less than 1% were transferred to adult court. Because the arrest outcome was not known for over one-third of the cases, no statistical analyses could be perform to investigate whether there were any systematic differences in arrest outcomes as a function of race, ethnicity, gender or any of the other demographic or situational variables. Furthermore, because only eight cases were diverted, no further statistical analyses could be performed. All that we know about these eight juveniles from the limited data set is that one was

Non-Hispanic White, three were Hispanic, and four were American Indian. Further analysis, which could yield more information about the specific circumstances of the cases that were diverted would require on site review of juvenile files.

Table 6: Arrest Outcomes for Petitioned Cases		
Crime Type	**Count**	**Percentage**
Guilty	187	50.4
Unknown	131	35.3
Dismissed	24	6.5
Other	15	4.0
Diversion	8	2.2
Probation	5	1.3
Transfer to Adult Court	1	0.3

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles who were petitioned.

Committed Cases

An ICLA score was available for only 35 cases, which means that only 35 cases were committed (i.e., only those juveniles who are committed have an ICLA score). Once again, due to the small number of committed cases we could not perform any systematic statistical analyses. What we do know from the limited data is that nearly 63% of the committed juveniles were either Native American and Hispanic youth (11, over 31%, each). The remaining 13 (or 37%) of committed juveniles were Non-Hispanic White. As seen below in Table 7, this seems to indicate that Native American and Hispanic youth are committed at a disproportionately higher rate than their White counterparts. Indeed, when we ran a statistical test to compare the percentages of committed cases across the three race/ethnicity groups relative to the expected percentages based on the actual percentages of arrested cases, we found a statistically significant difference, χ^2 (df = 2) = 18.40, $p < .01$. It is difficult to arrive at any conclusions about the reasons for this discrepancy based on the available data. To understand whether Native American and Hispanic youth are indeed committed at a higher rate and the reasons why, we would need to either collect additional data or conduct case file review to understand the specific context of the 35 cases that were committed.

Table 7: Committed Cases by Race/Ethnicity		
	Percentage of Cases	
Race/Ethnicity	**All Arrest Cases**	**Committed Cases**
Non-Hispanic White	52.3	37.1
Native American	19.0	31.4
Hispanic	28.0	31.4
Total	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles for whom race/ethnicity information was available.

Risk Level of Reoffending

A YLSI score, which assesses the juvenile's risk level of reoffending, was available for 359 (or 37%) of all cases. As seen below in Table 8, a vast majority (or nearly 88% of all cases of juveniles who had an YLSI score) had either a low (nearly 28%) or a moderate (just under 60%) risk level of reoffending; only less than 13% had a high risk of reoffending.

Table 8: Risk Level of Reoffending		
	Percentage of Cases	
Risk Level	**Count**	**Percentage**
Low	99	27.6
Moderate	215	59.9
High or Very High	45	12.5

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles who had an YLSI score.

Statistical analysis revealed no significant differences across race/ethnic groups or gender, but it did reveal significant differences as a function of age and whether a juvenile had a prior crime.

The first statistically significant finding was related to the age of the juveniles, $F(2) = 6.02$, $p < 0.1$. Juveniles who had a low risk level of reoffending ($M = 14.9$) were on average younger than those who had a moderate ($M = 15.12$) or a high ($M = 15.84$) risk level of reoffending.

The second statistically significant finding was related to whether or not juveniles had a prior crime, χ^2 (df = 2) = 9.27, $p < .05$. As seen below in Table 9, juveniles who had a prior crime were more likely to have a moderate risk level of reoffending (over 81% of juveniles who had a moderate risk of reoffending were those who had a prior crime) than either a low or a high (approximately 67% each) risk level of reoffending. Conversely, juveniles who did not have a prior crime were more likely to have either a low or a high (approximately 33% each) risk level of reoffending than a moderate risk level of reoffending (less than 19%).

Table 9: Differences in Risk Level of Reoffending as a Function of Whether a Prior Crime Was Committed			
Prior Crime	**Percentage of Cases**		
	Low	**Moderate**	**High**
Yes	67.7	81.4	66.7
No	32.3	18.6	33.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The percentages in this table are calculated out of arrest cases involving juveniles who had an YLSI score and for whom information about whether a prior crime was committed was available.