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Our Process

• Receive Relative Rate Index (RRI) data from WA-PCJJ
• Analyze data, create summary charts
• Interview stakeholders: Is this data accurate? What are the possible explanations for DMC? What is your county doing to address it?
  – At least three people, ideally from Court, Community, and Police, but usually more (data managers, probation, detention, etc.)
• Identify additional data that might answer questions above
• Write report summarizing level of RRI by county, reasons for it, and
Our Progress

• Developed interview protocol, obtained IRB approval, acquired and cleaned data for most jurisdictions
• Obtained relevant literature
• Established connections with the Task Force on Race and Justice
• Working with AOC and WA-PCJJ to get data on automatic transfers to adult court
• Built RRI and decision-point graphs for all counties
• Completed most interviews for King County and Pierce County
• Scheduling and conducting interviews for other JDAI jurisdictions
The method that OJJDP has selected for the identification stage is termed the Relative Rate Index (RRI). This method involves comparing the relative volume (rate) of activity for each major stage of the juvenile justice system for minority youth with the volume of that activity for white (majority) youth. The RRI provides a single index number that indicates the extent to which the volume of that form of contact or activity differs for minority youth and white youth. In its simplest form, the RRI is simply the rate of activity involving minority youth divided by the rate of activity involving majority youth.
## Completed/Scheduled Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Court administration</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Community member</th>
<th>Data analyst</th>
<th>JDAI Coordinator</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton/Franklin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations

• The category of Hispanic/Latino(a) is not collected for arrest.
• RRIs are initially based on census data
• Data on youth who are automatically transferred to adult court are not available (currently)
• Data on “probation placement” is not available for most counties unless it is tracked and entered locally.
Limitations

• Counties likely differ in their definitions of decision-points and race/ethnicities—comparing data across counties should be done with caution, if at all.

• Data may inappropriately categorize many groups of concern, such as East African immigrants, Eastern European immigrants, and many Asian and Pacific Islander.

• Race and ethnic categories may be excluded from analysis due to low numbers of youth in that category; this is a particular issue in small counties.
Initial Findings

• Jurisdictions are already engaging in the DMC reduction “praxis” (the cycle of reflection and action)
• There is a need for a statewide, unified, high-quality database with consistent data entry criteria
• DMC generally appears to be larger in earlier decision-points, specifically arrest, referrals, and diversion
• “Ownership” of DMC
• Concerns about overall decreases in juvenile contact, but stable or increasing RRIs
• Concerns about the highly interrelated disproportionate outcomes in child-serving systems (particularly juvenile justice, child welfare, education)