Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)
What is DMC?

- Refers to the rates of contact with the juvenile justice system among juveniles of a specific minority group.

- During SFY 2013 (7/2012-6/2013) Black youth were arrested more than 3 times the rate of white youth.
  - This racial disparity is called disproportionate minority contact.
What is DMC (Continued)?

- DMC used to stand for Disproportionate Minority Confinement
  - Changed in 2002 from Confinement to Contact, because of the concern for the racial disparities in all of the nine juvenile justice contact points (Arrest, Diversion, Detention, Probation, etc.)
OJJDP’s DMC Reduction Model

PHASE I
Identification

PHASE II
Assessment/Diagnosis

PHASE III
Intervention

PHASE IV
Evaluation

PHASE V
Monitoring

Ongoing DMC Reduction Activities
Phase 1: Identification

Answer the questions:

• Does DMC exist?

• If so, where on the juvenile justice continuum?

• And with what minority population?

• To what extent?
Relative Rate Index

- RRI = minority rate/white rate

- Vital Signs

- Does DMC Exist? To What Extent?

- Use RRI to compare jurisdictions, trends, and decision points

- For data-based targeting of assessment studies, identifying points of intervention, and resource allocation.

- Drives Decision Making-It is a Compass
## State of Oklahoma
### RRI SFY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Rate Index Compared with</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black or African-American</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Other/ Mixed</th>
<th>All Minorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Juvenile Arrests</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Refer to Juvenile Court</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cases Diverted</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cases Involving Secure Detention</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cases Petitioned</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group meets 1% threshold?**

| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |

**Key:**

- Statistically significant results: **Bold font**
- Results that are not statistically significant: **Regular font**
- Group is less than 1% of the youth population: *
- Insufficient number of cases for analysis: **
- Insufficient number of cases for analysis: ---

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Rate Index Compared with:</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black or African-American</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Other/Mixed</th>
<th>All Minorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Juvenile Arrests</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Refer to Juvenile Court</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cases Diverted</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cases Involving Secure Detention</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cases Petitioned</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group meets 1% threshold?**

Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  No  Yes  Yes

**Key:**

- Statistically significant results: **Bold font**
- Results that are not statistically significant: Regular font
- Group is less than 1% of the youth population: *
- Insufficient number of cases for analysis: **
- Missing data for some element of calculation: ---
Five Steps to Analyze RRI

- **Statistical Significance**
  - A difference in rates is unlikely to have happened by chance

- **Magnitude**
  - 1.0=Equity
  - Arrest, Refer to Juvenile Court, Petitions Filed, Secure Detention, Delinquent Findings, Secure Confinement, Transfer to Adult Court
    - Goal is 1.0 or less
  - Diversion/Probation
    - Goal is 1.0 or Greater

- **Volume of Activity**
  - The amount of activity at each contact point.

- **Comparison with other Jurisdictions**
  - How the county compares with other counties across the country with available data (715+ counties).

- **Local Context**
Contextual Considerations:

• Is the agency involved in that decision point amenable to change?

• Have there been recent events (public relations issues) that make a change in DMC patterns more or less likely?

• Are funds or resources available that might assist (or hinder, if lacking) the DMC effort at this decision point?

• Is strong leadership available that is committed to addressing DMC issues?

• Are best practices models for this decision point available and applicable?

• Is there support for DMC reduction within the affected minority group and within the political leadership of that group?

• Are there issues with the affected minority group regarding media attention at this decision point (e.g., potentially high visibility events that could generate support or resistance for DMC)?
Phase II: Assessment

Answers the questions:

- Given the knowledge we have about our community, what probable explanations may be generated about DMC in the areas of focus?
- What are the types of data and patterns of results needed to support the possible explanations generated?
- What are the sources of the needed data?
- Based on analyses of data obtained, what are the most likely mechanisms creating DMC in the areas of focus based on data analysis?
- What are the mechanisms that the community decides to address with intervention strategies?
Assessment Tools

- Studies Conducted by the University of Oklahoma
- Local Assessment
Mechanisms Leading to DMC

• Differential Treatment
  ◦ Intentional/Unintentional Bias
    • **Intentional bias** is overt and operates on stereotypes and assumptions.
    • **Unintentional bias** is typically indirect and operates through legitimate criteria but disadvantages minority youth.
Mechanisms Leading to DMC

- Differential Behavior/Offending
  - In offenses reported to the police, do descriptions of an offender’s race indicate that minorities and non-minorities commit offenses at different rates?
  - How does this difference lead to the DMC numbers that we see? Do we have differences in drug-related offenses, violence offenses, gang offenses, and/or recidivism offenses per age groups?

Suggested data sources
- Arrest records (police records)
- Self-reported delinquency reports (*Youth Risk Behavior Survey*)
- Incident-based crime reports (*National Incident-Based Reporting System*)
- Aggregated crime statistics (State Statistical Analysis Centers)
Mechanisms Leading to DMC

- **Mobility**
  - Is there an influx of juveniles that temporarily changes the demographic composition of the population?
    - For example, is this a summer destination or spring break destination?
  - What is the relationship between the youth’s legal residence and the location/jurisdiction of apprehension?

Suggested data sources
- Arrest data (police reports)
- Court referral data
Mechanisms Leading to DMC

- Indirect Effects

- What are the risk factors for involvement in the juvenile justice system?

- To what extent do risk factors differ for kids of color, and does it explain RRI?

Suggested data sources:
- OJJDP Model Programs Guide community indicators
- Self-report data on alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use
- Community-level income data
- Community-level unemployment rate
- Community-level demographic data
- Area-level school attendance data
Mechanisms Leading to DMC

Differential Opportunities for Prevention and Treatment

- Equal Access to services (location, fees, other requirements)

- Are minorities and non-minorities offered prevention and early intervention programming at the same rate?

- If minority youth are more involved in particular offenses, are prevention and treatment services available to address those types of behavior?

- What is the rate at which minorities are admitted to community-based programs for first-time offenders compared with the rate at which they are confined in secure detention? How do these rates compare with the rates for non-minorities?

- What is the rate at which minorities are enrolled in prevention programming for at-risk youths? How does this rate compare with the rate at which non-minorities are being admitted?

- What is the minority participation in existing prevention programs? What is the effectiveness of the programs?

Suggested data sources:
- Prevention program availability, enrollment, and participation data
- Court disposition data
Mechanisms Leading to DMC

- Differential Handling or Inappropriate Decision-Making
  - What are the bases or criteria which decisions are made?
  - Are those criteria applied consistently across all groups of youth?
  - Are the criteria structured in a manner that places some groups at a disadvantage?
  - Are minorities and non-minorities treated similarly by the justice system?
  - Are minorities and non-minorities treated similarly when charged with the same offense?
  - How do the rates at which minorities and non-minorities are adjudicated for the same offenses differ?
  - How do the rates at which minorities and non-minorities are offered programming compare?
Mechanisms Leading to DMC

- Differential Handling or Inappropriate Decision-Making
  - Do youth’s reports of interaction between youth and those who work in the juvenile justice system differ across races and ethnicities? How?
  - How do arrest rates compare with incident-based crime reports for minorities and non-minorities?
  - What factors are putting youths at risk of offending?
  - What factors are protecting them?

Suggested data sources:
NIBRS data (where available)
Periodic client surveys
Mechanisms Leading to DMC

• Justice By Geography
  ◦ To what extent, do different neighborhoods, communities, or regions have different rates of arrest, different sensitivity to types of offenses, different definitions of severity or other juvenile justice decisions?

  ◦ Do those differences coincide with different racial and ethnic composition?

Suggested data sources:
  • Arrest data by neighborhood, region, county, or state
Mechanisms Leading to DMC

- **Legislation, Policies, and Legal Factors with DMC Impact**
  - Do these rules disproportionately affect minorities?
  - What rules exist for releasing youths after the initial hearing?
  - What policies are in place to regulate behavior among youths at the area schools?
  - Does enforcement deployment differ?
  - What procedures exist for providing youth with indigent defense?

Suggested data sources:
- State and/or local code
- Administrative rules regarding handling of youths in the juvenile justice system
Mechanisms Leading to DMC

• **Accumulated Disadvantage**
  1. **Simple Accumulation**
     • Do small to moderate differences at each stage compound into a disadvantage for minority youth?
  2. **Impacts on Later Decisions**
     • Do decisions made at earlier stages affect outcomes at later stages, in particular, judicial disposition?

Suggested data sources:
• RRI data
• Transactional data including race/ethnicity and the outcomes of multiple decisions within the juvenile justice system
Phase III: Intervention

Answer the following questions:

- What direct services are available?
- Is there training and technical assistance available?
- What systems change activities are needed?
**Intervention**

- Multi-pronged & Evidence Based
  - Direct Services
  - Training and Technical Assistance
  - System Change
DMC Strategies in Oklahoma

- OJJDP Community and Strategic Planning (CASP) Projects
  - Comanche County
  - Oklahoma County
  - Tulsa County

- Statewide Law Enforcement Training

- YLSI Risk Assessment administered in all 77 Counties (OK County, Tulsa, & Comanche Counties)
Comanche County

- First OJJDP CASP Site
  - Process Evaluation-Positive Results
  - Local Coordinator
  - Connecticut Law Enforcement Training
  - Policy/Practice Changes
  - Day Reporting

- Comanche County Health Department Partnership
  - Local Coordinator
  - Social Autopsy
Oklahoma County

- Second OJJDP CASP Site
- Outcome of CASP Project
  - JDAI Model for Responding to Probation Violations
    - 52% of the detention stays were for Probation Violations
  - Alternatives to Successful Outcomes: System Improvement and Graduated Incentives, Interventions, and Sanction Implementation
    - Offers alternatives to hold youth accountable which are based on a validated needs and risk assessment
    - Provides for swift, immediate interventions, incentives, and sanctions
    - Utilizes secure detention only in cases when there are no other lesser alternatives that are adequate to protect the youth and the public
  - Development of Policy and Procedure
  - Training for Juvenile Justice Stakeholders and Staff
Tulsa County

- OJJDP FIRE (Field Initiated Research and Evaluation)-Detention and Arrest

- Current CASP Site-funded with JABG funds
  - Local Coordinator
  - Arrest
  - Law Enforcement Training
  - OJJDP Street Law Curriculum
  - Diversion & Petitions Files
    - Policy & Procedure Review
Phase IV: Evaluation & Performance Measurement

- What is the effectiveness of DMC Intervention efforts?
- How can the interventions be improved?
- What additional Resources are Needed?
Phase V: Monitoring

Uses the same methods as the Identification Phase to address the following questions:

- Has the targeted RRI improved or worsened?
- Have other RRI values improved or worsened?
- What can account for these changes?
For More Information:

Laura Broyles, State DMC Coordinator
Office of Juvenile Affairs
laura.broyles@oja.ok.gov
405-530-2928