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Discussion Topics

- Delinquency Trends – National
- Delinquency Trends – Florida
- Understanding Racial & Ethnic Disparities in Florida’s Juvenile Justice System
- Special Topics: Questions and Answers
National Arrest Trends:
National – Total Delinquency Caseloads
Between 1960 and 2014, juvenile court delinquency caseloads more than doubled. However, juvenile caseloads have declined since the late 1990’s.

National – Caseloads by Offense Group

Caseloads have declined across all four “general” offense groups.

Florida Arrest Trends:
Total Delinquency Arrests (All Florida)

-24% reduction in delinquency arrests since FY 2012-13

Source: Delinquency Profile (2017). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Felony Delinquency Arrests (All Florida)

-2% reduction in juvenile felony arrests since FY 2012-13

Source: Delinquency Profile (2017). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Misdemeanor Delinquency Arrests (All Florida)

- 40% reduction in juvenile misdemeanor arrests since FY 2012-13

Source: Delinquency Profile (2017). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
“Other” Delinquency Arrests (All Florida)

-22% reduction in "other" juvenile arrests since FY 2012-13

Source: Delinquency Profile (2017). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Question:
What are the Most Common Delinquency Offenses?
Florida – Most Common Juvenile Offenses

During FY 2016-17, Burglary was the most common felony ($n=8,840$) and Assault/Battery was the most common misdemeanor offense ($n=8,483$).

Source: Delinquency Profile (2017). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Question:

Are there Gender Differences in Delinquency Arrests?
Caseloads have declined for both male and female youth.

Florida - Gender

In Florida, caseloads have declined for both male and female youth. During FY 2016-17, female youth accounted for just under 1 in 4 delinquency arrests.

**Source:** *Delinquency Profile (2017). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity*
Understanding Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Juvenile Arrests and Case Processing
National – Delinquency Caseloads by Race
Since 2005, delinquency caseloads have declined for White, Black and Hispanic youth.

Florida - Percentage of Cases Involving Black Youth

Black youth were overrepresented at every major stage of Florida’s Juvenile Justice system during FY 2016-17.

Source: Delinquency Profile (2017). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Florida – Proportional Arrests by Race & Ethnicity
Smaller numbers of youth were arrested from each racial/ethnic group. Although the number of black youth arrested in Florida declined over the past five years, they now comprise a larger proportion of overall arrests.

Source: Delinquency Profile (2017). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
How Can Research Help Improve DMC/RED?

- Gender, racial, and ethnic “neutrality” in risk assessment and structured decision-making tools.

- Examining and reporting disparities where they exist:
  - Analyzing case notes and PDR’s for syntax structure and unintentional bias.
  - “Resisting” arrest charges
  - Etc.
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Why is This Important?

• During 2014, juvenile courts processed just under one million delinquency cases throughout the United States (Hockenberry, 2017).

• Resisting arrest can have a number of implications for both juveniles and adults, including serious injury or even death (Whichard, 2016).

• Reasonable to expect that minority youth might have a differential experience when interacting with law enforcement.

• Could “extra” charges be affecting plea negotiations and exacerbating disparities in court processing and outcomes?
Types of Resisting Arrest

For the purposes of this study, we are interested in two primary types of obstruction charges (Misdemeanor & Felony):

- **Misdemeanor**: does not include violence; false ID to LEO, destruction of evidence, etc.

- **Felony**: Involves violence; typically involves fighting with the arresting officer, causing harm to the arresting officer during the arrest, fleeing or eluding after lights & siren deployed, etc.
Previous Research on Resisting Arrest

Limited prior research exists, and it has focused primarily on adults:

• Research should include characteristics of the offenders and not just the officers. (Kavanagh, 1997)

• Important to use nuanced measures of police citizen encounters. Important to understand accumulated experiences. (Brunson, 2007)

• Focused on state and federal inmates. Found factors other than race were more important; carrying contraband, mental illness, etc. (Whichard & Felson, 2016)
The Present Study:

Exploratory research with the following primary research questions:

1. Black youth will be more likely to have a misdemeanor resisting arrest charge associated with the arrest.

2. Black youth will be more likely to have a felony resisting arrest charge associated with the arrest.
Risk Assessment Data (controls)

- Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT)

The PACT assessment includes 12 major domains related to juvenile delinquency and continued criminal activity based on prior research:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIG 8</th>
<th>PACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social attitudes &amp; beliefs</td>
<td>Domains 10, 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes/Behaviors, Aggression, Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social peers (and isolation from pro-social peers)</td>
<td>Domain 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of anti-social behavior</td>
<td>Domain 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Record of Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social personality pattern</td>
<td>Domains 10, 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes/Behaviors, Aggression, Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic circumstances at home (family/marital)</td>
<td>Domain 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family/ Living Arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic circumstances at school or work</td>
<td>Domain 3 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School &amp; Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic leisure circumstances</td>
<td>Domain 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Domain 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcohol &amp; Drugs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA: Descriptive Statistics

• Base analysis file started with:
  – 99,297 charges
  – 32,338 individual youth
  – 54,670 arrest events (cases)

• Unduplicated by case and included a marker for obstruction charges and type
  – 4,191 cases dropped because of missing PACT
  – final $n=50,479$
Methodology and Measurement

• Logistic Regression
  – STATA 15 MP/4

• Dependent Variables:
  – **Misdemeanor Resisting** = Arrest included one or more misdemeanor obstruction charges (1 = Yes)
  – **Felony Resisting** = Arrest included one or more felony obstruction charges (1 = Yes)
Variables and Measurement

Risk (1 = Low to 4 = High)

Male (1 = Yes)

Black (1 = Yes)

Hispanic (1 = Yes)

Early Offender (1 = Yes)

Age at Offense (6, 7, 8, 9, etc.)

Good Values (1 = Yes)

Negative Peers (1 = Yes)

Obeys Rules (1 = Yes)

Drug Use (1 = Yes)

Mental Health (1 = Yes)

Violence (1 = Yes)
DATA: Descriptive Statistics

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for All Variables \((n=50,479)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor Obstruction</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Obstruction</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>1.914</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Offender</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Offense</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Values</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Peers</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obeys Rules</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>50,479</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

Table 2: Logistic Regression on Presence of One or More Obstruction Charges by Type (Misdemeanor or Felony)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Misdemeanor 1</th>
<th>Misdemeanor 2</th>
<th>Felony 3</th>
<th>Felony 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>1.171*** (.022)</td>
<td>1.119*** (.025)</td>
<td>1.406*** (.077)</td>
<td>1.503*** (.097)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.987 (.055)</td>
<td>.970 (.055)</td>
<td>.549*** (.082)</td>
<td>.5182*** (.079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.282*** (.064)</td>
<td>1.300*** (.066)</td>
<td>1.930*** (.311)</td>
<td>1.924*** (.313)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.089 (.075)</td>
<td>1.088 (.075)</td>
<td>1.734** (.347)</td>
<td>1.624** (.327)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Offender</td>
<td>1.126 (.066)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.599** (.112)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Offense</td>
<td>1.087*** (.018)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.010 (.057)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Values</td>
<td>.836*** (.040)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.971 (.140)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Peers</td>
<td>1.136 (.080)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.710 (.164)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obeys Rules</td>
<td>1.038 (.051)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.862 (.131)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>1.151** (.052)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.980 (.133)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>.883* (.054)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.012 (.172)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>1.086 (.074)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.589** (.137)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n=50,479\). Logistic regression odds ratios presented with standard errors in parentheses. *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.000.
Summary of Findings

- Find initial support for the hypotheses that black youth are more likely to have obstruction charges associated with the arrest.
- This was true for both misdemeanor and felony obstruction charges.
Limitations & Implications for Future Research

- Small number of cases with felony obstruction charges.
- Initial covariates don’t allow us to adequately test theoretical models.
- Analysis looks broadly at obstruction and future models can look specifically at different “types” of obstruction (resisting arrest, false ID to LEO, etc.)
- Some youth ONLY had obstruction charges, which should be explored further.
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Question:

What age groups are most commonly associated with delinquency?
Florida – Arrests by Age
During FY 2016-17, 75% of all delinquency arrests involved a youth age 15 or older. During the same period, 5% of all delinquency arrests involved a youth age 12 or under.

Source: Delinquency Profile (2017). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Prevalence of Serious, Violent & Chronic Juvenile Offenders in Florida
Serious, Violent & Chronic Youth

What is the definition of a serious, violent and chronic offender?

- **Serious** = (1) or more felony offenses
- **Violent** = (1) or more “violent” felony offenses
- **Chronic** = (4) or more separate arrest events

Serious, Violent, Chronic Youth

SERIOUS = 55%

VIOLENT = 29%

CHRONIC = 15%

SVC = 8.9%

NOT S, V, or C = 43%

Serious, Violent & Chronic Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serious, Violent and Chronic by Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serious</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Greenwald, M.A., and Baglivio, M.T. (2015). *Analysis of Serious, Violent and Chronic Delinquency in Florida*. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity.
### SVC Youth: Why does it Matter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Youth</th>
<th>Not S, V, or C</th>
<th>Not SVC</th>
<th>SVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism Rates</strong></td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gang Association</strong></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 50% of SVC youth were 12 or under at age of first referral

*Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity*
Priority Research and Data Projects for 2018
Priority Projects for 2018

- DRAI
- PACT & R-PACT
- Disparities in Juvenile Case Processing
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