

Colorado's FY 2017 Plan for Compliance with the Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Requirement of the JJDP Act



February 2017

Submitted to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice Assistance
Colorado Department of Public Safety
Division of Criminal Justice
700 Kipling Street
Denver, CO 80215
1-800-201-1325
303-239-5705

The Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ)/Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice Assistance (OAJJA) employs a State Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Coordinator at 75% time, whose responsibilities are coordination of the state's DMC efforts to address the DMC core requirement of the JJDP Act. The DMC Coordinator has been a DCJ employee since 1993 and has a thorough understanding of the DMC causes, correlates and contributing mechanisms. The DMC Coordinator attends OJJDP DMC Conferences, participates in DMC conference calls and webinars and is seen as a resident expert on DMC for the State of Colorado. In addition, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Council (SAG) has a DMC committee, the Coalition for Minority Youth Equality (CMYE), in place since 1994 which serves in an advisory capacity to the JJDP Council (State SAG).

Phase I: Identification

1. Updated DMC Spreadsheets

Colorado has entered information for the State, City and County of Denver (Judicial District 2), El Paso County (Judicial District 4), and Arapahoe County (Judicial District 18) in the DMC Data Entry System. The spreadsheets from that system are submitted as Attachment 2.

2. DMC Data Discussion

(A) Not applicable Colorado has data.

(B) Discuss the RRI data, compare the updated data to FY 2015-2017 3-Year Plan and illustrate how the data inform/guide the state's FY 16-17 DMC reduction efforts. Indicate if data is a duplicated count.

Comparison prior year's data.

Two tables condensing several years of data for African American/Black (Black) and Hispanic/Latino (Latino) youth is below. These tables provide a format for the state to look at several years of data at once. Black and Latino data are separated because, the RRI and trends differ greatly between Colorado's two largest minority populations. Asian youth are not represented in a table because they are not over represented in Colorado's juvenile justice system but rather under represented. Native American youth data is not represented in a trend table because while there is disproportionate contact at the detention decision point this represents a small volume of youth which could produce skewed RRIs.

Colorado's annual collection of data for the RRI tables makes it possible to look at trend data. We want to caution though, that the change in the time-frame for which data was pulled may impede the ability to compare all of the decision points and identify trends over time. In Colorado, law enforcement agencies are not required to report their 2016 arrest data until March of 2017 which means there may be missing arrest information being used as the basis of the arrest RRI and subsequently for the detention RRI. Despite this concern, it appears as if the arrest data is following a similar pattern as noted in previous years' comparisons. The greater impact of not having complete arrest data may actually occur in the RRI calculation for detention, as the arrested numbers serve as the base of this calculation. If the arrest data is missing arrests then it may be artificially showing an increase in DMC at the detention decision point. Noting these data limitations, the following is the interpretation of the trends (comparison between this year and last) for both Black and Latino youth.

Comparing RRIs to previous years shows the following. A slight increase in the arrest RRI for Black youth from 4.20 last year to 4.27 this year. Although the increase was small it still continues to indicate that Black youth continue to be arrested at rates 4 times greater than White youth, a great cause of concern in the state. We continue to benefit from the trend showing a reduction in the RRI for Latino youth from 1.24 in FY 10-11 to 1.22 last year and now 1.11. We believe that there is an under-reporting of Latino youth arrests with many being reported under the White race category. We continue to raise this concern and look for ways to address the issue. Even though we believe may be under reporting, the trend is still going in the right direction, a positive in the area of Latino arrests. Despite efforts to address the disproportionate number of arrests, the work is not equally affecting Black and Latino youth. The clear effort to address the disproportionate contact of arrests of Black youth must continue into this next year.

While this was a very intentional focus this past year we know that we cannot impact such disparities within one year and so it necessary to keep this focus as a long term strategy for the state.

Although we focused heavily on detention, the RRI rose for both Black and Latino youth. Black youth's RRI went from 1.37 to 1.75 and the Latino youth's RRI went from 1.45 to 2.15. Again, since we know that change takes longer than a year, a concerted focus on detention needs to continue. In addition, there could be another explanation for all or some of this increase due to the unreliability of the arrest data as noted above, not all law enforcement data has yet been reported (due March 1, 2017). If the comparison of rates for detention is based on the arrest rate of contact and there is missing data, depending on the race and ethnicity of the youth in that missing data set the RRI could be either negatively or positively impacted. We will recalculate the data after the March data deadline to ensure when we work with judicial districts we are reflecting their data accurately. Again, we know that we will not reach parity in one year but need to continually monitor and address detention as a long term strategy.

The last area of focus based on data is on the commitment of Latino youth. The RRI increased slightly from 2.03 to 2.11. We must use arrest as the prior step in the calculation and for the basis of the comparison rate instead of adjudication because the adjudication ethnicity data are flawed (discussed next). When using arrest in the calculation, we believe that we get a more realistic picture of the commitments for both Black and Latino youth since missing ethnicity data at adjudication affects the White, Black and Latino calculations. We have not systematically addressed commitment in the past so we will begin exploring ways to address the disparity where Latino youth are committed two times more than White youth.

The reason for calculating the commitment RRI differently stems from the continued concern of the quality of data from State Judicial which includes the district filings, adjudications, and probation data. The data sets still do not have a field for ethnicity and while there are plans to change that in the future with changes in their data management system, this solution is still far from being complete. We have been meeting with judicial, specifically the probation area and providing training for probation officers on the importance of updating the race field to reflect race and ethnicity once they have the youth in front of them. This has helped us improve probation data but this is not consistently done across the state. We will continue to remind State Judicial of the importance of collecting ethnicity in a state where Latino youth represent almost 33% of the total youth population ages 10-17.

African-American/Black Youth					
Decision Points	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY13-14	FY 14-15	***FY15-16
Arrest	3.31	3.39	4.10	4.20	4.27
Pre Adjudicated Detention	1.31	1.84	1.64	1.37	1.75
*District Filings	.72	** .78	** .67	** .65	.54
*District Adjudication	**1.20	1.11	**1.21	1.27	**1.08
Probation Supervision	.07	.92	.95	.72	.92
Commitment NYC	**1.95	**2.42	3.17		
Commitment to NYC calculated using arrest as the base instead of adjudications				1.81	1.29

Hispanic/Latino Youth					
Decision Points	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	***FY15-16
Arrest	1.10	1.04	1.12	1.21	1.11
Pre Adjudicated Detention	1.72	1.91	1.87	1.45	2.15
*District Filing	.47	.41	.32	.25	** .23
*District Adjudication	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Probation Supervision	1.04	1.38	1.31	1.14	1.36
Commitment NYC	**3.68	**4.27	6.10		

Commitment to DYC calculated using arrest as the base instead of adjudications				2.03	2.11
---	--	--	--	-------------	-------------

*Judicial race data often does not distinguish between race and ethnicity (particularly "White" and "Hispanic"). As a result, the ability to accurately interpret this data is limited. This limitation also results in skewed RRIs for commitment (see explanation of commitment data above). **Numbers bolded are statistically significant. The numbers not bolded (and marked with **) were not statistically significant and cannot be used to analyze or make assumptions about the RRI at that decision point. Arrest data was extracted from NIBRS data provided by the Colorado Bureau of Investigations, data included race and ethnicity as reported by law enforcement agencies. ***The data for FY15-16 is for October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016 where available. Previous data was collected on a state fiscal year, July-June. This will affect the ability to compare data accurately across years.

Illustrate how the data inform/guide the state's FY 2016-17 DMC reduction efforts. Data is used by the JJDP Council (State Advisory Group) and it's DMC Committee, the Coalition for Minority Youth Equality (CMYE), to direct recommendations and strategies. It is used to indicate what area of the juvenile justice system on which to focus for addressing DMC. The three main areas of concern continue to be arrest, detention and commitment which based on the data above indicate the need for intervention. We will also continue to focus on improving judicial data. This information will be presented to the CMYE in February so they can provide feedback for the strategies developed.

Indicate if data is duplicate count. The data provided for the matrices come from several data sources. NIBRS is used for the law enforcement data so this count is by incident which is a duplicate count since each incident is reported separately. Data for filing, adjudication, and probation comes from the State Judicial Department. This data is a duplicate count because it is reported for each case a youth acquires. Since each youth case is reported separately, a youth with multiple cases would be included in the data for each case. Lastly, the data for pre-adjudicated detention and commitments to Division of Youth Corrections (DYC) are collected from DYC and are also a duplicated count. They report a youth each time the youth enters detention and each time they are committed on a new case. The state does not need a time-limited plan to determine if the counts are duplicated or unduplicated because the sources of the data have clearly indicated how they count youth contact.

(C) Relative Rate Index tracking sheet and Discussion of State and Three Jurisdictions

COLORADO 2017 RELATIVE RATE INDEX (RRI) ANALYSIS AND TRACKING SHEETS				
<i>FY 15-16 RRI Data for African American Youth – State and Judicial Districts</i>				
Identification of Statistical Significance (S), Magnitude (M) and Volume (V); Not sufficient numbers = NS#				
Decision Points	State	2nd JD	4th JD	18th JD
Arrest	4.27 4310 S,M,V	2.97 1380 S,M,V	3.89 560 S,M,V	6.41 1778 S,M,V
Detention (Pre-adjudication)	1.75 1080 S,M,V	1.75 337 S,M,V	1.67 183 S,M,V	1.46 330 S,M,V
Cases petitioned (Felony and Misdemeanor Charges Filed)	.54 1554 S	.40 409 S	.99 393	.42 379 S
Delinquent Findings (Felony and Misdemeanor Adjudications)	1.08 530	1.17 171 S	1.00 108	1.6 112 S,M,V
Probation Supervision	.92 385 S	1.24 111 S	.77 73	.76 93 S
*Commitment DYC	1.21 58 S	NS 22	1.96 10 S,M	1.47 12 S,M
Direct File Adult Court	2.96 16 S,M	2.9 11 S	NS 3	NS 1

FY 15-16 RRI Data for <u>Hispanic Youth</u> – State and Judicial Districts				
Identification of Statistical Significance (S), Magnitude (M) and Volume (V); Not sufficient numbers = NS#				
Decision Points	State	2nd JD	4th JD	18th JD
Arrest	1.11 7863 S	1.13 2408 S	.79 369 S	2.01 1583 S,M,V
Detention (Pre-adjudication)	2.15 2411 S,M,V	1.47 493 S,M,V	3.39 245 S,M,V	1.44 289 S,M,V
Cases petitioned (Felony and Misdemeanor Charges Filed)	.23 1079	.12 212 S	.51 133 S	.14 110 S
Delinquent Findings (Felony and Misdemeanor Adjudications)	NS 417	1.01 81	1.20 44	1.58 32 S,M
Probation Supervision	1.36 450 S	2.32 93 S,M	.73 28	1.54 54 S,M
*Commitment DYC	2.11 174 S,M,V	NS 27	4.76 16 S,M	1.02 11 S
Direct File Adult Court	NS 3	NS 0	NS 1	NS 1

*Commitment to the Division of Youth Corrections RRI used is the one calculated using arrest as the base instead of adjudication. Adjudication numbers from State Judicial do not include a field for ethnicity thus rendering those numbers suspect. #s in red are statistically significant, #s in black are not.

The DMC Coordinator completed the RRI Analysis and Tracking Sheet and identified areas that were statistically significant and of those statistically significant, those with the greatest magnitude and for those that were statistically significant and had magnitude then identified those with volume. Filling in the DMC tracking charts with not only the identification of statistical significance, volume and magnitude but also the RRI and the number of youth represented assists in getting a true picture of what is occurring in the state. By continually using this method there is a greater understanding of the trends, particularly of areas where both the RRI and number of youth are increasing and conversely areas where we are seeing a reduction in RRI and the volume of youth. Please note the charts above are filled-out using the customized in-state matrix forms created by Dr. Feyerherm for Colorado. The customized charts break out decision points further than the DMC database. For this reason some of the numbers in this table may differ from the DMC database reports.

Below is a discussion of the state and three jurisdictions the City and County of Denver (2nd Judicial District), El Paso County (4th Judicial District), and Arapahoe County (18th Judicial District). The discussion includes:

Discussion on those areas that meet all three criteria 1. Statistically Significant, 2. Showed a High Magnitude, and 3. Had a High Volume, will be discussed below. In addition statistical parity and 5. Context will also be discussed below.

4. Comparison - Not applicable, Colorado is not including a comparison of its communities to others in the nation because the national data sets are missing Hispanic data making the comparison less significant based on the large number of Hispanic youth in Colorado.

State of Colorado

Data: The racial and ethnic population of Colorado youth age 10-17 is: White youth 57% (down from 59%), Black youth remains 4.7%, Latino youth 33% (up from 32%), Asian youth 4% and American Indian youth 1%. The decision points for the state that meet the three criteria (statistically significant, magnitude

and volume) and make them a concern to the state and should be the focus of addressing DMC are: Arrest for Black youth, Detention for both Black and Latino youth and Commitment for Latino youth.

Arrest: Efforts to address the disproportionate rate of Black youth as a separate issue from the arrest of Latino youth started last year due the magnitude at this decision point. Colorado developed a plan that focused on the three judicial districts with the highest Black youth population as compared to the rest of the state. Those judicial districts are also the ones with the highest numbers of arrests for Black youth in the state. Because those judicial districts are the ones that Colorado focuses on more specifically and because we have learned over the years that to impact the state rate you must impact the local judicial districts contributing the most to that disparity, we will discuss more specific strategies in the discussion of each judicial district below. While the Relative Rate Index has not yet been impacted and remains at a 4.2, continued focus will continue in this area. We anticipate it taking several years to impact the RRI. One positive is that the volume of youth was reduced from affecting 4,736 Black youth last year to 4,310 youth this year. When looking at statistical parity, we can see that it would take 3,301 less arrests of Black youth in the state to reach equity.

At the detention decision point there is disparity for both Black and Latino youth where the magnitude is about 2 for each and more specifically, 1.75 for Black youth representing a volume of 1,080 youth and 2.15 for Latino youth representing 2,411 youth. Again, this area was a priority last year and many efforts were made to address the issue, beginning by identifying the eight judicial districts with the highest magnitude and volume of Black and Latino youth being detained. To reach statistical parity in the state we would have to reduce the use of detention for 464 Black youth and 1,287 Latino youth. Again, the state will continue to address the issue locally by judicial district.

In order to work appropriately with judicial districts the detention RRI will be calculated again based on full arrest records available in March. This will ensure that we are accurately reflecting what is occurring to each judicial district with which we work. In addition, the intense focus on the detention decision point began in the fall of 2016 so there was not time to impact the FY 15-16 numbers within that time-frame. Colorado expects that next year's numbers will reflect the impact of such a focused effort. To address detention, in addition to working with individual judicial districts we will also continue to work with the Division of Youth Corrections as a partner. While there is DMC in other decision points we are learning as we are teaching local communities that if efforts are too widespread, it may lessen the intended impact in the individual areas. We have learned that it is best to focus on one or two decision points and get traction there before moving on. Efforts in the filing, adjudication and probation areas will focus on improving data. All these areas will include a heavy emphasis on technical assistance for local judicial districts in their local efforts to identify and address causes of DMC specific to their situations.

DYC Commitment was also statistically significant, had a magnitude of 2, representing a volume of 174 Latino youth. The state will begin addressing this area by meeting with stakeholders who can provide guidance on why this may be occurring and then us their guidance to develop an intervention strategy. We are unsure of what the number would be to reach parity due to missing ethnicity data at adjudication.

Context: The RRI for Black youth arrested will continue to be one of the biggest areas of focus along with the detention decision point. As mentioned above we will do some exploratory work related to the commitment disparity for Latino youth but want to be careful not to spread ourselves too thin.

We believe that we have momentum in several judicial districts where the largest arrest disparities exist for Black youth and will be able to continue implementing our strategies in this area. We also have a very collaborative partnership with the Division of Youth Corrections and with local SB 94 (Alternatives to Detention) Coordinators. The fact that so many of the judicial districts identified as contributing to the state disparity requested training from the DMC Coordinator (detailed in the intervention section) is evidence that they understand the seriousness of the issue and have made commitments to addressing it within their communities.

Data, Highlights of Work and Context in Three Jurisdictions: There are twenty-two Judicial Districts in Colorado. Three Judicial Districts (2nd, 4th and 18th) have been selected for several reasons. These three judicial districts make up 44% of the state's total youth population ages 10-17 representing 81% of

African American youth and 41% of Hispanic youth in the state. In addition, those judicial districts account for 51% of the state's total juvenile arrests, 86% of the state's Black youth arrests and 55% of the Hispanic youth arrests. Each of these jurisdictions differ greatly in their context and readiness to address DMC at different decision points. Below is a description of the decision points that are statistically significant and which show both magnitude and volume. In addition the context for each of these jurisdictions is described as well as highlights of their accomplishments over the last year.

City and County of Denver (2nd Judicial District)

Data: The City of Denver is the capital of Colorado and has the most diverse population in the state. Latino youth represent 58% of the youth population age 10-17 (up 1% from last year) and White youth represent, 24% of that same age group (down 1% from last year). The rest of the population 10-17 is: Black youth 13%, Asian youth 4.5% and Native American youth 1%.

The decision points which are statistically significant, have a high magnitude and represent a significant volume in the 2nd Judicial District (Denver) are the arrest of Black youth and the detention of both Black and Latino youth. The magnitude at the arrest decision point has started to move in the right direction and is down from FY 13-14 when the RRI was 3.55 to FY 14-15 when it was 3.22 and now FY 15-16 at 2.97. Although we are pleased with the direction of movement (reduction), we are cognizant that Black youth were still arrested 3 times more than White youth in FY 15-16 and the volume of Black youth represented was at 1,380. To reach parity would mean reducing the number of arrests by 915 Black youth.

The trend for detention has gone in the opposite direction, the Black rate of detention went from 1.42 last year to 1.75 this year and from 1.06 to 1.47 for Latino youth. This also represents a significant volume of youth, 337 Black and 493 Latino and to reach parity the 2nd Judicial District would have to detain 145 less Black youth and 158 less Latino youth.

Context: With Denver representing such a large number of youth, there are many agencies, organizations and initiatives working to address issues related to DMC. The DMC Coordinator work with or keeps abreast of many of these initiatives. Below are some highlights of the work in Denver.

Related to detention, a technical assistance request was submitted to OJJDP requesting training at the detention level for direct staff to begin learning about issues that may affect or be related to DMC and best practices. This request was due to a change in how detention screening and services were being provided in this judicial district. Previously the district had contracted the screening and pre-trial services to an outside vendor. Within the last six months this function has moved directly to the local Alternatives to Detention initiative, the SB94 program. There is a SB94 program in each of Colorado's 22 judicial districts and this includes a Coordinator position and a board to oversee the program called the Juvenile Services Planning Committee (JSPC). The request for technical assistance was submitted by the SB 94 Coordinator. She is focusing on improving the detention system in Denver and recognizes that 80% of their detention population are youth of color. She has also implemented some other changes since October 2016 that have resulted in a reduction of the Average Daily Population and Length of Stay in their detention facility. One change was the hiring an Intervention Specialist who helps youth transition out of detention and also the use of an evidence-based curriculum for service delivery.

In addition there was recent contact between the 2nd Judicial District SB94 program and our office to inquire about research related to DMC. There is interest in hiring a researcher to collect and analyze data related to the detention population. The JJ Specialist has been in contact with them and has suggested a local research firm which we have used for our DMC analyses (case studies) which are summarized in the Assessment Phase of the plan. In fact Denver was part of one of the case studies in 2015 and it is possible that the information in that case study would still be valuable and can be built upon as they move forward. The JJ Specialist also suggested that they use the state DMC Coordinator to assist them in their work.

There is also direct service work occurring in the 2nd Judicial District aimed at addressing the disparate number of arrests of youth of color in that city. The Denver Office of the Independent Monitor (OIM) have just started their third year of Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) funds to implement a Youth Outreach Project, called Bridging the Gap. The project seeks to proactively improve relationships between youth

and law enforcement in Denver by educating youth on their rights and responsibilities when in contact with law enforcement, and educating officers on the key aspects of adolescent development and de-escalation techniques when contacting youth. In addition to the youth forums, the OIM has used Connecticut's Effective Police Interactions with Youth to train several officers. In the 2 years and 3 months this project has been operational they have created the curriculum for both the law enforcement training and the youth/law enforcement forums. Utilizing those curriculums they have held 13 youth/officer forums which involved 454 youth participants. Another critical component of the success of the project has been community involvement and engagement. They do this by engaging community leaders and training them to facilitate the youth/officer forums. There have been 85 community leaders trained to date to facilitate the forums; 20 of the facilitators are youth and 80 of the 85 are people of color. Finally, 173 officers have been trained on adolescent development and de-escalation techniques using the Connecticut curriculum. To measure impact the JJDP Council is utilizing Formula Grant funds to evaluate the impact on the youth who participate in the forums. This is explained in detail in the 2016 plan accomplishments section under the evaluation goal.

The two focuses described above provide ways to address the decision points identified in the beginning of this section; arrest and detention. At this point the 2nd Judicial District is actively working on addressing their DMC issues and we anticipate that this will continue in some capacity.

El Paso County (4th Judicial District)

Data: The 10-17 year old population in the 4th Judicial District is 64.2% White (down slightly), 7% African American, 22.9% Latino (up slightly), 4.5% Asian and 1.4 percent Native American. Similar to the state and the 2nd Judicial District, the areas that are statistically significant, show a magnitude and volume that indicate a need for focus are arrest of Black youth and detention for both Black and Latino youth.

The magnitude of the Black youth arrests is 3.89, an increase from last year when it was 3.37, representing a volume of 560 youth. To reach statistical parity they should have arrested 416 less Black youth in FY 15-16. This was an area of focus in the plan last year and will continue into this year.

Looking at the detention decision, the trend for Black youth was fairly similar to previous years when looking at magnitude. The RRI in FY 13-14 was 1.63, last year (FY 14-15) it was 1.51 and in FY 15-16 it is 1.67 so it is hovering in the same range. The 1.67 represents a volume of 183 youth and to reach parity the 4th Judicial District would have needed to detain 73 less Black youth.

The magnitude for Latino detention went up significantly from 2.08 last year to 3.39 in FY 15-16 representing a volume of 245 youth and in order to reach parity they needed to detain 173 fewer Latino youth. The state will need to reexamine if that large of a jump was really due to more Latino youth being detained or to the issue that all the law enforcement agencies have not reported their arrest data. This issue may not have affected the 2nd Judicial District as much because they only have one law enforcement agency and the 4th has several. The suspicion is, that it is a little bit of both and more than likely will remain over 2 so this is an area where focus needs to continue.

Context: The 4th Judicial District is important to the state's efforts to address DMC in particular because 21% of the state's overall Black population ages 10-17 live there. Secondly, the 4th Judicial District has had a Minority Over Representation (MOR) Committee (Committee) for nearly twenty years. The Committee is part of the judicial district's Juvenile Court's Best Practices efforts and they have worked hard to create a Committee with stakeholders who are committed to addressing MOR issues.

Presently, the Committee includes representatives from the El Paso County Sheriff's Office, supervisors from the Department of Human Services, attorneys from the El Paso County Attorney's office; judges of the Fourth Judicial District; attorneys who represent respondent parents in dependency and neglect cases; community activists from the Latino and African American communities; and members of the Colorado Springs Police Department. It is a very vibrant and committed group of individuals.

Demonstrating that they have the capacity to address DMC they have implemented several intervention strategies over the last couple of years which include:

Creation of a PowerPoint presentation designed to be shared with various stakeholders. The presentation addresses the existence, potential causes, and remediation of MOR in the juvenile justice, child welfare, school disciplinary, and criminal justice systems. Committee members have given the presentation to many audiences at a state and local level. This past year, a professor from a local community college who specializes in social sciences and statistics joined our subcommittee, and has become a valuable resource regarding statistics, updating the PowerPoint slides, etc.

They have continued to arrange for the use of interpreters and Spanish language forms that facilitate inclusion of Spanish speaking families at the Family Treatment Drug Court as well as continuing their work in Dependency & Neglect (D&N) cases which began last year. Committee members have been instrumental in the creation and distribution of Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) pamphlets used at every D&N preliminary protective case proceeding to assist in the assessment of any Native American Ancestry of the subject children. A number of committee members are very active with, and dedicated to ICWA issues in D&N cases. One serves on a statewide board creating D&N ICWA Bench Cards. The Committee has developed a Race and Ethnicity Questionnaire which is being utilized in all D&N proceedings. The Committee worked with State Judicial to obtain approval of the Questionnaire, which permits parents to self-identify the race/ethnicity of themselves and their children. It is hoped the Questionnaire will be useful in developing statistical data by which they can more effectively track and assess the relationship between race/ethnicity and outcomes in the D&N context –such as successful reunification of families, foster placement, congregate care placement, adoption, termination of parental rights, etc. If this is a successful effort the state can encourage other judicial districts to adopt these interventions and work toward a more fair and equitable D&N system.

The Committee is currently working on a program to provide community recognition of youth who have overcome adversity. The award will be called ilnspire (like Apple Products iPad and iMac). They are working on an insignia and are exploring the use of the Educating Children of Color (ECOC) Summit 501(c)(3) as a vehicle for fundraising, in the hope that they can solicit donations and provide recognized youth a tangible award. The El Paso County Board of County Commissioners is partnering with them on this program: a member of the Board will serve as a member of the ilnspire subcommittee, and the youth will be recognized at a televised Board of County Commissioners' meeting. They also continue to provide support to Judge Walters and her leadership team that annually produce the Educating Children of Color Summit held every January. The Summit educates students, professionals, parents and community advocates on the educational needs of children of color and best practice in filling those needs. It has inspired and provided scholarships and laptop computers to thousands of students. It is a great community service by bringing focus to an important issue and draws participants from all over the state.

The Committee realizes that there is a disparity issue in the arrest of Black youth in their community. They are looking for ways to intervene so members attended the Kids and Cops (youth/officer forums) event sponsored by the Denver Office of the Independent Monitor. During the event, they also learned about LYRIC and Project LEAD, two additional resources for educating youth on their rights and responsibilities. They were extremely inspired by the event, as well as the information they received about LYRIC and Project LEAD and plan to bring one of these programs, or something similar, to the 4th Judicial District.

In addition, the Committee has worked closely with Magistrate Curtis to support her efforts to evaluate and remediate the existence of MOR as part of the Fourth Judicial District's School Pathways Project. The School Pathways to Juvenile Justice System Project (a national project originally started in partnership with NCJFCJ) started a few years ago and through Magistrate Curtis' oversight have undertaken intensive data tracking, study, and analysis to get a more clear picture of where the school-based delinquency cases that are filed into their district are coming from (what school, school district, law enforcement agency) and who these students are (demographical break out based on gender and race that is included in the charging document). NCJFCJ helped them with an initial data analysis of 12 months of data spanning from April 2014-April 2015. After their collaborative group reviewed this analysis, they decided to intensively partner with Colorado Spring District 11 and Colorado Springs Police Department with a goal of achieving a statistically significant reduction in the number of "Interference with School Staff" charges that are filed into the district court. The hypothesis is that through heightened awareness of the issues involved, concerted effort on the part of school administration and school

resource officers to delineate between disciplinary behavior and criminal behavior, and agency cross-training, they can achieve a significant reduction in filing of the charge of Interference with School Staff. They have partnered with UCCS (University of Colorado-Colorado Springs) to do the data analysis for the grant as this time. So far, they have provided 3 months of blinded data to UCCS for analysis based on August, September, and October of 2016 and have raw data waiting for de-identification from November and December of 2016. Although it may be too early to see if the hypothesis will be born out, the efforts of this collaborative group are exciting and encouraging. Since it is known that school-based behavior resulting in delinquency charges have been shown through research to have a disproportionate impact on students of color, they believe these efforts to reduce low-level disciplinary incidents from becoming delinquency charges are an important piece of the efforts to address DMC issues within the juvenile justice system specifically addressing arrest.

One last effort to address the arrest of youth of color has focused on providing youth soccer opportunities throughout the city of Colorado Springs called the Southeast Springs Soccer Initiative (SeSSI). The location of the program is in a predominately a Latino community and the soccer program has the involvement of law enforcement officers as a primary goal. They are impacting the youth and communities view of law enforcement and vice a versa. Through this strategy they have successfully recruited 3 adult mentors for a youth led council, engaged 28 families, 6 parent coaches and 7 law enforcement officers (DA, parole, CO Springs Police Department, etc.) whom participate in games consistently. In addition, the Southeast Springs Soccer Initiative SeSSI Violence Prevention Coordinator is housed at Second Chance Through Faith and is working to build relationships with at-risk youth and families there, they do this by encouraging informal and formal involvement of families of high risk youth as coaches, referees, playing soccer, and 'team moms". SeSSI continues to meet the first Tuesday of every month at the Sand Creek Police Station. Approximately 30-40 people consistently attend each meeting. Summer 2016- Family presence at parks significantly increased. On average, there were 10 families actively participating in kick-arounds which often included a parole officer and a district attorney.

This effort has impacted the Latino community and they know by looking at the numbers that they need to have a similar effect on the Black community. So, they are currently looking for a program that will produce the same results in predominantly Black communities.

Regarding the detention decision point, the Judicial District received DMC training in the fall of 2016 and made a decision to prioritize the over representation issue as they continue to look at who is screening in to their detention facilities. The next step is for the Juvenile Services Planning Board and the Senate Bill 94 (Alternative to Detention) Coordinator to use previous and recent data to inform their SB94 plan due this spring. They should use the data to determine the needs of the youth they are seeing who are predominantly Black and Latino and develop evidence-informed services to keep youth out of detention. They also recognize that keeping youth from being arrested in the first place is the best way to reduce the number of youth of color being detained and fully support the efforts described above that are more focused on preventing arrests.

Arapahoe County (18th Judicial District)

Data: The 18th Judicial District is unique in that it is comprised of four counties, Douglas, Elbert, Arapahoe and Lincoln but the majority of the youth population and the majority of the minority population is concentrated in one county. Arapahoe County is home to 60% of the judicial district's 10-17 population, 81% of the judicial district's Latino and 94% of the district's Black youth age 10-17. Conversely Arapahoe County only has 49% of the entire judicial district's White youth 10-17 population. The population of the district as a whole is 64% White (down 1%), 7.5% Black, 21% Latino (up 1%) and less than 1% Native American. The entire judicial district encompasses 33% of the state's Black youth population (10-17) and 41% of the state's arrests of Black youth (10-17) making it an essential part of the state's DMC efforts.

This is the only Judicial District where the Arrest of both Black and Latino youth are statistically significant with a magnitude indicating the need to address them and having an impact on a large volume of youth. The magnitude for Black arrests still indicates that Black youth were arrested at least 6 times more than White youth (down from 7) while Latino youth were arrested twice as often as White youth (down from 2.6). The volume of youth affected is 1,778 Black youth and 1,583 Latino youth. Black and Latino youth make up 58% of all arrests in the 18th Judicial District while only making up 29% of that judicial district's

general youth population. To reach parity there needed to be 1,501 less Black youth arrested and 796 less Latino youth arrested. This is clearly an area to be addressed. These calculations will be reviewed once we have all law enforcement data reported.

In addition to arrest, in the 18th Judicial District we also have to continue to focus on the detention of Black and Latino youth. Keeping in mind the data reliability issue (missing law enforcement data) preliminary data shows a magnitude of 1.46 for Black youth (up from 1.22) representing a volume of 330 Black youth and a magnitude of 1.44 for Latino youth (up from .89) representing a volume of 289 youth. To reach parity the district would have needed to detain 104 fewer Black youth and 88 fewer Latino youth. There are on-going conversations between the Alternatives to Detention Coordinator and the DMC Coordinator and efforts to look for strategies to mitigate these numbers already underway.

At this time the focus will remain on arrest and detention as the magnitude and/or volume of youth in the other decision points does not rise to the same level. It is best to continue our efforts in the two areas identified and work diligently in those areas.

Context: The 18th Judicial District is similar to the 4th Judicial District in that it has a longstanding MOR Committee. They have consistent monthly meetings with good attendance from probation, district attorney's office, the Division of Youth Corrections and human services and the Aurora Police Department. The February meeting focused on engaging community members as this representation has been missing for a couple of years. The DMC Coordinator attends these monthly meetings to provide technical assistance and support as they continue to work through their action plan and revise and add to it as needed. Communication between the chair of the committee and the DMC Coordinator is very good and they often have conversations about intervention strategies and next steps. They have already discussed the arrest and detention numbers reported for FY 15-16 and have begun to talk about possible avenues that could be pursued.

While the RRI went up for detention for both Black and Latino youth, there still remains great effort to continue to keep the number low. The high was in FY10-11 when both Black and Latino youth were 4 times more likely to be detained than White youth. The increase was small but still keeps this decision point at the forefront of their intervention plan. Past strategies put in place during a prior OJJDP/MacArthur grant are still in place such as, not using detention for truancy VCO's or Child Welfare VCO's , the Truancy Problem-Solving Court, the Evening Reporting Center and better access to culturally appropriate services. At this time it is difficult to say what strategies will be pursued because they do not have all the law enforcement data and do not want to lose credibility by presenting faulty numbers. This is the same for the arrest RRI, although they know it is extremely high they will wait to present the information to the MOR Committee once the data is reanalyzed with updated arrest information.

The 18th JD knows that there is capacity to address both the arrest and detention issues in the MOR Committee and the Judicial District. Just recently the MOR Committee agreed that spreading themselves too thin was resulting in little to no changes and so they prioritized the arrest decision point. A division chief at the Aurora Police Department sits on the committee and volunteered to be the next decision point they delve into. This judicial district will capitalize on that enthusiasm and begin efforts to work with the police department which is both the largest and serves the most diverse population within the judicial district. There is also a project funded by a Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) focused on qualitative assessments to gather information to improve the Aurora Police Departments relationships with communities of color. The study will include opinions and input from youth, parents and police. The product from this project will be a report with recommendations to assist the Aurora Police Department in making changes. This grant was requested by the Aurora Police Department in an effort to improve their relationships with communities of color. The Project Director for this project is the newest member of the 18th Judicial District's MOR Committee.

In addition, the alternatives to detention program is already implementing changes to improve their services and keep youth from entering detention. They are going back and looking at unsuccessful cases to determine what might have gone wrong or what could have been put in place to help that youth succeed. They will use this information to modify or add to their current services. Once they are confident

in the arrest and detention numbers they will add to what is already taking place and move forward with strategies to address both arrest and detention.

Phase II: Assessment/Diagnosis

(1) Brief Summary of the Findings – DMC Assessment Study

Colorado started an assessment project in early 2010 which was completed in 2011. The completed products include an Executive Summary, State Report, 4th Judicial District Report and 18th Judicial Report (emailed to OJJDP February 2013). Below is a brief summary of the findings.

Priorities identified in Colorado's Three-Year Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Plan for compliance with the DMC core requirement included increasing capacity to document DMC for youth at the point of arrest and developing an understanding of contributing factors and strategies for addressing DMC. With these priorities in mind, DCJ contracted with the OMNI Institute to conduct an evaluation that focused on two core areas: Statewide Measurement and Monitoring of DMC and Local-Level Work to identify DMC Contributing Factors and Reduction Strategies.

Emphasis was placed on the latter, evaluating the perspectives, efforts, and needs of community-level coalitions and stakeholders. Understanding how DMC is measured and monitored, the factors contributing to it, and the strategies expected to help mitigate it, requires an understanding of local context. See the full report for a detailed description of the evaluation activities, methodologies, and data sources.

FINDINGS

State-level Work

MOR committees and coalitions should ensure sufficient capacity and readiness before beginning local level work (assessments); and have realistic expectations

The criteria used to select judicial districts for participation in the local 'case studies' proved to be critical, it is not recommended that committees engage in this process unless they are sufficiently established, comprise diverse sectors, and most importantly, are able to acknowledge and honestly discuss complex and sensitive race and class issues at both theoretical and practical levels. A data-driven approach to selecting intervention and prevention strategies is critical, yet even successfully obtaining the data, much less analyzing and interpreting it, can take considerable time.

DCJ should provide state-level orientation/training and resources to MOR committees prior to beginning efforts (case studies/assessment/interventions)

While MOR committee members and stakeholders may be well versed in how DMC plays out in their communities, they may not be as familiar with broader theoretical and practical frameworks for understanding and addressing DMC. DCJ can play a valuable role in educating and increasing readiness of interested committees. Key recommendations, outlined further in the full report, are:

- Provide training(s) that teach the OJJDP framework for addressing DMC, and outline how to implement data-driven approaches to DMC
- Develop and provide useful resources and tools for communities/coalitions that have been trained and are ready to begin the process of engaging in local 'case studies'. Facilitate opportunities for more experienced local MOR committees to share successes and learnings; and to serve as consultants to less experienced groups

Local-level Work to identify DMC Contributing Factors and Reductions Strategies

While most judicial districts in Colorado have DMC, in order to develop a more in-depth understanding at the local level, a process was conducted to identify and recruit judicial districts to take part in intensive 'case studies'. The following criteria led to selection of the 18th and 4th judicial districts for participation: Past state data indicating *disproportionate rates of arrest* for African American and/or Hispanic/Latino youth in the district (with significant population for study); existence of a *local, active MOR/DMC*

committee or coalition; willingness and ability to examine local data critically, and limited opportunity and resources available to study the issue otherwise.

Finally, both the 18th and 4th JD MOR committees communicated the value of more nuanced perspectives from community members who could speak to the experiences of youth and families of color with school and juvenile justice systems and practices.

Key Characteristics and Circumstances of Arrested Youth

A common assumption is that disproportionality in arrests for youth of color is explained by factors such as gang-related activity, or commitment of more severe offenses.

- An objectively low percentage of youth of color who were referred to the Juvenile Assessment Center (JAC) in the 18th JD were identified as having gang associations and in both the 18th and 4th judicial districts, available data showed no further overrepresentation of youth of color among arrests for more serious offenses.

For youth brought into the 18th JD Juvenile Assessment Center (JAC) and assigned to detention, a greater share of African American youth had holding statuses of ‘Failure to Appear’ or ‘Failure to Comply’ and were also more likely to have the Court identified as the holding authority.

- This pattern suggests that socio-economic barriers may adversely and disproportionately impact African American youths’ justice outcomes. The transportation and job security hurdles of parents, particularly single parents, may undermine youths’ ability to comply with court requirements, leading to more severe sanctions.

Examination of youth arrest data from the Colorado Springs Police Department (CSPD) revealed that both Hispanic/Latino and African American youth were overrepresented in charges of disorderly conduct.

- Disorderly conduct is more subjectively determined than other offenses. Research indicates that cases where individuals’ judgment or discretion must be applied are more likely to result in bias, even if unintentional.

Data on the timing of youth arrests by the Colorado Springs Police Department indicated that for all youth, regardless of race and ethnicity, a larger proportion of arrests occurred during week days than on the weekends and, further, over half of all incidents occurring on weekdays took place during school hours (between 8am and 3pm).

- This finding indicates that youth are commonly engaging in activities leading to arrest when they should be attending school, and supports intervention strategies targeted at engaging youth and reducing crime during school hours. The connection of youth suspended, expelled or who have dropped-out to the higher rates of delinquency during school hours should be explored to further refine appropriate intervention strategies.

The Relationship of School Policies and Practices to DMC

The national trend in schools toward zero-tolerance policies and utilization of assigned police officers (known as School Resource Officers, or SROs) has led to identification of a phenomenon known as the ‘School to Prison Pipeline’ whereby school policies and practices are contributing to increased justice system involvement of youth, particularly youth of color. To explore the potential relationship of school policies and practices to youth DMC in Colorado, OMNI (vendor selected to facilitate the intensive ‘case studies’) reviewed a number of state and local policy documents, as well as broader literature on school-based recommendations to reduce DMC. Publicly available school disciplinary action data were also obtained from the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) website for all school districts in the 18th and 4th judicial districts.

The review revealed several potential contributing factors to disproportionate school disciplinary actions for youth of color in Colorado. These factors are explained in further detail in the full report and included:

- Heavy reliance on parent/guardian involvement (e.g. for notification, meetings, appeals process)
- Requirements for special handling of gang-related activities
- Unclear definitions of and harsh consequences for students determined to be “habitually disruptive”
- Guidelines allowing students to be disciplined (including expulsion) for committing crimes outside of school

OMNI analyzed disciplinary action data for school districts in the 18th and 4th, with a focus on assessing disproportionality in rates of in- and out-of-school suspension and expulsion for youth of color compared to White youth.

- The data showed varying rates of disproportionality for youth of color across school districts and types of disciplinary action. Closer examination and comparison of these districts’ policies and practices might help further reveal areas where schools are either contributing to or helping limit contact of minority youth with the justice system.

Experiences of Minority Youth and Families

To provide additional context for the case studies, focus groups and interviews were conducted. The results validated the MOR Committees’ perceptions of the following potential contributors to DMC in their districts:

- Differential or discretionary treatment of student delinquency among school personnel;
- Insufficient communication and parental engagement by schools on student disciplinary issues and protocols;
- Difficulty for families in navigating court systems and complying with requirements (including those influenced by socioeconomic barriers); and
- The need for improved cultural competence and training for staff (e.g., case workers, law enforcement officers) who work with minority youth and families.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this project was to assist DCJ in identifying ways to help the state and local communities assess and address DMC utilizing various research methods. Much was accomplished through this collaborative process, and the emphasis on local-level engagement with selected judicial districts proved highly beneficial and rewarding. One step that can begin immediately is to explore opportunities to implement the ‘case study’ approach with other interested and qualified committees. Developing a competitive application process would allow DCJ to apply criteria that have proven to be critical, and to build training, resources, and tools into the requirements of the funding. These steps would ensure committees’ capacity and readiness, and further standardize the process. An additional benefit to DCJ of these local-level efforts is that they encourage collaboration across key players and ‘guardians’ of data within each judicial district, including attorneys, law enforcement, and school officials. Utilizing MOR committee members to engage these stakeholders in conversations about DMC and related data needs, can facilitate better collection, coding, analysis, and reporting of race and ethnicity data across the state.

In addition to the assessment study completed on juvenile justice in late 2012 a case study of two more judicial districts was completed in October 2014. The findings were released and presentations were made to the JJDP Council and the state’s DMC Committee in 2014. Below is a summary of the results of those two case studies.

Case Study – Denver (2nd Judicial District) and Mesa County (21st Judicial District)

While DCJ closely monitors state and judicial level data on DMC, it has also dedicated resources to work with local communities on expanding understanding of DMC and potential strategies to address it at the local level. Understanding how DMC is measured and monitored, the factors contributing to it, and the strategies expected to help mitigate it, all require understanding of the local context. This is particularly true for states like Colorado with a state-supervised, county administered structure, where ‘local control’ may hamper the state’s ability to standardize and mandate data collection procedures, and to widely implement policies that can effectively address DMC. Further, DMC may look different in different

communities, with a range in level of severity as well as contributing factors. Thus, DCJ has deliberately pursued a 'bottom-up' process whereby broader learnings and strategies for Colorado could begin to be identified through intensive and reflective work conducted throughout various communities.

Both the 2nd and 21st judicial district DMC committees expressed a need and commitment to grow local understanding of the critical factors impacting DMC for youth of color in their districts. A common theme for these two districts was an established acknowledgement of the existence of DMC in their jurisdictions, as well as a committed group of stakeholders prepared to explore the issues. Additionally, neither district had yet had the opportunity to sufficiently explore local data that could inform DMC-related efforts and interventions. Each judicial district was asked to narrow their work to one decision point; the 2nd Judicial District selected arrest while the 21st looked at detention.

The process of data exploration for both communities was deliberately exploratory, iterative, and participatory with the specific priorities, content and structure of the research activities being determined by local DMC committee members. The process first included identifying data sources and assessment areas of interest. OMNI then completed preliminary analyses and worked with the each committee to examine initial findings and develop subsequent assessment questions. A series of committee discussions and deeper explorations of data were then completed to consider all available data findings for possible factors contributing to DMC at the local level. Final discussions focused on potential next steps to further inform efforts to reduce DMC in each community.

- First, local committees should continue to capitalize on the work they have accomplished in the way of forming partnerships between local entities in school and juvenile justice systems. Expert sources of information (e.g., DPD, SB-94) can provide ongoing access to data as well as critical contextual information about decision-making, processing and documentation.
- Next, both communities should commit to ongoing dialogue with key systems professionals to continue to contextualize the information, interpret the data and understand the underlying implications of findings as they relate to local DMC-related efforts.
- Both communities also expressed interest in exploring ways to better track youth trajectories throughout school and juvenile justice entities, in order to identify characteristics of high-risk youth early in their involvement with these systems.
- A number of areas specific to the work of each community were identified as related to the initial data patterns observed:
 - For Denver, it will be critical to monitor arrest activity in key neighborhoods and hot spots and to identify additional neighborhood-level factors that may be influencing arrests (e.g., environmental issues such as key locations and socioeconomic risk factors that may increase risk for delinquent behavior; local policies that may influence the way youth behavior is handled in certain areas) for youth in key neighborhoods. It will also be important to explore factors that may increase the likelihood of youth of color (particularly Hispanic/Latino youth) having custodial versus cite and release arrests (e.g., decision-making protocols, socioeconomic factors that may limit the ability of police to make contact with parents/guardians, etc.).
 - For Mesa, it will be important to further explore variation in data patterns across school years as related to the consistency of discipline strategy implementation and data reporting, along with looking at additional disciplinary actions a school can take outside suspensions and expulsions (e.g., warning/reprimand; contract; community service, etc.). Further contextualizing the patterns observed within juvenile justice system data will also be critical, and will require consistent commitment from each key system to interpret the initial findings from these data.

Potential Opportunities for Interventions

OJJDP recommends a comprehensive, multimodal approach to addressing DMC. This means employing strategies aimed at multiple decision points where DMC exists, as well as focus on multiple contributing factors. A compilation of strategies is suggested by OJJDP in order to both address gaps in programmatic efforts (e.g., direct services for youth and families) and larger systemic issues (e.g., personnel-focused training and policy change). While each local community is in the best position to identify appropriate

strategies based on the data and deeper understanding of other contextual factors, several OJJDP approaches can be considered broadly in identifying possible local DMC-related intervention strategies.

School-Specific Strategies

School systems surfaced as having a critical impact on DMC within each community. The national trend in schools toward zero-tolerance policies and utilization of assigned police officers (known as School Resource Officers, or SROs) has led to identification of a phenomenon known as the 'School to Prison Pipeline' whereby school policies and practices are contributing to increased justice system involvement of youth, particularly youth of color. Exploration of strategies aimed at system-level changes involving school policies and practices (e.g., disciplinary protocols) as well as interventions to enhance school culture and engagement could therefore be critical within both communities.

- **Partnerships with local advocacy organizations** working on school discipline issues (e.g., Padres Y Jóvenes Unidos) could be sought to explore implications of current school discipline legislation (e.g., Colorado Smart School Discipline Law) and to develop effective and culturally responsive disciplinary approaches.
- Communities can also further explore the school level of discretion in decision-making about consequences. Further, **identifying and tracking youth interactions with law enforcement** at the school level could be highly beneficial.
- Continued **implementation of evidence-based direct service strategies** focused on mitigating youth risk factors for specific behaviors or offenses. There is also increasing emphasis in Colorado on **school-based alternatives** to discipline through restorative justice practices, which help schools and youth resolve disputes (and, indirectly, reduce truancy, suspensions, and expulsions) without the engagement of law enforcement.
- **Dedication of resources to cultural responsiveness training** for teachers and other school personnel could also be a critical next step in enhancing understanding of youth background, risk factors and potentially effective support strategies.

Additional Strategies

For both communities, findings suggest possible benefits of implementing strategies outside of school systems.

For Mesa, further interpretation and contextualization of the findings presented on the juvenile justice touch points is critical. Doing so would further enhance local understanding of the data and allow for deeper dialogue regarding specific strategies. More generally, the OJJDP acknowledges that minority overrepresentation may exist at one, several or every decision point within a given geographic area or juvenile justice system. Many general approaches to reducing DMC at early stages of contact with the system have shown promise. Prevention and early intervention programs have successfully impacted differential offending and differential opportunities for services (including indirect effects such as economic status, etc.).

For Denver, preliminary findings revealed higher rates of arrest for youth of color in certain geographical locations, with these associations typically reflecting (a) where youth of color reside; and/or (b) where all youth are congregating and engaging in delinquent activity. Thus, the overall picture of arrests of youth of color may be most significantly impacted by activity and decision making in these geographic areas. It may be critical, therefore, for extra steps to be taken by these communities, and their schools and law enforcement agencies, to mitigate system penetration for youth of color through more innovative, responsive approaches.

An additional goal for these local case study efforts was to derive broader learnings for how DCJ can continue to support other local coalitions and committees across Colorado in their efforts to address DMC in their communities. The following learnings emerged from observations by the evaluation team, analysis of committee meeting minutes and other project documentation, and ongoing discussions regarding process with local and DCJ stakeholders.

Ensure sufficient community capacity and readiness

The involvement of professionals from all key systems is paramount to the success of local DMC case studies. Committee members need to be consistently active and engaged in efforts to ensure access to

data, as well as the sharing of critical context needed to interpret and understand the implications of data findings.

Establish access to data in advance of the case study project

The success of local case study efforts is dependent upon access to needed data. Communities should establish data sharing agreements with key entities and outline general expectations of data analysis and/or additional data collection prior to initiating the project.

Outline reasonable goals in advance of the case study project

It is important to outline realistic goals for each community that are based on local readiness as well as prior data collection efforts. Clarifying expectations of the data gathering effort early in the process will ensure that all stakeholders are clear on the level of detail that may emerge from data findings as well as what reasonable next steps might entail.

Provide additional support prior to the case study project

As recommended following the first round of case studies in 2010-11, it continues to be important to enhance community preparation efforts and overall readiness prior to beginning the case study process. Potential opportunities and ideas for this support include the following:

- State-level orientation/training
- Resources such as guides related to understanding DMC and similar efforts in other communities; templates for data sharing; committee confidentiality agreements; data collection tools (e.g., focus group guides)
- Opportunities to communicate with and learn from other jurisdictions that have completed similar work

While utilizing established criteria to select local communities for participation in case study process is essential, these additional recommendations will help facilitate the continued success of local DMC projects.

(b) Plan and Time-line for completion of the Assessment

Not applicable, Colorado completed an assessment in December 2011 and additional case studies in 2014. Another set of case studies is planned for 2016-17.

PHASE III: Intervention

1. Progress made in FY 2016.

GOAL #1: IDENTIFICATION (DATA)

Improve the DMC data collection and use of DMC data in Colorado

OBJECTIVE 1: Continue to collect and analyze DMC data annually.

Activities:

- ✓ Collect DMC data with the assistance of the Office of Research Statistics (SAC).
- ✓ Analyze data at the state level and for at least three of the largest jurisdictions annually.
- ✓ Post data on Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice's website

Activities Implemented/Planned: The Office of Research and Statistics within the Division of Criminal Justice which serves as Colorado's Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) assists in collecting the data utilized for the DMC data base, planning and state on-line resources. Over the years we have established great relationships with the data analysts in other state divisions allowing us to get data from each of those systems for a different time-frame than in the past. Although we were able to access data for the new DMC reporting time-frame, we anticipate rerunning the data in March so that we have similar data as in prior years in order to compare trends for our local judicial districts. The local judicial districts' ability to convince their stakeholders to engage in efforts to address DMC depends on the ability to demonstrate a problem over years of data; anything that affects the reliability of the data can unravel our efforts. Data is

always analyzed for the state and three of the largest judicial districts. This year we have continued to look at the data for the same three districts the 2nd, 4th and 18th. In addition to the data for those three districts we also collect and present the data for all judicial districts in Colorado so we can identify hotspots for locals that need attention and provide assistance. This data is shared with local SB 94 (Alternatives to Detention) Coordinators and the Juvenile Services Planning Committees in each of the 22 Judicial Districts in the state. Data was also posted on the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice's (CCJJ) website to serve as an on-line resource to individuals, communities and the commission itself. To review the CCJJ website go to: <https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/ccjj/ccjj-dmc>.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

OBJECTIVE 2: Improve DMC data usability and accessibility by local jurisdictions.

Activities:

- ✓ Continue to update the on-line database that makes data accessible to jurisdictions and systems through the web.
- ✓ Update trend data on the website.
- ✓ Assist communities in understanding what the DMC identification (matrix) data means in their community.

Activities Implemented/Planned: To assist judicial districts access to immediate information, we have an interactive map that can be used as a dashboard by communities on our Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice Assistance website. Through our partnership with the Office of Research and Statistics we are able to keep data for multiple years so that judicial districts can look across at trend data for a specific decision point. To access that tool go to:

http://public.tableau.com/views/MOR-OAJJA/MOR?:embed=y&:showTabs=y&:display_count=yes&:showVizHome=no.

Technical assistance is provided either in person or by telephone to communities to explain their DMC data and what direction they should take based on that data. The DMC Coordinator explains the RRI and how it is calculated, walks people through their data sheet and helps them identify which decision points are showing the most volume and magnitude. In addition the DMC Coordinator and the community contact person discuss the best way to present the data to others in their community. Sometimes this is in tables, graphs, trend data and at times as a percent when there are small populations that do not lead to an RRI being generated or the RRI is clearly skewed due to smaller populations.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

OBJECTIVE 3: Continue to work on ways that represents the data more accurately.

Activities:

- ✓ Continue to work with probation and local probation departments to evaluate the reliability of the data.
- ✓ Continue to present the data in ways that account for the unreliability of filing and adjudication data.
- ✓ Work with CJJ to determine issues of reliability and their effects on the RRI.

Activities Implemented/Planned: When presenting at local stakeholder meetings the reliability issue of the probation data is discussed. The probation department is then tasked with carefully looking at the data being reported for them and compare it with any internal information to verify the accuracy. In addition at a stakeholder meeting held in August 2016 to discuss the various state data reliability issues the Juvenile Probation State Specialist was in attendance and committed to insuring that the importance of good data is emphasized when training new probation officers. The goal is to have trained probation officers that ask the youth before them how they identify and if the response is different then what is in their data system take the time to correct the database. There are two ways that the data can be presented to minimize the impact of the filing and adjudication data. The first, is to recalculate the decision points after adjudication as has been done in the data reported in the tables above; the

commitment data is calculated using the arrest data as the base. Additionally, the data can be presented as a percent and the judicial district can review the data and the way kids of color are being processed through their juvenile justice system. Both methods have their flaws but it has been the DMC Coordinator's experience that either or both of the methods is successful in bringing attention to the need for better judicial data and to any DMC identified at the commitment decision point.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: The Coalition for Juvenile Justice (CJJ) had committed to facilitating a committee to look at the RRI and determine if at this time it is still best practice or if another method could be used to mitigate some of the data reliability issues states face. The Colorado DMC Coordinator volunteered to serve on this committee but the committee never convened. The DMC Coordinator will continue to use the methods described above in districts to facilitate a discussion about data issues and also the occurrence and level of DMC at the commitment decision point.

GOAL # 2: ASSESSMENT (RESEARCH)

Identify DMC contributing mechanisms to direct intervention strategies

OBJECTIVE 1: Continue to look for opportunities to assess “why” DMC is occurring in communities.

Activities:

- ✓ Work with the research company conducting the case studies in the 1st Judicial District looking at arrest and in the 18th Judicial District looking at diversion.
- ✓ Assist the two communities in identifying research questions and direction for the case studies.
- ✓ Assist the two communities in using the findings to develop/modify intervention strategies.
- ✓ Present results of case studies to the JJDP Council.
- ✓ Use the findings as examples for other judicial districts that are looking for ways to start addressing the issue.

Activities Implemented/Planned: For the better part of 2016 the DMC Coordinator has been working with OMNI Institute to conduct an assessment case study of arrest in the 1st Judicial District. The scope of the project was limited to the City of Lakewood which encompasses the largest population of youth of color. The other reason for focusing in Lakewood was that the 1st JD Minority Over Representation Committee had the support of the Lakewood Police Chief and a judge in Lakewood Municipal Court. The Police Department authorized 5 years of data to be transferred to OMNI Institute for analyzing. The data included race/ethnicity, location of crime, zip code of arrestees as well as other variables. At the start of the case study it was identified that tickets did not have a field for ethnicity. Since tickets represent the majority of youth arrests in Lakewood they needed to find a way to determine if there were differences in the youth ticketed versus those custodial arrested. In order to do this the Municipal Court with the assistance of OMNI developed a data collection form to be given to youth appearing before the court for their ticketed accused offenses. Data was collected from the court for a six month period of time July 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016. By analyzing the ethnicity of youth coming to court for tickets, OMNI was able to establish patterns for youth who received a ticket. In addition there was one more source of data. The Juvenile Assessment Center within the 1st Judicial District was able to provide additional data for youth arrested. The data from the Assessment Center was for the entire 1st Judicial District and not limited to the City of Lakewood. This data yielded information on how youth come into the JAC, what is done with the youth and often the outcome of their involvement with the JAC. All of this data has been used to develop a draft report with findings and recommendations. The plan is for the MOR Committee to review and finalize the draft so it can be used to drive a strategic plan for addressing DMC at arrest. Work has started on the 2nd case study looking at diversion within the 18th Judicial District. Because diversion is under the authority of the elected District Attorney we had to get approval from him to proceed. He has since given permission for the case study and release of data to OMNI to analyze. The DA elected to form a steering committee specifically to guide this case study. The first meeting of that committee will be February/March 2017. The DMC Coordinator has been an integral part of planning both case studies including assistance in developing the research questions that will yield the best information for developing strategies.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: The plan is to use the final report in the 1st Judicial District to develop an intervention plan. The same will happen in the 18th Judicial District. Due to data issues (lack of ethnicity on tickets in the City of Lakewood), this project is just running behind the project in the 1st. Once both case studies are complete the findings and recommendations will also be presented to the JJDP Council. In addition as planned the case studies will serve as a roadmap for other judicial districts engaging in a case study process.

GOAL # 3: INTERVENTIONS (PROGRAMS, POLICIES AND PRACTICE)

Improve the Juvenile Justice System response to minority youth and their families.

OBJECTIVE 1: Provide technical assistance on DMC issues to judicial districts and agencies.

Activities:

- ✓ Provide technical assistance on the DMC data.
- ✓ Provide technical assistance on solutions to DMC.
- ✓ Provide technical assistance to help communities start or continue an Action Plan for DMC.
- ✓ Provide technical assistance to local MOR committees.
- ✓ Use what has been learned from communities working to address DMC to assist other communities in implementing similar strategies.

Activities Implemented/Planned: Training/Technical Assistance was provided to several judicial districts, these were the 1st, 20th, 18th and 21st. Depending on where they were in the process, the technical assistance was focused in different areas. The 1st and the 20th were just starting their assessment phase. The 1st Judicial District was able to work with a research firm hired through Formula Grant funds to assist them in delving deeper into the arrest decision point in one of the cities in their judicial district with the highest population of youth of color. The DMC Coordinator assisted in facilitating this process and attended every meeting between the 1st JD MOR Committee and the research agency to make sure that the focus of the study remained on DMC and remained on areas where the information could help the committee develop intervention strategies. The preliminary report indicates that there are several ways they may focus their intervention strategies including targeting offense specific crimes such as those lower offenses (disorderly conduct, fighting in public, etc.), they could focus on one type of arrest such as arrests on warrants, or they could focus on one particular area of the city where the data indicated the most Latino youth were being arrested (their largest minority population). The DMC Coordinator will assist them in deciding on the best strategy for them at this time knowing that they can move on to other areas once they have success in the area they first select as their focus. The 20th Judicial District had several planning meetings where they received training on DMC and what it looked like in their jurisdiction. Once everyone was on the same page they decided as a group to move forward to the next phase, assessment. To help them with the assessment the DMC Coordinator submitted a request for technical assistance from OJJDP and this was approved. The DMC Coordinator has participated in several planning calls between the 20th Judicial District and the TA provider, Dr. Feyerherm. The goal of the TA is not to conduct the assessment but to teach the committee and the data people how to do an assessment. This TA will result in the 20th's ability to continue on their path to developing a data driven action plan. The 18th Judicial District MOR Committee has been meeting for several years so the DMC Coordinator continues to provide them on-going monthly TA and assist them in focusing their strategies in their action plan so that they have the ability to be successful. The 21st Judicial District is in the process of reenergizing a long standing MOR Committee by transferring the work to another established committee on which all the needed stakeholders are participating. The DMC Coordinator is providing them with assistance in reestablishing their committee by developing a goal and a vision to guide their future work.

To help other communities in addressing DMC we have also completed a lot of training which had a heavy emphasis on successful strategies that other Colorado Judicial Districts have attained.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

OBJECTIVE 2: Market the DMC Core Requirement.

Activities:

- ✓ Provide training to at least two organizations/systems/conferences a year.
- ✓ Continue to update and develop a more robust DMC website.
- ✓ Use the Stakeholder Meeting to market/engage other systems in finding solutions that address DMC and MOR issues.

Activities Implemented/Planned: The DMC Coordinator in partnership with other initiatives trained at the National Juvenile Justice Symposium held in Denver in late October/early November. The first session had about 15 attendees and focused on DMC 101 and then more specifically on an intervention strategy being used in the 2nd Judicial District (Denver). More information on the intervention strategy can be found at Goal 4, Obj. 3 reporting below. The second training had at least 50 attendees and focused once again on DMC 101 with more time to go in-depth and then on the intervention strategies used in the 18th Judicial District to address DMC at the detention decision point. Both trainings went well and participants engaged by asking questions and staying after the presentation to have discussions on the issues and solutions. More on the training done for the SB 94 (Alternative to Detention) Committees will be below in Obj. 9.

The DMC website only had the DMC data and an explanation of DMC. This year we added an area on assessment where people viewing the website could learn what type of questions to ask when in the assessment phase. So now we have information on the website for the Identification and Assessment phases. The next step will be to add the Intervention phase information to the website so that those looking to start addressing DMC can see that there are some tangible intervention strategies that have been successful in reducing DMC.

The Statewide Stakeholder meeting was held on August 18, 2016. There were many systems represented and in addition the representation was from higher level managers or directors who could make changes within their systems. The systems represented were Office of Family, Youth and Children; Child Welfare; Education; Colorado Bureau of Investigation (arrest data); Division of Youth Corrections (detention and commitment); Judges (adjudication and commitment); and the Probation Services Division. In addition we had members of the state DMC Committee (CMYE) and representatives from more specific parts of the system such as Division of Youth Corrections, Case Managers and the Juvenile PREA Coordinator. The plan is to follow-up at the six month mark which will be mid-February to update them on progress made and to remind them of the commitments they made. Several of the directors and associate directors committed to looking at additional data they have access to and looking at it by race and ethnicity. Also, Probation Services committed to emphasize the importance of good race and ethnicity data in the training done for new probation officers. Due to the success of this first stakeholder meeting we are planning one for August 10, 2017.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

OBJECTIVE 3: Provide staff support to the CMYE membership to assist in DMC planning and work.

Activities:

- ✓ DMC Coordinator will provide staff support to the CMYE under the DMC Staff support Formula grant; at a minimum support will include scheduling, agenda development, meeting set up, minutes and staffing subcommittees.
- ✓ Train CMYE (new members) annually.
- ✓ Identify any deficits in membership and work to fill those roles.
- ✓ Continue a method of disseminating information on resources and funding opportunities to CMYE Members.
- ✓ Designate one CMYE meeting a year to invite stakeholders to the table and have a discussion on what can be done to address DMC.
- ✓ Follow-up work from 1st Stakeholders meeting held August 2016.

Activities Implemented/Planned: The DMC Coordinator has provided staff support to the DMC Committee, the Colorado Coalition for Minority Youth Equality (CMYE) all year. This has included staffing three meetings which consist of communication, agenda development, co-facilitation with the chair, minutes, meeting set-up and other logistics. This year there was a greater focus on keeping members up to date and on top of what is happening in the state. CMYE had presentations on the Behavioral Health Equity Report and on the recidivism study completed by the Division of Youth Corrections. In addition there is always time on the agenda for the DMC Coordinator to report on the state level work in an effort to keep people informed but more importantly to get feedback and input. The other large part of each agenda is the reporting of work and activities being done in the local communities. The meeting is usually attended by at least 4 or more judicial districts working on addressing DMC. Training for newer members occurred in May 2016 and the DMC Coordinator used feedback from that training to improve the training presentation used across the state (discussed more in Goal 4, Obj. 1). Continued to disseminate pertinent information on funding, resources, and opportunities available to the committee to keep them connected to the national and state level activities occurring that impact DMC or youth of color. The Stakeholder meeting was held August 18, 2016 and the detail of that meeting and the impact is described above in Goal 3, obj. 2. Immediate follow-up was done after the Stakeholder meeting which included receiving information on questions asked at the meeting and forwarding the responses to the participants and also thanking them for their attendance.

The mid-year follow-up to the stakeholder meeting occurred on February 9, 2017. The follow-up communication sent to those who were able to attend and those who were not able to attend provided a summary of the first meeting as well as highlighted the commitments made by a few people. The communication also included the documents that were provided at the meeting in case someone needs to refer back to any of the information provided. Lastly, the follow-up was a way to let people know when the next stakeholder meeting was planned, August 10, 2017.

One immediate concrete outcome of the Stakeholder meeting is a connection that was made between Padres (community based organization working to end disparities in school discipline and referrals to law enforcement) and Jefferson County Public Schools. The connection that was made between these two entities lead to training for the entire Jefferson County Schools' Drop-out Prevention and Recovery Department and then led to training for the Diversity Liaison from approximately 60 schools. The training focused on disparities in discipline and referrals to law enforcement and appropriate alternatives.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

OBJECTIVE 4: Provide DMC-related policy and practice information to the CMYE and the JJDP Council.

Activities:

- ✓ DMC Coordinator will keep abreast of DMC policies and practices in other states to keep both the CMYE and the JJDP Council informed.
- ✓ Participate on the DMC Coordinator calls, and take other opportunities to learn what is going on in other states related to DMC policies and practices.
- ✓ CMYE discusses and addressed implications of new policies.
- ✓ CMYE will make policy/practice recommendations to the JJDP Council when appropriate.

Activities Implemented/Planned: The DMC Coordinator participates in all the calls for DMC Coordinators and on JJ Specialist calls when time allows. This gives her the opportunity to learn from other states about what is taking place and contact other DMC Coordinators for more information afterward. In addition the DMC Coordinator attended two conferences this year where there were sessions highlighting DMC intervention strategies in other states. This allowed for in-person conversations with other DMC Coordinators. All pertinent information is passed along to the CMYE and JJDP Council at meetings through report outs. The policy piece has mainly been left to the JJDP Council as the designated body and as individual professionals who can impact policy. The DMC Coordinator is present at all JJDP Council meetings when DMC is being discussed and contributes to DMC related discussions regarding issues when they arise. The CMYE also has discussions of around policy and the

outcome of those discussions is passed on to the JJDP Council. Discussion usually comes up around proposed legislation.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

OBJECTIVE 5: Continue collaboration with other initiatives and systems so that they are aware of DMC issues in their work.

Activities:

- ✓ Include working with established initiatives. This should include Educational Stability, Pathways to Success, Systems of Care, Restorative Justice Council, CLAS Learning Collaborative and other initiatives that complement the DMC work.
- ✓ Serve as a resource to other initiatives and systems.
- ✓ Connect resources to initiatives.
- ✓ Support the implementation work of other initiatives and systems in addressing MOR issues.

Activities Implemented/Planned: Collaboration, connecting and serving as a resource to other initiatives that have or could have an impact on DMC occurred. The DMC Coordinator actively participated in the Pathways to Success initiative focused on ending foster youth experiencing homelessness. She also participated in the Systems of Care, CLAS working group for half of the year. They have taken a hiatus and it is not clear if they will continue to meet. The DMC Coordinator is also a participant on the JJDP Council's Evidence Based Programs and Practices, Low Risk High Needs and Review of the Children's code committees. Each of those committees impacts youth and family of color in the state. Perhaps the one that potentially will have the most impact in the future is the Review of the Children's Code Committee. Lastly, there is collaboration with a Colorado initiative called Colorado 9to25 which is working to implement a state plan that addresses all children and youth services in the state. There is a constant reminder that the services that work for one population of youth may not work for another so the services provided as part of the 9to25 plan need to be culturally relevant and appropriate.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

OBJECTIVE 6: Address the large number of youth being referred by schools to law enforcement.

Activities:

- ✓ Continue to work with Colorado Department of Education on the School-Justice Partnership Project; work on the DMC module.
- ✓ Work with the Office of Research and Statistics data researcher working on the legislation that required the Division of Criminal Justice to analyze school arrest data.
- ✓ Identify what would be the most useful strategies to address both discipline issues and law enforcement referrals given the current resources.
- ✓ Continue work with community based agencies to implement strategies to mitigate the number of youth being referred by law enforcement as well as the disproportionate number of youth being suspended and expelled (disciplined).

Activities Implemented/Planned: Work continued in collaboration with the CO Department of Education on the School-Justice Partnership to develop a curriculum for SRO's and school administration to educate them on DMC and to provide resources and ideas on how they can improve their school's strategies to discipline and refer to law enforcement in an equitable manner. The DMC Coordinator assisted in developing the DMC, data, resources and introduction sections of the curriculum. The curriculum is ready to send to outside reviewers for feedback and then there is a plan in place to do a pilot of the curriculum in March in order to make any revisions before delivering it to a larger audience in June/July. The DMC Coordinator provided assistance to the researcher analyzing school arrest (incidence) data. The result is that all incidences reflected in the report were broken out by race and ethnicity and that the report addressed DMC directly. The data was also put into a data dashboard that allows the user to search by school and look up the school population and compare it to the number of contacts and then further view the data by offense. The benefit of this function is that a school or other stakeholder can quickly identify if

more youth of color are being referred to law enforcement for low level offenses. With the current resources the work described is the best strategy at this time. Once the curriculum is completed the DMC Coordinator will continue to be one of the trainers. We will still look to get involved in other collaborative initiatives as they arise. Collaboration with the community based organization, Padres, who is leading the charge in addressing the disproportionate discipline in Colorado schools has continued. One of the organizations leads is a member of CMYE. In addition he and the DMC Coordinator have on-going discussions about other initiatives in the state and how they can connect with the work Padres is doing. One of the major strategies being implemented by Padres through a collaboration with the Colorado Department of Education's Dropout Prevention & Student Re-engagement Division started this past summer, it was the creation of the End the School-to-Jail Track In Colorado Network (CO-ES2J) which will be hosting a regular series of network calls/webinars to connect education stakeholders across different regions of the state (rural, urban, etc.) to better coordinate efforts to address the school-to-prison pipeline, to increase best practice development and share, and facilitate statewide advocacy. The CO-ES2J network now has a base of support of over 900 individuals, including school parents, youth, representatives of community and advocacy groups, schools, education, criminal justice and juvenile justice agency officials, educators, other education agencies, service providers, law enforcement officials, and others.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities implemented.

OBJECTIVE 7: Oversee truancy work and address DMC issues in the work.

Activities:

- ✓ Oversee the prevention pilot in the 6th Judicial District.
- ✓ Oversee both truancy problem solving court pilots.
- ✓ Ensure strategies being implemented in the three communities are addressing the over representation issue.
- ✓ Oversee the truancy study on the use of detention and ensure that race and ethnicity will be addressed in the report.
- ✓ Use what is learned from the truancy work to assist communities in developing strategies to address DMC/MOR issues.

Activities Implemented/Planned: The DMC Coordinator has overseen the grant for prevention of truancy in the 6th Judicial District (La Plata). The majority of the youth participating in this program are Latino. The agency implementing the program is aware of DMC issues and is using culturally relevant intervention strategies for the population being served. We also have three problem solving truancy court projects across the state. Again, as with the prevention program the majority of youth participating in the problem solving courts are Latino. The judges/magistrates are aware of the role truancy and education has in contributing to DMC. The coordinators of the programs are also aware and do all they can to ensure the interventions they use are culturally relevant/appropriate for their clients and more importantly that the youth being served are having similarly positive outcomes regardless of the ethnicity of the youth being served. The goal of the prevention and truancy problem solving courts was always to improve outcomes for youth they are serving. Although not one of the requirements of the grant, all three court sites have made changes to the way they deal with truancy. From the beginning of the grant the 1st Judicial District decided not to use detention as a sanction for a VCO. In year two the 18th Judicial District followed and although the 16th Judicial District has not taken the option off the table they have reduced their use from 15% in FY 13 to 2% use in FY 16. This is important because it affects the DMC rates for detention in each of these judicial districts and any positive movement in this area helps youth and their subsequent outcomes as they are not being exposed to delinquents in detention.

The DMC Coordinator in collaboration with the JJ Specialist oversee the second phase of a study looking at the outcomes for truants detained for truancy court violations of a court order and those not detained but also involved in truancy court. Phase one of the study proved that youth who are detained pursuant to the Valid Court Order have worse outcomes then those that do not. They have less chance of graduating, more chance of dropping out and more chance of committing future delinquency. The study also found that those youth filed on and thus those detained were predominating youth of collar and poor as evidenced by their eligibility for free and reduced lunches. Phase two of the study will expand on the

original study to look at outcomes for a longer period of time and to look at behavioral health issues and evaluate how these contribute to the long-term outcomes.

The outcome of the study and lessons from the pilot sites help us (DMC Coordinator and JJ Specialist) when we are providing assistance to judicial districts and stakeholders who are trying to improve their strategies for dealing with truants. The results of the phase I study have been particularly helpful in reaching judges and magistrates and talking to them about their practices. This past year we had the least number of youth detained for truancy so progress is occurring.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

OBJECTIVE 8: Address the disproportionate contact at the arrest decision point.

Activities:

- ✓ Staff the subcommittee of the CMYE created to look specifically at this issue.
- ✓ Continue Focus on addressing the highest rates of arrest for African American youth. Implement the plan developed by the subcommittee; evaluation of Denver strategies, work with the 4th Judicial District, Continue to work with the 18th Judicial District MOR Committee Chair to work with the police department in the area with the highest minority population.
- ✓ Develop next steps for the following year.

Activities Implemented/Planned: Since there was a plan with a starting point to begin addressing the magnitude of the arrest rate for Black youth the committee has not met recently. The plan is being implemented. The first strategy is the evaluation of the Denver (2nd Judicial District) strategy working with their Denver Police Department and youth. All the work that has gone into that activity can be found under Goal 4, Obj. 3. The third strategy listed is to work with the 18th Judicial District around working with the Aurora Police Department. It has taken a while but in November the Captain that represents the Aurora Police Department on the 18th MOR Committee volunteered to be the focus of the next year's (now) focus on the arrest decision point. He really wants to focus on the prevention efforts the police agency has underway so we will work with him in that area while looking for other appropriate ways to intervene. The activity to work with the 4th Judicial District is still in process. The DMC Coordinator connected them to the program being implemented in the Denver (described in Goal 4, Obj. 3) so they could observe and determine if something similar would work in their judicial district. The DMC Coordinator will make sure that she has a discussion with them soon related to how she can help support their efforts. Next steps will focus on seeing through the work that has begun. Continued work with the 2nd and 18th Judicial and meeting with the 4th to see what needs and ideas they have.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented or partially implemented with a plan to complete.

Objective 9: Continue to address the number of youth detained pre-adjudication.

Activities:

- ✓ Continue to work with the Division of Youth Corrections to address DMC issues at detention.
- ✓ Continue to educate the Senate Bill 94 (Alternatives to Detention) local committees and the coordinators about DMC in their judicial district.
- ✓ Provide technical assistance to local SB 94 Coordinators and Juvenile Services Boards in their efforts to address DMC.
- ✓ Provide them information on solutions that have worked in other judicial districts.
- ✓ Address the disproportionate contact of Native American youth at the detention decision point with those judicial districts affected.

Activities Implemented/Planned: The work with the Division of Youth Corrections (DYC) involved a meeting with the Director and Associate Directors to discuss the state DMC RRI and talk about an appropriate way to provide assistance to those judicial districts that were larger and represented a

significant part of the state's DMC. The decision was that the DYC would bring up the issue at the state plan reviews for their Alternative to Detention Program (SB 94) which is administered at the local judicial district. To follow-up, the Division of Criminal Justice through the JJ Specialist and DMC Coordinator sent a letter to each SB 94 Coordinator and the chairs of their local Juvenile Services Planning Committees (JSPC) in those eight districts informing them of their DMC findings and that the DMC Coordinator was available to help them look closer at their data and learn how to address DMC at detention. After the communication, all but two contacted the DMC Coordinator and set up trainings for their JSPC. The DMC Coordinator trained the 1st, 4th, 8th, 10th, 18th, 19th and 20th Judicial Districts. The training consists of DMC 101 including what is DMC, how you calculate the RRI, a conversation about their RRI, what are some common causes of DMC, and then solutions. Many of the Coordinators followed up after the training for some technical assistance in how to proceed or some additional data. In addition to training the Alternatives to Detention Committees a training was also done for the North East and Southern regions of the Division of Youth Corrections which include Detention Directors and case managers in those regions. Because of this outreach, we have identified some impacts. At the training for the 8th Judicial District there was a very involved magistrate present. When the DMC Coordinator talked about an example of an unintentional bias built in to the rule that only a parent or guardian can pick up their youth from detention and how this negatively impacts families of color because statistically they are more likely to have hourly jobs instead of salary that do not allow them to leave their job on the spur of the moment, she realized that she had a similar rule in her court room where the parent or guardian is required to be in court with the youth. She decided that she was going to begin asking the parent/guardian at the first court appearance if there was someone else in the family that they felt comfortable representing their child. This was an intervention that does not cost anything but could impact many families. Also, at that same training the Diversion Director was inspired to go back to her office and look at the data for who they serve and identify where they could make improvements. The 10th Judicial District JSPC was trained in the fall and they have also been working on an initiative funded by the JJDP Council through Formula Grant funds to use data for decision making and using that data to select evidence-based strategies that meet the identified needs in that community. After the DMC training they decided that they wanted to move to the Assessment Phase and use some of the technical assistance they are getting related to data and evidence-based strategies and ensure they remain alert and focused on the needs of youth and families of color and how they may need different strategies to be equally effective. One last impact identified, in the 4th Judicial District they have been funding Minority Family Advocacy for several years. When there were more Formula Grant funds the JJDP Council used to fund one position and the SB94 initiative funded one position. Once Formula Grant funds were no longer available for this purpose, the community was left with one Minority Family Advocate to handle a case load of 20 youth at any time. After the training and the discussion of their data and level of over representation at detention, the JSPC voted to fund a second Minority Family Advocate which would double the number of youth who will benefit from this service. In the past we did an evaluation of the Minority Family Advocacy Program and know that it is successful in keeping youth from further penetrating the system.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: We did not address the DMC of Native American youth. We will relook at this this year and address the concern with those judicial districts impacted.

GOAL # 4: EVALUATION

Measure the impact of Colorado's DMC interventions

OBJECTIVE 1: Evaluate the increased knowledge people have after DMC training.

Activities:

- ✓ Use the evaluation results to modify DMC training.

Activities Implemented/Planned: The DMC Coordinator trained many groups this past year which included training for the CMYE new or fairly new members. As mentioned this was the first training done this year and the discussion and evaluation feedback helped the DMC Coordinator refine her presentation. In addition the DMC Coordinator has been using the feedback from the evaluations to make tweaks to the presentation so that it flows better and is clearer. Of the 81 evaluations received 95% rated the training above average or excellent. 99% of the evaluations indicated that the training was needed and they learned at least one new thing from the training. The comments indicated that 98% of the people

would not change the training. The overwhelming majority felt like the data and emphasis on solutions was the most important part of the training. At the last training, one person commented that the training seemed too rehearsed which is probably true after presenting it so many times. To address this the DMC Coordinator has been investigating ways to make the training more interactive and the presentation more dynamic. There is an opportunity in the summer to learn power point content skills from more seasoned presenters that the DMC Coordinator is looking forward to attending. Another lesson from the trainings was that those that received a 30 minute presentation felt it was not nearly enough time. Those who received a 45 minute training still wanted a little more time so it seems like an hour is the best amount of time for training. While this is true it is not always possible for a group to give up 1 hour of their agenda so the DMC Coordinator will continue to offer the training within multiple time-frames to accommodate her audience.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

OBJECTIVE 2: Evaluate any direct service interventions implemented.

Activities:

- ✓ Evaluate direct service intervention strategies by minimally tracking RRI data.

Activities Implemented/Planned: Currently there are no direct services funded through the formula grant program. If direct services are funded in the future efforts will be made to evaluate the strategies.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

OBJECTIVE 3: Evaluate Denver's strategy to address DMC through the Denver Office of the Independent Monitor.

Activities:

- ✓ Work with the Emerging Leaders Committee who will be sponsoring the evaluation of Denver's strategy to address DMC at arrest.
- ✓ Oversee the contract and contractor conducting the evaluation of Denver's strategy.
- ✓ Assist in the development of the evaluation plan and dissemination of findings.
- ✓ Use outcomes to guide further intervention strategies and market the strategy to other judicial districts.

Activities Implemented/Planned: The DMC Coordinator collaborated with the Emerging Leaders (Youth) Committee of the state SAG to jointly review and approve a plan to evaluate the Office of the Independent Monitor's Law Enforcement/Youth Forum Project. The Project itself is funded through the Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program which supports the staff needed to implement this project. The project includes training Denver Police Officers in an eight hour curriculum addressing youth development, DMC, and de-escalation techniques. The second part of the project focuses on youth/law enforcement relationship building. Through forums that last five-hours and target youth and law enforcement interaction the plan is to engage and train youth and law enforcement and to establish better relationships or at least respect amongst the two groups. The training and interaction includes youth development training, adolescent development training and implicit bias training for youth. Simultaneously, the youth receive training on their rights and responsibilities when stopped by law enforcement and also implicit bias. The youth and law enforcement then come together to develop a plan that addresses best practice for youth interacting with law enforcement and also for law enforcement interacting with youth. The forums are powerful tools and the evaluations show that the majority of participants leaving with a better understanding and respect for one another. The next step is to evaluate the longer term impacts. Due to funding limitations we are starting by funding an evaluation of the impact the forums have on the receiving the intervention. The DMC Coordinator is overseeing the contract and assisting in the development of the evaluation plan. To date we have contracted with a University of Colorado-Denver professor. The professor is working with the DMC Coordinator and the project staff to develop an instrument that will measure longer term impact on future delinquency for the youth who receive the intervention in comparison to youth similarly situated who do not receive the intervention. The project is at the beginning stage and it is a two-year project to allow for meaningful analysis of future

delinquency. The plan is still to disseminate the findings and use those findings if they are positive to shop the project to other law enforcement agencies across Colorado.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: The plan is being implemented as designed.

GOAL # 5: MONITORING

Assess the changes to the RRI matrix annually

OBJECTIVE 1: Develop a report that shows jurisdictions trend data for the previous three-years.

Activities:

- ✓ Continue to work with the SAC to update the data workbook which allows judicial districts to view trend reports for multiple years of data.

Activities Implemented/Planned: As mentioned in the first goal and objective the DMC Coordinator partners with the Office of Research and Statistics (SAC) to make sure the data gets updated and reflects at least three-years of data. This is also a useful tool for the DMC Coordinator to quickly look and see a community's trend data and use this information when preparing to deliver training or technical assistance.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

OBJECTIVE 2: Report on DMC Performance Measures

Activities:

- ✓ Track information for the DMC Performance Measures.
- ✓ Enter data into DMC Database annually as required.

Activities Implemented/Planned: The DMC Coordinator keeps a log of work and accomplishments on the DMC Project. This information is provided to the Formula Grant Coordinator who uses this information to report on the OJJDP Performance Measures within the DCTAT system.

Activities Not Implemented/Plan: All activities were implemented.

(2) Identification of DMC Sites but Have Not Implemented Activity

Not Applicable, Colorado has implemented system improvement interventions in the 2nd, 4th, and 18th Judicial Districts and has been working with the 1st Judicial District, another primarily metro area jurisdiction to develop a plan to address arrest. In addition work has started with the 20th Judicial District (Boulder) by accessing assistance through the OJJDP provided technical assistance to begin the assessment phase, specifically focused on the arrest and detention decision points.

Phase IV: Evaluation

Due to the reduction in funds, the JJDP Council has not funded any direct service programs or intervention strategies for several years. Rather, our intervention strategies have had a system improvement focus and have included training and technical assistance to the communities mentioned above (2nd, 4th, and 18th) on a regular basis with technical assistance being provided to other judicial districts based on requests.

An arrest RRI comparison of jurisdictions where DMC has been addressed at least by having an MOR Committee is below. As you can see, for the 2nd Judicial District there has not been much change in the arrest rates for either Black or Latino youth. The 4th Judicial District still does not show disparate rates of arrest for Latino youth and remained rather constant for Black youth. The 18th Judicial District has seen a steady increase for Black youth and a consistently high rate of 2 times more than White youth for the Latino youth population. The arrest decision point will be a continued focus in FY17 and arrest in the 18th Judicial District will focus on both populations of youth.

African American Arrest RRI's	FY 12-13	FY 15-16
2 nd JD	2.89	2.97
4 th JD	3.42	3.89
18 th JD	5.73	6.41

Hispanic Arrest RRI's	FY 12-13	FY 15-16
2 nd JD	1.04	1.13
4 th JD	.89	.79
18 th JD	2.08	2.01

The Detention decision point has been a focus of intervention over the last year. Although the efforts have not had a chance to affect the RRIs as most of the training and strategies were implemented in the fall of 2016. For the pre-adjudication decision point there is a slight decrease in the 2nd Judicial District for both Black and Latino youth. The 4th Judicial District had a significant increase for Latino youth going from 2.15 to 3.39 and when comparing the 18th Judicial District to three years ago in FY12-13 the RRI rose slightly for both Latino and Black youth but remains relatively low compared to a high of 4 for both population in FY10-11. As previously mentioned Colorado will continue to prioritize and address the detention decision point through various strategies.

African American Detention RRIs	FY 12-13	FY 15-16
2 nd JD	1.80	1.75
4 th JD	1.61	1.67
18 th JD	1.28	1.46

Hispanic Detention RRIs	FY 12-13	FY 15-16
2 nd JD	1.59	1.47
4 th JD	2.15	3.39
18 th JD	1.01	1.44

Since we will continue to work in these jurisdictions we will continue to evaluate impact on these DMC RRIs in the future in addition we will most likely add one or two other jurisdictions.

Performance Measures: The DMC Coordinator along with the Formula Grant Manager work together to ensure the State is collecting all of the necessary performance measures. The performance measures used for DMC in Colorado are:

Outputs:

Required – Number and percent of program staff trained, Number of hours of program staff training provided, Number of program youth served, Number of planning activities conducted; Number of assessment studies conducted, Number of data improvement projects implemented, Number of objective decision-making tools developed

Optional - Number of FTEs funded with FG \$; Number of programs implemented; Number of program materials developed, Number of program/agency policies or procedures created, amended, or rescinded

Outcomes:

Required - Number and percent of program youth who offend during the reporting period (short term); Number and percent of program youth who offend during the reporting period (long term); Number and percent of program youth who re-offend (short term); Number and percent of program youth who re-offend (long term), Behavior Change in School attendance (short term)

Optional –Number of state agencies reporting improved data collection systems (short term and long term), Number of contributing factors determined from assessment studies, Number of contact points reporting reduction at the state level, Number of contact points reporting reduction at the local level, Number and percent of recommendations from assessment studies implemented

Phase V: Monitoring

1. Time limited Plan for Tracking Changes/DMC Trends over time.

Colorado collects and reports identification data annually which enables the tracking of trends to be more thorough. The DMC Coordinator works with the State's Statistical Analysis Center (SAC), which has taken on the duty of collecting the RRI matrix data from the other state agencies and entering it in the state individualized matrices developed by Dr. Feyerherm for this purpose. The SAC also provides technical assistance on data questions, as well as assists the DMC Coordinator in making decisions on the best sources of data to represent each decision point most accurately.

The main barrier in annual data collection continues to be the lack of adequate judicial data which affects the filing, adjudication and probation data. While this is a large loss, we continue to focus on the data that is available and reliable while working on ways to improve the data that is not.

2. Description How the State will Monitor Intervention Strategies.

The State DMC Coordinator is responsible for monitoring activities in the DMC Plan including the state's system improvement efforts and other activities from the state plan implemented to reduce DMC. The DMC Coordinator monitors this progress by working with many of the communities across Colorado working to address DMC, keeping track and analyzing trend data, and working with the state's DMC Coalition.

3. Who is Responsible for Monitoring

Responsibility for monitoring of DMC lies with the DMC Coordinator. In Colorado the DMC Coordinator is currently a 75% time position. Items monitored include changes in RRI data and other factors in jurisdictions the DMC Coordinator is working in and this would include monitoring any grants or contracts Colorado has with agencies to assist in addressing DMC.

4. Timeline for current and/or future monitoring activities

The goal is to continuously look at the RRI data at least annually and utilize the information to drive the state's DMC intervention strategies.

DMC Reduction Plan for FY 2017

This plan for FY 2017 is based on data, needs and context of the state and the three jurisdictions. Based on the data the areas of focus should be the arrest of Black youth, the detention of both Black and Latino youth and the commitment of Latino youth. Note that many of the strategies are a continuation of the 2016 plan or expand on the 2016 plan since we know from Implementation Science that change takes between 3-5 years and this plan describes the third year of our efforts. We believe that we are still at the beginning stage of Implementation Science when it comes to addressing the arrest of Black youth, paper implementation. We are still at the point where we are exploring and having discussions with individual law enforcement officers, usually sergeants and above in various jurisdictions explaining DMC and having a discussion on their thoughts surrounding the over representation of Black youth at arrest and the possible under-count of Latino youth at arrest. We have only done this informally with three agencies but they all have the same message if we can prevent youth from committing "crimes", we can prevent arrests. This of course points to direct service strategies that we do not have enough Formula Grant funds to cover in any sort of meaningful way. We can and have started to talk to MOR Committees about how to work with their community-based agencies and services to ensure they are not only serving youth of color but that they are as successful with Black and Latino youth as they for the White youth they serve. From one conversation, we learned that in order to show law enforcement that this is also a law enforcement issue, we need to pull data in a different way. We need to break the data out to show the

disparity in the arrest of youth for lower level offenses where law enforcement officers have more discretion and then have discussions about those disparities where they exist.

At the detention decision point we have just completed the second stage of implementation, process implementation. We spent lots of time and effort on training those jurisdictions that were shown to impact the state's disparity at the detention decision point. Although, this work took place primarily in the fall of 2016 so the data do not yet reflect any changes that may have come about from that training. We also know that such change takes more than training, so this coming year we will focus on the third phase of implementation, performance implementation. We need to work with the 6 jurisdictions identified and trained and assist them in applying what they learned in the training and additional data collection they were able to do and turn that into changes in procedures and processes. In addition, we have 2 jurisdictions who still need to be trained.

The last area identified was the disparity in the commitment of Latino youth where they are twice as likely to be committed as White youth. We recognize that this is an issue that affects 174 Latino youth and that this is a very detrimental intervention if it is not truly needed. We will likely begin talking to judges and other stakeholders about this issue and what may work as strategies. We are a little hesitant to jump completely into addressing another decision point for fear that trying to affect too much may lead us to zero affect. Our larger energy will be on detention and moving it to the next level, simultaneously looking for ways to start informing larger law enforcement agencies about DMC through our work with the 2nd JD (Denver) and the 18th JD (Arapahoe), and lastly doing some exploratory work around commitment. We also consulted with our state-wide Coalition for Minority Youth Equality and they agreed that we need to primarily stay the course with the exception of the addition of one area, municipal tickets which falls into the area of addressing arrests. Lastly, also included are those strategies that are on-going and must be completed annually in order to have the data and information needed for a state to be successful in their ability to address DMC.

(1) ACTIVITIES AND TIMELINES

GOAL #1: IDENTIFICATION (DATA)

Improve the DMC data collection and use of DMC data in Colorado

OBJECTIVE 1: Continue to collect and analyze DMC data annually. (On-going)

Activities: (Combined activities previously under Obj. 1 &2)

- ✓ Collect DMC data with the assistance of the Office of Research Statistics (SAC).
- ✓ Analyze data at the state level and for at least three of the largest jurisdictions annually.
- ✓ Improve DMC data usability and accessibility by local jurisdictions; post data for all 22 judicial districts on the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice's website and the Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice Assistance's website.
- ✓ Assist communities in understanding what the DMC identification (matrix) data means in their community.
- ✓ Keep trend tables on Arrest and Detention up to date.

OBJECTIVE 2: Continue to work on ways that represents the data more accurately. (Continuation)

Activities:

- ✓ Continue to work with probation and local probation departments to evaluate the reliability of the data.
- ✓ Continue to present the data in ways that account for the unreliability of filing and adjudication data.

GOAL # 2: ASSESSMENT (RESEARCH)

Identify DMC contributing mechanisms to direct intervention strategies

OBJECTIVE 1: Continue to look for opportunities to assess “why” DMC is occurring in communities. (On-going)

Activities:

- ✓ Work with the 1st Judicial District to use the findings of their case study on arrest to direct them to more defined data points which will continue to inform their strategic plan.
- ✓ Work with the research company conducting the case study in 18th Judicial District looking at diversion.
- ✓ Develop a request for Documented Quote and hire a research entity to conduct another case study within one of the largest eight judicial districts across the state. Give priority to any judicial district willing to look more closely at the arrest decision point as it relates to the disproportionate arrest contact of Black youth and under reporting of Latino youth arrests.
- ✓ Work with the awarded vendor to select and support a new case study including developing research questions and direction for the case studies.
- ✓ Present results of any case studies to the JJDP Council.
- ✓ Use the findings as examples for other judicial districts that are looking for ways to start addressing the issue.

OBJECTIVE 2: Provide assistance to communities in using other data available to look deeper at their DMC issues. (New)

Activities:

- ✓ Demonstrate and assist communities in using the Division of Criminal Justice’s Data Dashboard on School Incidences.
- ✓ Look for other state data bases to assist communities in looking at more detailed data (like the Department of Education’s website with data on education, discipline and law enforcement referrals).

GOAL # 3: INTERVENTIONS (PROGRAMS, POLICIES AND PRACTICE)

Improve the Juvenile Justice System response to minority youth and their families.

OBJECTIVE 1: Provide technical assistance on DMC issues to judicial districts and agencies. (On-going)

Activities:

- ✓ Provide technical assistance on the DMC data.
- ✓ Provide technical assistance on solutions to DMC.
- ✓ Provide technical assistance to help communities start or continue an Action Plan for DMC.
- ✓ Provide technical assistance to local MOR committees.
- ✓ Use what has been learned from communities working to address DMC to assist other communities in implementing similar strategies.

OBJECTIVE 2: Market the DMC Core Requirement. (On-going)

Activities:

- ✓ Provide training to at least three organizations/systems/conferences a year.
- ✓ Continue to update and develop a more robust DMC website.
- ✓ Designate one CMYE meeting a year to invite stakeholders to the table and have a discussion on what can be done to address DMC and use this 2nd Annual Stakeholder Meeting to continue to move other systems toward solutions.
- ✓ Continued follow-up work from Stakeholder meetings to keep people engaged and motivated.

Objective 3: Provide staff support to the CMYE membership to assist in DMC planning and work. (On-going)

Activities:

- ✓ DMC Coordinator will provide staff support to the CMYE under the DMC Staff support Formula grant; at a minimum support will include scheduling, agenda development, meeting set up, minutes and staffing subcommittees.
- ✓ Train CMYE (new members) annually.
- ✓ Identify any deficits in membership and work to fill those roles.
- ✓ Continue a method of disseminating information on resources and funding opportunities to CMYE Members.

OBJECTIVE 4: Provide DMC-related policy and practice information to the CMYE and the JJDP Council. (On-going)

Activities:

- ✓ DMC Coordinator will keep abreast of DMC policies and practices in other states to keep both the CMYE and the JJDP Council informed.
- ✓ Participate on the DMC Coordinator calls, and take other opportunities to learn what is going on in other states related to DMC policies and practices.
- ✓ CMYE discusses and addressed implications of new policies.
- ✓ CMYE will make policy/practice recommendations to the JJDP Council when appropriate.

OBJECTIVE 5: Continue collaboration with other initiatives and systems so that they are aware of DMC issues in their work. (On-going)

Activities:

- ✓ Include working with established initiatives. This should include Pathways to Success, Systems of Care, Children's Code Review Committee, Low Risk High Needs Committee, Evidence-Based Programs and Practices Committee, Restorative Justice Council, CLAS Learning Collaborative, Colorado 9to25 and other initiatives that complement the DMC work.
- ✓ Serve as a resource to other initiatives and systems.
- ✓ Connect resources to initiatives.
- ✓ Support the implementation work of other initiatives and systems in addressing MOR issues.

OBJECTIVE 6: Address the large number of youth being referred by schools to law enforcement. (Continuation and Expansion)

Activities:

- ✓ Continue to work with Colorado Department of Education on the School-Justice Partnership Project; serve as a trainer through-out the state.
- ✓ Continue working with the Office of Research and Statistics data researcher working on the legislation that required the Division of Criminal Justice to analyze school arrest data.
- ✓ Work with judicial district MOR Committees to identify what would be the most useful strategies to address both discipline issues and law enforcement referrals given the current resources.
- ✓ Build on work with community based agency to implement strategies to mitigate the number of youth being referred by law enforcement as well as the disproportionate number of youth being suspended and expelled (disciplined).

OBJECTIVE 7: Oversee truancy work and address DMC issues in the work. (Continuation)

Activities:

- ✓ Oversee the three truancy problem solving court pilots.

- ✓ Continue to ensure strategies being implemented in the three communities are addressing the over representation issue.
- ✓ Oversee Phase II of the truancy study on the use of detention and ensure that race and ethnicity will be addressed in the data review and report.
- ✓ Continue to use what is learned from the truancy work to assist communities in developing strategies to address DMC/MOR issues.

OBJECTIVE 8: Address the disproportionate contact at the arrest decision point. (Continuation and Expansion)

Activities:

- ✓ Reconvene and staff the subcommittee of the CMYE created to review current efforts and make recommendations for continued or additional strategies.
- ✓ Continue Focus on addressing the highest rates of arrest for African American youth. Continue to implement the plan developed by the subcommittee; oversee the evaluation of Denver strategy to improve youth/law enforcement interactions and relationships, identify strategies to work with the 4th Judicial District, Continue to work with the 18th Judicial District MOR Committee Chair. Work with the largest law enforcement agency on their local MOR committee to develop strategies for addressing the disparity of arrests of Black youth.

Objective 9: Continue to address the number of youth detained pre-adjudication. (Continuation and Expansion)

Activities:

- ✓ Continue to work with the Division of Youth Corrections to address DMC issues at detention.
- ✓ Reach out to, train and educate SB 94 (Alternatives to Detention) local committees and their coordinators identified as having DMC at the detention decision point who have not been previously trained.
- ✓ Provide on-going technical assistance to the six judicial districts identified as having DMC at the detention decision point who received training in 2016.
- ✓ Address the disproportionate contact of Native American youth at the detention decision point with those judicial districts affected.

Objective 10: Explore the over representation of Latino youth at the commitment decision point. (New)

Activities:

- ✓ Begin discussions with magistrates, judges and other stakeholders to identify various ways to provide training, information and identify intervention strategies that can be implemented in the following years.

Objective 11: Pilot a partnership with 1-3 municipalities to explore the level of DMC issues for youth who receive municipal tickets. (New)

Activities:

- ✓ Identify 1-3 municipalities who will partner with the state and the Coalition for Minority Youth Equality to share data on municipal cases.
- ✓ Analyze data provided to identify if DMC exists and to what degree.

GOAL # 4: EVALUATION

Measure the impact of Colorado's DMC interventions

OBJECTIVE 1: Evaluate the increased knowledge people have after DMC training. (On-going)

Activities:

- ✓ Continue to use evaluation results to modify the DMC training to be more useful to the participants.

OBJECTIVE 2: Evaluate any direct service interventions implemented. (On-going)

Activities:

- ✓ Evaluate direct service intervention strategies by minimally tracking RRI data.

OBJECTIVE 3: Evaluate Denver’s strategy to address DMC through the Denver Office of the Independent Monitor. (Continuation)

Activities:

- ✓ Continue to oversee the contract and contractor conducting the evaluation of Denver’s strategy.
- ✓ Assist in the development of the evaluation plan and dissemination of findings.
- ✓ Use outcomes to guide further intervention strategies and market the strategy to other judicial districts.

GOAL # 5: MONITORING

Assess the changes to the RRI matrix annually

OBJECTIVE 1: Develop a report that shows jurisdictions trend data for the previous three-years. (On-going)

Activities:

- ✓ Continue to work with the SAC to update the data workbook which allows judicial districts to view trend reports for multiple years of data.

OBJECTIVE 2: Report on DMC Performance Measures (On-going)

Activities:

- ✓ Track information for the DMC Performance Measures.
- ✓ Enter data into DMC Database annually as required.

(2) FUNDING

2015

75% DMC Coordinator, CMYE activities, state plan implementation - \$110,072
Community Case Study - \$25,000
Total- \$135,072

2016

75% DMC Coordinator, CMYE activities, state plan implementation - \$114,556
Evaluation Denver Youth/Law Enforcement Project - \$40,000
Total- \$154,556

2017

75% DMC Coordinator, CMYE activities, state plan implementation - \$120,000
Community Case Study - \$25,000
Total- \$ 145,000