



Shay Bilchik, Administrator

September 1998

JUVENILE JUSTICE BULLETIN

Disproportionate Minority Confinement: 1997 Update

Heidi M. Hsia, Ph.D., and Donna Hamparian

The disparate treatment of minorities in America's juvenile justice systems, as evidenced by the disproportionate confinement of minority juveniles in secure facilities, was brought to national attention by the Coalition for Juvenile Justice (formerly the National Coalition of State Juvenile Justice Advisory Groups) in its 1988 annual report to Congress, *A Delicate Balance* (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 1988). In the 1988 amendments to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-415, 42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.), Congress required that States address disproportionate minority confinement (DMC) in their State plans. In the 1992 amendments to the JJDP Act, DMC was elevated to a core requirement, with future funding eligibility tied to State compliance. Prevalence studies to examine the likelihood of juveniles being incarcerated in a juvenile corrections facility before the age of 18 were subsequently conducted in 16 States (DeComo, 1993). These studies showed that African-American youth had the highest prevalence rates of all segments of the population in 15 of the 16 States. In 2 States, it was estimated that 1 in 7 African-American males (compared with approximately 1 in 125 white males) would be incarcerated before the age of 18. Although minority youth constituted about 32 percent of the youth population in the country in 1995, they represented

68 percent of the juvenile population in secure detention and 68 percent of those in secure institutional environments such as training schools (Sickmund, Snyder, and Poe-Yamagata, 1997). These figures reflect significant increases over 1983, when minority youth represented 53 percent of the detention population and 56 percent of the secure juvenile corrections population. Additional research has consistently substantiated that minority overrepresentation has not been limited to confinement in secure facilities; it also is significant at each of the major decision points in the juvenile justice system process (e.g., arrest, detention, prosecution, adjudication, transfer to adult court, and commitment to secure facilities). This holds true in most States and the District of Columbia. Thus, the term "minority overrepresentation" has been used to describe the phenomenon of disproportionately large numbers of minority youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system at various stages, including, but not limited to, secure confinement.¹ During the past decade, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

¹ In this Bulletin, the term "DMC" refers to the impact of minority overrepresentation across the juvenile justice system because nearly all local, State, and Federal efforts to address DMC include the examination of minority overrepresentation at multiple points of juvenile justice system processing.

From the Administrator

A prerequisite of an effective juvenile justice system is to treat every offender as an individual and provide needed services to all. There are troubling indications that the system is not meeting this standard. As one reflection of this problem, we find that the percentage of minority youth in secure confinement is more than double their representation in the general juvenile population—comprising nearly 7 out of 10 juveniles in such environments.

As part of its overall mission, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention provides leadership and resources to our Nation's efforts to address disproportionate minority confinement (DMC). This Bulletin offers an overview of the status of the DMC initiative and describes one State's efforts to meet the needs of minority youth served by its juvenile justice system. Pennsylvania's multiyear, systematic approach demonstrates how important it is to have sound data as a basis for raising public awareness, mobilizing support and resources, and planning and implementing an effective DMC strategy.

All youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system must receive an appropriate response, including the treatment they need. We have not yet reached that goal, but this Bulletin tells us that the DMC initiative is bringing about change and focusing attention on a problem that must be addressed.

Shay Bilchik
Administrator

(OJJDP) has assumed a leadership role, calling on the Nation to address the DMC issue in a deliberate and systematic manner that includes the following:

◆ **DMC as a core requirement of the JJDP Act Formula Grants Program.** OJJDP administers the Formula Grants Program under Title II, part B, of the JJDP Act. Under the Formula Grants Program, each State must address efforts to reduce the proportion of youth detained or confined in secure detention facilities, secure correctional facilities, jails, and lockups who are members of minority groups if it exceeds the proportion of such groups in the general population.² For purposes of this requirement, OJJDP has defined minority populations as African-Americans, American Indians,³ Asians, Pacific Islanders, and Hispanics (OJJDP Formula Grants Regulation, 28 C.F.R. Part 31). Because addressing DMC is one of the core requirements of the JJDP Act, States failing to meet the DMC plan requirement are ineligible to receive 25 percent of their annual formula grant allocation.⁴

◆ **DMC training and technical assistance.** Publications such as the OJJDP Fact Sheet *Disproportionate Minority Confinement* (Roscoe and Morton, 1994) and the DMC national reports cited in footnote 4 have been disseminated widely as technical assistance tools. OJJDP also has sponsored a variety of national and regional training sessions for juvenile justice practitioners, researchers, and policymakers. To further assist States, OJJDP contracted with Community Research Associates (CRA), Inc., in Champaign, IL, to provide training and technical assistance upon request on all aspects of this core requirement. In addition, a



technical assistance manual was produced in 1990 by OJJDP, in conjunction with CRA, to provide State juvenile justice specialists and State advisory group members with a step-by-step blueprint for systematically addressing DMC. This manual is currently being updated. Portland State University also was contracted to provide training and technical assistance to five competitively selected pilot States (Arizona, Florida, Iowa, North Carolina, and Oregon) in their efforts to address DMC. The DMC Initiative in the five pilot States is described below.

◆ **The DMC Initiative.** To enhance States' ability to comply with the DMC requirement, test various approaches to assessing DMC, and experiment with approaches to reducing DMC, OJJDP established the Disproportionate Minority Confinement Initiative in 1991. Over the next 3 years, five competitively selected pilot States aggressively assessed the extent of DMC in their juvenile justice systems, designed comprehensive strategies, and implemented interventions to address the problems identified. OJJDP's national management evaluation contractor, Caliber Associates, Inc., provided all five States with technical assistance and design support to develop a process and/or impact evaluation, evaluate their efforts, and share relevant information nationwide. Five final reports (one on each of the pilot States), produced under the DMC Initiative, were products of this effort.⁵ An OJJDP Bulletin focusing on lessons learned from this initiative is in preparation (Devine, Coolbaugh, and Jenkins, in press).

◆ **National Innovations to Reduce DMC.** This discretionary grants program is also known as the Deborah Ann Wysinger Memorial Program in memory of a deceased OJJDP staff person who spearheaded OJJDP's DMC efforts. Grants have been awarded under the program to States, local units of government, private not-for-profit organizations, and American Indian tribes to develop interventions that address DMC. The program's goals are to refine previous assessment findings and improve data systems, develop new interventions to reduce DMC, develop model DMC programs, and encourage multidisciplinary collaborations at the community level to reduce DMC. In fiscal years 1995 and 1996, 11 DMC discretionary grants were awarded (one program was given a 2-year grant).⁶ The awards included research, training and technical assistance, and demonstrations to test innovative interventions designed by States and local communities. Grants to 10 of the projects have been completed, with the remaining project to be completed in September 1998.

² See § 223(a)(23) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended.

³ In practice, this category has been interpreted to include American Indians, Eskimos, Aleutians, and others (Hamparian and Leiber, 1997).

⁴ For a detailed historical account of DMC as a "core requirement" of the Formula Grants Program; descriptions of the identification, assessment, and intervention phases of DMC that States are required to address in their State plans; and States' DMC activities in these phases, see *The Status of the States: A Review of State Materials Regarding Overrepresentation of Minority Youth in the Juvenile Justice System* (Feyerherm, 1993) and *Disproportionate Confinement of Minority Juveniles in Secure Facilities: 1996 National Report* (Hamparian and Leiber, 1997).

⁵ In 1996, Caliber Associates, Inc., Fairfax, VA, published the following reports: *Evaluation of the Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC) Initiative: Arizona Final Report*, *Evaluation of the Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC) Initiative: Florida Final Report*, *Evaluation of the Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC) Initiative: Iowa Final Report*, *Evaluation of the Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC) Initiative: North Carolina Final Report*, *Evaluation of the Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC) Initiative: Oregon Final Report*. These reports are available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse by calling 800-638-8736 (\$15 each, \$39 for all five).

◆ **National DMC training, technical assistance, and information dissemination initiative.** In 1997, recognizing the need to foster development and documentation of effective strategies nationwide using training, technical assistance, information dissemination, practical and targeted resource tools, and public education, OJJDP launched a 3-year national initiative. Through an OJJDP cooperative agreement with Cygnus Corp., interested jurisdictions will be provided with information designed to enable them to successfully address those factors that contribute to DMC. Cygnus will review and synthesize current State and local practices and policies; develop and deliver training to grantees, personnel involved with the juvenile justice system, policymakers, and others regarding effective interventions; and identify effective approaches for improving States' DMC efforts.

Update on State Compliance With the DMC Core Requirement

As noted, the 1992 reauthorization of the JJDP Act substantially strengthened the national effort to address DMC by elevating it to a "core requirement" of the Formula Grants Program along with deinstitutionalization of status offenders, removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups, and sight and sound separation of juvenile offenders from adults in secure institutions.⁷ States participating in the Formula Grants Program are required to

⁷The following programs were awarded discretionary grants: TeenCourt Youth Diversion Program (Lummi Indian Nation, Bellingham, WA); Interventions to Reduce Disproportionate Minority Confinement (Academy, Inc., Columbus, OH); Disproportionate Minority Confinement (New Jersey Superior Court Probation Division, Patterson, NJ); Comprehensive Intensive Aftercare for Incarcerated African American Youth (Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections, Baton Rouge, LA); Interventions to Reduce Disproportionate Minority Confinement (Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, Gardnerville, NV); Disproportionate Minority Confinement (Pima County Juvenile Court Center, Tucson, AZ); Community Alternatives to Detention (Chatham-Savannah Youth Futures Authority, Savannah, GA); Disproportionate Minority Confinement (Wayne County Neighborhood Legal Services, Detroit, MI); Interventions to Reduce Disproportionate Minority Confinement (Project Heavy West, Los Angeles, CA); and Disproportionate Minority Confinement: A Time for Change (American Correctional Association, Lanham, MD).

⁷ See § 223(c)(3) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, *as amended*.

address the DMC issue in three phases: (1) identification (identify the extent to which DMC exists); (2) assessment (assess the reasons for DMC if it exists); and (3) intervention (develop an intervention plan to address these identified reasons). Progress is reported by each State and territory in its comprehensive JJDP 3-year plan and subsequent plan updates (in compliance with Section 223(a)(23)). OJJDP reviews the plan updates annually. The status of State compliance with the DMC core requirement based on the States' 1997 plans is summarized below. Readers desiring additional information concerning individual States are encouraged to contact the State's juvenile justice specialist.⁸

Based on OJJDP's review of FY 1997 State plans, 39 States have completed the identification and assessment phases and are implementing the intervention phase of DMC. Three States have completed the identification and assessment phases and are formulating their intervention plans. These States are making a concerted effort to address the factors that contribute to minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system. However, DMC remains a serious concern, requiring an ongoing and continuous effort. Recommendations for future action discussed in the *1996 National Report* (Hamparian and Leiber, 1997), including the need for comprehensive data collection and analysis, the development of research- and data-based State intervention plans, and the strategic importance of prevention and early intervention, remain valid actions for States in refining and improving their approaches to reducing DMC.

This Bulletin provides the updated status—as of December 1997—of compliance with the DMC core requirement among the jurisdictions participating in the JJDP Formula Grants Program (48 States, 6 territories, and the District of Columbia). However, unlike previous national reports, which highlighted DMC activities undertaken by various States in the identification, assessment, and intervention phases, this Bulletin provides an in-depth description of how Pennsylvania moved from one DMC phase to the next in a systematic, data-driven, and targeted effort to comprehensively address DMC.

⁸ A directory of State juvenile justice specialists is available by contacting OJJDP. See "For Further Information."

Pennsylvania's Process as an Example of a Systematic DMC Approach

Description of the Pennsylvania Model

Pennsylvania's DMC efforts began in 1986, 2 years prior to the inclusion of DMC as a Formula Grants Program plan requirement. During that year, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) and the State advisory group, the Juvenile Advisory Committee (JAC), recognized the problem of minority overrepresentation. In 1990, JAC established the Minority Confinement Subcommittee to focus on the DMC issue.⁹ The subcommittee's analysis of 1988 juvenile justice data for detention and other secure holding programs revealed that, although representing just 12 percent of the juvenile population, minority juveniles accounted for 70 percent of secure placements statewide. To help determine which decision points in the juvenile justice system and which jurisdiction(s) the State's DMC efforts should target, further analysis was conducted using 1989 data both statewide and in the 18 counties with the highest minority populations. Statewide Pennsylvania data indicated that minority juveniles represented 27 percent of all juveniles arrested and 48 percent of all juveniles formally charged in juvenile court. All of the State's counties showed minority overrepresentation, which was amplified as cases moved through the system. In response to these preliminary analyses, the subcommittee funded outside research to identify causes and develop options to address the problem while simultaneously implementing prevention and intervention programs. This two-pronged approach has guided the subsequent State DMC strategy.

Target Area #1: Dauphin County

Dauphin County, including the State capital, Harrisburg, was selected as the first target site because it showed the greatest difference between the proportion of minorities arrested (50 percent) and the proportion of minorities (22 percent)

⁹The Minority Confinement Subcommittee reports to JAC, which reports to PCCD. JAC submits an annual report to the Governor on juvenile justice and delinquency prevention issues and activities.

Summary of State Compliance With DMC Core Requirement¹ (as of December 1997)

- ◆ States that have completed the identification and assessment phases and are implementing the intervention phase:

Alaska	Kansas	North Dakota
Arizona	Maryland	Ohio
Arkansas	Massachusetts	Oklahoma
California	Michigan	Oregon
Colorado	Minnesota	Pennsylvania
Connecticut	Mississippi	Rhode Island
Florida	Missouri	South Carolina
Georgia	Montana	Tennessee
Hawaii	Nevada	Texas
Idaho	New Jersey	Virginia
Illinois	New Mexico	Washington
Indiana	New York	Wisconsin
Iowa	North Carolina	Utah
- ◆ States that have completed the identification and assessment phases and are formulating a time-limited plan of action for completing the intervention phase:

Alabama	West Virginia
South Dakota	
- ◆ States (and the District of Columbia) that have completed the identification phase, submitted a time-limited plan of action for the assessment phase, and agreed to submit a time-limited plan for addressing the intervention phase:

Delaware	Louisiana
District of Columbia	Nebraska
- ◆ Territories that have completed the identification phase (it has been determined that minority juveniles are not disproportionately arrested or detained in the following territories):

American Samoa	Republic of Palau
Guam	Virgin Islands
Northern Mariana Islands	
- ◆ States that have completed the identification phase and are exempt from the DMC requirement because the minority juvenile population in the State does not exceed 1 percent of the total juvenile population:

Maine	
Vermont	
- ◆ State that has now reached 1 percent minority population (statewide) and will begin conducting the identification phase:

New Hampshire

- ◆ Territory that is exempt from complying with the DMC requirement (as it has been exempted by the U.S. Census Bureau from reporting racial statistics due to the homogeneity of the population):

Puerto Rico

- ◆ States that were not participating in the Formula Grants Program in FY 1997:

Kentucky
Wyoming

¹Pursuant to Section 31.303(j) of the OJJDP Formula Grants Regulation (28 C.F.R. Part 31).

in the at-risk population (ages 10 to 17 years). The subcommittee convened local community-based organizations serving minorities along with Dauphin County Juvenile Probation, the Harrisburg Bureau of Police, the Harrisburg School District, and other community representatives to discuss the problem.

In 1991, PCCD provided subgrant funds to initiate five prevention and intervention programs in Harrisburg for a period of 30 months:

- ◆ **The Business Entrepreneur Club.** This program helps young minority females learn work and life skills.
- ◆ **Targeted Outreach.** This program helps identify and recruit minority youth within its service area to take advantage of the educational, physical, social, and vocational programs available through the Boys & Girls Club of Harrisburg.
- ◆ **Positive Choice.** This program, previously known as Teens Together, provides minority juveniles with tutoring, homework assistance, and special classes with speakers who address topics of interest and also helps youth make positive choices for their future.
- ◆ **Project Connect.** This program, now part of the Boys & Girls Club, prevents youth from dropping out of school by improving school attendance and academic achievement and addressing other social and familial needs.
- ◆ **Hispanic Center After-School Program.** This program helps at-risk Hispanic students improve their school performance, reducing the rate of school failure and dropping out among Hispanic youth.

The community-based organizations of Dauphin County continued to meet monthly with the directors and staff of the funded programs. Through these repeated interactions, and as the group became aware of the advantages of working together, the Youth Enhancement Services (YES) coalition was formally established in 1993. PCCD, based on a recommendation of JAC, funded YES' executive director position. Despite a sometimes fluid membership, the coalition model has continued to encourage the networking of resources and support services and has successfully driven the local planning process. A subsequent evaluation showed that these community-based DMC programs achieved levels of service provision and funding enhancement that would not have been possible without the YES coalition. For example, after the PCCD seed money expired in March 1994, the programs collectively increased their funding level by 2½ times the original funding by expanding their funding sources and contracting with county and State youth services agencies, such as Dauphin County Children and Youth Services (Clouser, 1994).

Moreover, the DMC community assessment evaluation information was utilized extensively for the development of Dauphin County's application for a grant under the JJDP Act's Title V Community Prevention Grants Program. Through the Title V Program, which assesses risks and resources in the community, school, family, and personal domains, Dauphin County developed a delinquency and violence prevention program based on the Communities That Care (CTC) process in the same neighborhoods as the minority programs, thus expanding and enhancing the prevention efforts in targeted areas with a high

concentration of minorities. The Dauphin County CTC program includes economic empowerment, family support, community mobilization against violence and drugs, and youth advisory council components.

Target Area #2— Philadelphia

After gaining experience with the coalition model in Dauphin County, the JAC subcommittee identified a second target area in 1992. Based on the original data analysis, which identified Philadelphia as having the highest number and percentage of minority juvenile arrests statewide (65.9 percent), further analysis of data from all 23 police districts was conducted to identify the police district in which the DMC effort could have the greatest possible impact. The 25th Police District was chosen because of its high number of juvenile offenses, high rate of juvenile crime per 100,000 population (the total number of offenses divided by the total juvenile population), high percentage of drug-related offenses, and diverse racial population (40 percent African-American, 35 percent Hispanic, 23 percent white, and 2 percent Asian-American).¹⁰ Like Dauphin County's coalition model, the formative meeting of the Philadelphia coalition involved police; probation officers; school personnel; city, State, and Federal representatives; and citywide youth-serving agencies. This group, now known as the East Division Coalition, has held monthly meetings since 1992. A director was hired in 1994 with seed subgrant funds provided by PCCD per JAC's recommendation.

Programs implemented in Philadelphia include:

- ◆ **Dreams of Tomorrow.** This program provides educational and social support to minority juveniles who have had or are at risk of having minor involvement with the juvenile justice system.
- ◆ **Project Youthlead.** This project helps minority juveniles develop and attain positive goals for their future.
- ◆ **Checkmate.** Checkmate decreases the delinquency rate and increases the level of school retention and success among targeted youth through life skills workshops, tutoring and homework



¹⁰ Although there are 23 police districts in Philadelphia, some police districts have maintained their numerical designations from a time when there were more than 23 districts in the city.

assistance, physical fitness and sports, community service projects, and monthly parent group meetings.

◆ **Youth Self-Empowerment Project.**

This project empowers youth to lead drug-free, crime-free, peaceful, and productive lives through training, tutoring, community service, recreational activities, and special outings.

◆ **Student Anti-Violence Education (SAVE).**

SAVE focuses on preadolescents by offering conflict resolution and impulse control training for juveniles and adults in addition to positive discipline strategies.

◆ **Truancy and Dropout Prevention Project.**

This program provides staff intervention and family support in working with schools and courts.

Encouraged by the success of these programs and the effectiveness of the East Division Coalition, the Philadelphia Department of Human Services has assumed the responsibility of providing funding for these programs.

Target Area #3—Allegheny County

In 1995, a similar process to address DMC issues began in Allegheny County, the third target area. A local analysis of minority crime and an identification of community-based youth and family programs were completed in 1995. Minority neighborhoods in and adjacent to the east end of Pittsburgh were identified as having high numbers of minority juvenile arrests and were selected as the focus in Allegheny County. This focus was affirmed by the Allegheny County Youth Crime Prevention Council's representatives from the Pittsburgh mayor's office, the Allegheny County Human Services Department, and the U.S. Attorney for the western region of the State. The Allegheny County Youth Crime Prevention Council serves as the coordinating body for prevention and intervention programs, which include both the Title V Delinquency Prevention/CTC and DMC programs. Additionally, across the State, 10 of the 14 Title V/CTC sites (including 2 in Allegheny County) focus on minority neighborhoods, thus beginning prevention work at an early stage in the lives of at-risk children.

Three DMC programs began in Allegheny County in April 1996:

◆ **Great Start Program.** Great Start provides juveniles with basic skills training, participatory sports, part-time employ-



ment, educational support, career guidance, socialization, and cultural enrichment.

◆ **Project Africa and Operation Hammer.**

This program offers tutoring, mentoring, community services (e.g., gardening and trash removal), job readiness assistance, nonviolent conflict resolution skills training, healthy recreation, and a youth crime prevention program with community police.

◆ **Targeted School-Based Outreach Worker's Program.**

This program offers life skills classes, tutoring, job readiness assistance, job referrals, counseling, pregnancy prevention information, recreational activities, and educational trips.

After considerable negotiation among the programs, Allegheny County's Youth Coalition of Western Pennsylvania was formed and the position of director was funded in July 1996 through the same mechanism as in the first two target areas. Subsequently, the coalition decided to use a consultant rather than a director to assist with program development and support. The 30 months of DMC funding will be completed in October 1998.

Target Area #4 (A New Direction)—Lehigh and Northampton Counties

Based on a review of State DMC data, the Minority Confinement Subcommittee is exploring the development of community-

based minority prevention and intervention programs serving primarily Hispanic youth in the Lehigh Valley (Lehigh and Northampton Counties). These two counties are among the top four in reported juvenile arrests of Hispanic youth: 753 arrests in Lehigh County and 483 arrests in Northampton County. Lehigh and Northampton Counties are located in an area of the State that has not previously been served by this program. The director of the Governor's Advisory Commission on Latino Affairs has joined the subcommittee to ensure that the perspectives of the Latino community are taken into consideration and to help identify existing programs in the focus area. The subcommittee anticipates holding meetings with Latino service providers and representatives from the police department, probation department, and local schools. A significant portion of the State's 1998 allocation of Formula Grants Program funds for DMC will be subgranted to support programs developed in the Lehigh Valley.

Evaluation of DMC Efforts in the Target Areas

An integral element of Pennsylvania's approach is the incorporation of evaluation from the very beginning. In the first year of implementation, the National Center for Juvenile Justice Training and Research (the Center) at Shippensburg State University was contracted to perform the first-year evaluation of the Harrisburg programs. Through this evaluation, the Center found that of the 200 adolescent clients referred to the coalition during its first year of operation, 169 satisfied a minimum attendance criterion. While 50 percent of the coalition clients had prior involvement with the juvenile justice system, just 20 percent were referred to juvenile probation subsequent to their involvement with the coalition. Further, involvement in coalition programs was associated with significantly lower levels of truancy and suspension and with slight improvements in academic performance.

As the model expanded to Philadelphia in the second year, a more comprehensive study was commissioned in 1993 through Temple University to evaluate nine funded programs in the two minority overrepresentation initiatives (five in Harrisburg and four in Philadelphia).¹¹ The

¹¹ SAVE and the Truancy and Dropout Prevention project, the other two Philadelphia programs, started more recently and were not included in the Temple evaluation.

evaluation consisted of three parts: a community assessment of the target areas, which included social, economic, and crime indicators; an evaluability assessment (i.e., ability to be evaluated) and process evaluation, which included clarification of program goals, activities, and objectives and an examination of service delivery; and an outcome evaluation of client performance both during and after participation in the programs through a review of police, juvenile justice, and school records from 1992 to 1995. The evaluation strategy is an interactive model in that the programs and coalition receive feedback from the evaluators regarding areas of success and difficulty, which is used on an ongoing basis to improve the programs. For example, certain program implementation issues were noted as impeding successful intervention and valid evaluation (Welsh, Harris, and Jenkins, 1995). Ways to rectify these issues, rendering the programs more effective

and more evaluable, were subsequently suggested (see table). In terms of outcome evaluation, the most positive outcome reported was for the 1992-93 Harrisburg target site. The rate of recidivism over a 3-year period for the high-attendance group (25.8 percent) was impressive, especially considering that nearly half of the clients had arrests prior to their referral. In contrast, the low-attendance control group had a recidivism rate of 53 percent for the same period.

The Training and Education Component

To provide relevant information on DMC to juvenile justice practitioners, youth workers, public officials, and the general public, a number of training and educational opportunities have been developed that create awareness of the issue and focus attention on possible solutions. The Juvenile Court Judges' Commission (JCJC) offers periodic training for

judges and probation staff on managing cultural diversity. In 1992, JCJC's annual statewide training conference had as its theme Crime, Kids, and Color: The Issue of Race and Juvenile Justice. The first DMC-related conference, Crisis of Minority Overrepresentation, was held in Philadelphia in January 1993. A second conference, Promising Approaches: Prevention and Intervention Services for Minority Youth, was held in Harrisburg in May 1997. This was recently followed by a third conference, Promising Approaches II: Building Blocks for Prevention and Intervention Services for Minority Youth, in Pittsburgh in May 1998. The goal of the most recent conferences was to highlight the proactive approach Pennsylvania has taken on the DMC issue, focus on effective use of media, and feature both the prevention and intervention programs and coalitions funded by PCCD and the many other State programs that have an impact on minority delinquency.

Program Implementation Issues That Affect Program Effectiveness and Evaluability*

Program Implementation Issues	Suggested Actions
Target selection procedure	Clearly define characteristics of intended clients and regularly monitor client population.
Client participation and completion of program	Develop incentives for participation. Provide outreach to clients. Provide an interesting and challenging array of services.
Staffing levels and staff turnover	Increase program resources. Provide ongoing staff training and development. Realistically address staff qualifications.
Information and recordkeeping	Provide program resources. Emphasize importance of accurate, complete data to staff.
Family component	Provide tangible incentives for family involvement. Conduct parent support groups.
Educational component	Provide tutoring and learning opportunities on a daily basis. Use volunteers. Provide positive feedback to students and volunteers. Work with the neighborhood school system.
Volunteers/mentors	Recruit, screen, train, monitor, and support.
Program structure	Engage in goal-oriented activities that are implemented in a consistent manner at a regular time.
Adequacy of physical facilities	Send positive messages through pleasant, clean, and well-maintained physical space.
Monitoring by program director/ executive director	Employ hands-on directors. Engage in a continuous process of growth and self-evaluation. Welcome criticism in addition to positive feedback.

* Based on information found in Welsh, W.N., Harris, P.W., and Jenkins, P. 1995. *Evaluation of Minority Overrepresentation Programs in Pennsylvania: Evaluability Assessment and Process Evaluation. Report #2*. Philadelphia, PA: Department of Criminal Justice, Temple University.



Pennsylvania's Strengths

The strengths of the Pennsylvania process in addressing DMC follow.

The active support of the Governor, PCCD, and JAC. Governor Tom Ridge has provided strong support for juvenile justice and children's issues. In 1997, the Governor met with representatives of JAC, including Daniel Elby, chair of the Minority Confinement Subcommittee, to discuss recommendations to strengthen the juvenile justice system and prevent delinquency. The Governor has acted on six of these recommendations, including the creation of a delinquency prevention policy specialist position in PCCD. This individual will assist with the coordination of State and local prevention initiatives and oversee the DMC and Title V/CTC programs. From 1991 to 1997, PCCD and JAC have awarded nearly \$4 million to support the DMC Initiative. For 1998, \$500,000 has been reserved to continue support for the initiative.

The effectiveness of the subcommittee. JAC's Minority Confinement Subcommittee was established to ensure that the issue of minority overrepresentation would receive adequate attention and would not become lost among JAC's many responsibilities. The subcommittee has been meeting three to four times a year since 1990 and has set up quarterly meetings for 1998. Nine of the ten subcommittee members are minorities (eight African-Americans and one Hispanic) with rich experience in working with minority juveniles. Their strong dedication and expertise are important to the subcommittee's overall effectiveness. The subcommittee

has further benefited from the strong and continuous leadership of its chair, Daniel Elby, the executive director of Alternative Rehabilitation Communities, Inc. Moreover, this subcommittee provides regular DMC reports (both verbal and written) to both JAC and PCCD to keep them advised of subcommittee activities and program implementation. These reports serve as information dissemination tools and help maintain and promote the State's focus on the DMC issue. Through the JCJC, cultural diversity training is offered to court staff and minorities are actively recruited for court positions. In addition, a staff position within PCCD provides critical support to the subcommittee, supports program planning and development, and provides technical assistance under the DMC Initiative.

The utility of the coalition model. The coalition model encourages networking and resource consolidation. This model requires dedication by a wide range of concerned people and organizations over an extended time period. Because of the sheer number of individuals and organizations involved, initiating and sustaining coordination and momentum are inherently challenging. The importance of having the police, schools, probation, and community-based agencies involved in the coalition's decisionmaking cannot be overemphasized. Pennsylvania's effort in forming coalitions in its first three targeted DMC areas has proven effective in breaking down barriers among agencies and securing local funding. Funding staff positions for the coalitions proved critical to maintaining and enhancing these community-based groups.

The data-driven and data-based approach and ongoing data analysis. Pennsylvania's need-based selection of DMC sites was determined by total arrest rates, size of the minority population, and the overrepresentation of minorities in arrest rates. In addition, using data from the Pennsylvania State Police, the JCJC, the State Data Center, and the National Center for Juvenile Justice, Pennsylvania analyzes minority overrepresentation annually to determine changes that have occurred in disproportionate minority processing in the juvenile justice system at arrest, detention, prosecution, adjudication, transfer to criminal court, and State and local confinement. These annual analyses are conducted for the State as a whole and for the 18 counties in which 96 percent of the State's total minority juvenile population resides. This ongoing monitoring helps guide the actions of the subcommittee and JAC and provides valuable feedback regarding the impact of Pennsylvania's program efforts. For example, the State's 1995 DMC data showed encouraging signs of progress as compared with its 1988 data. Although the minority juvenile population who are at risk increased from 12 percent in 1988 to 13 percent in 1995, minority juveniles confined in secure detention and correctional facilities decreased from 73 percent to 66 percent and minority juvenile arrests decreased from 30 percent to 29 percent. Minority juveniles transferred to adult court, however, increased from 71 percent in 1988 to 72 percent in 1995.

The systematic and stepwise approach. Instead of tackling the DMC issue throughout the State all at once, Pennsylvania has adopted the strategy of first targeting jurisdictions or communities with the greatest DMC concerns (Harrisburg in Dauphin County, the 25th Police District in Philadelphia, and Allegheny County, in that order, plus Lehigh and Northampton counties for Hispanic juveniles). Within each of the first two target areas, planning and program funding were facilitated by a local coalition of community organizations brought together to address the DMC problem. As Harrisburg and Philadelphia began the evaluation phase, Pennsylvania formed a local coalition and planning process in Allegheny County, the third target area, which is expected to benefit from the cumulative experience of the earlier two.

The emphasis on prevention and early intervention. In Pennsylvania, overrepresentation of minorities in the juvenile justice system begins at arrest—minorities are arrested at a rate two times their proportion in the general population. Overrepresentation more than doubles at the detention stage and increases slightly at the point of commitment to juvenile corrections. More than five times as many minority juveniles are transferred to criminal court compared with their numbers in the general population (Center for Juvenile Justice Training and Research, 1989 and 1995). Because the difference between minority and nonminority juvenile representation is amplified at each decision point from early to later stages, Pennsylvania has elected prevention and early intervention as its primary DMC strategy. All five DMC projects in Harrisburg, six in Philadelphia, and three in Allegheny County are designed to reduce DMC at the front end of the juvenile justice system. Reducing overrepresentation in the early stages is expected to further reduce minority representation at later stages in the system. It is important to note that, based on an early and deliberate subcommittee decision, all of these projects are located in established, neighborhood-based organizations with a history of working with at-risk minority youth.

The inclusion of evaluation in the implementation phase. All too frequently, DMC programs and initiatives have neglected to build in an evaluation component. The Temple evaluation is an interactive approach, which means that the evaluators work with the programs during the course of the study to identify ongoing problems and to suggest options

for change. The programs address issues as they arise rather than waiting until the evaluation is complete. Evaluation assessments of process and program content are ongoing. The results are used to design valid outcome measures for each individual program and for the initiative as a whole. However, the overall goal of reducing the number of minority youth in the juvenile justice system and the extent to which the programs meet their other objectives, such as improving educational performance, employment, and interpersonal relationship skills, are addressed for all programs.

Conclusion

Because of multiple factors that are unique to each State, OJJDP does not specify a process or strategy that States must use to address DMC. Instead, OJJDP outlines the phases that the States need to move through to address the DMC core requirement and offers sample intervention strategies for State consideration.¹² However, the principles that emerge from the Pennsylvania process, such as stable leadership by the JAC subcommittee, data-based and systematic strategies, broad community involvement and coalition building, significant financial commitment from the advisory committee, strong support from the State's top officials, and investment in evaluation that, in turn, is used to strengthen prevention and inter-

¹² For example, Pennsylvania's intervention strategies are primarily programmatic in nature. Future DMC national updates may feature different intervention strategies employed by other States, such as legislative, administrative, or policy changes in juvenile justice system processing.

vention projects in a continuing and ongoing manner, are applicable to all settings. States' efforts to reduce DMC are likely to be greatly facilitated if they can be guided by these principles. OJJDP resources will continue to be available to provide technical assistance to State and local governments working to address DMC.

References

- Center for Juvenile Justice Training and Research. 1989. *Disposition Report Data*. Shippensburg, PA: Juvenile Court Judges' Commission.
- Center for Juvenile Justice Training and Research. 1995. *Disposition Report Data*. Shippensburg, PA: Juvenile Court Judges' Commission.
- Clouser, M. 1994. Reducing minority youth over-representation. In *Pennsylvania Progress: Juvenile Justice Achievements of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency*. Vol. 1, no. 1. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.
- Coalition for Juvenile Justice. 1988. *A Delicate Balance*. 1988 annual report. Washington, DC: Coalition for Juvenile Justice.
- DeComo, R.E. 1993 (September). *Juveniles Taken Into Custody Research Program: Estimating the Prevalence of Juvenile Custody by Race and Gender*. NCCD Focus. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Devine, P., Coolbaugh, K., and Jenkins, S. In press. *Disproportionate Minority Confinement: Lessons Learned From Five States*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Feyerherm, W. 1993. *The Status of the States: A Review of State Materials Regarding Overrepresentation of Minority Youth in the Juvenile Justice System*. Portland, OR: Portland State University.
- Hamparian, D., and Leiber, M. 1997. *Disproportionate Confinement of Minority Juveniles in Secure Facilities: 1996 National Report*. Champaign, IL: Community Research Associates, Inc.
- Harris, P., Welsh, W., Jenkins, P., Mullen, J., and Becton, E. 1994. *Community Assessments of Harrisburg and Philadelphia's 25th Police District. Report #1*. Philadelphia, PA: Department of Criminal Justice, Temple University.



Maniglia, R. 1994. *Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Profile: Pennsylvania Reducing Minority Overrepresentation: One City at a Time*. Vol. 6, no. 3. Champaign, IL: Community Research Associates, Inc.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 1990. *Disproportionate Minority Confinement Technical Assistance Manual*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. 1994. *Disproportionate Minority Confinement Report by the Juvenile Advisory Committee's Minority Confinement Subcommittee*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. 1996. *Disproportionate Minority Confinement Report by the Juvenile Advisory Committee's Minority Confinement Subcommittee*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. 1997. *Disproportionate Minority Confinement Report by the Juvenile Advisory Committee's Minority Confinement Subcommittee*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency.

Roscoe, M., and Morton, R. 1994 (April). *Disproportionate Minority Confinement*. Fact Sheet #11. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Sickmund, M., Snyder, H.N., and Poeyamagata, E. 1997. *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Snyder, H.N. 1997 (November). *Juvenile Arrests 1996*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Welsh, W., Harris, P., and Jenkins, P. 1995 (January). *Evaluation of Minority Overrepresentation Programs in Pennsylvania: Evaluability Assessment and Process Evaluation. Report #2*. Philadelphia, PA: Department of Criminal Justice, Temple University.

For Further Information

JJDP Formula Grants Program

Heidi Hsia, DMC Coordinator
State Relations and Assistance Division
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
202-616-3667
202-307-2819 (Fax)
E-Mail: hsiah@ojp.usdoj.gov

Evaluation of the DMC Initiative (Five DMC Pilot States)

Eric Peterson, Social Science Specialist
Research and Program Development Division
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
202-616-3648
202-307-2819 (Fax)
E-Mail: eric@ojp.usdoj.gov

National Innovations to Reduce DMC
Douglas Dodge, Director
Special Emphasis Division
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
202-616-3652
202-307-2819 (Fax)
E-Mail: doug@ojp.usdoj.gov

National DMC Training, Technical Assistance, and Information Dissemination

Gail Olezene, Program Specialist
Training and Technical Assistance Division
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
202-305-9234
202-307-2819 (Fax)
E-Mail: olezenec@ojp.usdoj.gov

Directory of JJDP State Contacts

State Relations and Assistance Division
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-5924
202-307-2819 (Fax)

Pennsylvania DMC Initiatives State Contract

Mary Ann Rhoads, Delinquency Prevention Specialist
Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency
P.O. Box 1167
Federal Square
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1167
717-787-8559
717-783-7713 (Fax)
E-Mail: rhoads@pccd.state.pa.us

This Bulletin was prepared under contract number OJP-95-C-004 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of OJJDP or the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

Acknowledgments

This Bulletin was written by Heidi M. Hsia, Ph.D., State Representative, State Relations and Assistance Division, OJJDP, and Donna Hamparian, Contract Consultant to Community Research Associates.

OJJDP gratefully acknowledges the efforts of States and local agencies to reduce disproportionate minority confinement. We thank Reggie Morton of Community Research Associates and individual OJJDP staff who reviewed the draft and provided valuable input. Also, thanks are due Ruth Williams and Mary Ann Rhoads of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency and Daniel Elby, chair of the Minority Confinement Subcommittee of the Pennsylvania Juvenile Advisory Committee, who contributed materials and assistance to ensure an accurate account of Pennsylvania's DMC efforts.

Share With Your Colleagues

Unless otherwise noted, OJJDP publications are not copyright protected. We encourage you to reproduce this document, share it with your colleagues, and reprint it in your newsletter or journal. However, if you reprint, please cite OJJDP and the authors of this Bulletin. We are also interested in your feedback, such as how you received a copy, how you intend to use the information, and how OJJDP materials meet your individual or agency needs. Please direct your comments and questions to:

Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse
Publication Reprint/Feedback
P.O. Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000
800-638-8736
301-519-5212 (Fax)
E-Mail: askncjrs@ncjrs.org

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Washington, DC 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
DOJ/OJJDP
Permit No. G-91