DARYL FOX: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to today's webinar, “Overview of the *Youth and the Juvenile Justice System: 2022 National Report*,” hosted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. At this time, it's my distinct pleasure to introduce Liz Ryan, Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, for welcoming remarks and to begin the presentation. Administrator Ryan?

LIZ RYAN: Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm Liz Ryan, Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, or OJJDP. Thank you so much for joining us to review findings from *Youth and the Juvenile Justice System: 2022 National Report*. This is the fifth edition of a comprehensive, crucial report for the juvenile justice field. The National Center for Juvenile Justice produced this report under our cooperative agreement by the National Institute of Justice with funding support from OJJDP. OJJDP and NCJJ have collaborated for many years on reports, fact sheets, and other resources ensuring that data on youth justice issues are both current and accessible. I'm grateful for the expertise and dedication that NCJJ brings to our partnership. The *2022 National Report* reflects the Center's deep commitment to young people and to quantifying their experiences in the juvenile justice system.

OJJDP's vision emphasizes transforming the juvenile justice system. It takes real work to make real change. OJJDP's work requires listening to youth and families who are directly impacted by the juvenile justice system, strategizing with experts, and implementing actionable research to answer the needs of justice-involved young people and their families. To do it well, OJJDP and our grantees must have accurate, relevant data drawn from reliable research. The NCJJ's work enables us to identify trends and to anticipate and respond to changes. Policymakers and other youth justice professionals also rely on the Center's expertise.

Nothing is static in youth justice. To meet young people where they are, cognitively, emotionally, authentically, our collective efforts must be informed. Actionable research and reliable data ensure that we do.

I'm now pleased to introduce Chaz Puzzanchera, Senior Research Associate at NCJJ and an author of the *2022 National Report.* Chaz will present key findings from the report, along with updated data where available. Among them, 2020 data showing an overall drop in violent crime by youth, ongoing evidence of racial disparities in the way the juvenile justice system treats youth of color, and changes in transfer laws, which allow juvenile court judges to waive jurisdiction and transfer certain cases to adult criminal court. Following Chaz's presentation, there will be an opportunity for you to ask questions. One of Chaz's colleagues and co-author of the *National Report*, Research

Associate Sarah Hockenberry, is also on-hand to help answer your questions, along with OJJDP Senior Policy Advisor, Andrea Coleman. Thank you.

CHARLES PUZZANCHERA: Thank you, Administrator Ryan. And greetings, folks. Thanks for joining today's webinar. My name is Charles Puzzanchera. I'm a Senior Research Associate with the National Center for Juvenile Justice. NCJJ is located in Pittsburgh and we are the Research Division of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. Today's presentation is based on the content of the *Youth and the Juvenile Justice System: [2022] National Report*. The report, as Administrator Ryan mentioned, was made possible through a cooperative agreement, awarded and managed by the National Institute of Justice, with funding support from OJJDP. However, the presentation today does not represent the official position of OJJDP, NIJ, or the Department of Justice.

Some housekeeping things before we get into the topic. As was noted earlier by Administrator Ryan, this is our fifth report in a series that began in the mid-1990s. Since its inception, the report has been designed to put together all of the most relevant and reliable research around youth and package it in one comprehensive report that was accessible to many. It's not intended for an academic audience or anyone who has insider knowledge. This is for the masses to take advantage of what the latest research shows and the most recent data tell us about youth and their involvement with the justice system. As you may imagine, writing a report like this does require some decisions to be made. One such decision is what data year are you going to use to anchor the report. We knew this was a print publication, so we had to have some decisions made about what timeframe we're going to use.

For this report, we decided that 2019 was going to be our anchor year because all the major data says that we needed to work on the report were available at the time we started writing. But as was noted by Administrator Ryan, the presentation today allows us to take advantage of newer data that's been released since the report was published, so we're integrating the newer information into today's presentation. And as you may imagine, summarizing a report of over 200 pages is not really a thing to do in an hour-long presentation today. So we have focused on themes that Administrator Ryan highlighted in her introduction about stuff that stood out to us or we think that are salient issues that are worth spending time in a setting like this to convey to all those who are interested in youth and their involvement in the justice system.

If you are watching on screen with the slides here, you'll notice a QR code on screen now. If you don't have a copy of the report, either in digital or electronic form, use your

phone or any other device you can for reading those QR codes and you can order a print copy of the report or download the PDF by chapter or the entire report.

Now, with those things out of the way, we're going to get started with our first two topics. The first of which focuses on major depressive episodes reported by youth and our second topic, we'll look at substance use as reported by youth.

First topic to discuss is the proportion of youth who report experiencing a major depressive episode. The information we're going to use today draws on information available from the National Survey on Drug Use and Health, sponsored by SAMHSA, which is the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. It's based on a survey of persons ages 12 and older and it comes from a report called *Key Substance Use and Mental Health Indicators in United States*. If you're not familiar with this report, it is a wealth of information about youth on a range of topics from mental issues we're going to talk about today, substance use disorders. It's a really wonderful resource. If you're not familiar with it, you should give it some time to review.

The phrase I introduced earlier is major depressive episode. I'm not going to read the specific definition that is used by the survey, but I will highlight a couple elements of what a major depressive episode is. First, we'll talk about the duration. It's a period that lasts for about two weeks where almost every day you have a feeling of a depressed mood or a loss of interest and pleasure in those normal routine kinds of things. You have that duration and that experience then coupled with a variety symptoms, including problems eating, sleeping, concentrating, feelings of self-worth, thoughts of suicidal ideation or death. Those things combined together are indicative of what's called a major depressive episode. And we can see here on our first presentation slide, the trend and the proportion of youth ages 12 to 17 who've experienced a major depressive episode from 2004 to 2021.

Now, before I get into the meat of the matter, you'll notice the dots on the far right of the graph. Those are intentional. The data collectors experienced some challenges with data collection as a consequence of the pandemic, so those dots represent adaptions that were made to try to maintain the integrity of the collection but knowing that the pandemic likely impacted some data collection, particularly in 2020 more so than 2021.

In any case, what we see here is a pattern of increase. Back in 2004, less than 10% of youth ages 12 to 17 experienced a major depressive episode. By 2021, that's over 20% had done so. That 20 percent of an age group of 12 to 17 represents about five million kids. So this is not necessarily a small problem.

One of the other elements that's captured in this data collection is something called major depressive episode with severe impairment. And severe impairment is probably something you might conjure up on your own. The depression is so strong that it basically limits your ability to participate in sort of these routine activities. For children or for youth, that's participating in chores at home, doing well at work or at school, their ability to get along with your family, or to just have a social life. So it's a pretty impactful and intense period, it runs around two weeks. And about three in four youth who would experience a major depressive episode in the past year, had it to the extent where the severe impairment was also very evident. Meaning they were pretty much debilitated by this major depressive episode. In addition to evaluating youth and who has experienced a major depressive episode, this data collection also finds out and reports on the proportion of youth that received treatment for depression. While the pattern here is less clear in terms of showing a sign of an increase, in 2021, about 40% of all youth 12 to 17 who had experienced a major depressive episode also went on to receive treatment for depression. So that's about two million youth ages 12 to 17 in 2021 that received treatment for depression.

Our next topic, we're going to switch gears and focus on substance use as reported by youth. We have a lot of candidates to draw on here in terms of informing our understanding of self-reported drug use. We're going to use, today, the Monitoring the Future data collection, which is probably one of the longer running data collections. Like the NSDUH survey we talked about with Topic 1, Monitoring the Future is also based on the self-report data collection. It dates back to the mid-1970s. Initially, a survey of high school seniors. And in the early 1990s, the survey extended it to include eighth graders and tenth graders. So we're going to take a look at what Monitoring the Future has to say around substance use by youth.

In our first slide here, we're going to start with some usual suspects, if you will. Alcohol, cigarettes, and marijuana are substances commonly associated with youth and is part of the growing rites of passage youth typically go through. What we're looking at here is the proportion of seniors who reported past month use of alcohol, cigarettes, and marijuana. And we're anchored at 1985, just for the purposes of today. And there's some good news showing on here, if you're looking at it. The alcohol trend since 1985 has generally been on the decline, so that the proportion of seniors reporting past month alcohol use has dropped from about 66%, 67% in the mid-80s, to under 30% by

2022. Similarly, cigarette use has been on a decline since about 1997. So much so that by 2022, we're talking about a handful of a percent of seniors reported using cigarettes in the past month. Unlike the other two patterns, however, marijuana shows sort of a different trend. It had this decrease through the early 90s and then increased somewhat through the mid-90s, late 90s, and has kind of stayed within this limited range, somewhere between 18% and 24% of seniors report using marijuana in the past month.

We're going to zoom in here on a more recent period of time, the last handful of years or so, of the Monitoring the Future collection and focus on cigarette use and marijuana use to see the more recent pattern here. On the left here, the cigarette use pattern shows you the proportion of seniors that used in 2017 compared to 2022 has been cut in half. And on the right side, you see marijuana use has declined somewhat but not nearly to the same extent as what we're seeing for cigarette use reported by seniors. And if I stop there, you might think this is relatively good news. Some of you are probably foreshadowing what's coming next. And we have a change that has happened and the change deals with vaping. And if you are around, I don't know, teenage kids, perhaps you may know of this already. Monitoring the Future extended their collection into vaping and specific substances, excuse me, in 2017. So the images we were just looking at, I added vaping nicotine to the image on the left, vaping marijuana to the image on the right. And what this shows and what it tells us is that cigarette use in its traditional form has been replaced by vaping of nicotine. And if you look at the pattern from 2017, this is a short window of time. The proportion of seniors who vaped nicotine in the past month pretty much has grown each year, through 2019, and it's come down somewhat, but it's still twice as many seniors reported use in 2022 compared to 2017.

On the flip side, for marijuana use, that's still the predominant means of accessing or using marijuana by seniors, but vaping of marijuana has been on the rise each year since 2017. And these are the kinds of trends, if you look at them by grade, as I mentioned, Monitoring the Future takes things apart by eighth, tenth, and twelfth grades. They also do other demographics. The patterns we're looking at here on vaping, both nicotine and marijuana are replicated across grades. And, in fact, the increase between eighth graders and tenth graders in the proportion at either vape nicotine or vape marijuana, both those proportions doubled from eighth grade to tenth grade.

We're going to jump now into topics that are more aligned with youth and their connection or linkages to the justice system, the first of which deals with violence against youth and sort of where we sit now relative to where we've been in the past. And this first topic on violence, on the victimization side, we have some candidates that we can draw on for understanding what the victimization experiences are like for youth. We're going to use two for today's purposes.

The first is the National Crime Victimization Survey, which is sponsored by BJS, Bureau of Justice Statistics. It's also based on a household survey of persons ages 12 and older. We'll also take a look at the supplemental homicide reports as collected by the FBI to look at both non-fatal victimization and fatal victimization. We're going to start with the non-fatal victimization reported by youth and the patterns we see from 1993 through 2021. The images you see now split violence into two types. The line in red is serious violence, which includes robbery, violent sexual assault, and aggravated assault, and then the blue line represents simple assault only. And you can see the good news, generally, here is that victimization rates for youth ages 12 to 17 have declined considerably since the early 1990s. In fact, I believe the decline for both serious violence and simple assault, in terms of youth victimization rates, are down about 90% for both of those offenses from 1993 through 2021. So that's, I think, what we would agree that that's somewhat encouraging. But I also think when we're dealing with violence and when we're talking about the issue of violence, I think what we're mostly concerned about is murder or homicide, and that's a different story to talk about.

Switching gears again, drawing on data collected by the FBI Supplementary Homicide Reports, we're looking at the number of youth homicide victims from 1980 through 2020. And I've got some color-coded bars here I want to talk through real quickly here. The red bar in 1993 was the peak year in terms of the number of youth homicide victims, about 2,800 victims. There's a lighter blue bar around 2013, about 1,200 victims. That was the lowest number of youth homicide victims during this 1980 to 2020 period. And then the more recent year, 2020 shows about 1,700, almost 1,800 youth homicide victims. And had we been talking about this through data year 2019, I'd probably have this conversation a little differently because prior to 2020, things, in terms of the number of youth victims of homicide, had sort of stabilized somewhat.

But then 2020 happened. And the reality is between 2019 and 2020, there was a 30% increase in the number of youth homicide victims. That's an increase of about 400 victims under the age of 18 in one year. And that increase, that 30% increase in that one-year period is the largest such increase during the 1980 to 2020 period. And if you pay attention to some of the news that's been circulating now around violence, you may know what I'm about to say. In the five-year period, from 2016 to 2020, homicide was the third leading cause of death among youth ages 10 to 17. During that same five-year period, the number one leading cause of death was unintentional injuries, which are your accidents. And third was suicides. We do know certain things about the patterns in homicide that are helpful to understand the one-year growth between 2019 and 2020. Now, in any given year, youth ages 15 to 17 generally account for the largest share of homicide victims. And the next largest group would be youth under the age of six. When

we look at the increase between 2019 and 2020, we see that almost two-thirds of the increase in homicides between that one year were associated with the killing of youth ages 15 to 17 with a firearm. So we're going to look at firearms as our next part of the homicide discussion.

Briefly, I'll talk about the change here is in, we're looking at the proportion of youth who were killed with a firearm, youth victims under the age of 18, 1980 to 2020. And in 2020, nearly two-thirds of youth victims were killed by a firearm. If you've been in the field or in this business for any amount of time will know about what was going on in the mid-1990s with respect to youth as victims of violence or youth as offenders or on the offending side, the mid-90s were a problematic period. The proportion of youth killed by a firearm in 2020 exceeded the proportion at this peak violent time in the mid-1990s. We also know, however, that firearm violence in particular, there are certain age groups who are at larger risk or greater risk of being killed by a firearm. The slide here looks at the youth demographics of firearm victims in 2020. And if you look at the top chunk in the dark blue bar bars, it's just the victim's age profile. So 90% of youth victims ages 15 to 17 in 2020 were killed by a firearm. We see that Black youth victims were more likely than white victims to be killed by a firearm, as were males more likely to be killed by a firearm than females.

When you look at the age distribution, the zero to five age group, very unlikely to be killed by a firearm. If we were in-person, this would be one of the question-and-answer sections, but for youth under the age of six, the most common weapon used is what's called a personal weapon, which is hands, fist, or feet. We're staying on the topic and theme of violence. Look at it from a different perspective in terms of violent crime by youth from the period through 2020. Violent crime by youth over this long period is at a relatively low level. The data source that we're going to focus on here is information collected by the FBI through what was called the Uniform Crime Reporting Program, which, as you may know, is being replaced, or has been replaced, by the National Incident-Based Reporting System. The data we're using for this chunk of the presentation focuses on data collected through the Uniform Crime Reporting Program so we can look at a long window of time using data collected in a consistent manner. For context, we're going to start, however, with the overall trend in arrests of youth just generally.

So this first slide here is the estimated number of youth arrests over a relatively long period of time. This is all offenses, 1980 through 2020. Youth is zero to seventeen for the purposes of the next couple of slides. So this is the real big picture. Arrests for youth for any kind of offense has been on a decline for quite some time, basically since 1996. Between 1996 and 2020, youth arrests for any offense fell by more than 80%. We are at

a peak of about 2.6 million arrests in 1996 and we're below 500,000 as of 2020. So I think that's a relatively solid way to think about context, what's been going on with youth and their involvement in offending. And we know that violence is a generally small proportion of overall offending or arrests by youth.

We'll switch gears here and look at trends in arrests for violent offenses. Violent crimes for the purposes of today include murder, robbery, aggravated assault. The brief reason for that is there was a definitional change for rape, some years ago that we have elected to remove rape from the violent crime index and just focus on this family of violent crimes. So what we're looking at now is a trend in youth arrests for violent crimes for the same time period. And the graph here looks somewhat similar to the one we just looked at. You see this peak in the mid-1990s, followed by a generally long period of decline. In fact, the estimated number of arrests of youth for violent crimes in 2020 is about 78% below the peak in 1994. So it's pretty substantial change that we've seen over a period of time.

And if you think about the number of arrests for violent crimes in 2020, which is about 32,000, and I do want to do a little thought game with you. If we can pretend for just a minute that each one of those arrests represented a person. That's not really how the data are collected. They're not a count of people. They're a count of an arrest. But if we think about them in terms of each arrest for a violent crime of a youth was for a specific individual youth, that would suggest that 32,000 kids under the age of 18 were arrested in 2020 for a violent crime, and the youth population zero to 17 is 72.8 million. So if you take out your phone, use your calculator, that 32,000 over that 72.8 million would suggest that a fraction of the U.S. youth have been arrested for violent crime. Less than one-half of one percent of, and it's actually smaller than that. But that's something to put your head around. A really small proportion of youth are arrested for violent crime.

But this big pattern has smaller patterns within it that are useful to understand, and the first of which will focus on our trends for robbery and aggravated assault, as these two offenses dominate the volume of arrests for violent crime. Real quickly, we see robbery in the red line, aggravated assault arrests on the lighter blue line. And robbery, they show different patterns. Robbery has this period of decline, increase, decline, increase, and then basically a period of decline through 2008 to 2020, where aggravated assault is more of a prolonged decline from the mid-1990s down through 2020. Both have declined since 1994, which was the peak year of arrest for youth for either robbery or aggravated assault. Both have declined about 74%, 75% since their peak to where we are now in 2020.

But as I mentioned on the victimization side, I think when we're talking about violence, I think what we're really mostly concerned about is the offense of murder. So that's what we're looking at here. This is a trend in the estimated number of arrests for murder, 1980 through 2020. And lots you can take away from this long-term view here. Again, the mid-1990s were a problematic period for youth on the offending side and on the victimization side. You can see the rise in murder arrests involving persons under the age of 18 from about 1984 through 1993 and then you see the concomitant decline, a substantial decline as it was an increase from 1993 to about 2020. But if you've been in the field, you may have heard this phrase, the super predator, and a lot of what was going on in the 90s and the notions of our youth sort of becoming something unrecognizable in terms of their propensity for violence, a lot of those perceptions and a lot of those concerns were born out of this rise of a graph like this that was just growing. We didn't know the end of the story. We only knew things were climbing. But the good news is all of that increase between—the decade-long increase from 1984 to 1993 was all erased by 2000 in terms of murder arrest for youth. Since that time, you'll see that arrests for youth declined through 2012, which is its lowest point in this period of 1980 through 2020, and then there was an increase, about 27%, in the number of youth arrests for murder between 2012 and 2018, and since then it's basically stabilized.

The overall takeaway here is that where we are now, and now it's the data year of 2020, number of youth arrests for murder is 75% below than the number of arrests in 1993, peak year.

Our next topic sort of ties into what we were just talking about. It looks at transfer provisions in particular and how most states, and since the period of about 2004 through 2019, it has gone about changing some of the parameters of their transfer provisions. Transfer provisions come in a couple different forms. Administrator Ryan mentioned earlier in her opening remarks about what we call a judicial waiver as one of the more common transfer mechanisms that's available through all the states. One of the comments that I think about when I talk about the violence by youth, and what we understand about changes in transfer policies that were born around the same time that idea of the super predator, many folks would argue that those provisions that changed become harsher for some states, some folks would say those are the direct response to the increase in violence by youth that official data were telling us about that. I'm not specifying that that's exactly what happened, but I know I have read many things where folks tried to make that connection for us. What I can talk about is what we have seen in terms of change in the period 2004 through 2019. And we have just a few things we'll talk about here.

The first big takeaway here—I do appreciate the person who did respond and asked me to slow down. That's the kind of feedback I do appreciate. So thank you for chiming in and taking one probably for whoever else was on the call. I will try to do that. This map here is looking at the period of 2004-2019 and our assessment of state transfer provisions and categorizing whether or not states made a change. The map is four categories. The unshaded areas, unshaded states, from our determination, effectively no meaningful change during that period of 2004 to 2019 in those states. States in the blue, the dark blue, are what we considered narrow changes. And the narrow changes are things that would limit the age criteria that make a youth eligible to be transferred to criminal court. This category would also include Raise the Age initiatives, changes to a state's upper and lower age of juvenile court jurisdiction or changing the offenses that make a youth eligible to be transferred to criminal court. It would also include the adaptation of what's called reverse waiver provisions. So about 16 states narrowed their transfer provisions, fewer youth eligible reduced the pool eligible to be transferred. The green states, they're a little bit of both. They both expanded and narrowed. And the example that we came up with is New York state that erased the upper age of juvenile court jurisdiction, which is a good thing if you believe that juvenile court is the place for youth to have their matters heard, so more kids were eligible for juvenile court jurisdiction. But they did make an expansion through the exclusion provision to include additional offenses and lowering the minimum age for certain offenses. So those are the seven states in green. And then we have seven states in yellow or gold where they expanded. That was the only meaningful change they made, where they expanded their transfer provision. Typically, this would be adding offenses, or lowering the age limits, or adding additional transfer provisions to their mix of what's available. So this will be a few we can say with some confidence about legislative change.

But one of the things that I think is important to keep in mind and one of the questions we at NCJJ get asked fairly often is, how many youth are transferred or handled, depending on the phrasing, it's how many youth are transferred to, handled by, processed in criminal court? And it's a question in 2023 we really don't have a great answer for. And, in fact, in some regards, we know embarrassingly little about the number of youth in criminal court. And what we do know comes from a different project, and it's not about kids, it's about cases. The image that's onscreen now is showing us the trend and the number of delinquency cases that are judicially waived to criminal court. So a couple things I want to make sure I unpack clearly here. Judicially waived, in this instance, this means a matter originated in juvenile court was subject to a waiver hearing and a juvenile court judge determined that the matter should be handled in criminal court. So these aren't counts of kids. These are counts of cases that were brought before juvenile court, a juvenile court judge determined that criminal court was the appropriate venue to handle the matter. So hopefully I said that clear enough.

The data that populates this and tells us about this comes from an OJJDP project called the National Juvenile Court Data Archive. It produces a report series called the *Juvenile Court Statistics* and it makes available a range of frequently asked questions and a data analysis tool where you can ask and answer your own kinds of questions about a range of things related to processing delinquency cases in juvenile court. This is our data source for understanding the volume of cases that originate in juvenile court but end up in criminal court.

And if we look at the offense pattern or the offense trends since the peak year of 1994, when the largest number of delinquency cases were waived to criminal court, we see that a couple things show up when we look at the graph by the most serious offense of the case. Person offenses. Things like aggravated and simple assault, robbery, violent sexual assault, those kinds of things have always been the larger number of cases that found their way into criminal court via judicial waiver. We can see that the numbers of property, public order, and drug offense cases that have been judicially waived have declined substantially since 1994. Each declined at least 80%. And the decline for person offenses has been somewhat more mild. Well, not mild. That's not the right phrase. Somewhat less. Sixty-six percent. And what that leaves us with is something like this, when we look at the proportion of the offense profile of cases judicially waived to criminal court. Back in 1994, about 42% of all cases waived to criminal court were person offenses. By 2020, that was up to about 62%. So the profile cases that are moving into criminal court via judicial waiver are by and large more likely to include a person offense than another kind of offense.

Let me try and put some of the prior information together in a different way, and one of the topics that's been of interest to OJJDP for some time used to be called DMC. Now it goes under the phrasing of racial and ethnic disparities. And it boils down to youth of color and how they are handled in juvenile court. The topic here is phrased as youth of color are handled differently in juvenile court than their white peers. There's a couple ways in which we tend to unpack this topic and try to understand it. I'm going to talk about two techniques that are fairly common to use, and both are useful to frame the problem and understand where different areas of case processing may exhibit troublesome signs. Well, the first and most direct way of thinking about this is looking at proportions, and I'm going to explain it with the next slide.

And it's really just a matter of you find out what the race profile of the resident population, for example, what proportion of youth population is this race, this race, this race, and this race. And they do the same kind of comparison and computations to find

out what proportion of youth are, the race profile of youth by different processing stages of the juvenile court structure. That's one way of understanding overrepresentation.

Another way of thinking about disparity is looking at case processing rates and looking at the likelihood of something occurring for one group versus another group. And if I do this well, that will make complete sense in a few minutes. So we'll see if I do make sense soon.
This first picture is an attempt to summarize this proportional type of comparison. So what we're looking at here is a lot. I'll try to walk through what we've got going on here. The first bar across the top is just the race profile of the youth population. So this is for 2020 and what we're looking at here is 53% of the white, non-Hispanic population in 2020 were white youth, 15% of the 2020 youth population were Black youth, 24% were Hispanic youth, 2% were American-Indian, and about 6% were Asian, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander youth. So that's our base comparison. This overrepresentation idea is you now do the same kind of computation for other components of a system. I picked some juvenile court processing stages here. I looked at cases referred to juvenile court, cases detained, cases that were petitioned for formal processing, cases that were adjudicated, meaning that the case was brought before juvenile court and they adjudicated the case for a delinquent offense "committed." The youth, he or she "committed" the offense, if you want to use generic criminal court language. And those that were adjudicated and placed, and finally cases that were judicially waived.

And the main takeaway from this slide is if you follow the dark red bars, what it's showing here is that at each stage of juvenile court, Black youth are overrepresented relative to their proportion in the youth population. And they're not overrepresented by a small degree. In fact, they're proportionate. All the juvenile court stages are, at least, twice their proportion in the youth population. For example, Black youth accounted for 15% of the youth population in 2020. They accounted for 40% of cases detained in 2020, 41% of cases that were adjudicated and ultimately placed out of the home. And they accounted for more than 53 [percent] of the cases judicially waived to criminal court. Not showing on this particular slide, the arrest age. And the arrest age is not shown here mainly because the arrest data at the time through 2020, the ethnicity component was not very strong in the UCR data collection. We can do ethnicity evaluations with the juvenile court archive data that are used for this particular presentation. But the arrest pattern, if you ignore the ethnicity component, the Black proportion of arrest relative to their population repeats the same general pattern, we're looking at here.

The other way to think about this and the other way to look at this is to create and calculate a series of case processing rates. And I'm not going to talk through the

granular components of the math. I don't think the nuance-y steps of it are important here but basically what I want to be able to do is make comparisons from one group to the next. And a nice way to do that is to calculate a rate of some kind to compare, for example, the referral rate for white youth to the referral rate for youth of other races. So for Black youth, America-Indian youth here. And I wouldn't pay too much attention to the values that are on screen now. This is just to kind of set the tone for where we're going to go next. But these are case processing rates for select stages of the juvenile court process. So the rows are cases referred to juvenile court, cases that are diverted, cases that are detained, cases that received formal probation, and cases placed out of the home. And then across the top are the different race groups that we want to evaluate and compare. So these are case processing rates by race. And what we want to do is compute these rates and then compare the rates for white youth to each of the other youth of color groups. So we create this ratio and the ratio then tells us how much more likely an event is for one group compared to another group. And we do that division and we do those rate calculation, we get something that looks like this. And everything that just turned red or pink, whatever light color that displays on there, it has a bold font face, is telling us that the referral rate for Black youth is 2.8 times higher than the referral rate for white youth for delinquency cases referred to juvenile court in 2020. Similarly, the referral rate for delinquency cases involving America-Indian Alaskan Native Youth was 1.3 times higher than the referral rate for white youth.

So if you are following along how I'm talking through this, the two stages that tend to be problematic when we look at a matrix like this are the detention step. As you can see here, for each race or ethnic group shown, their rate of detention is, at least, 40% higher than the rate of detention for white youth. Go down into the last row, these are cases that are adjudicated and placed out of the home. And for Black youth and for Hispanic youth, cases involving either Black youth or Hispanic youth, are about 40% more likely to result in a disposition of placement than cases involving white youth. So that ratio is telling us, A, something is more likely than the other and then the magnitude of that difference. And that's what we want to pay attention to is how much more. Not just a matter of is it more likely for group A versus group B but how much more likely I think is an important way to understand the problem. So I think it allows us to think about how we monitor trends and change over time.

So, here, we are looking at now a one-year window of four different decision points, and we're looking at all the general offenses that we have available to us, which are person, property, drugs, and public order. And the boxes here, hopefully, if you're viewing us on a screen, this is clear. You've got referral rates in the top left, over to the right, you've got diversion rates, and then detention and placement. And the pattern I just talked about before about placement and detention being particularly problematic stages

where youth of color tend to have higher rates of detention and placement relative to cases involving white youth, that's a pattern that's replicated across offenses. The flip side of that that I didn't hammer home real strongly the first time is diversion rates tend to be higher for cases involving white youth than for cases involving youth of color. And these kinds of patterns—I'm paying attention to time here. I want to make sure I get through the last couple things. These patterns that we've seen have been in that I've shown you for one year have been in place for a really, really long time. So I'm going back to a higher level summary here where I'm looking at detention rates on the right, excuse me, detention rates on the left for delinquency offenses and placement rates on the right for period 2005 to 2020. And across all these years, the rates for white youth are generally lower than the rates for cases involving youth of color.

Because I'm trying to make sure we have time for questions, I'm going to skip to Topic 7 because I want to make sure I cover this. Number of youth in residential placement continues to decline. And I can't tell you how delighted I am to be able to share data from the latest Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement collection for data year 2021. Just arrived in our offices about a month or so ago. So we can talk a little bit about that. If you're not familiar with where these data come from, OJJDP sponsors two data collections relevant to youth in residential placement facilities.

The first collection that we're going to talk about is the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement. That is a count of kids in placement on one day, the fourth Wednesday of October in odd-numbered years is when we take a picture of the youth population in residential placement. The opposite collection is called the Residential Facility Census and it's about the facilities that hold youth. But the point that I want to focus on, two points here. One, this is the pattern looking at youth in placement, and that means youth who are held for an offense. 1997 is when the CGRP was introduced. Looking at this long window of time, 2021 is the first time the collection reports a population of youth in placement under 25,000. So we've had a 77% decline in the overall youth population in placement since 2000 peak. Since almost 109,000 youth in placement in 2000, that's dropped to under 25,000 rather in 2021. And you are the first folks to know about the 2021 change, so congratulations. So when we look at the CGRP data and understand our youth in placement, I tend to focus on its core groups. The overall population count is useful to get a sense of youth under correctional supervision, but that big number really breaks out into two particular pieces. One is youth who are in a placement facility under a status of detention. So that's more of a temporary situation. They're waiting some other action by the courts or some other hearing to be held. So they are not intended to be there for the long haul. It's more of a temporary stay. That's one type of youth who is in a placement facility. The other type are youth who find themselves in placement as a result of a court order sanction, and

those are youth who are these as part of a disposition. And you can see that those populations of both detained youth and committed youth have declined considerably since the start of the collection in 1997.

There is another group here called a diversion group, but they typically account for less than two or three percent of the overall standing population in any given year. But the population of detained youth and committed youth have dropped considerably. But what's interesting, in terms of some of the characteristics of youth in placement for a detention or commitment, is something similar to what I mentioned before when talking about judicial waiver, is that a growing proportion of youth in placement for a detention or for commitment are there for a person offense. If you look over the long period of time, about 30% of detained youth in 1997 were there for a person offense. By 2021, that's more than half. Similarly, about 35% of youth committed to placement in 1997 were there for a person offense. About 46% in 2021 were there for a personal offense.

The last topic, in the interest of time, I am going to abbreviate parts of this and I will be intentionally quick. Not to hide anything. This slide deck is available to anybody who wants it, and I'll give you my email at the end. A few months ago, my colleague, Sarah, who's on the call, my esteemed colleague, Sarah, I meant to say, and, fortunately, to have her work as a co-author in so many things, her and I were fortunate enough to do some analysis of a cohort of youth referred to juvenile court. We looked at youth born in the calendar year 2000 and wanted to find out like what proportion of these kids are referred to juvenile court and then what proportion of them come back and how often. So kind of a referral analysis, referral history, if you will. This is not the venue to get into the specific methodology of it. I'm going to walk through quickly some of the key findings because I think it's useful to—the last slide is the one I really want to focus on.

Overall, we found that the proportion of youth in our cohort who came back was not what we necessarily expected. We called most of the cohort as being one and done. That is 37% of the youth in this particular cohort came back at some point before they aged out of juvenile court. And the images on here now just show you the return rates of youth by different demographic. So males are more likely to come back, at least once, than females. Black and American Indian youth more likely to come back than their peers. Younger youth obviously, if they start early are more likely to come back than older peers. Youth referred for motor vehicle offense or a burglary offense more likely to return than youth who are first referred for other offenses. This slide is not animated but this is the slide I wanted to talk about. And what the slide is, what I think is impactful about what we're able to look at, is that a real small number of youth generate a lot traffic for juvenile courts. So we had a sample of 161,000 youth. More than 60 percent of those youth, 101,000, only had one referral. That's all we saw from them in their time

under juvenile court jurisdiction. Another 37,000 had two or three referrals—in their history. Twenty-two thousand had four or more referrals. So you're talking about—37% of youth, if you look at the cases they generate—those with four or more referrals generated 153,000 cases. Almost half of all the cases that generated by the cohort were generated by 22,000 youth who had four or more referrals to juvenile court.

And I apologize that I had to speed up there. I do not like to try to talk too, too fast. Good news, bad news. Good news is I'm done talking, so your ears will get a break. Bad news is if you missed anything and want to hear it again, I can't say it exactly, but I'll be glad to share this presentation with you. The QR codes that are onscreen now, the one on the left is to access the report and to request a print copy or to download the PDF. The blue QR code on the right is to OJJDP's Statistical Briefing Book. While the report itself is now outdated because new information is available, that new information, it's our responsibility at NCJJ to keep the content of the report up-to-date as quickly as possible, and we do that through adding content to the OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book. I went a little bit longer than I meant to, but I am going to stop here and try to look at some of the questions so I can get caught up. And I will thank you if you have to bail. I thank you for your attention today.

I'm going to start answering some questions that were filtered to me, if that's okay. And since I can't see anybody, nobody can really show me that they disagree. So I'm going to try to summarize the question and my answer might be that I don't know, but, at least, I want to let you folks know that we are reading what's going on here.

So one question, "Does the data for youth arrests include youth charge as adults due to their nature of their crime?" The arrest data? Yes, for the purposes of the way the UCR data were collected, the age groups were bifurcated simply on an age cut. Under 18, 18 and over. So that charged as adult or not charged as adult was not coming into play to determine whether or not—sorry. I didn't phrase that properly. The juvenile count is a distinction of the age of under the age of 18. It's not specific to the matter in which that youth will be handled. So for D. Whipple, I hope that helps. If not, please shoot me a question separately.

"How do disproportionate rates of referral, detention placement act for youth of color differ by geographic area?" How do they? I can tell you that they do. We're using national data to address that. We do have the ability to look at geographic changes. We did not do that for the purpose of this presentation. But if—it's Julianna. I can point you to some resources. If you grab my email address, we can follow up and have a side conversation about that offline, if you don't mind. "Is the data referred?"

ANDREA COLEMAN: Chaz, if I could just jump in here sort of...

CHARLES PUZZANCHERA: Yup.

ANDREA COLEMAN: ...to tag on to what you said about racial and ethnic disparity and how it looks different across the country and not only does it look different, of course, these are national data. Also, the races and ethnicities of youth also vary depending on where you are in the country as well. So, for example, in parts of the country where there's a large Native American/Alaskan Native youth population, their disproportionate numbers are going to be higher than what we would think for those "traditional youth of color" like Black youth and Latinx kids. So I just wanted to provide some context for those data.

CHARLES PUZZANCHERA: Thank you, Andrea. I'm sorry. Just, folks, so you know, I'm seeing questions are kind of not in order necessarily, so I'm trying to read things that I feel like I can address in the time we have. And for anybody who does have a question, I can stay on longer if you would like to. "Is there any data that verifies the successes of residential placements?" Not in the way the national data are collected, no. There probably are accounts of successes that you could find from more of like unique or individualized research studies, but the national data are not designed or engineered to tap into that particular aspect. Andrea, if that's a spot you have one way on, feel free. D. Whipple, I can point you to someone who I know has done work in this area. It may be that you can find some information on a model data guide, what's the…Andrea, what's the name of that? I just went blank.

ANDREA COLEMAN: The Model Programs Guide.

CHARLES PUZZANCHERA: Thank you.

ANDREA COLEMAN: OJJDP's Model Program Guide, yes.

CHARLES PUZZANCHERA: Yes. It went away completely. There might be some information that you can pull from there that would, at least, hint at the kind of…the question you're asking. You folks are active chatters, which I appreciate. I just want to get caught up so I don't miss anything. I'm sorry. Now, a question that came in last. "Any data on youth with IEPs?," Sarah, that—I don't know if you know or recall of anything on the JRFC that has that specific in there. We've tended not to look at it, but I'm not certain if you recall the content of the JRFC, if it's being said at all.

SARAH HOCKENBERRY: Yeah. No. That information is not collected in the JRFC. The extent to what we learn about education at juvenile facilities is just whether or not youth are screened for educational needs, what grade level they're at, as well as what kind, if any, educational instruction is provided at the facility, but we don't know anything more specific than that.

CHARLES PUZZANCHERA: Okay. "What constitutes public order?" I don't know if Julianna Berardi is still on. Public order, lots of different things go into that. Typically, it's going to be obstruction of justice, disorderly conduct, certain weapons offenses, tools of crime kinds of things, nonviolent sex offenses. Some of—what's included there does depend on the data collection, but those types of offenses are the kinds of things you would find in there. "Are we able to see data broken down to a state-by-state level?" The answer is it depends. It depends on which data. Actually, it primarily depends on which data. CJRP data, they come out every other year. There are certain presentations available to look at state level. The juvenile court data that we use from the National Juvenile Court Data Archive are mainly presented and disseminated at the national level. There is arrest information you can get at the state level. The world of the arrest data and all of our law enforcement data understanding is changing with a shift to NIBRS between 2020, 2021. The FBI does have a website called the Crime Data Explorer where you can get information that's organized around state. It does become a question of how complete are the data you're looking at, and that varies by state and it always has varied by state from the law enforcement standpoint. For the other topics, I don't know if those questions were relevant to like the NCVS victimization. SHR data, homicide data, you can look at by state, assuming the state participates in it. Monitoring the Future and the NSDUH data on major depressive episodes, I am not certain offhand if those are available by states.

"Are [INAUDBIBLE] for the last piece that you went over." Katie Clark, thank you. Excellent question. And, yes, we have. The bulletin that we prepared was an attempt to replicate some parts of more detailed analyses that were done with a different cohort many years ago. And instead of trying to do everything we could do, we tried to get this document prepared, otherwise we'd still be working on it because it would never end. We couldn't answer everything we wanted to answer. We tried to develop a document that was like here's some things that we feel are easy to address, easy to explain kinds of questions. But the kind of question you first stated about the time at risk, the data aren't perfectly suited the way that we get them from the different data contributors, but certainly being able to control for time at risk is important for any kind of reoffending analysis and to the extent we're able to control for what we'd like to. But the work we had done initially was not positioned to tackle that. This one. Yeah, survival, sorry. I read the second part after the first part. Yes. I concur. I get it. Am I missing anything

else that's in here that somebody wants, if somebody is online that hasn't had their question answered, if you throw it back in the chat, I will try to address it.

SARAH HOCKENBERRY: Chaz, if you don't mind, I wanted to answer a question that Kendall Cooper had asked...

CHARLES PUZZANCHERA: Yeah.

SARAH HOCKENBERRY: ...towards the beginning about "How do you see the movement towards the legalization of marijuana..."

CHARLES PUZZANCHERA: Okay.

SARAH HOCKENBERRY: "...in multiple states changing the juvenile justice landscape? Do you think states who legalize it will keep marijuana offenses under status offenses or drug offenses?" This is something that we have our finger on right now. We don't know the answer. I can speak to you from the perspective of the data that's collected by the National Juvenile Court Data Archive. We are starting to see the ripple effects of states legalizing marijuana in the data that we receive at the juvenile court level. At the moment, using that data to inform our understanding. We just don't know enough yet. We are seeing that some states have reassigned it to a status offense. Some have kept it in the drug offense category but they have lessened the severity of it. Basically, we are really going to be using the next couple years to really try to understand how this is going to change the landscape, and not only that but like the data that we receive and how that's going to impact the data that we provide to the public. So we don't know yet but we definitely are starting to see the impact of it on the data that we receive.

CHARLES PUZZANCHERA: All right. Anything else? I'll come back in just because INDISTINCT] all right. I'm not certain I see more questions. I see a couple statements which I think those are separate side conversations. Good statements. I'm not discounting that. But I also like to respect folks' time. They've obligated themselves from 2:00 to 3:00. And I'm a Chatty Cathy if I get going, so I don't need to be tying up your afternoons. So if there are no other questions, I'm very thankful for you to take your time and join us today. And for those who are sticking around, I absolutely dropped the ball earlier on. I meant to publicly thank Sarah, Melissa Sickmund, and Nancy Tierney, my Pittsburgh colleagues for all the work that they did to help make sure we could get this report done, as well as our NIJ Grant Managers, Caitlin and Ben. All of those folks made this a better document than I ever would have done had I had to do it by myself. And, thankfully, I didn't have to work alone. I had a great team and I'm very thankful for all their help. So with that, I'm going to be done talking, and thank you again.

DARYL FOX: Wonderful. So on behalf of OJJDP, NCJJ, our panelists, we want to thank you for joining today's webinar. This will end