

DETENTION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase/up, decrease/down), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

NATURE & EXTENT OF DETAINED POPULATION

JUVENILE DETENTION ADMISSIONS & AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION

- For Questions 1-5, use Table 1 (Juvenile Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity and Gender).

1. Using the data in Table 1 (Cell I5), describe the overall change in juvenile detention admissions between 2012 and 2015.

Overall, admissions between 2012 and 2015 by 87 from 157 to 70. White admits decreased a total of -71.6% (-73 admits), while Black admits increased 59.1% from 2012 to 2015 (+13 admits). What is important to note is while there is an increase in Black admits comparing 2012 to 2015, there is a decrease in Black admits from 2014 to 2015 of -56% from 62 Black admits in 2014 to 35 in 2015. Hispanic admits decreased by -27 from 2012 to 2015, an -81.8% decrease. There were no admissions in the Other category for either year.

2. Insert into the chart below detention admissions by race/ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of admissions for 2015 (Column F).

Ranking of Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity for 2015		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1	Black	35
2	White	29
3	Hispanic	6

4	Other	0
---	-------	---

3. Insert into the chart below detention admissions by gender, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of admissions in 2015 (Cells D5 & E5).

Ranking of Detention Admissions by Gender for 2015		
Rank	Gender	Number
1	Male	47
2	Female	23

4. Insert into the chart below the % change in admissions by race/ethnicity (Column I), beginning with the groups that had the greatest number of detention admissions between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of % Change in Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1	White	-71.6	-73
2	Hispanic	-81.8	-27
3	Black	59.1	+13
4	Other	0	0

5. Using the information in the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county's juvenile detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender in 2015? How have admissions by race/ethnicity and gender changed since 2012?

Total admissions to detention are down overall from 2012 to 2015, there is an increase in Black admissions by 59.1% between 2012 and 2015. While the percentage is high the number of youth increased by 13. What is important to note is that there is a decrease in Black admissions from 2014 to 2015 of -56%, or -27 admissions. The Hispanic admissions have seen a significant decrease of -81.8% from 2012 to 2015. The admissions of white males has seen an -82.2% decrease while white females saw a small increase of +8.3%.

Black males and females both saw increases between 2012 and 2015, +23.8% and 800% respectively. Again those raw numbers are relatively small, an increase of +5 males and +8 females. There was a significant decrease in those numbers between 2014 and 2015; -16 males and -11 females. The Hispanic admissions saw a -79.2% decrease in males and an -88.9% in females between 2012 and 2015.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial And Ethnic Disparities

6. Using the data in Table 2, describe admissions to detention as a percentage of referrals to juvenile court for each racial/ethnic group in 2012 and 2015 (Columns C & F). Also compare changes in this figure from 2012 to 2015, in percentage points, across each racial/ethnic group (Column G).

Court referrals admitted to detention decreased between 2012 and 2015 from 15% to 10.6%. Whites accounted for 6% of the court admissions to detention. Blacks accounted for 36.5% of court referrals admitted to detention and Hispanics accounted for 8.3% of court referrals admitted to detention.

7. Using the data in Table 3, describe how the length of stay, average daily population and approved capacity utilization in detention has changed between 2012 and 2015.

The length of stay increased between 2012 to 2015 from 30.2 days on average to 47 days. This is an increase of 16.8 days. The average daily population increased by 0.8% between 2012 and 2015, and the approved capacity utilization has decreased -3.7% between 2012 and 2015.

ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH IN DETENTION

- **For Questions 8-11, use data from the JJC “Data for Detention Section of Comprehensive Plan” report (JDAI sites), or from data collected locally (non-JDAI sites).**

8. Insert into the chart below the top three municipalities of residence for youth admitted to detention in 2015, beginning with the municipality with the highest frequency.

Ranking of Municipality where Juveniles Resides, 2015			
Rank	Municipality	Frequency	Percent
1	Brick	9	12.9
2	Lacey	8	11.4
3	Lakewood	8	11.4

9. Describe the age of youth admitted to detention in 2015, including the age category with the most youth, and the average age.

In 2015, 17 year olds accounted for the most admissions to detention with 24 of 70 admissions. The average age at admission to detention in 2015 is 16.8 years old.

10. Insert into the chart below the top ten offense types for youth admitted to detention in 2015, beginning with the offense type with the highest frequency.

Ranking of Most Serious Current Offense, by Type, 2015			
Rank	Category	Frequency	Percent
1	VOP	28	40.0
2	FTA	15	21.4
3	Assault	7	10.0
4	Burglary	5	7.1
5	Violation of Court Order/Other Violation	3	4.3
6	Robbery	3	4.3
7	Sex Offense	3	4.3
8	Eluding	2	2.9
9	Weapons	2	2.9
10	Terroristic Threats and Other Persons Offenses (each)	1	1.4

11. Insert into the chart below the degrees of the offenses for which youth were admitted to detention in 2015, beginning with the degree with the highest frequency.

Ranking of Most Serious Current Offense, by Degree, 2015			
Rank	Degree	Frequency	Percent
1	No Delinquency Charges (Violation etc.)	46	66%
2	3 rd	12	17%
3	2 nd	7	10%
4	1 st	4	6%
5	DP/PDP	1	1%
6	4 th	0	0

12. Describe the typical youth in detention by discussing the most common characteristics of the population by drawing on your answers for question 5 and for questions 8 through 11 (municipality, age, offense). Please use the information from all 5 answers in your response.

In 2015, the typical youth in detention was a black male from Brick Town, Lakewood or lacey Township with a VOP and an average age of 16.8 years old.

CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH SERVED BY YSC-FUNDED DETENTION ALTERNATIVES

➤ For Questions 13-20, use JAMS data tables from the JAMS packet.

13. Looking at the “Total” in Table 1 for each program on the detention point of the continuum (Total Intakes by Program, 2012 & 2015), describe how admissions to detention alternative programs have changed from 2012 to 2015.

There is no JAMS data available for 2012, however in 2015 the Home Detention/Electronic Monitoring Program completed 42 intakes in JAMS. In 2014 the HD/EM program served 79 youth, and a total of 46 youth in 2015 for a decrease of -33 youth.

14. Looking at the total for each gender in Table 2 (Total Intakes by Gender, 2015) and the “Total” column in Table 3 (Total Intakes by Race, 2015), and comparing this information with your answer to Question 5 (detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender), describe any differences or similarities between juvenile detention admissions and admissions to detention alternative programs, in terms of the gender and race/ethnicity of youth admitted.

While detention admissions were down overall between 2012 and 2015 there was an increase in Black admissions for both males and females. Utilization of detention alternatives for Blacks was relatively low in 2014 accounting for only 16% of intakes, there is an increase of utilization of alternatives in 2015 and 2016 for Blacks with the utilization going from 28% in 2015 to 30.6% in 2016. White males still account for the most detention alternative intakes overall.

15. Looking at Table 4 (Average Age by Program, 2015) and comparing this information with your answer to Question 9 (age at admission), describe any differences or similarities between the age of youth placed in detention and the age of youth placed in detention alternative programs.

The average age for youth in detention in 2015 was 16.8 years old, and the average age for youth placed in detention alternative programs was the same.

16. Insert into the chart below the top 10 Problem Areas for youth admitted to detention alternatives (“Total” column of Table 6), beginning with the Problem Area affecting the largest number of youth, for 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Problem Areas by Program	
2012	2015

Rank	Problem Areas	Total	Rank	Problem Areas	Total
1	n/a		1	Family Circumstance/Parenting	121
2			2	Peer Relations	49
3			3	Education	45
4			4	Personality/Behavior	41
5			5	Substance Abuse	36
6			6	Attitudes/Orientation	35
7			7	Vocational Skills/Employment	8
8			8	Teen Pregnancy/Parenting	7
9			9	Medical Problems	1
10			10		

17. How has the ranking of Problem Areas changed between 2012 and 2015? Describe in terms of those Problem Areas that have moved up in rank the most.

There was no data to analyze for 2012, however the #1 problem area was Family Circumstance/parenting, with Peer relations coming in #2.

18. Insert into the chart below the top 10 Service Interventions Needed, But Not Available, for youth admitted to detention alternative programs ("Total" column of Table 8), beginning with the Service Intervention most often needed, for 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Service Intervention Needed					
2012			2015		
Rank	Service Intervention Needed	Total	Rank	Service Intervention Needed	Total
1			1		
2			2		
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

8			8		
9			9		
10			10		

19. How has the ranking of Service Intervention Needed changed between 2012 and 2015? Describe in terms of those Service Interventions Needed that have moved up in rank the most.

JAMS data not available for analysis.

20. Insert into the chart below the top 10 Service Interventions Provided for youth admitted to detention alternative programs (“Total” column of Table 7), beginning with the Service Intervention most often provided, for 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Service Intervention Provided					
2012			2015		
Rank	Service Intervention Provided	Total	Rank	Service Intervention Provided	Total
1	n/a		1	Electronic Monitoring	38
2			2	Intensive Supervision	37
3			3	Supervision	34
4			4	Urine Monitoring	29
5			5	Substance Abuse Evaluation	2
6			6	Substance Abuse Treatment/Counseling	1
7			7	Role Model/Mentor	1
8			8	Anger Management Training	1
9			9		
10			10		

21. How has the ranking of Service Interventions Provided changed between 2012 and 2015? Describe in terms of those Service Interventions Provided that have moved up in rank the most.

There was no JAMS data available for 2012, however the service intervention for 2015 ranked #1 was Electronic Monitoring, with Intensive supervision ranked #2 and Supervision ranked #3.

IMPLICATIONS FOR JUVENILE DETENTION PLAN

Extent of Need

22. Taken collectively, what do the answers to Question 1 (overall change in detention admissions), Question 7 (change in average daily population), and Question 13 (change in detention alternative admissions) tell you about how your County's overall need for secure detention beds and detention alternative programs has changed in recent years?

Overall, admissions to detention have decreased by -55.4%, and Black admissions decreased between 2014 and 2015 by 56% which could be a result of our Enhanced Stationhouse Adjustment program which started in 2014. However, the length of stay increased from 2012 to 2015 by 30.2 days and in 2015 the detention alternative program served -33 less youth than previously in 2014. In a nutshell, in 2015 detention LOS increased and the utilization of the detention alternative program decreased.

Nature of Need

23. Based on the answers to Question 5 (detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender), Question 12 (description of the typical detained youth), Question 14 (race/ethnicity and gender of youth admitted to detention as compared to youth admitted to detention alternatives), Question 15 (age of youth admitted to detention as compared to age of youth admitted to detention alternatives), Questions 16 and 17 (top ten problem areas and change in problem areas), Questions 18 and 19 (interventions needed but not available), and Questions 20 and 21) (interventions provided), what are the characteristics of youth and the service needs that you must account for or address programmatically through your County's juvenile detention plan?

Total admissions to detention are down overall between 2012 and 2015. The typical youth in detention in 2015 was a black male from Brick Town, Lakewood or Lacey Township with a VOP and an average age of 16.8 years old. While detention admissions were down overall between 2012 and 2015 there was an increase in Black admissions for both males and females. Utilization of detention alternatives for Blacks was relatively low in 2014 accounting for only 16% of intakes, there is an increase of utilization of alternatives in 2015 and 2016 for Blacks with the utilization going from 28% in 2015 to 30.6% in 2016. White males still account for the most detention alternative intakes overall. The top problem areas for youth admitted to detention alternatives was Family Circumstances/Parenting, and the number 1 ranked service intervention was electronic monitoring, along with intensive supervision. In summary, Ocean County needs to focus on better utilization of the detention alternative programs, specifically for male youth of color.

24. Looking at your answer to Question 6, what does this information tell you collectively about the status of disproportionate minority contact and racial/ethnic disparities at this point of the juvenile justice continuum within your County?

Court referrals admitted to detention decreased between 2012 and 2015 from 15% to 10.6%. Whites accounted for 6% of the court admissions to detention. Blacks accounted for 36.5% of court referrals admitted to detention and Hispanics accounted for 8.3% of court referrals admitted to detention. Youth of color are overrepresented in court referrals admitted to detention.

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need

25. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, was used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used submit a copy in Chapter 13.) If so, what does that data tell you about how your County's overall need for secure detention and detention alternative programs has changed in recent years and about the needs and characteristics of youth that should be addressed through your county's juvenile detention plan? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

Stationhouse Adjustment Data, as well as YSC Annual funded program data specific to the Home Detention/Electronic Monitoring program. This additional data supports the need to increase utilization of detention alternatives for male youth of color.

RECOMMENDATIONS

29. Looking at your answers to Questions 22, 23, and 25, state the need and/or service gap to be addressed. Cite the data that supports the need and/or service gap. List your recommendations for your County's juvenile detention plan.

State need and/or service gap to be addressed	Cite the data that indicates the need and/or service gap exists	Recommended service/program activity to address the need and/or service gap
Lack of supervision for youth while on detention alternative.	JDAI data collection methods are extensive and comprehensive and serve as the backbone for the continued usage of detention alternatives such as Electronic Monitoring. In 2015, male youth of color accounted for 36.5% of the court referrals for admission to detention. Additionally, the LOS increased between 2012 and 2105 by 30 days, and the utilization of the detention alternative program decreased in 2015 by -33 youth.	Continue funding the home detention and electronic monitoring programs.
Family Engagement	OC YSC Needs Assessment Results show the top 10 Problem areas are: • #1 Difficulty in controlling youth's behaviors – 48% • #2 Poor problem solving skills – 37.9% • #3 Few or no positive friends – 36.6% • #4 Poor anger management – 34.4% • #5 Poor school performance – 33.4% • #6 Poor frustration tolerance – 32.8% • #7 Drug Abuse – 31.2% • #8 Inconsistent parent figure – 29% • #9 Verbally aggressive – 28.3% • #10 Physically aggressive/Disruptive behavior in school – 27.1%	Family Engagement will be written into ALL of the YSC competitive contracts for the 2018-2020 Plan. The YSC recognizes the importance of making family engagement a standard for ALL providers as family engagement is an essential key to the success of our youth.

Comments:

In 2015, Ocean County has VOP listed as the #1 category for Most Serious Current Offense for an admission into detention, accounting for 40% of the admissions, and the #2 category is FTA, accounting for 21% for an overall 61% of admissions.

30. Looking at your answers to Questions 24 and 25, what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Juvenile Detention policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider to ensure similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?

Comments:

In addition to the efforts of the Multi-Disciplinary Team, which discusses every youth in Detention or on a detention alternative every week, the JDAI Detention Alternative/ Case Processing subcommittee examines every youth and every charge and compares the handling of white vs minority cases in detail. Thus as a result of the use of Electronic Monitoring, there has been an overall decrease of -55.4% in Juvenile Detention admissions. Likewise, according to Juvenile Supervision, where applicable, officers can file a VOP with a recommendation of Detention with a release to the Electronic Monitoring program, which serves as an effective deterrent for those who are in danger of non-compliance.