



**Justice Center**

THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

# **MICHIGAN JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM TASK FORCE**

## **FIFTH TASKFORCE MEETING JANUARY 21, 2022**

# Goal of Juvenile Justice Data Analysis

- Collect and analyze juvenile justice data from across the state to observe:
  - System trends (2015-2020)
  - How youth move through the system
    - Variation across race/ethnicity, gender, and geography
  - Research alignment and youth outcomes
  - Data challenges/gaps



# Data collection efforts

## Initial Contact

Arrest/Referral	No
Release	No
Diversion	No

## Intake & Detention

Arrest/Referral Source	No
Type (Paper/Formal)	No
Offense/charges	Yes
Assessments	No
Divert/Dismiss	No
Detention	Some

## Judicial Processing

Divert/Dismiss	Some
Offense for disposition	Yes
Offense type (new vs violation)	Some
Adjudication	Yes
Disposition/Sentence	Some
Prior referral/adjudication	Some



# Data collection efforts

## Community Supervision

Supervision Dates	No
Supervision Type/Level	No
Programs/Services	No
Outcome/Closure	No

## Placement & Commitment

Placement Dates	Yes
Facility	Yes
Facility Type	Yes
Services/Programs	No
Incidents	Some
Discharge reason/type	Yes

## Reentry

Reentry dates	No
Services/Programs	No



# Data challenges that limit analyses

## Availability

Certain data elements are either unavailable or not easily extractable from state and local data systems.

## Completeness

Missing and incomplete data fields create gaps in what we can learn from the data.

## Standardization

Different data definitions across systems make aggregation and comparison difficult.

## Linkability

There are no unique identifiers to link youth across different parts of the system.



# Judicial Processing Data

Data Sources	Description
Judicial Data Warehouse (JDW)	2017-2019 case level data for formally processed cases statewide.
County court data from 32 counties representing 55% of state juvenile population	2015-2020 case level data on petitioned cases.
Michigan State Police (MSP)	2015-2020 juvenile adjudications and subsequent adult charges.



# Key Questions Around Judicial Processing

JDW

- How many cases were adjudicated statewide from 2017-2019?
  - How many youth were re-adjudicated during this period?
  - How were adjudications distributed across youth demographics, geography, and offense level?
- 

County  
court  
data

- How many cases were petitioned, diverted, placed on consent calendar, adjudicated, disposed to community supervision/placement/commitment during the study period?
  - How did cases move through the court system from petition to adjudication (and disposition/sentencing where available)?
  - How did this vary by youth demographics, geography, offense level, offense type (new vs. technical violation)?
  - To what extent do these system trends align with what we know from research and best practice?
- 

MSP

- How many youth in the MSP database experienced a re-adjudication or conviction in the adult system within one, two, and three years?



# Placement & Commitment Data

Data Sources	Description
MDHHS	2015-2020 statewide case level data on youth placed in juvenile residential facilities under the supervision of MDHHS (dual status and juvenile), and aggregate license and MIC violations.
Placement data from 11 county courts representing 40% of state juvenile population	2015-2020 case level data on youth placed in residential placement facilities under the supervision of the court.





# Key Questions Around Placement and Commitment

## Population Profile

- What is the risk, offense, history and demographic profile of youth in residential placement facilities under state and court supervision?

## Length of Stay

- How long do youth under state and court supervision spend in residential placement facilities? How does this vary by demographics, risk, history, offense?
- How often do youth move in and out of placements during a supervision period?

## Incidents (MDHHS only)

- What are the most reported incidents in placement facilities serving state supervised youth?
- How do reported incidents vary by facility type and youth demographics?



# Best Practices in Data Collection

- Performance measures are identified that include system outputs, alignment with research, system disparities, and youth outcomes.
- Quality assurance practices ensure completeness of data and adherence to clear and specific definitions of data terms promotes consistency across locales.
- Data collection is flexible, and information is regularly updated, continuously available, and easy to query.
- Data is analyzed by key variables and contextualized to ensure it is meaningful.
- Data can be shared across systems and strong data security practices are in place.
- Frontline staff, agency leadership, and policy makers value and use data to guide decision making and continuous quality improvement.



# Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Judges Commission

- Mandated by statute to collect juvenile justice data, provide technical assistance, and disseminate evidence-based practices (EBP)
- Utilizes a statewide case management system to collect and report dispositional data and recidivism from the primarily county-run juvenile justice system
- System provides accessibility to a continuous feed of data at the state-level from locally run juvenile courts
- Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy, the states juvenile justice strategic plan, incorporates data into decision making process



# Texas Juvenile Justice Department

- The Research and Statistics Division of TJJJ collects and maintains data on youth committed to state custody and youth referred to juvenile court and on probation supervision.
- These data are shared from county-run juvenile probation departments monthly through an extract of case-level data.
- Each county has a data coordinator responsible for ensuring the accurate and timely submission of data, consistent with reporting requirements.
- TJJJ monitors the quality of the data, produces statistical reports, responds to public information requests, and provides data analysis at the request of policymakers.



# Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts, Washington State Center for Court Research

- Established by an order of the Washington State Supreme Court as the research arm of the Administrative Office of the Courts.
- Maintains research-ready databases of referrals with dispositional information, detention, and evidence-based programming for statistical reporting and research. Data is collected from multiple systems and combined into a comprehensive record.
- Research and data management staff have protocols for data collection, cleaning, and information sharing.
- The Center also conducts research to test program effectiveness and inform program design of services for youth on probation.



# Iowa Department of Human Rights, Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning

- Mandated by statute to be a clearinghouse for juvenile justice data and to provide analysis to decision makers
- Maintains a juvenile justice data warehouse containing case-level data on juvenile referrals and case processing decisions
- Produces statistical reports on juvenile justice topics
- Maintains a dashboard on key decision points in the juvenile justice system that can be disaggregated by district, county, age, sex, and race of juveniles

