

DATA BOOK

Systems Perspective
(Including Information on Racial & Ethnic Disparity)

February 2021

Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services
KDOC-JS (Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services)



Sedgwick County...
working for you

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	<u>3</u>
Systems Overview	<u>5</u>
Risk Level Identification and Focus of Programming/Services	<u>7</u>
Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center (JIAC)	<u>10</u>
Juvenile Detention	<u>15</u>
Alternatives to Detention	<u>17</u>
Prosecutions & Diversions	<u>21</u>
Juvenile Court Services.....	<u>22</u>
Juvenile Field Services (JFS) & Evening Reporting Center (ERC)	<u>23</u>
Racial and Ethnic Disparity (RED)	<u>37</u>
Gender	<u>53</u>
JIAC Intakes and Prevention Provider Service Provision by Top 10 Zip Codes.....	<u>58</u>
Summary and Use of Data.....	<u>61</u>
Cross-Referenced Reports	<u>62</u>

Sedgwick County
Department of Corrections
Juvenile Services
Data Book
Delores E. Craig-Moreland, PhD
Wichita State University
Introduction

This book is a consolidation of juvenile justice and juvenile services in Sedgwick County, Kansas. It is a product of a desire to locate all pertinent information in one spot. By pertinent information, the reference is to descriptive information on long term trends in numbers of court referrals (filings), probation, detention and alternatives, and juvenile case management. The aforementioned events/units involve youth who made contact with the juvenile justice system. They had at least one encounter with that system which addresses criminal behavior by individuals less than 18 years of age. When it comes to the information on youth served in the programs funded to prevent delinquency or reduce future involvement with delinquency, the individuals may or may not have previous contact with the juvenile justice system. The secondary prevention programs served youth at risk for delinquent behavior while tertiary programs served youth already involved with the juvenile justice system. The two programs, PATHS and PANDO, are secondary prevention and therefore serve youth with elevated risk for future criminal conduct, but no current involvement.

The book contains a section of information on the system overall. This is where you look if your interest is in seeing how numbers have changed over time. Changes can be the result of legislative action such as SB367, which set limits on court involvement with a juvenile offender, among other things. The most significant trend here is the continued decline in numbers of youth at all aspects of the juvenile justice continuum until SFY 2019, when increased numbers began to appear for state custody youth and those referred to a juvenile correctional facility.

A prominent question in the world of juvenile justice is how to explain juvenile crime. This data book includes a short statement on risk factors and levels of risk that help to address how this plays out in Sedgwick County. By referring to the information on risk it is possible to understand the strategic plan developed each year by Team Justice, the local juvenile corrections advisory board. The discussion of risk precedes details of risk among those youth who experience an intake and assessment following some involvement with law enforcement. This information comes from the Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center (JIAC), which serves as the front door to the juvenile justice system.

A most significant decision facilitated at JIAC is whether a youth needs to be securely detained to control further criminal conduct or to assure appearance for court proceedings. The section following the JIAC information relates to juvenile detention and alternatives to detention. In Sedgwick County the alternatives include Detention Advocacy Services (DAS), Home-based Services (HBS), the Juvenile Residential Facility (JRS), and a weekend alternative program that serves to sanction youth under court supervision without actually detaining them.

Once the case of the juvenile makes it to the 18th Judicial District Attorney's office, an option for youthful first offenders is diversion. Details of that program in SFY18 are in the data book. Upon conviction, youth were generally referred to Juvenile Court Services for a period of probation. For those convicted of more serious crimes or repeat offenses, the referral can go to Juvenile Field Services (JFS). JFS operates with state funds under the State of Kansas Department of Corrections-Juvenile Services.

A few years ago a new program became available to address needs and risks of all youth adjudicated in Sedgwick County: Evening Reporting Center (ERC). ERC is a single location with connections between


youth in the various elements of the juvenile justice system, evidence-based practices and programs to reduce risk of future criminal conduct. Data particulars are included in this book.

An important element of juvenile justice in Sedgwick County is an effort to address racial and ethnic disparity (RED). Local efforts have mainly been oriented to collecting information on RED, and seeking national and local strategies to reduce RED. To that end the Burns Institute worked with Team Justice to be able to understand methods of reducing RED. The section includes a snapshot of race, ethnicity, and gender in Sedgwick County juvenile detention and alternatives, and the relative representation index (RRI) from the last year when a full data set was available, SFY16. The main reason RRI computation is not available has to do with changes in the basis of record keeping. The latest program evaluation report included the racial and ethnic and gender success rates in funded secondary and tertiary prevention programs. Efforts are under way to determine how best to continue careful observation of RED data so system improvements can be attempted and evaluated. It is important to develop an ongoing information set to measure progress in this important area.

Crime in Sedgwick County distributes unevenly geographically, so two years of information on the matchup of JIAC intakes and crime prevention program clients appears, courtesy of the Sedgwick County GIS staff. Each zip code has an entry of the annual intakes to JIAC, and the annual number of crime prevention program clients with addresses in that zip code. It is clear that services are following JIAC intakes.

In summary, there is a great deal of information in this data book. It is the 2021 edition of such a book and made available to clarify the world of juvenile justice in Sedgwick County. This information can inform local agency grant applications and can help community leaders to assure the best performance by the juvenile justice system and providers who serve juvenile justice.

SEDGWICK COUNTY JUVENILE SYSTEM ACTIVITY CHART



- Juvenile Filings
- Juvenile Intensive Supervision Average Daily Population
- KDOC-JS New Custody
- Case Management Average Daily Population
- Juvenile Correctional Facility Commitments
- % JDF population in KDOC-JS Custody awaiting placement by CY no longer collected in 2016*

Kansas Juvenile Justice System Activity

	SFY16	SFY17	SFY18	SFY19	SFY20
Total Juvenile Court Filings*	8,156	7,328	936	1,078	813
Number of Youth who started KDOC-JS Custody during the year**	459	296	171	125	121
KDOC Sedgwick County District 18 with % of state total	83 (18%)	59 (19.9%)	30 (17.5%)	30 (25%)	32 (26.4%)
Juvenile Correctional Facility Commitments	250	281	171	168	136
Juvenile Intensive Supervision: Youth Population at Year End	787	650	657	621	531
Juvenile Case Management: Youth Population at Year End	734	454	225	95	8
Juvenile Correction Facility: Youth Population at Year End	219	209	177	166	137

Courtesy of Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services (except data pertaining to juvenile court filings).

*Sources: Fiscal Year 2018 Annual Report, Kansas Department of Corrections.

Comprehensive Statistics Annual Report published annually by the Office of Judicial Administration and available online at <http://www.kscourts.org> (specifically: <http://www.kscourts.org/cases-and-opinions/default.asp>).

**This is strictly KDOC-JS custody and does not include JISP.

*** The state provided updated data. Pervious data included duplicate numbers.

RISK LEVEL IDENTIFICATION

Focus of Programming/Services

Juvenile delinquency receives a lot of research attention. It is a commonly held belief that opportunities exist to stop a crime career early if proper intervention is available. The research has driven the development of a strong model for understanding delinquency: Risk-Needs-Responsivity. The risks and needs are expressed as eight factors which can be measured to determine how likely a given youth is to engage in delinquency. The responsivity element refers to barriers existing in efforts to reduce risks and needs. Local data on risk/needs were reviewed by Team Justice, and priorities were determined. Priorities in service to address risks were set by Team Justice each year in the Comprehensive Plan for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in Sedgwick County. First, a factor that does not change through service is criminal history, or prior bad acts. This risk factor simply indicates that past behavior can be a good predictor of future behavior. The three most potent dynamic risks are **antisocial personality**, **antisocial cognition**, and **antisocial associates**. While these three risk factors do not exist at high levels very often, when they are present, they predict serious delinquent behavior. The four most common locally experienced factors include family, school/work, leisure/recreation, and substance abuse.

JIAC used a brief screening instrument (which evolved into the Risk of Recidivism instrument) to determine the relative level of delinquency risk associated with each of the risk factors, and combined those risks to describe a youth in terms of low, moderate or high risk for future criminal conduct. It is very important that youth of low risk receive minimal involvement with the juvenile justice system, because any contact with the juvenile justice system threatens to disrupt the good things in their life that protect them from such future behavior.

The most bang for the buck comes in working with higher risk youth. Fortunately, there are few high-risk youth in the juvenile justice system in Sedgwick County, but where they are identified, it is crucial to have needed resources and programs to address their issues. Team Justice determined the best means to address these needs could be found by offering Evening Reporting Center (ERC) to connect such youth to services. For moderate risk youth there is a great opportunity to change the direction of such a life by addressing issues related to family, leisure/recreation, school/work, and substance abuse. A review of the Program Evaluation for programs funded through the Sedgwick County Crime Prevention Program or KDOC-JS funds provides good information on what was offered, and the success levels experienced.

Long term success in reducing delinquency in Sedgwick County requires adherence to good assessment of risk/need, attention to barrier dismantling, and focus of attention to serving those at elevated risk levels. All program providers are required to know risk levels and domains of risk for youth they serve. The information can come from a JIAC intake or from assessment at the time of intake to a given program.

Risk-Needs-Responsivity Model Factors & Associated Risks

Factors	Risks	Dynamic Risk	Static Risk
History of antisocial behavior	Early and continued involvement in a number of antisocial acts [as evidenced by formal records such as arrests, case filings and convictions]		✓
Antisocial personality	Adventurous, pleasure seeking, weak self-control and restlessly aggressive	✓	
Antisocial cognition	Attitudes, values, beliefs and rationalizations supportive of crime, cognitive emotional states of anger, resentment and defiance	✓	
Antisocial associates	Close association with criminals and relative isolation from pro-social people	✓	
Family	Two key elements are nurturance and/or caring, better monitoring and/or supervision	✓	
School and/or work	Low levels of performance and satisfaction	✓	
Leisure and/or recreation	Low levels of involvement and satisfaction in anti-criminal leisure activities Low neighborhood attachment and community disorganization	✓	
Substance abuse	Abuse of alcohol and/or drugs	✓	

Example of Outcomes by Risk Level
Juvenile Intensive Supervision (JISP) - Annual Successful Completions Rate

% Successful Completions	2016	2017	2018*	2019	2020
TOTAL	90/144 63%	60/144 58%	73/88 83%	81/108 75%	80/96 83%
Low Risk (Prior to 2018 Included in General Caseloads)	100%	100%	1/2 50%	4/4 100%	1/2 50%
General Caseloads	62%	49%	47/54 87%	43/52 82%	44/49 90%
High Risk Unit	13/24 54%	21/33 64%	25/32 78%	34/54 63%	35/45 78%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

*Case Length Limit Closures started occurring in 2018.

Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center (JIAC)

JIAC provides a 24-hour a day program serving youth in contact with law enforcement agencies in Sedgwick County. Youth are either brought in by law enforcement because they are juveniles suspected of illegal behaviors or an assessment is scheduled in response to a Notice to Appear (NTA) or an Agreement to Appear (ATA). JIAC's goal is to help youth avoid reoffending and getting more deeply entrenched in the juvenile justice system by providing effective intake booking, assessment and referral services. JIAC staff achieves this goal by performing intake and assessment activities and by making appropriate referrals for the youth and the youth's family. Youth referred to JIAC are

either booked or receive a complete intake and assessment which typically includes completion of the Intake Questionnaire, the Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument, Version 2 (MAYSI-2) to assist in identifying youth who might have special mental health needs, the Kansas Detention Assessment Instrument (KDAI) to determine the most appropriate placement disposition and the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections Risk for Reoffending screening tool that provides preliminary risk level information. Placement of youth to the Juvenile Detention Facility are generally for severity of the booking offense, warrants (with no new charges), commitment orders, sanctions or out-of-state runaways.

JIAC – Completed Intakes / Assessments

	SFY16	SFY17	SFY18	SFY19	SFY20
Juvenile Offenders (JO)	2,038	1,442	1,657	1,718	1,475
Males	1,321	969	1,160	1,214	1,022
Females	473	499	499	504	453
Non-Offender (NO)		2	4	0	1
Males		2	1	0	0
Females		0	3	0	1
Status Offenders (SO)	151	96	83	112	93
Males	96	52	36	57	51
Females	55	44	47	55	42
TOTAL	2,189	1,540	1,744	1,830	1,569

*Keep in mind, as of 7/1/17, Intakes to JDF are included with Complete I/As. This change was made due to the KDAI now being conducted on Pass-throughs and those intake records now being uploaded to KDOC-JS (JJAMS – the state database)

JIAC – Referrals Performance Measures

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
% of youth receiving recommendations for service	98%	99%	99%	99%	98%
% of youth accepting referrals	59%	75%	76%	76%	58%
% of youth completing initial appointment with referral agency	71%	72%	78%	58%	59%
Recidivism rate at JIAC	17%	N/A*	N/A*	N/A*	N/A

Source: Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center

JIAC - Notice to Appear (NTA) Intakes

Calendar Year	# Issued	Ineligible	Successful	Unsuccessful
2017 2-1-17 to 12-31-17	492	26	92.3% (454 out of 492)	7.7% (38 out of 492)
2018 1-1-18 to 12-31-18	458	15	91.9% (421 out of 458)	8.1% (37 out of 458)
2019 1-1-19 to 12-31-19	412	4	91.7% (378 out of 412)	8.3% (34 out of 412)
2020 1-1-20 to 12-31-20	341	12	93.9% (318 out of 341)	6.7% (23 out of 341)
2017 – 2020 2-1-17 to 12-31-20	1,703	57	92% (1,571 out of 1,703)	8% (132 out of 1,703)

While the NTA data reported on a monthly basis to KDOC-JS and SCDOC is the actual number of NTA intakes conducted, *this report reflects the outcomes for all NTAs issued during the year regardless of the year the intake was conducted.*

In 2017, there were 435 NTA intakes while 454 were successful because there were 16 NTAs issued in 2017 with the intake being conducted in 2018. Also, there were 3 with multiple NTAs that were combined into a single intake.

In 2018, 2019 and 2020 there were 409, 359 and 308 NTA intakes respectively with the numbers differing from the number successful for the same reasons noted for 2017.

“Ineligible” is determined for a variety of reasons including: Municipal code violations; DCF custody – placed out of county; inpatient mental health treatment; active warrants; and, resides out of state.

Sedgwick County Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center
Agreement to Appear (ATA) Intakes
State Fiscal Years: SFY14 - SFY18

Fiscal Year	# Issued	Ineligible	Successful	Unsuccessful
SFY14 7-1-13 to 6-30-14	223	3	94% 207 out of 220 (193 intakes; 14 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	6% 13 out of 220
SFY15 7-1-14 to 6-30-15	261	3	93% 239 out of 258 (214 intakes; 25 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	7% 19 out of 258
SFY16 7-1-15 to 6-30-16	201	2	92% 184 out of 199 (174 intakes; 10 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	8% 15 out of 199
SFY17 7-1-16 to 6-30-17	191	3	94% 176 out of 188 (155 intakes; 21 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	6% 12 out of 188
SFY18 7-1-17 to 6-30-18	204	4	93% 185 out of 200 (172 intakes; 13 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	7% 15 out of 200
SFY19 7-1-18 to 6-30-19	221	2	99% 217 out of 219 (208 intakes; 9 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	6% 2 out of 219
SFY20 7-1-19 to 6-30-20	170	0	95% 161 out of 170 (208 intakes; 9 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	5% 9 out of 170
SFY12 – SFY20 7-1-11 to 6-30-20	1,903	21	95% 1,781 out of 1,882 (1,650 intakes; 131 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	5% 101 out of 1,882

“Successful” indicates that the youth completed an intake and assessment appointment OR was referred to their supervision officer.

“Ineligible” is determined for a variety of reasons including: the youth’s age; having an open CINC case; being placed in foster care; having a subsequent arrest; being admitted for inpatient treatment; moving out of the country; AWOL from placement; and being sentenced.

Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center Calendar Year

	CY11	CY12	CY13	CY14	CY15	CY16	CY17	CY18	CY19	CY20
Total Referrals	3,730	3,534	2,975	2,869	2,817	2,506	1,832	1,874	1765	4,311
Complete I/A	2,901	2,716	2,164	2,079	2,090	1,883	1,576*	1,834*	1,754*	1,272
Intake to JDF	829	746	714	700	657	529	198*	--	--	--
Booking	--	72	97	90	70	94	58	40	11	2

*Effective 7/1/17, Intakes to JDF are included with Complete I/A's.

18th Judicial District - JV Offender Case Statistics Calendar Year

	CY11	CY12	CY13	CY14	CY15	CY16	CY17	CY18	CY19	CY20
JV Offender	1,327	1,171	1,248	1,150	1,227	1,123	1,002	1,047*	1,005	551

*Source: <http://www.dc18.org/stats/stats2018.html>

18th Judicial District - JV Offender Case Statistics
Reduction in JV Court Filings

YEAR	TOTAL	1 YEAR CHANGE TOTAL FILINGS	CHANGE FROM 2009 TOTAL FILINGS
2009	1,374	--	--
2010	1,522	+10.8%	+10.8%
2011	1,327	-12.8%	-3.4%
2012	1,171	-11.8%	-14.8%
2013	1,248	+6.6%	-9.2%
2014	1,150	-7.9%	-16.3%
2015	1,227	+6.7%	-10.7%
2016	1,123	-8.5%	-18.3%
2017	1,002	-10.8%	-27.1%
2018	1,047	+4.5%	-23.8%
2019	1,005	-4.0%	-26.9%
2020	551	-40.5%	-56.5%

Immediate Intervention Program (IIP)

The Immediate Intervention Program (IIP) is a program directed to youth alleged to have committed a juvenile offense established pursuant to [K.S.A. 38-2346](#) by which an eligible juvenile may avoid prosecution and which meets the requirements of applicable IIP standards published by the Kansas Department of Corrections.

The Office of the District Attorney, 18th Judicial District of the State of Kansas and the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections entered into a Memorandum of Understanding on May 25, 2017, to work in collaboration in developing and adopting policies and procedures, including guidelines for an Immediate Intervention Program. Local efforts were made to identify youth eligible for the program, the manner in which eligible youth would be identified and referred to the program, and the scope of local programming and services. Legal perspectives around IIP, however, resulted in a delay in implementation of the program with an examination of key elements required by statute (K.S.A. 38-2346) and standards. On March 17, 2020, Court Services again declined being the agency to operate an IIP in this district. The Sedgwick County Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center (JIAC) agreed to provide an IIP in Sedgwick County.

With two adjustments, the referral process to the Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center began around July 1, 2020. The D.A.'s Office adjusted the referral process to occur upon a lack of prosecution (LOP) decision rather than a probable cause finding. Consequently, the discharge summary is for satisfactory completion rather than a statement that no formal charges or further action will be taken.

A Level of Supervision Grid is utilized to determine the duration of supervision, frequency of agency contact and conditions of supervision. The Referral Criteria and Levels of Supervision are as follows:

Level 1

- Alleged offense is a misdemeanor (excluding sex offenses; vehicle offenses such as DUI, evade/elude; and, firearm involved offenses);
- Has no prior adjudications; and,
- Goes through Juvenile Intake and Assessment System (JIAS) or is referred by either the county/district attorney or court.
- D.A.'s Office requirement that their office has LOP'd the case.
- To maintain immediacy, the violation is to have occurred within 8 weeks of the referral date.

Level 2

- Meets Level 1 criteria and youth has one (1) prior successful discharge from an IIP.

Level 3

- No prior adjudications;
- Alleged offense is a non-person felony; and,
- Youth has not previously participated in the Immediate Intervention Program.
- D.A.'s Office requirement that their office has LOP'd the case.
- To maintain immediacy, the violation is to have occurred within 8 weeks of the referral date.

During the first 6 months of operation, the Immediate Intervention Program established staffing, finalized all policies and procedures and the job description, set up client files and staff were trained on the state's IIP database. There were 260 referrals to the program from the D.A.'s Office; however, the majority (140 or 54%) had an offense that occurred more than 8 weeks from referral or did not meet referral criteria (102 or 39%). Reasons for not meeting referral criteria varied from the youth being an adjudicated juvenile offender or the alleged offense being a person felony, a sex offense or firearm involved. Of the remaining 18 referrals, 3 initiated services. In November, the referral process was examined and in December the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections met virtually with the D.A.'s Office twice to review the data and make adjustments.

District Attorney Marc Bennett facilitated a revision of the referral process with law enforcement. This process entails going forward in 2021 with all juvenile misdemeanor battery and disorderly conduct cases in Sedgwick County being assigned to a designated detective who will funnel them into the Immediate Intervention Program and other resources. For the time being, it is those two classifications only and all other cases remain with the complaint detective. This is to shorten the time for cases to be referred to IIP. The two most common offenses at intake are Theft and Possession of Marijuana, so those may present an opportunity for consideration if stakeholders see benefit in broadening the base of offenses eligible.

Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF)

The Sedgwick County Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF) is a 108 bed facility for secure detention for male and female offenders ages 10 – 17 years of age. The facility is licensed by Department for Children and Families (DCF) and has annual licensing inspections. JDF has seen a decrease in admissions since the onset of implementation of SB367.

There were 656 admissions to detention in 2018 with an average length of stay of 30

days. The average daily population in 2018 was 53.

In consideration of the underutilization of secure beds, the Department of Corrections leased space in the facility for secure care beds for the child in need of care (CINC) system due to an identified need for this level of secure placement for non-offender youth. The lease was effective August 1, 2018. Per SB367, the use of detention as secure care ended June 30 2019.

CY 2020 Details of Juvenile Detention

	2017 – 2019 Average	2020
Admits	637 (1,910/3)	400
Average Daily Population		
Juvenile Detention Facility	53 (19,432/365)	44
Juvenile Residential Facility	15 (5,331/365)	15
Demand for Detention Services (Days)		
Juvenile Detention Facility	*19,432 (58,297/3)	15,927
Juvenile Residential Facility	5,331 (15,995/3)	5,540
Home Based Supervision	9,667 (29,000/3)	13,415
Average daily demand	94 (103,292/365/3)	95
Secure Bed Monthly Fluctuations		
Monthly Average	53 (160/3)	44
Monthly Low	45 (136/3)	32
Monthly High	61 (183/3)	55

*Numbers used in previous years were ALOS instead of ADP.

Juvenile Detention Alternatives

Detention Advocacy Service (DAS) was provided by Kansas Legal Services through the end of fiscal year 2019. Beginning July 2019 Sedgwick County DOC has been providing the case management portion of this funding. KLS counties to provide legal services. The program is part of the continuum of detention alternatives to secure custody at the Juvenile Detention Facility. The program has two primary goals: reducing disproportionate minority contact and reducing length of stay for all youth in the Juvenile Detention Facility. The program has a legal component and a case management component.

In 2018, the combined average daily demand for detention and alternatives was up by 3 (89 in 2017 and 92 in 2018). The 2019 average daily demand is down by 1 from the five-year average 2015-2019.

The Weekend Alternative Detention Program (WADP) was established as part of the continuum of detention alternatives to secure detention with courses beginning in January 2010. The program allowed juvenile offenders who had violated their court orders to be held accountable while reducing the use of detention beds and increasing the likelihood that youth would successfully complete community supervision without the need for further confinement. The program was implemented in November 2009 and courses began in January 2010. The program was dissolved in 2017 with a focus on a revamping of the service. The current alternative is The Change and Community Service Programs which is a response alternative to detention and holds youth accountable. This program was started in May 2018.

The Sedgwick County Department of Corrections has maintained a Juvenile Residential Facility (JRF) since June of 1994. This is a 24 bed detention alternative. The program serves male and female juveniles between the ages of 10 and 18 who require detention services but do not require secure confinement. In 2019, JRF served 263 youth with an average daily population of 14.

The Sedgwick County Department of Corrections has established and maintained Home-Based Services (HBS) as an alternative to secure detention for selected youth who are deemed to be releasable to their parents'/guardians' home under supervision of program staff. This is to allow the youth to remain in their home environment while awaiting a court hearing.

The purpose of HBS is to maintain the safety of the youth, family, community, and to maintain supervision of the youth in the least restrictive environment possible. HBS is a level of supervision that places youth on a strict contract that limits their freedom to only approved activities. HBS clients may be male or female and range in age from 10 to 17 years. However, they can be 18 or older if they have an open juvenile case. In addition, electronic monitoring can be used with GPS tracking increases supervision and accountability. In 2019, the program served 196 youth.

Detention Advocacy

2019	DAS ADP	2020	DAS ADP
JAN	29.16	JAN	15.03
FEB	25.46	FEB	11.52
MAR	30.71	MAR	6.29
APR	31.63	APR	4.87
MAY	30.00	MAY	5.84
JUN	15.43	JUN	6.03
JUL	8.10	JUL	3.61
AUG	11.42	AUG	1.23
SEP	12.57	SEP	2.47
OCT	8.45	OCT	0.68
NOV	10.70	NOV	2.80
DEC	12.68	DEC	5.52
YTD	22.60	YTD	5.47

*Detention alternative services were provided by Kansas Legal services until the end of their grant year 06/30/19. SCDOC began case management for these youth on 7/01/19.

Change and Community Service (CACS) (Previously Weekend Alternative to Detention Program)

2020	CACS Attended
JAN	6
FEB	20
MAR	0
APR	0
MAY	0
JUN	0
JUL	0
AUG	0
SEP	0
OCT	0
NOV	0
DEC	0
YTD	26*

*Due to COVID-19 services were not provided between March 2020 and December 2020

**Department of Corrections
Juvenile Residential Facility (JRF)**

Performance Measures	2015 – 2019 Five Year Average	2018 Actual	2019 Actual	2020 Actual
Average daily population	16	14	15	15
Percent successful completions	811/1190 74%	188/267 70%	188/247 76%	107/153 70%
Percentage of AWOLs	189/1192 16%	57/267 21%	38/247 15%	28/153 18%
Actual unit cost per day for JRF	\$167.87	\$167.74	\$183.95	\$185.95
Percentage of juveniles reporting feeling safe	569/588 97%	107/109 98%	115/119 97%	109/113 96%
Percentage of clients arrested for new crimes	11/948 1%	6/283 2%	3/263 1%	0/160 0.0%
Number of clients served	255	283	263	160*

*Although the number of clients served by JRF reduced from 263 in 2019 to 160 in 2020, the average daily population actually increased from 14.5 in 2019 to 15.2 in 2020.

Department of Corrections Home Based Services (HBS)

Performance Measures	2014 - 2018 Five Year Average	2016 Actual	2018 Actual	2019 Actual	2020 Actual
Average daily population	24	27	25	27	31
% of HBS admits based on youth authorization – 2017 Baseline Year			163/177 92%	165/178 93%	122/139 88%
Percent successful completions*		91/118 77%	89/112 79%	102/115 89%	99/120 82.5%
Percent of unsuccessful due to new arrest / (number)		5/118 4%	6/112 5%	2/115 2%	3/120 2.5%
Readmit on Technical Violations 2017 Baseline Year			17/112 15%	11/115 10%	18/120 15%
Actual unit cost per day for HBS	\$29.10	\$38.13	\$33.13	\$29.66	\$24.07
Number of clients served	235		211	212	171*

District Attorney's Juvenile Intervention Program (Diversion)

The District Attorney's Juvenile Intervention Program (juvenile offender diversion) is an important option for the juvenile justice system. It allows consequences for first offenses without deep involvement in the juvenile justice system. Certain second time offenders may be offered an opportunity to complete Diversion, if deemed appropriate. Early intervention is a key component of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's comprehensive strategy for communities to address juvenile delinquency through a continuum of local programs, sanctions and services.

The Juvenile Intervention Program utilizes the Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center (JIAC) Brief Screen as well as a structured interview along with a thorough background investigation to assess clients for a wide range

of risk factors. Program staff members administer the assessment and review results of any previous screening. The JIAC screening instrument assesses criminogenic risk factors in an actuarial, objective way while the interview assesses risk factors in a non-actuarial, subjective way. Diversion coordinators develop recommendations regarding the appropriateness of the client for diversion and the appropriate services, level of service and monitoring that would be beneficial for the client. This "service plan" is incorporated into the client's diversion agreement, and each client is required to comply with all conditions of the agreement. While there are standard conditions that all clients will have to comply with, each diversion agreement is individually developed to match the needs of the client with the level of service that is provided.

District Attorney's Juvenile Intervention Program* – CY20	
Number of Youth Eligible to Apply	321
Number of Diversion Applications Received	204
Number of New Clients Accepted into the Program	156
Number of Clients Denied or Ineligible for the Program	56
Number of Clients Revoked from the Program / Motion Filed	93
Number of Clients Successfully Completed	149
Restitution Collected for Victims	\$436.25

*This program is a Judicial District 18 program but is not equivalent to the state SB367 Immediate Intervention Program (IIP).

Juvenile Court Services

Probation

Juvenile offenders convicted of offenses that do not merit referral to a juvenile correctional facility are typically placed under court jurisdiction. Court Services monitors compliance with court orders for youth placed on standard probation. Juvenile Field Services provides supervision for youth placed on juvenile intensive supervision, juvenile case management and conditional release. The number of contacts varies based upon risk and client needs. Court Services provides Pre-Sentence Investigation reports to the court. An assessment tool, the Youthful Level of Service / Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) is conducted and scored on juveniles who meet certain criteria. Court Services provides YLS/CMI scores at the time of sentencing to aid the judge in selecting sentencing options. The desired outcome of implementing the risk and needs assessment instrument is enhanced community safety achieved by providing appropriate intensive supervision and programming to juveniles who score at

moderate risk or above, and less supervision and programming to low risk youth. Random drug testing is performed. Sedgwick County Division of Corrections makes electronic monitoring available to Court Services to address supervision issues for juveniles residing in the home.

In the table below is the total number of new cases assigned to a Court Services Officer in juvenile probation for the entire year. The other three categories are a snapshot of juveniles as of the last day of the year. The total number represents the number of juveniles with Court Services involvement; the number of cases would be higher as some juveniles have multiple cases, but each juvenile is only counted once. The Administrative Total includes the following: JISP cases, KDOC-JS cases, Intra State Transfers and Inter State Transfers. During the five year period in the table, there has been a nearly 50% decrease in juveniles with Court Service involvement.

Performance Report Activities

Juvenile Court Services Probation	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
# of New Cases Assigned	345	292	212	230	129
Pending Sentencing	99	75	89	94	57
Active Standard Probation Cases	188	132	92	120	79
Administrative Total	313	255	197	196	172
TOTAL	600	462	378	410	308

Juvenile Field Services

Juvenile Field Services consists of three programs: Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program (JISP), Juvenile Case Management (CM) and Conditional Release (CR). The division was formed in March 1998, and operates with state funding under the State of Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services (KDOC-JS).

Juvenile Field Services places emphasis on public safety, preventing future offenses through the use of evidence-based correctional practices and services, education, employment and enhancing positive family impact on the offender's behavior. Offenders are supervised on level systems based on their risk to reoffend as determined by evidence-based correctional risk assessments. Juvenile offenders are monitored utilizing a graduated response approach to technical supervision violations. Graduated responses may consist of regularly scheduled community service work projects, reduction in curfew or attendance at an Accountability Panel. Accountability Panels consist of community volunteers who meet with the

offender to address issues relating to community supervision to arrive at creative solutions.

Offenders submit to urinalysis and breath analysis tests to detect drug use. Contacts with employers, educators, treatment providers, caregivers and the offender are characteristic of the program. In some cases, electronic monitoring is used to restrict freedom and provide sanctions for minor violations of the conditions of supervision. This restricts the offender's mobility to the home or other approved locations. If the offender violates the rules, staff members are quickly notified and can take action.

The three tables provided show long-term trends (decreases) for average daily population, admissions, and re-offense rates. The exceptions to the downward trend are in the re-offense rates for conditional release and intensive supervision at 12 months after the case was closed. The average number of new adjudications per month for KDOC-JS custody clients is lower in 2017, but has been relatively stable.

State Fiscal Year	SFY15	SFY16	SFY17	SFY18	SFY19	SFY20
Case Management						
Average Daily Population (Non-JCF* and Non-CR)	142	131	86	85	48	42
Average Daily Population (JCF and CR)	123	111	53	53	35	29
Average Daily Population - Total	266	242	139	138	83	71
% JCF and CR of Total Case Management	46%	46%	38%	38%	42%	41%
JISP						
Average Daily Population	152	153	114	115	133	116

*JCF-Juvenile Correctional Facility

JFS New Admits by Month

NEW ADMITS	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Case Management						
January	9	6	3	1	5	4
February	9	2	11	2	2	1
March	6	13	5	1	4	2
April	18	5	5	1	5	0
May	17	12	5	1	3	2
June	8	8	5	4	2	5
July	5	9	5	0	4	4
August	9	6	6	1	3	4
September	14	8	6	3	3	4
October	11	6	5	3	8	2
November	5	7	6	4	2	2
December	5	1	0	2	5	5
TOTAL	116	83	62	23	46	35

JISP						
January	20	13	13	14	21	13
February	15	7	13	16	13	12
March	13	10	13	16	8	7
April	22	13	5	16	20	2
May	15	14	8	17	18	4
June	12	13	14	6	10	27
July	18	10	12	13	15	6
August	21	8	6	10	14	11
September	22	11	8	10	11	19
October	17	8	10	18	18	17
November	9	10	19	24	11	9
December	6	9	6	9	18	6
TOTAL	190	126	127	169	177	133

JFS Recidivism Rates

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Case Management Percentage Re-offenses 12 Months After Case Closure	18%	14%	6%	10%	13%
Conditional Release Percentage Re-offenses 12 Months After Case Closure	16%	17%	19%	12%	6%
Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program Percentage Re-offenses 12 Months After Case Closure	11%	15%	18%	17%	1%
Average # of New Adjudications Per Month – KDOC-JS Custody Clients	4	4	1	3	3

Source: Juvenile Field Services

Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program (JISP)

Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program is an intensive community-based program providing services to offenders at risk of entering state's custody offenders are supervised according to a level system. Frequent contacts with employers, educators, treatment providers and the offender are components of intensive supervision, as are additional services including electronic monitoring, urinalysis testing, DNA testing and registration, surveillance and job readiness training. Emphasis is placed on

public safety, preventing future offenses, education and enhancing positive family impact on the offender's behavior. The primary goals of this program are: to enhance community safety, reparation and behavior change in juvenile offenders through effective case management by holding them accountable for their criminal behavior; and providing effective correctional intervention, supervision and services to offenders assigned to JISP.

JISP - Performance Measures

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number JISP clients served	345	272	275	284	304	263
ADP for JISP	146	148	115	127	130	107
Unit Cost per day for JISP	\$12.04	\$10.52	\$11.14	\$14.27	\$13.42	\$13.90
Average Caseload Size*	24	29	19	13	14	15

Source: Juvenile Field Services

*Mixed caseload of JISP & CM clients.

JISP – Recidivism

	Average (2014 – 2019)	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program Percentage Re-offenses 12 Months After Case Closure	14%	6%	11%	15%	18%	17%	1%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

JISP - Annual Successful Completions Rate

% Successful Completions	2016	2017	2018*	2019	2020
Successful Closures	90	104	88	81	80
TOTAL	90/144 63%	60/144 58%	73/88 83%	81/108 75%	80/96 83%
Low Risk (Prior to 2018 Included in General Caseloads)	100%	100%	1/2 50%	4/4 100%	1/2 50%
General Caseloads	62%	49%	47/54 87%	43/50 82%	44/49 90%
High Risk Unit	13/24 54%	21/33 64%	25/32 78%	34/54 63%	35/45 78%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

*Case Length Limit Closures started occurring in 2018.

JISP - Summary of Recent Case Failure Outcomes (General Caseloads)

Closures	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Outcome of Unsuccessful Closures	51/141 36%	44/148 30%	15/103 15%	27/108 25%	16/96 17%
Juvenile Correctional Facility	4/51 8%	10/44 23%	6/15 40%	15/27 56%	8/16 50%
KDOC-JS Custody / Out-of-Home	26/51 51%	17/44 39%	2/15 13%	1/27 4%	N/A
Sanctioned / Closed	19/51 37%	12/44 27%	7/15 47%	1/27 4%	5/16 31%
Adult Charge / Closed	2/51 4%	3/44 7%	0/15 0%	2/27 7%	1/16 6%
Client Turned 21 / Other	0/51 0%	2/44 5%	0/15 0%	8/27 30%	2/16 13%
Successful Closures	90	104	88	81	80
Total Closures	141	148	103	108	96

Source: Juvenile Field Services

Juvenile Case Management (JCM)

Juvenile Case Management provides supervision, case management and placement to offenders. Offenders served include those in state's custody, and those directly committed to state Juvenile Correctional Facilities (JCFs). The offenders may be placed in the community, in residential treatment facilities and in JCFs. Offenders are supervised according to a level system. Contacts with employers, educators, treatment providers and the offender are components of supervision, as are additional services including electronic monitoring, urinalysis testing, DNA testing and

registration, job readiness training, surveillance and independent living services. Emphasis is placed on public safety, preventing future offenses, education and enhancing positive family impact on the offender's behavior. The primary goals of this program are: to enhance community safety, reparation and behavior change in juvenile offenders through effective case management by holding youth accountable for their criminal behavior; and providing effective correctional intervention, supervision and services to offenders assigned to JCM at Juvenile Field Services.

JCM - Performance Measures

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number CM clients served	411	354	232	151	110
ADP for CM	227	167	105	75	67
Unit Cost per day for CM	\$15.55	\$17.98	\$27.57	\$54.29	\$50.89
Average Caseload Size*	29	19	13	14	15

Source: Juvenile Field Services

*Mixed caseload of JISP & CM clients.

JCM – Recidivism

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Case Management Percentage Re-offenses 12 Months After Case Closure	18%	14%	20%	2/31 6%	13%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

JCM - Annual Successful Completions Rate

% Successful Completions	2016	2017	2018*	2019	2020
TOTAL	76%	82%	100%	83%	86%
Low Risk (Included in General Caseloads)	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
General Caseloads	77%	83%	100%	71%	71%
High Risk Unit	74%	80%	100%	100%	93%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

*Case Length Limit Closures started occurring in 2018.

In 2017, the overall percentage of successful completions increased by 6% compared to 2016. Success rates for all categories are above target rates (overall successful completion rate target is 60%). The high risk team experienced an increase in successful completions, with the highest successful completions rate at 80%.

Conditional Release (CR)

Conditional Release provides supervision and case management for youth returning to the community from juvenile correctional facilities on conditional release. Juveniles served by this unit are placed in their family homes, detention, resource homes, residential treatment facilities and independent living programs. The Conditional Release population continues to be a very difficult

population to work with, and finding the means to help these clients be successful continues to be a struggle. Compared with the general caseloads, the high risk unit experienced success with this population. Success rates for the high risk unit returned to a point near the 60% goal, and rates are 100% for the low risk caseload.

CR – Recidivism Rates

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
12 Months After Case Closure	16%	17%	3/16 19%	2/17 12%	1/18 6%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

CR - Annual Successful Completions Rate

% Successful Completions	2016	2017	2018*	2019	2020
TOTAL	47%	68%	56%	73%	60%
Low Risk (Prior to 2018 Included in General Caseloads)	100%	100%	33%	100%	N/A
General Caseloads	55%	100%	62%	81%	50%
High Risk Unit	30%	59%	50%	56%	67%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

*Case Length Limit Closures started occurring in 2018.

KDOC - JS Custody Youth Placements
Average End of Month Placements

Conditional Release	SFY15	SFY16	SFY17	SFY18	SFY19	SFY20
Comm. Integration Program	.67	.92	0	0	0	0
Detention	12.8	12.2	12.08	10.2	10.5	7
Emergency Shelter	.17	.08	.08	.08	0	0
Family Resource Home	0	0	0	0	0	0
Home/Relative	16.6	17.5	27.9	25.4	15.58	16
Hospital	0	0	.08	0	0	0
Independent Living	4.3	3.1	2.08	3.1	4	3
Juvenile Correctional Facility	0	.92	.08	.17	0	0
Juvenile Justice Foster Care	.42	.58	.17	.25	0	0
PRTF	0	0	0	.08	0	0
Residential D/A Treatment	.17	.17	.08	.17	0	0
Specialized Family Res. Home	0	0	0	0	0	0
Therapeutic Family Res. Home	0	0	0	.17	0	0
Transitional Living Program	4.1	2.1	5.4	4.17	1.75	2
YRC I	0	0	0	0	0	0
YRC II	13.6	6.9	1.25	.25	0	0
Average Total Placements	53	44	49	44	32	28

Source: Juvenile Field Services / AWOLs are not included in this table.

Evening Reporting Center

The Evening Reporting Center (ERC) serves youth aged 10 to 22.5 from Sedgwick County or from the surrounding counties (Butler, Harvey, Elk, Greenwood, Sumner, McPherson, and Cowley). Youth targeted are identified as moderate to high-risk on the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS-CMI). The population served includes post-adjudicated youth, as well as youth in Court Services, case management, and Intensive Supervision Probation with community corrections. Youth may also become involved following a sanction by community corrections programs.

- **Evidence-based group services:** these include Aggression Replacement Training (ART), Thinking for a Change (T4C), Moral Recognition Therapy (MRT), Courage to Change (C2C), and Cognitive Behavioral Intervention (CBI).
- **Drug and Alcohol Treatment:** if necessary, youth are eligible for drug and alcohol services provided by a local community provider on-site at ERC.
- **Seeking Safety:** present-focused counseling to help attain safety from trauma and/or substance abuse.
- **Girls Circle:** a structured support group for girls that foster strengths and promote resiliency while developing a connection with peers and adults.
- **Independent Living Skill Groups:** youth may receive support with employment, cooking, budgeting, college preparation, community resources, housing, health, and other related skills.
- **Community Resource Team (CRT):** Provides support to youth within the Juvenile Justice System with a spectrum that focuses on community service work, education, employment, housing, medical, clothing, mental health, mentoring, food resources, and obtaining important documents.
- **Youth Council:** Youth are able to provide mentorship to their peers. They also ensure there is positive interaction with youth by providing constructive criticism and reassuring positive behavior while encouraging active engagement within their probation requirements.
- **Family Council:** Families meet quarterly to review and provide feedback around programming, changes to policies and services delivered by ISO, ERC and JFS staff. This ensures that families have positive outcomes with their experience and increase the likelihood of expedient case closure and a successful program completion.
- **Education Services:** Site based tutoring, GED preparation and educational enrichment provided by a contracted certified teacher. Educational services provide supports for youth needing credit recovery, reconnecting to school and preparing for post-secondary education.

There were one hundred seventeen (117) individual youth served through the ERC in 2020 (January 1, 2020-December 31, 2020). These include 70 youth and families served by CRT. Of those 117 youth, 23 youth completed programming with 20 youth successful. As of December 31, 2020, 94 youth were still listed as actively attending programming, detained, AWOL, inpatient treatment, or non-compliant.

Risk level is determined by youth's YLS/CMI score. Youth scoring low risk were diverted to other programming, in order to avoid the criminogenic contagion that can occur by mixing them with moderate and high-risk youth. Moderate and high-risk youth are offered the same programming; however which group youth are placed in is done on a case-by-case basis, with the referral team assigning a schedule based on court-orders, YLS/CMI sub-scores, and individual needs.

The program has the ability to address issues such as gender and race. For gender sensitive groups (such as *Seeking Safety* and *Girls Circle*), gender-matching facilitators are used exclusively for the girls' group and at client discretion for the boys' groups. In addition, the program offers coed groups. We have a diverse group



of youth in terms of race and ethnicity. We have not had issues placing youth in programming based on racial/ethnic demographics.

As needed for non-English speaking persons, ERC staff utilize our on-call translation service to complete parent update phone calls, notification calls, and even CRT sessions. We also have some curriculum materials available in Spanish; however we have not yet had a need to utilize these.


Any pre-adjudicated youth were separated from ERC programming, so as not to mix them with post-adjudicated/higher risk youth.

The program specifically asks about gang involvement and safety concerns on our referral form so that we can assign youth to appropriate programming, without putting them at risk for interaction with opposing gang members or court-ordered no-contacts (be they victims, perpetrators, or co-respondents).


ERC youth with especially traumatic histories, increased mental health needs, and cognitive functioning issues are given special consideration (such as 1:1 sessions, referrals to other community services, and specialized group scheduling).



2020 Completions







CSW Hours By Quarter 2020




N=102.5

Youth Served by Risk Level 2020






**Youth Served
by Age
2020**



**Youth Served
by Age Range
2020**



RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITY (RED)

History:

Racial and Ethnic Disparity (RED), formerly referred to as Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC), has been an issue for a long time. Growing overrepresentation of minority youth in secure facilities across the nation in the 1980s led to efforts to examine and address the problem. Sedgwick County Juvenile Detention Facility became involved in 1992, when amendments to the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act elevated DMC to a core protection for minority youth, tying funding eligibility to states' compliance. At that time, the detention facility experienced rapid growth in population in response to law enforcement crackdowns on gang violence in the community. The prevalence of gangs at this time was largely African American, and that had an impact on the detention population.

Sedgwick County responded to the growth in demand for secure detention beds by developing detention alternatives consistent with the juvenile detention reform movement that was emerging in the field. By June 1994, a continuum of programs composed of secure beds, non-secure residential beds and home-based supervision with and without electronic monitoring was established.

In 1996, the Detention Utilization Committee began to provide oversight of the utilization of juvenile detention, detention alternative programs and planning future needs. Reports developed focused on tracking admissions, admission reasons, length of stay, and profiling the juvenile population by – legal status, race, gender and age. Through these reports, it became evident there was a higher percentage of minorities represented in the detention population. The information obtained became a basis for further study and it helped to guide efforts to reduce minority representation at the facility.

Cooperation and collaboration have been keys to implementing effective reforms. Policy and practice changes require multiple agencies and stakeholders to work together. Judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, detention managers, probation officers, school personnel, law enforcement, and community advocates have participated in an ongoing examination and review of system policies, practices and impacts, intended and unintended, to make progress on DMC reduction. Data collection, unbiased analysis and professional research-based recommendations to guide changes are critical to making continuous improvements. Starting in 1996 research support for this effort came from the School of Community Affairs (now School of Criminal Justice) at Wichita State University working with Sedgwick County Division of Corrections.

During the period of October 1, 2007 through September 30, 2012, Sedgwick County was a partner site in the Models for Change (MFC), DMC Action Network, funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. This work resulted in several strategies to impact disproportionate minority contact in our local justice system. The change process involved collaboration, training, data collection, analysis, designing strategies, intervention, evaluation, and reporting of results. The process continued to improve results in collaboration with multiple systems stakeholders (police, court, school, mental health, corrections, child welfare and community).

Examples of the variety of changes made during this period included:

- establishing a weekend non-residential programming alternative to detention
- establishing deeper data collection
- more focused prevention programming
- developing a sanction grid
- expanding workplace diversity and cultural competency training
- expanded use of objective assessment tools
- addressing language barriers in service delivery and critical documents
- and targeted community engagement of advocates interested in reducing disparity at the point of arrest, including alternatives to arrest at schools for minor offenses

Results from this project include reductions: arrests for specific offenses; arrests at school; and, reliance on juvenile detention for sanctions. Additionally, reform efforts focused on access to specialized defense counsel, better serving crossover youth and collaboration with the educational system.

The use of the Youth Level of Service/ Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) risk assessment tool and the Sedgwick County Division of Corrections Juvenile Risk Assessment Instrument: Brief Screen (a shortened and validated version of the YLS/CMI) has led to significant improvements in program outcomes. Staff learned to use the information in recognizing and responding to risk, needs and responsivity factors. In 2019, the Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center began using an improved assessment tool. The Risk of Recidivism tool is more reflective of current efforts to identify needed referrals. Motivational Interviewing has also been a powerful and complimentary philosophy and skill set to guide youth in making changes in their behaviors. Evidence of the positive impacts includes an overall increase in the rate of successful completions from prevention programs.

Sedgwick County has participated since 2011 in the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). This work is helping to sustain our efforts to focus on improving case processing time, detention utilization for special populations, conditions of confinement in detention, and to evaluate detention alternatives. While these efforts are important, it is also important to note that many youth enter the juvenile detention facility for reasons other than criminal conduct. Too many status offenders, mentally ill individuals, youth from child welfare and teen victims of human trafficking wind up in detention through various legal means and lack of adequate community services that provide more relevant alternative to detention. Changes in ability to admit such youth to detention are the next phase of SB367, and will be in place July 1st, 2019.

Sedgwick County embarked on an effort to improve racial and ethnic disparity, working in partnership with the Burns Institute to explore opportunities to reduce racial and ethnic disparity in the juvenile justice system. That work was a part of the SFY18 effort. During SFY 2020 and SFY 2021 Team Justice began gathering information on racial and ethnic disparity and community perceptions. During the fall of 2020 there were 18 listening sessions, a community needs assessment, and a photovoice project completed to further understand the needs within the community. On January 23, 2021 Team Justice held a virtual community summit to hear about the results of the listening sessions, community survey, and photovoice. The virtual summit also included presentations regarding national programs and breakout groups to further discuss community input. From the community input Team Justice selected five priorities that will be the target for the KDOC-JS Evidence Based Funding. Those priorities are Sedgwick County Continuing Legal Education on Juvenile Justice, mentoring, family support, youth voices, and employment.

Current Issues and Information:

For the past twenty years the RRI (relative rate index) was the gold standard of data to judge how well minority youth do in the juvenile justice system. It used the rates of various activities in the juvenile justice system to compare each identifiable group (race, ethnicity, gender). Recent changes in the various data systems do not allow for computation of RRI across the entire juvenile justice system. This report includes three tables of information for calendar year 2018: Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF), Juvenile Residential Facility (JRF), and Home-based Services (HBS). The Juvenile Detention Facility is locked and secure care for juveniles in need of detention. The Juvenile Residential Facility provides a reduced security level, with greater freedom for residents (attending school, visits to family, etc.). Home-based Services is an alternative to detention and features supportive supervision in the home setting.

The information in the three tables showed African American youth were 41.1% of JDF admissions, 41.9% of JRF admissions, and 37.5% of HBS admissions. Hispanic youth were 23.3% of JDF admissions, 23.5% of JRF admissions, and 18.75% of HBS admissions. Caucasian youth were 34.4% of JDF admissions, 32.4% of JRF admissions, and 41.96% of HBS admissions. Taken as a whole these figures support relatively the same percentages in the detention facility as in the next least restrictive environment, the juvenile residential facility. The percentages for Home-based Services, the least restrictive environment in the detention continuum, show lower admissions for minorities than for Caucasian youth. Each detention alternative has criteria for admission that explain differences in percentages of admissions. The detention continuum requires monitoring for issues that might unfavorably impact a particular group.

Average length of stay in each of the three detention options provided further ability to understand differences experienced by minority and majority youth. Caucasian youth stayed an average of 10 days less in JDF than African American youth, and 4 days less than Hispanic youth. For JRF, the shortest stay was for Hispanic youth, and the longest stay was for Caucasian youth. In HBS the shortest stay was for Caucasian youth, while African American and Hispanic youth stays were more than two weeks longer.

The tables represent only one year of data, a snapshot in time. Nonetheless, there are indications of some differences by race and ethnicity. African American youth are in JDF at percentages of admission almost double their numbers in the community. The same is true for Hispanic youth.

Following the three tables related to the detention continuum are the RRI tables for 2016, the last year for which RRI was computed. These tables are provided as a reminder of the conditions at that point.

JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY

2020

ADMISSION REASON SUMMARY

	TOTAL	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
<i>New Charge</i>	115	16	9	6	12	11	6	9	14	5	6	11	10
<i>Court Ordered Commitment</i>	60	7	9	4	4	3	4	4	5	7	2	3	8
<i>Failure to Appear</i>	43	12	2	3	1	2	2	2	6	1	2	5	5
<i>Other Program Failure</i>	41	1	4	10	2	5	2	0	4	6	2	3	2
<i>Other Warrant</i>	16	2	1	3	2	2	0	2	0	3	0	0	1
<i>Pre-Adjudication House Arrest</i>	30	3	5	2	2	0	2	3	5	1	1	4	2
<i>Pretrial Supervision</i>	7	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
<i>Probation Warrant</i>	82	12	9	6	3	3	8	8	10	8	6	3	6
<i>Sanction House</i>	6	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total	400	53	43	35	28	26	27	29	46	31	19	29	34
<i>Return from Temp Release</i>	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0

ADMISSION TO DETENTION BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

	Total	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
African American	216	28	24	17	12	11	14	16	27	24	9	17	17
Amer Ind/Alask Native	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Asian	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	74	8	9	5	7	7	2	7	5	5	4	7	8
Caucasian	107	15	10	13	9	8	11	6	13	2	6	5	9
Total	400	53	43	35	28	26	27	29	46	31	19	29	34

ADMISSIONS TO DETENTION BY GENDER

	Total	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Female	94	10	8	11	6	2	5	10	9	7	7	9	10
Male	306	43	35	24	22	24	22	19	37	24	12	20	24
Total	400	53	43	35	28	26	27	29	46	31	19	29	34

ADP IN DETENTION BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

	YTD ADP	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
African American	24.58	29.97	30.59	28.26	26.23	29.84	26.67	18.87	20.29	22.10	22.39	19.20	20.87
Amer Ind/Alask Native	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Asian	0.01	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	11.20	14.55	11.52	14.13	13.50	16.71	14.50	11.48	7.77	6.93	7.06	7.57	8.61
Caucasian	7.72	10.10	9.79	11.19	9.63	10.23	9.53	5.84	6.32	3.83	4.81	5.50	5.87
Total	43.52	54.71	51.90	53.58	49.36	56.78	50.70	36.19	34.48	32.86	34.26	32.27	35.35

ADP IN DETENTION BY GENDER

	YTD ADP	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Female	7.42	7.55	7.00	8.61	8.70	10.94	9.00	5.52	6.16	4.63	5.74	7.50	7.65
Male	36.10	47.16	44.90	44.97	40.67	45.84	41.70	30.68	28.32	28.23	28.52	24.77	27.71
Total	43.52	54.71	51.90	53.58	49.37	56.78	50.70	36.20	34.48	32.86	34.26	32.27	35.36

ALOS IN DETENTION BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

	YTD ALOS	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
African American	41.65	34.25	58.81	37.09	17.00	18.10	69.95	65.52	46.95	30.81	59.63	27.73	11.31
Amer Ind/Alask Native	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Asian	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	72.49	40.92	156.14	45.25	3.00	32.33	43.67	78.36	146.88	78.75	23.40	170.40	34.17
Caucasian	26.72	12.56	31.00	34.70	25.64	10.71	43.06	96.83	9.87	12.00	4.17	24.33	24.17
Total	43.55	28.73	71.03	38.10	19.12	21.04	56.90	74.18	51.38	35.64	40.59	58.30	18.96
Number of Releases	412	59	33	41	25	26	39	38	45	28	27	23	28
<i>Temporary Releases</i>	5	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0

ALOS IN DETENTION BY GENDER

	YTD ALOS	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Female	26.41	20.40	26.13	14.22	6.75	19.25	69.43	22.60	46.13	50.13	9.00	9.33	17.38
Female Releases	91	10	8	9	4	4	7	10	8	8	9	6	8
Male	48.41	30.43	85.40	44.81	21.48	21.36	54.16	92.61	52.51	29.85	56.39	75.59	19.60
Male Releases	321	49	25	32	21	22	32	28	37	20	18	17	20
Total	43.55	28.73	71.03	38.10	19.12	21.04	56.90	74.18	51.38	35.64	40.59	58.30	18.96
Total Releases	412	59	33	41	25	26	39	38	45	28	27	23	28

2020 JRF DATA													
ADMISSION TO JRF BY RACE AND ETHNICITY													
	Total	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
African American	69	6	5	7	4	3	11	7	12	6	5	2	1
Amer Ind/Alask Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	25	3	4	3	1	2	4	2	2	3	0	1	0
Caucasian	51	11	9	5	4	3	4	7	3	4	0	0	1
Total	145	20	18	15	9	8	19	16	17	13	5	3	2
ADMISSIONS TO JRF BY GENDER													
	Total	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Female	29	3	3	5	2	0	6	2	3	4	1	0	0
Male	116	17	15	10	7	8	13	13	15	9	4	3	2
Total	145	20	18	15	9	8	19	15	18	13	5	3	2
ADP IN JRF BY RACE AND ETHNICITY													
	YTD ADP	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
African American	5.30	7.06	6.07	4.68	6.77	6.84	5.60	5.19	4.97	6.43	5.32	2.67	2.06
Amer Ind/Alask Native	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Asian	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	1.92	1.65	3.90	1.48	1.50	1.26	1.20	1.32	1.55	3.40	2.45	1.97	1.48
Caucasian	7.92	11.16	11.00	7.84	8.93	10.29	8.60	9.00	8.32	6.37	5.19	4.00	4.39
Total	15.14	19.87	20.97	14.00	17.20	18.39	15.40	15.51	14.84	16.20	12.96	8.64	7.93
ADP IN JRF BY GENDER													
	YTD ADP	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Female	1.20	2.35	2.34	2.45	1.10	0.00	1.37	2.52	0.58	1.53	0.19	0.00	0.00
Male	13.94	17.52	18.62	11.55	16.10	18.39	14.03	13.00	14.26	14.67	12.77	8.63	7.94
Total	15.14	19.87	20.96	14.00	17.20	18.39	15.40	15.52	14.84	16.20	12.96	8.63	7.94
ALOS IN JRF BY RACE AND ETHNICITY													
	YTD ALOS	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
African American	17.33	42.60	35.20	11.29	48.67	54.57	13.91	28.50	16.55	15.75	29.60	44.00	2.00
Amer Ind/Alask Native	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Asian	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	23.69	14.50	24.50	1.00	25.67	0.00	21.20	9.67	3.00	38.50	28.00	103.00	16.00
Caucasian	42.60	5.71	16.00	57.57	8.67	15.00	29.40	103.80	49.14	71.00	121.00	0.00	12.00
Total	32.17	20.14	23.00	32.20	27.67	42.70	21.71	51.36	27.84	45.00	43.54	58.75	10.00
Number of Releases	154	14	21	15	9	10	21	14	19	11	13	4	3
ALOS IN JRF BY GENDER													
	YTD ALOS	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Female	14.81	11.00	31.00	18.50	15.29	0.00	2.00	9.00	19.40	6.00	17.00	0.00	0.00
Female Releases	31	3	3	2	7	0	2	4	5	3	2	0	0
Male	36.54	22.64	21.67	34.31	71.00	42.70	23.79	68.30	30.86	59.63	48.36	58.75	10.00
Male Releases	123	11	18	13	2	10	19	10	14	8	11	4	3
Total	32.17	20.14	23.00	32.20	27.67	42.70	21.71	51.36	27.84	45.00	43.54	58.75	10.00
Total Releases	154	14	21	15	9	10	21	14	19	11	13	4	3

2020 HBS DATA													
ADMISSION TO HBS BY RACE AND ETHNICITY													
	Total	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
African American	79	9	5	9	5	7	10	6	6	3	7	5	7
Amer Ind/Alask Native	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	22	2	2	1	3	2	6	2	1	1	1	0	1
Caucasian	30	4	3	6	2	2	5	3	2	0	2	0	1
Total	131	15	10	16	10	11	21	11	9	4	10	5	9
ADMISSIONS TO HBS BY GENDER													
	Total	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Female	24	4	3	1	5	2	2	2	1	0	1	0	3
Male	107	11	7	15	5	9	19	9	8	4	9	5	6
Total	131	15	10	16	10	11	21	11	9	4	10	5	9
ADP IN HBS BY RACE AND ETHNICITY													
	YTD ADP	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
African American	14.52	11.03	11.90	14.03	17.03	15.74	18.50	19.16	16.87	13.60	13.26	11.33	11.16
Amer Ind/Alask Native	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Asian	0.67	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	8.03	10.52	8.34	7.65	8.77	10.71	10.10	11.74	9.87	7.40	4.61	3.77	2.55
Caucasian	9.87	16.84	11.24	10.26	10.80	12.68	10.73	9.55	9.00	8.20	6.87	5.93	5.94
Total	33.09	39.39	32.48	32.94	37.60	40.13	40.33	41.45	36.74	29.20	24.74	21.03	19.65
ADP IN HBS BY GENDER													
	YTD ADP	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Female	6.27	9.77	6.17	6.26	9.97	10.10	8.33	8.71	7.87	3.70	1.87	0.70	1.68
Male	26.72	29.61	26.31	26.68	27.63	30.03	32.00	32.74	28.87	25.50	22.87	20.33	17.97
Total	32.99	39.38	32.48	32.94	37.60	40.13	40.33	41.45	36.74	29.20	24.74	21.03	19.65
ALOS IN HBS BY RACE AND ETHNICITY													
	YTD ALOS	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
African American	64.51	24.67	54.83	35.50	52.86	101.25	85.67	51.00	77.40	98.75	68.63	72.50	33.86
Amer Ind/Alask Native	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Asian	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	361.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	106.27	40.00	96.00	106.67	0.00	0.00	106.14	44.00	130.75	112.00	63.00	377.00	204.00
Caucasian	95.57	71.38	61.00	74.00	0.00	29.00	101.56	249.33	67.50	41.00	231.00	107.50	0.00
Total	83.79	54.64	65.00	69.33	52.86	86.80	97.12	99.42	89.50	117.40	92.31	114.11	55.13
Number of Releases	148	14	17	12	7	5	25	12	16	10	13	9	8
ALOS IN HBS BY GENDER													
	YTD ALOS	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Female	91.50	89.20	46.67	0.00	69.50	189.00	55.20	112.00	136.20	118.33	308.00	68.00	6.00
Female Releases	32	5	6	0	2	1	5	1	5	3	1	2	1
Male	81.66	35.44	75.00	69.33	46.20	61.25	107.60	98.27	68.27	117.00	74.33	127.29	62.14
Male Releases	116	9	11	12	5	4	20	11	11	7	12	7	7
Total	83.79	54.64	65.00	69.33	52.86	86.80	97.12	99.42	89.50	117.40	92.31	114.11	55.13
Total Releases	148	14	17	12	7	5	25	12	16	10	13	9	8

Demographics of Youth Served in SFY20 by Prevention Programs in Sedgwick County

Program	African American	African American/Hispanic	American Indian / Alaskan Native	Asian	Caucasian	Caucasian/Hispanic	Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	Other/Unknown	Other/Unknown/Hispanic	Multi-Race	Multi-Racial/Hispanic	Multi-Racial/Hispanic
Pando Initiative	31%	2%	2%	0%	35%	11%	0%	>1%	7%	11%	>1%	>1%
Detention Advocacy Service (KDOC Grant)	35%	0%	0%	0%	37%	28%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Functional Family Therapy	14%	14%	0%	0%	57%	10%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%
Learning the Ropes	10%	0%	5%	1%	35%	48%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
McAdams Academy	33%	0%	3%	0%	17%	23%	0%	0%	0%	20%	3%	3%
Big Brothers Big Sisters	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Mental Health Association	29%	0%	<1%	<1%	2%	0%	<1%	52%	13%	2%	0%	<1%

Differential Success Rates by Race

Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services &
County Crime Prevention Funded Programs

		Successful	Percent	Unsuccessful	Percent
SFY20	Caucasian Youth	86	84%	16	16%
	Minority Youth	131	65%	70	35%
	African American Youth	45	52%	42	48%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	4	67%	2	33%
	Asian Youth	1	100%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	1	100%	0	0%
	Multi-Race Youth	9	50%	9	50%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	71	81%	17	19%
	Other/Unknown	1	50%	1	50%
	TOTAL CLOSURES (305)	218	71%	87	29%
PANDO (122)	Caucasian Youth	34	83%	7	17.07%
	Minority Youth	37	49%	39	51%
	African American Youth	12	32%	25	68%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	2	100%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Multi-Race Youth	3	25%	9	75%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	20	80%	5	20%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	1	100%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	71	60%	47	40%
Detention Alternative Services (KDOC Grant) (69)	Caucasian Youth	20	91%	2	9%
	Minority Youth	33	79%	9	21%
	African American Youth	18	72%	7	28%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Multi-Race Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	15	88%	2	12%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	0	0%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	53	83%	11	17%
EmberHope (21)	Caucasian Youth	6	60%	4	40%
	Minority Youth	5	56%	4	44%
	African American Youth	2	33%	4	67%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Multi-Race Youth	1	0%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	2	100%	0	0%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	0	0%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	11	58%	8	42%

		Successful	Percent	Unsuccessful	Percent
Higher Ground (81)	Caucasian Youth	21	88%	3	13%
	Minority Youth	33	69%	15	31%
	African American Youth	4	57%	3	43%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	2	50%	2	50%
	Asian Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	1	100%	0	0%
	Multi-Race Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	26	72%	10	28%
	Other/Unknown	1	100%	0	0%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	55	75%	18	25%
McAdams (30)	Caucasian Youth	5	100%	0	0%
	Minority Youth	23	92%	2	8%
	African American Youth	9	82%	2	18%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	1	0%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Multi-Race Youth	5	0%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	8	100%	0	0%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	0	0%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	28	93%	2	7%
*PATHS (403) .	Caucasian Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Minority Youth	0	0%	1	100%
	African American Youth	0	0%	1	100%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Multi-Race Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	0	0%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	0	0%	1	100%
**BBBS (1)	Caucasian Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Minority Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	African American Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Multi-Race Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	0	0%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	0	0%	0	0%

Differential Success Rates by Race

Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services &
County Crime Prevention Funded Programs

		Successful	Percent	Unsuccessful	Percent
SFY19	Caucasian Youth	225	87%	42	13%
	Minority Youth	465	83%	97	17%
	African American Youth	246	82%	53	18%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	4	100%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	28	97%	3	3%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	1	100%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	162	88%	33	22%
	Multi-Race Youth	24	75%	8	25%
	Other/Unknown	175	78%	52	22%
	TOTAL CLOSURES (1,059)	868	83%	191	17%
Pando (80)	Caucasian Youth	20	69%	9	31%
	Minority Youth	26	52%	24	48%
	African American Youth	12	55%	10	45%
	Multi-Race Youth	6	46%	7	54%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	8	53%	7	47%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	1	100%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	46	58%	34	42%
KLS Crime Prev (48)	Caucasian Youth	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Minority Youth	39	81%	9	19%
	African American Youth	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Asian Youth	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	39	81%	9	19%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	0	0.00%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	39	81%	9	19%
KLS-KDOC-JS (210)	Caucasian Youth	65	82%	14	18%
	Minority Youth	103	87%	15	13%
	African American Youth	77	85%	14	15%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	1	100%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	3	100%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	22	96%	1	4%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	0	0%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	168	85%	29	15%

		Successful	Percent	Unsuccessful	Percent
EmberHope (26)	Caucasian Youth	7	70%	3	30%
	Minority Youth	6	60%	4	40%
	African American Youth	3	60%	2	40%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Multi-Racial Youth	2	100%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	1	33%	2	67%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	0	0%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	13	65%	7	35%
Higher Ground (70)	Caucasian Youth	11	56%	8	44%
	Minority Youth	28	63%	15	37%
	African American Youth	5	56%	4	44%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	0	0%	2	100%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	23	70%	9	30%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	0	0%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	39	61%	23	39%
McAdams (31)	Caucasian Youth	6	98%	1	14%
	Minority Youth	20	99%	3	13%
	African American Youth	8	98%	2	20%
	Multi-Racial Non-Hispanic	3	100%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	9	99%	1	10%
	Other/Unknown	0	0%	1	100%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	26	99%	5	16%
PATHS (639)	Caucasian Youth	117	94%	7	6%
	Minority Youth	245	90%	27	10%
	African American Youth	141	87%	21	13%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	3	100%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	25	96%	1	4%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	1	100%	0	0%
	Multi-Racial	13	93%	1	7%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	62	94%	4	6%
	Other/Unknown	175	78%	50	22%
	TOTAL CLOSURES	537	86%	84	14%

Gender and Race

The case was made in introducing the RED section for attention to race and ethnicity as a factor in youth involvement in the juvenile justice system. Following that same reasoning, each of the programs provided to prevent or reduce delinquency tracks the race/ethnicity of the individuals served. Historical and 2018 data showed success in programs was about the same for minority youth as for Caucasian youth.

Greater awareness of gender differences has driven the development of gender-specific programming, with attention to trauma related to abuse in childhood. Data on gender is included in the three tables at the beginning of the RED section. It showed females at about one-quarter of the JDF admissions, but about one-fifth of the JRF admissions and 22.4 % of the HBS admissions.

A look at the program participation levels by gender showed in 2018 about one-third of participants were female, and their success rates are equal to those of males.

Both the race/ethnicity and gender information on program participation shows reason for satisfaction with success rates. Program providers appear to be overcoming any barriers introduced by race, ethnicity, or gender.

Differential Success Rates by Gender
Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services &
County Crime Prevention Funded Programs

SFY20 305*			<u>Successful</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	Males	207	150	72%	58	28%
	Females	97	68	70%	29	30%
	Total	305	218	72%	87	28%

PROGRAMS

		Successful	Percent	Unsuccessful	Percent
Pando 122 (4 youth continued)	Male Youth	42	61%	27	39%
	Female Youth	29	59%	20	41%
DAS – 69 (5 youth continued)	Male Youth	43	83%	9	17%
	Female Youth	10	83%	2	17%
**BBBS - 1 (1 youth continued)	Male Youth	0	0%	0	0%
	Female Youth	0	0%	0	0%
EmberHope - 21 (2 youth continued)	Male Youth	4	44%	5	56%
	Female Youth	7	70%	3	30%
Higher Ground - 81 (8 youth continued)	Male Youth	37	73%	14	27%
	Female Youth	18	82%	4	18%
McAdams - 30	Male Youth	24	92%	2	8%
	Female Youth	4	100%	0	0%
PATHS - 403	Male Youth	0	0%	1	100%
	Female Youth	0	0%	0	0%

Differential Success Rates by Gender - Historical
Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services &
County Crime Prevention Funded Programs

SFY20		<u>Successful</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	Male Clients	207	72%	58	28%
	Female Clients	68	70%	29	30%
	Total = 1,515	218	72%	87	28%

SFY19		<u>Successful</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	Males = 614	503	81.6%	111	18.4%
	Females = 398	319	80.2%	79	19.8%
	Unknown=47	46	98%	1	2%
	Total = 1,059	868	82%	191	18%

SFY18		<u>Successful</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	Males = 575	528	92%	47	8%
	Females = 399	366	92%	33	8%
	Unknown=118	112	95%	6	5%
	Total = 1,092	1,006	92%	86	8%

SFY17		<u>Successful</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	Male Clients	711	87.9%	98	12.1%
	Female Clients	575	95.0%	30	5.0%
	Unknown	25	100.0%	0	0.0%
	Total = 1,439	1,311	91.1%	128	8.9%

SFY16		<u>Successful</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	Male Clients	586	80.3%	144	19.7%
	Female Clients	403	83.4%	80	16.6%
	Total = 1,213	989	81.5%	224	18.5%

Service Provision by Crime Prevention Programming and JIAC Intake Sedgwick County top 10 zip codes

This geographic information confirms the reality that juvenile delinquency distributes unevenly throughout the City of Wichita. A comparison of the JIAC information and the prevention program numbers reveals that some zip codes are overserved while others are underserved. The JIAC intakes map according to the address of the youth in question. The prevention programs map according to where service is delivered. A zip code can receive more provider program clients than JIAC intakes if the program has a school-based program with large numbers of clients in a given area.

In summary, it would be more beneficial for the distribution of services to align with the distribution of delinquency.


ZIP	City/Area	SFY19	SFY19
		JIAC	Prev. Prg. #
67203	Wichita	113	30
67204	Wichita	73	174
67211	Wichita	105	67
67212	Wichita	90	20
67213	Wichita	124	35
67214	Wichita	199	75
67216	Wichita	100	114
67217	Wichita	100	26
67218	Wichita	272	70
67219	Wichita	79	19

1255/1860 684/1194
67% 57%

ZIP	City/Area	SFY20	SFY20
		JIAC	Prev. Prg. #
67203	Wichita	78	10
67204	Wichita	75	11
67211	Wichita	60	40
67212	Wichita	100	53
67213	Wichita	61	7
67214	Wichita	91	17
67216	Wichita	102	267
67217	Wichita	78	13
67218	Wichita	94	40
67219	Wichita	193	1


932/1567 459/657
59% 70%

Definition
 JIAC --> Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center
 Program --> Prevention Provider #s served



Date: 11/26/2019

© 2019 Sedgwick County Kansas Government. All rights reserved.
 FILE: C:\GIS\GisMaps\Juv\JuvCorrection\Juv_enile_2019.mxd
 NAME: mamador



It is understood that the Sedgwick County GIS, Division of Information and Operations, has no indication or reason to believe that there are inaccuracies in information incorporated in the base map.

The GIS personnel make no warranty or representation, either expressed or implied, with respect to the information or the data displayed.

SFY19 JIAC Intake Numbers with Prevention Provider Targeted Population Numbers Served


State Fiscal Year 2018
 07/01/2018 Thru 06/30/2019

Sedgwick County, Kansas

Data Provided by Division of Corrections-316.660.7018

Zip Code

67203	67214
67204	67216
67211	67217
67212	67218
67213	67219



SUMMARY and USE of DATA

The data in this document covers many important aspects of juvenile delinquency, prevention and intervention in Sedgwick County, KS. It is timely, and uses the most up to date information available. Use this information to understand recent trends in the system and in the various agencies of juvenile justice.

The data showed a downward trend for numbers in juvenile justice related services until SFY19 when several important indicators changed to reflect increasing numbers. The recent change in the trend shows the twin problem of more youth in secure custody, and more youth in community-based programs. Most of the increases in youth in custody but in the community are those recently released from a juvenile correctional facility.

The data presented is best understood when combined with the other reports related to juvenile justice. A list of those reports is on the final page of this data book. If one of these other reports is of interest, please keep in mind the information in this report to fully appreciate the other report. The reports are synergistic.

Cross-Referenced Reports

The following can be located on the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections Site:

<https://www.sedgwickcounty.org/corrections/reports-plans-and-initiatives/>

Benchmark 5
Comprehensive Plan for Juvenile Delinquency Prevention
Program Evaluation for State Fiscal Year 2018

In addition, the Department of Corrections Strategic Plan is located on the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections Site:

<https://www.sedgwickcounty.org/corrections/>