



## The Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Data Analysis: Recommendation of Standards

In March 2008, the Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (GJJAC) contracted with the Washington State Center for Court Research (WSCCR), the research section of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), to perform an evaluation, make recommendations, provide technical assistance, and conduct analyses of the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) in Washington State. Juvenile courts participating in JDAI are King, Pierce, Spokane, Whatcom, and Benton/Franklin.

This is an extensive study and this report is the second in the series, following the Data Capacity Assessment.<sup>1</sup> The Data Capacity Assessment describes the sites' 1) JDAI data collection efforts, 2) analysis of JDAI data, and 3) production of JDAI-related reports. This report contains recommendations for a common set of standards for data collection, analysis and reporting. Based on information gathered during the assessment, and with the guidance of a JDAI Standards Working Group, recommended standards were developed after comparing current site practices, JDAI reporting requirements, available data and technical limitations. Once adopted the standards will reconcile site data, analysis and reporting, and allow valid comparisons of JDAI outcomes. The final report in the series, to describe the results of efforts to implement these standards of data collection and reporting

<sup>1</sup> E. Valachovic, 2008. *The Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Data Analysis: Data Capacity Assessment*. Olympia, WA: Washington State AOC available at <http://www.courts.wa.gov/wscrr/?fa=ccr.publications>

### Summary

In March 2008, the Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee contracted with the Washington State Center for Court Research to 1) perform an evaluation, 2) make recommendations, 3) provide technical assistance, and 4) conduct analyses of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative in Washington State. Juvenile courts in King, Pierce, Spokane, Whatcom, and Benton/Franklin counties participate in the program.

This report is the second in a series, following the Data Capacity Assessment, scheduled for release between June 2008 and February of 2009. This report contains a set of recommendations to reconcile the collection, analysis and reporting of JDAI data. The final report will describe the results of efforts to implement these standards and the analysis of JDAI outcomes.

The standards recommended in this report were developed using information gathered during site assessments and with the guidance of a JDAI Standards Working Group. The assessment revealed that data collection, analysis and reporting differed from site to site, but that the quality and availability of data permitted reconciliation. The standards are designed to make optimal use of the information available from each site, resolve discrepancies in definitions between sites, and produce conformity in analysis and reporting. Adoption of these recommendations will allow direct comparison of JDAI outcomes between sites, across time and statewide. Additionally, the recommendations will continue to satisfy the Casey Foundation requirements.

approaches, is anticipated to be completed by February 2009.

## Background

The Annie E. Casey Foundation (Casey) pursues a variety of activities intended to more effectively meet the needs of today's vulnerable children and families.<sup>2</sup> Launched in 1992, JDAI is a Casey Foundation program that focuses on the detention component of juvenile justice. The objective of JDAI is to reduce the unnecessary detention of juveniles. The goals of the initiative are to:

1. Reduce the reliance on secure confinement.
2. Improve public safety.
3. Reduce racial disparities and bias.
4. Save taxpayers' dollars.
5. Stimulate overall juvenile justice reforms.

JDAI currently has a national representation of approximately 100 sites across 22 states and the District of Columbia.<sup>3</sup>

GJJAC selected JDAI as a model for best-practices outcomes and, with a grant from the Casey Foundation, King, Pierce, Spokane, and Whatcom counties began implementing JDAI in 2004. Benton/Franklin counties joined the initiative in July 2007. These counties represent approximately one-half of Washington State's youth population aged 10-17 and account for approximately one-half of Washington's juvenile referrals.<sup>4</sup> GJJAC administers JDAI in Washington State through a project coordinator. GJJAC sought an agent to evaluate and assist the data collection, analysis, and reporting for JDAI in Washington State and contracted with WSCCR in March 2008.

---

<sup>2</sup> Information available on May 20, 2008 from <http://www.aecf.org>

<sup>3</sup> Information available on May 20, 2008 from <http://www.aecf.org/Home/MajorInitiatives/JuvenileDetentionAlternativesInitiative.aspx>

<sup>4</sup> Information available on May 20, 2008 from <http://www.dshs.wa.gov/ojj/JDAI.shtml>

## Study Objectives

This study aims to:

- Assess the current data capacity at each of the five sites with regard to the quality and capability of available data and accuracy of analysis and reporting.
- Recommend a common set of standards in data collection, analysis, and reporting to increase consistency across sites.
- Demonstrate the adopted standards for data collection, analysis, and reporting using data from each site.

## Research Design

Thus far, the JDAI data analysis project involved an assessment of the data, analysis, and reporting from each site. During the spring of 2008, data, documentation, definitions, and calculations were collected from the JDAI sites, the JDAI statewide coordinator, the JDAI Help Desk, and Casey analysts. These materials were reviewed to determine the similarities and differences between JDAI sites, compliance with Casey Foundation reporting requirements and the quality and availability of the data to report JDAI outcomes.

## Assessment Findings Summary

The assessment revealed that each site collected, analyzed, and reported JDAI data in an internally consistent manner. Where each site's procedures require modification, to ensure accuracy or consistency, the adjustments would be straightforward and feasible. The sites generally conform to JDAI reporting requirements.

Between sites, data collection, analysis and reporting procedures differ substantially. Current comparison between JDAI sites is challenging. Although sites use reporting templates, definitions, and calculations that appear similar, direct comparison of measures and outcomes cannot safely be made.

The quality and availability of data at each JDAI site are sufficient to permit reconciling the procedures

while continuing to satisfying Casey Foundation requirements. Furthermore, there is sufficient data available to report pre- and post-JDAI outcomes. However, the assessment revealed that reconciling the reports through a common set of standards, definitions and procedures is necessary to permit site to site and statewide comparisons.

The data capacity assessment identified several issues that would need to be addressed through standardization of site analysis and reporting procedures in order to satisfy JDAI reporting requirements and reconcile site reports:

- Exclude, or count separately, youth that do not participate in the JDAI.
- Collapse racial categories to a set that satisfies the Casey Foundations requirements but is sustainable based on the data limitations of each site.
- Subtotal Hispanic youth as an ethnicity, and then include it to match reporting requirements.
- Adopt a set of reported offense categories that is common to all JDAI sites.
- Adopt a standard ordering of offense categories to satisfy JDAI reporting requirements and increase comparability.
- Reconcile time data used in average length of stay (ALOS) and average daily population (ADP) calculations if supported by site data.
- Reconcile differences in reporting to more closely match the Casey Foundation templates.

This goal of this report is to describe a set of recommended standards that when adopted will reconcile all site reports with each other and with the Casey Foundation’s JDAI reporting requirements. Additionally, the standards will provide a framework to measure detention practices at non-JDAI sites statewide in order to provide comparisons to determine the effectiveness of JDAI.

The standards recommended in this report were developed using information gathered during the

assessment. They account for the particular circumstances of data availability at each site and the current reporting procedures. They are designed to improve the accuracy and increase comparability while requiring a minimum of resources from the sites.

With the guidance and technical expertise of a JDAI Standards Working Group, each issue raised in the data assessment was addressed and suggestions for addressing the issues were made. The proposals were carefully reviewed, modified and refined to the satisfaction of all participants. The recommendations described are a result of the consensus built within the workgroup around the solutions identified as reasonable, practical and effective for standardizing the reports.

### JDAI Standards Working Group

For this study, a JDAI Standards Working Group was organized to provide feedback, guidance, and technical assistance on issues of definitions, analysis, and reporting. The JDAI Standards Working Group is composed of designated representatives from each of the five JDAI sites, the Washington State JDAI coordinator, WSCCR and AOC staff.

The WSCCR would like to thank the designated JDAI Standards Working Group participants:

Rand Young, Washington State JDAI coordinator; Michael Gedeon, King County; Ed Vukich, King County; TJ Bohl, Pierce County; Allyson Erickson, Pierce County; Bonnie Bush, Spokane County; Marie Studebaker, Spokane County; Lori Pence, Spokane County; Karen Gehret, Spokane County; Colleen Smith, Spokane County; David Reynolds, Whatcom County; and Eric Lipp, Benton/Franklin Counties.

Conferences began after the release of the first report; some meetings were in-person, others were by telephone. The Working Group provided detailed information on the capabilities and limitations of site data, current practices and site expectations. The

Working Group took an active role in design of new collection, analysis and reporting procedures and tools. The Working Group reviewed proposals, suggested modifications and improvements, and built a consensus around the recommendations produced for standardizing practices.

### **Annie E. Casey Foundation**

The WSCCR, during the development of these recommendations, worked to ensure that proposed definitions and standards continue to satisfy Casey reporting requirements. The WSCCR consulted with Casey, particularly in areas where JDAI documentation left room for local variation in reporting. Casey has experience with JDAI on a national level and with a diversity of sites beyond those in Washington State. Where no clear requirements or expectations existed, Casey could also provide some insight into practices around the country for guidance. The Working Group incorporated these considerations into the development of standardized reports and procedures.

5

Casey produces site-specific discrepancy reports that identify problematic areas in the statistics and calculations in the quarterly reports. The WSCCR reviewed these discrepancy reports to identify any additional problematic areas. The discrepancy reports confirm the data quality issues previously addressed in the data capacity assessment. Furthermore, the evaluation of the reports indicates that the issues so far identified remains comprehensive.

Casey staff attested to the difficulty of comparing one site's data with that from another site. Casey staff did not identify additional requirements or expectations for data, definitions, calculations or report formats. Casey intentionally structures the definitions, directions and report templates loosely to allow the sites to customize them to their programs. The sites must then properly annotate definitions used and measures reported.

---

<sup>5</sup> The WSCCR would like to thank Lola Simpson, Casey Foundation data analyst, for the information and assistance provided.

The lone concern raised by Casey was the preservation of a continuous and comparable reporting timeline. One of the goals of JDAI and of this project is to compare pre- and post- JDAI outcomes. WSCCR understands and shares the concern that discontinuities in the measures, definitions and calculations would produce data that is not comparable with previously reported data. As part of the upcoming analysis phase of this project, WSCCR will review past quarterly reports to determine whether the results in them should be revised to achieve comparability across time.

## **The Recommended Standards**

### **Impact on site operation**

WSCCR notes that the recommendations offered below are not meant to eliminate data collection, analysis, and reporting at the local level that is tailored to meet local needs. The recommended standards were developed to reconcile site reporting procedures to produce data and analysis that allows for between-site and statewide comparison of JDAI outcomes.

### **Exclusion of Non-JDAI Youth**

Casey instructs sites to exclude from reports youth housed at detention centers that do not participate in JDAI. For example, Casey instructs sites to exclude from reports youth held for other jurisdictions ("contract holds") and youth held temporarily before transfer to other authorities. These youth that enter detention are not processed through JDAI. Their trajectory through the juvenile court is not representative of the initiative. If a site includes these youth in calculations, the result will be to bias the reports of JDAI outcomes.

The majority of sites do not exclude these youth. It is common for sites to include these youth in calculations of gender and race. Some sites attempt to count them separately when reporting detention reasons. However, these sites tend to compare subpopulations against a total detention population

that includes these youth. Through discussion with the Working Group, it was agreed to recommend:

***Youth that do not participate in the initiative should not be included when reporting JDAI outcomes. The recommended standard for reporting will be to exclude these youth entirely from the reports.***

### ***Accounting Completeness***

The five site databases that will support the production of these reports each serve as a nexus of information compiled from a variety of sources. This creates opportunities for inaccurate or incomplete data to accumulate. Problematic data will be compounded as statewide data from other databases, such as those residing at AOC, is included in the analyses.

Rarely, demographic data such as gender may not be known if there is incomplete data, unavailable data, or data errors. More common is incomplete or unavailable data for race and ethnicity. In some databases youth who are of unknown race or ethnicity may account for a significant portion of the reported population. In other words, reported categories sometimes do not account for youth with unknown demographic characteristics, excluding them, for example, from counts reported by sex, race, or ethnicity. Reported categories should reflect the full range of possible data values, or valid values, for that measure. This will improve reporting and ensure proper accounting in reports.

***Consensus is to recommend the inclusion of “Unknown” where appropriate when reporting demographic information.***

### ***Gender***

All sites report Gender in the same manner. With the addition of the category for when gender is unknown, the workgroup agreed to the following recommendation:

***The standard for reporting gender will be to include Male, Female, Unknown identifications.***

### ***Race/Ethnicity***

Most sites have the ability to record a greater variety of racial identifications than is suggested by the Casey report templates. Sites do not generally report the same set of racial categories. Casey’s reporting template documentation explicitly allows deviation from the JDAI templates for reporting race to match the individual needs and circumstances of sites.

By comparing the reported racial categories across the five sites and aligning similarities, the categories collapse to a set that satisfies JDAI reporting requirements and is supported by the data available statewide and at each JDAI site. The most striking change will be for those sites that currently have the ability to report additional races, or more than one race at a time. Those sites will collapse these racial identifications into the “Other/Multiracial” category.

***For all reports, the recommendation with regard to race is to report the following set of racial identifications: African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Caucasian, Native American, Other/Multiracial, and Unknown.***

According to Casey, it is acceptable to report Hispanic as an ethnicity separately from the racial identifications. Again, note that where this change is incompatible with previously reported statistics, past reports will be reevaluated. This standard brings the reports more in line with widely-accepted state and national standards for reporting race and ethnicity.

***The recommendation is to report ethnicity separately from race and to identify youth as Hispanic, Non-Hispanic or of Unknown ethnicity.***

The effect of these recommendations will be different for each site depending on whether the site currently has the ability to report race and ethnicity for each individual. For sites that can report both pieces of information for any individual, the procedure will be to do so. For sites that cannot because of unavailable data, youth previously identified as of Hispanic race will be reported as being of Hispanic ethnicity and unknown race.

***For those sites that do not have the ability to report ethnicity separately from race, youth that were previously identified as Hispanic will be reported as Hispanic with race unknown.***

## **Casey Foundation Required Reports**

### ***Detention Population Report***

The Casey Foundation's Detention Population Report template requires that youth be reported in categories that describe the reason for detention. The reporting format permits only one detention reason category per youth, including youth in detention for multiple detention reasons. The Casey Foundation instructions are to count youth by the "top" detention reason. Sites must develop an ordering or hierarchy that ranks offense category reasons and determines how to categorize youth with multiple detention reasons. The striking consequence of this constraint is that the statistics reported are highly influenced by the specific ordering applied. A different set of categories or a unique ordering will produce dramatically different results. Examples of the consequences of this constraint were explored in detail in the data capacity assessment report.

Reconciliation of site reports requires a universal set of detention reason categories that are well-defined, and a common ordering or hierarchy imposed upon these categories that govern how youth having multiple detention reasons are classified. The detention statistics produced using these standards will remain dependent upon the specific set of categories and order chosen, but the standard will increase accuracy of comparisons made between sites and statewide.

### ***Detention Reason Categories***

Casey provides suggestions for the reports' detention reason categories. However, the exact list of categories, and the definitions of what is included in these categories, are left for sites to develop. The Foundation remains flexible on the detention reason categories used if 1) those chosen reflect the broad

categories described in the template and 2) the choices are annotated.

There were numerous differences between the set of offense categories used by each site. Through a series of site surveys and comparisons of currently reported detention reason categories, the Working Group was able to isolate categories that had similar definitions, and collapse categories that were dissimilar into more broadly defined ones.

Of special note, it was agreed to define "Other" to include all offenses not otherwise enumerated in the definitions of Person, Property, and Drug/Alcohol crimes. For this reason, it was seen as helpful to divide the "Other" category into felonies and misdemeanors. Also, in the uncommon instances where the offense classification is not known, it was decided to include these offenses with the misdemeanors.

The workgroup developed a consensus around the resulting set of detention reason categories:

***It is recommended that the list of detention reason categories include: Person-Felony, Person-Misdemeanor/Unknown, Property-Felony, Property-Misdemeanor/Unknown, Drug/Alcohol-Felony, Drug/Alcohol- Misdemeanor/Unknown, Other-Felony, Other- Misdemeanor/Unknown, Civil Matters, Failure To Appear (FTA)/Warrants, Probation Violation, and Court Ordered.***

Finally, to reduce ambiguity, the original category called "Status", which can refer to acts that are otherwise not offenses if committed by adults, was renamed as "Civil Matters" to reduce ambiguity and clarify that the category does not refer to offenses.

***Civil Matters refers to Dependency, Truancy, and Becca (At Risk Youth and Child In Need of Services) contempt and warrants.***

An additional clarification was necessary because of different practices at different sites. It was recommended that:

***Post-Adjudication Warrants will be included in the “FTA/Warrant” category. Therefore, FTA/Warrants will include any offender matter warrants.***

### ***Which charge to use***

The potential exists within some of the sites’ data to refer to different charges when aggregating youth into the detention reason category. For example, when determining the appropriate category, the choice emerges of whether to use the original referral charge or the primary charge from adjudication. This issue is complicated if we try to capture the information that led to detention decisions. An example might include a referral on a Residential Burglary that is then filed as a Criminal Trespass, two offenses that would result in a youth being counted in different places on the reports. The sites agreed to the following recommendation:

***Post Adjudication detention reasons will use the primary charge when reporting. However, when youth arrive on a Probable Cause and remain in detention, those records will be reported by the primary referral reason.***

### ***Detention Reason Hierarchy***

The determination of which detention reason hierarchy should govern where youth are counted in reports was the most difficult issue encountered while trying to reconcile the reports and recommend a standard. There are various well-reasoned and valid arguments that support different orderings of the detention reasons. These generally correspond with the distinct research and management purposes that particular orderings best illustrate. In this decision, there is no right or wrong answer. Any choice will reveal a different aspect of the data but still be limited in scope and conditional on that specific ordering.

Through the course of discussion, two schools of thought emerged. One is concerned with the seriousness of the underlying charge and the influence that plays on the detention decision. The other is the concerned with the degree of discretion exercised in

the detention decision and the effect on the reform initiative. While these two purposes are not at odds, they are not always in agreement.

The goal of reporting the detention reasons in order of seriousness is often to reflect an impact on public safety and to illustrate the degree to which more serious offenses incur increasing detention time. Discussion with Casey suggested that this is the viewpoint Casey sees in the detention population report. As a tool to indicate the effect of the initiative on decreasing reliance on detention, the ordering of detention reasons to reflect the discretion exercised in the detention decision appears more effective. For example, sites indicated that youth arriving on a FTA/Warrant were mandatorily held in detention.

When we consider, as examples from the data capacity assessment revealed, that minor changes in the reported ordering can have significant effect on the outcomes, the importance of the decision is underscored. One additional consideration is that not all sites have the ability to modify their currently reported detention reason category hierarchy. In King County, the detention reason cited is made according to one hierarchy prior to entry into the data systems. Information about additional detention reasons for youth that have more than one is unavailable.

In order to accommodate all of these factors, the workgroup has decided to recommend that the Casey Foundation Detention Population Report be split into two versions. This decision to split the presentation of this report does not compromise the data in any way, the first ordered according to the restrictions placed on detention facilities to consider seriousness, the second ordered according to risks and safety. Doing so will provide two perspectives on the same set of data and the two reports will provide greater detail than could be found in any one report of this format.

***The recommendation is that Detention Population results will be reported in versions reflecting two different orderings of the detention reason***

categories. The two reported hierarchies, in order of priority, are:

1. **FTA/Warrants**
2. **Person-Felony**
3. **Property-Felony**
4. **Drug/Alcohol-Felony**
5. **Other-Felony**
6. **Person- Misdemeanor/Unknown**
7. **Property- Misdemeanor/Unknown**
8. **Drug/Alcohol- Misdemeanor/Unknown**
9. **Other- Misdemeanor/Unknown**
10. **Court Ordered**
11. **Probation Violation**
12. **Civil Matters**

And

1. **Person-Felony**
2. **Property-Felony**
3. **Drug/Alcohol-Felony**
4. **Other-Felony**
5. **Person- Misdemeanor/Unknown**
6. **Property- Misdemeanor/Unknown**
7. **Drug/Alcohol- Misdemeanor/Unknown**
8. **Other- Misdemeanor/Unknown**
9. **FTA/Warrants**
10. **Court Ordered**
11. **Probation Violation**
12. **Civil Matters**

### **Casey Reporting Template**

These recommendations above are used to modify the Casey reporting templates available from the JDAI Help Desk into the report templates attached (See Appendix A1-5). These templates are provided to be used for all future reporting of JDAI outcomes to the Casey Foundation. They will serve as models to reevaluate past quarterly reports.

***The recommendation is to use the detention population, referrals screened and override templates provided for quarterly reporting Washington State JDAI outcomes to the Casey Foundation (See Appendix A1-5).***

### **Referrals Screened (RAI) and Overrides Report**

Not all sites divide scores into a low, medium or high range, where low corresponds to a recommendation of release, medium to a recommendation of release with conditions and high with a recommendation of detain. While this complicates reporting, it does not prevent proper reporting for Casey or statewide purposes. Each site has the ability to use its own risk assessment tool, set the policy or special detention overrides, or designate the cutoffs for categorization as low, medium or high risk.

***Where data does not exist corresponding to combinations that are not possible for a particular site as the result of data unavailability, sites should not alter the template but rather leave those fields blank on the recommended template.***

Some sites do not calculate a risk offender score when a youth will be admitted to secure detention on a policy override. WSCCR recommends that, to provide perspective on the impact of policy overrides, a screening be completed for all detained youth. Regardless, without a score it is not possible to categorize these youth as high, medium or low, or as no override, up or down. These youth will be reported separately as special detention cases.

***The recommendation is to complete a screening for all detained youth. Special detention cases will be reported separately.***

### **Statewide Reporting**

The JDAI sites and GJJAC have expressed interest in research and analysis of JDAI outcomes beyond what is produced as part of the Casey Foundation's required quarterly report templates. In response to this interest WSCCR produced a series of draft reporting templates that explore detention population demographics and detention reasons in greater detail. Over the series of Working Group meetings, suggestions and revisions were made culminating in the proposed statewide report templates.

While the project will shift from development to analysis and reporting, it is important to note that the proposals for statewide reporting are flexible and open to further revision as new suggestions are made and areas of additional interest and research are identified. The recommendations below serve as a starting point and additional tools will be developed to explore and clearly report findings.

### *Gender, Race, and Ethnicity*

The recommendations listed above concerning the exclusion of non-JDAI youth, gender, race and ethnicity also apply to report templates designed for statewide reporting. Youth in detention but not subject to the effect of JDAI should be excluded. Hispanic ethnicity should be reported separately from racial identification. To match data available at each site and from courts statewide, an unknown category should be included with the other categorizations. Finally, the recommended racial categories should be the same as those recommended for the Casey Foundation reports.

### *Templates of Detention Demographics*

The detention demographic report templates were developed by studying the Casey detention population report template and incorporating the information that the JDAI sites found useful within areas where greater detail was desired.

The Detention Population Report (see appendix B1) contains information similar to that presented in the Casey Foundation's Detention Population report. Gender, race and ethnicity are presented. However, the Casey report template summarizes detention episodes by gender, race, and ethnicity separately. In an effort to portray a more detailed picture of the detention population while continuing to report measures such as admissions, releases, average daily population and average length of stay, the template was redesigned to allow for a summary of race and ethnicity in combination.

The Detention Population Demographic Report (see appendix B2) reports average length of stay and

average daily population by any combination of gender, race and ethnicity. This template was developed specifically in response to interest in observing greater detail for specific subpopulations. This allows a complete demographic breakdown into each possible partial table of classifications—the template format can characterize any demographic profile. This can be a useful and revealing analytical tool, since the marginal tables (i.e. the summary tables such as those found on the Casey report templates that ignore one or more of the above mentioned demographics) can exhibit surprisingly different characteristic profiles. For example, a hypothetical increase in the length of stay of African American female youth may be obscured by a decrease in the length of stay of African American male youth. By failing to report African American youth by gender, this profile will not be observed.

Similar to the recommendation made for the Detention Population report, sites that do not have the data to simultaneously report race and ethnicity for youth will report Hispanic youth as being from Hispanic ethnicity with unknown race. These templates for statewide reporting accommodate data from sites that record race and ethnicity separately and those that do not. Furthermore, the template will accommodate sites that expand their data records as they transition to measure ethnicity separately from race.

### *Template of Detention Reasons and Primary Charges*

The detention reason and primary charge report is a reason-based report. This presentation of the site data is in sharp contrast to the information presented on the Casey Detention Population report, which is person-based. For Casey reporting, each statistic or measure is reported so that the total in one quarter equals the number of detention episodes, or times that youth were detained. As previously stated, youth can be detained for multiple reasons, and a report that cites only one reason for each detention is discarding potentially valuable information.

A reason-based report format does not have the constraint of reporting only the number of detention episodes. A reason-based report can fully characterize the set of detention reasons that underlie the detention episode, and attribute the amount of detention time to each detention reason without having to make subjective aggregations. This greatly increases the amount of information reported and allows for a more detailed analysis.

The Detention Reason and Primary Charge Report (see appendix B3) presents summary statistics for each detention reason and the primary charges that are the basis for those detentions. Each primary charge is further classified into felonies and misdemeanors. Since this report template is aggregated by the detention reasons and primary charges and not the population of detention episodes, there is no constraint to the division or number of categorizations of interest. This reporting format does not require a partition of the detention episodes--i.e., there can be overlap between detention reason categories. Sites have suggested and continue to suggest additional indicators that are of particular interest, such as domestic violence or firearm offenses, and these are incorporated into the template. There is no restriction on the type or number of indicators that can be included and these will likely be expanded over time.

Finally, the problem of skewed statistics created by ordering the detention reason categories does not exist on this template as it does on the Casey template. Each detention episode will count under the detention reasons that contribute to it.

### ***Detention Reason Categories***

The detention reason categories recommended for statewide reporting share some common elements of the categories reported for the Casey Foundation. However, their grouping reflects the progression through the juvenile justice referral and adjudication process.

***It is recommended that the list of detention reason categories include: Probable Cause, Pre-Adjudication Violation, Sentence, Probation Violation, Failure To Appear, Warrants (not FTA), Civil Matters, and Other.***

Here again for clarity, "Civil matters" will replace the title "Status" as a detention reason category and will include Dependency, Truancy, and Becca (At Risk Youth and Child In Need of Services) contempt and warrants.

The definition of "Other" as a detention reason category is not similar to the Casey Report. It does not mean all offenses that are not Person, Property or Drug/Alcohol offenses. In this case, it does not refer to charges. The definition will include any remaining reasons for detention that do not fall under the other detention reasons.

### ***Primary Charge Categories***

In an attempt to describe the underlying charge behind each detention reason, the list of detention reasons is detailed by the primary charge. This report should better reflect the offenses associated with particular detention reasons and the time spent in detention.

***The recommended list of primary charge categories include: Person, Property, Drug/Alcohol, Sex Crime, Firearm, Domestic Violence, and Conduct.***

The offense types are further classified according to felonies and misdemeanors. If the offense classification is not known, it will be grouped with the misdemeanors.

Civil Matters do not refer to offenses and are not categorized by primary charges but rather by the type of civil matter, including Becca (At Risk Youth and Child In Need of Services), Truancy and Dependency matters.

### ***Re-offense***

During the assessment, it was learned that sites do not have access to reliable re-offense data. This data is not available for use in reporting

statewide. There is also no consistent and reliable source for re-arrest data. The JDAI sites currently use re-referral data in place of re-offense data. Re-referral data is not a perfect substitute. There are cases where youth are not referred by the police. However, the referral level data is the closest available to re-arrest and re-offense available as a proxy, and sites already uniformly substitute re-referral data for re-offense data when reporting.

***The recommendation is to use re-referral data as a proxy for re-offense data.***

## Validity

With the development of these recommended standards, there is an opportunity to incorporate validation rules to ensure the accurate reporting of JDAI outcomes. Prior to reconciling site reports, validation of reported measures was ad-hoc for each site. Casey currently produces a quarterly discrepancy report that indicates the presence of problematic data, but does not diagnose the cause or propose a remedy. This is understandable because the Foundation only has the quarterly reports submitted by sites and does not have access to the data from sites used for report production. Similarly, the quarterly reports were the only materials available for WSCCR to access at the time the data assessment report was produced and released. These Casey discrepancy reports were informative, and confirmed the observations that were made in the last report.

The validation rules applied by WSCCR and the Casey Foundation can be used by the sites in the production of their reports. These validation rules are simple but robust indicators of a wide range of data, calculation, or reporting errors. They are an immediate diagnostic tool that should be directly incorporated by sites into reporting. This will save time and energy when compared to the current arrangement of waiting for feedback from Casey and then revising quarterly reports. Likewise, WSCCR will build these validation rules into the reports produced as data analysis proceeds.

## Detention Population Report

The following are illustrative of simple validation rules recommended for the production of all reports, whether for the Casey Foundation or statewide research.

- The Start of Period detention population for each subgroup in a given quarter must be equal to the end of period detention population from the previous quarter.
- For each subgroup, the Start of Period population plus Admissions must equal the End of Period population plus Releases during the reporting quarter.
- For all Casey Reporting Templates and for the Washington State Detention Population and Demographic Reports, the subtotals for subgroup of any variable (race, gender or ethnicity) should sum to the same total count of episodes in secure detention during the quarter.
- The ALOS for the entire group must always be greater than or equal to the minimum ALOS and less than or equal to the maximum ALOS for any subgroup.
- The ADP for each subgroup must sum to the ADP for the entire group.

## Referrals Screened (RAI) and Overrides Report

It was observed during the data assessment report that the Overrides Report and the Referrals Screened Report were two different organizations of the same set of site data. This enables us to cross validate the reported measures contained in the two reports.

For any group or subgroup:

- The total referrals screened should equal the total number on the overrides report.
- The number of overrides up must equal the sum of those detained with a medium or high score plus those released with conditions having a low score.

- The number of youth with no override must equal the number detained with a high score plus the number released with conditions having a medium score, plus the number of releases with a low score.
- The number of overrides down must equal the number released with conditions having a high score plus the number released with a high or medium score.

### Alternative Programs

The Alternative Program report has similar measures and calculations to the Detention Population report. Some of the same validation rules apply:

- The Start of Period detention population for each subgroup in a given quarter must be equal to the end of period detention population from the previous quarter.
- For each subgroup, the Start of Period population plus Entries must equal the End of Period population plus Exits during the reporting quarter.
- For all Casey Reporting Templates and for the Washington State Detention Population and Demographic Reports, the subtotals by subgroup of any variable (race, gender or ethnicity) should sum to the same total count of youth in secure detention during the quarter.
- The ADP for each subgroup must sum to the ADP for the entire group.

### Next Steps

#### Adoption of the standards

The next step in this project will be to work with sites to implement these recommendations and templates and use them to begin to report JDAI

outcomes. WSCCR will analyze the extracts of data provided by the sites using these recommendations and standards. The results of this work will serve as a demonstration of the implementation of these measures and templates to the JDAI sites. WSCCR will provide technical assistance for sites that seek to incorporate these recommendations into analysis and report production at the local level. This cooperative work will provide the opportunity to verify prior reported outcomes and validate newly adopted procedures.

The analysis will expand to include statewide data extracted from AOC databases. With the inclusion of this data, evaluations of the effectiveness of JDAI throughout Washington State will be possible.

In the long term, WSCCR will continue to receive unprocessed data extracts from the sites periodically and develop a centralized “data mart” for JDAI data. This collection will become the primary source of JDAI report production. The sites and consumers of the data will be able to produce reports directly from this central data source.

#### Future Reports

An interim progress report will include preliminary analyses of site data and serve as a demonstration of the adoption of the recommended standards for data collection, analysis, and reporting. The interim report will also likely expand upon or modify the recommendations and report templates as additional areas of need are identified and research interests arise during analysis. The final report will summarize the progress towards adopting uniform standards, verify the reliability and accuracy of analysis and reporting, and compare JDAI sites and state wide data. The final report is anticipated to be completed by February 2009.

For further information, contact: Edward Valachovic at (360) 705-5336 or  
Edward.Valachovic@courts.wa.gov

WSSCR is the research arm of the AOC and was established in 2004 by order of the Washington State Supreme Court. The WSSCR conducts research to improve the understanding of the courts, help guide judicial policy, and improve the functioning of the judicial system.

## Appendix A1: Detention Population

XXX Quarter, YYYY

	Start of Period		Admissions		Releases		End of Period		ALOS	ADP	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	#	%
Female	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Male	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
African American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Caucasian	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Native American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Other/Multiracial	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Hispanic	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Non-Hispanic	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Person - Felony	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Property - Felony	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Drug/Alcohol - Felony	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Other - Felony	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Person - Misdemeanor	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Property - Misdemeanor	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Drug/Alcohol - Misdemeanor	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Other - Misdemeanor	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
FTA/Warrants	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Court Ordered	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Probation Violation	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Civil Matters	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Total	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%

## Appendix A2: Detention Population

XXX Quarter, YYYY

	Start of Period		Admissions		Releases		End of Period		ALOS	ADP	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	#	%
Female	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Male	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
African American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Caucasian	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Native American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Other/Multiracial	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Hispanic	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Non-Hispanic	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
FTA/Warrant	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Person - Felony	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Property - Felony	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Drug/Alcohol - Felony	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Other - Felony	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Person - Misdemeanor	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Property - Misdemeanor	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Drug/Alcohol - Misdemeanor	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Other - Misdemeanor	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Court Ordered	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Probation Violation	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Civil Matters	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Total	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%



## Appendix A4: Overrides

XXX Quarter, YYYY

	Override Up		No Override		Override Down		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
Female	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Male	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
African American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Asian/Pacific Islander	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Caucasian	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Hispanic	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Native American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Other/Multiracial	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Hispanic	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Non-Hispanic	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-
Total	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-



## Appendix B1: Detention Population Report – X Quarter, YYYY

		Start of Period		Admissions		Releases		End of Period		ALOS	ADP	
Gender		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	#	%
Total		-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Female		-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Male		-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Unknown		-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Ethnicity	Race											
Total	Total	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	African American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Asian/Pacific Is	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Caucasian	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Native American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Other/Multiracial	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Non-Hispanic	Total	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	African American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Asian/Pacific Is	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Caucasian	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Native American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Other/Multiracial	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Hispanic	Total	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	African American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Asian/Pacific Is	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Caucasian	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Native American	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Other/Multiracial	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Unknown	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%
Unknown	Total	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-%	-	-	-%

**Appendix B2: Detention Population Demographic Report - X Quarter, YYYY**

Gender		Total			Male			Female		
Ethnicity	Race	ALOS	ADP		ALOS	ADP		ALOS	ADP	
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
Total	Total	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	African American	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Asian/Pacific Is.	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Caucasian	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Native American	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Other/Multiracial	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Unknown	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
Non-Hispanic	Total	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	African American	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Asian/Pacific Is.	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Caucasian	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Native American	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Other/Multiracial	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Unknown	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
Hispanic	Total	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	African American	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Asian/Pacific Is.	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Caucasian	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Native American	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Other/Multiracial	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Unknown	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
Unknown	Total	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	African American	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Asian/Pacific Is.	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Caucasian	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Native American	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Other/Multiracial	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%
	Unknown	-	-	-%	-	-	-%	-	-	-%

**Appendix B3: Detention Reason and Primary Charge Report - X Quarter, YYYY**

Detention Reason	Primary Charge		ALOS	ADP	
			#	#	%
Total	Total	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
Probable Cause	Total	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Person	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Property	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Drug/Alcohol	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Sex Crimes	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Firearm	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Domestic Violence	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Conduct	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
Pre-Adjudication Violation	Total	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Person	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%

		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Property	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Drug/Alcohol	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Sex Crimes	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Firearm	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Domestic Violence	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Conduct	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
Sentence	Total	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Person	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Property	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Drug/Alcohol	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Sex Crimes	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Firearm	Total	-	-	-%

		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Domestic Violence	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Conduct	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
Probation Violation	Total	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Person	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Property	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Drug/Alcohol	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Sex Crimes	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Firearm	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Domestic Violence	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Conduct	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
FTA	Total	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%

		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Person	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Property	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Drug/Alcohol	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Sex Crimes	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Firearm	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Domestic Violence	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Conduct	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
Warrant (not FTA)	Total	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Person	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Property	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Drug/Alcohol	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Sex Crimes	Total	-	-	-%

		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Firearm	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Domestic Violence	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
	Conduct	Total	-	-	-%
		Felony	-	-	-%
		Misdemeanor	-	-	-%
Civil Matters	Total	Total	-	-	-%
	Becca	Total	-	-	-%
		At Risk Youth	-	-	-%
		Child In Need of Services			
	Truancy	Total	-	-	-%
	Dependency	Total	-	-	-%
Other	Total	Total	-	-	-%