



Minnesota Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee



2015
Annual Report



2015 JJAC Annual Report

Table of Contents

JJAC Membership, Ex Officios, DOC Inspectors and Staff	1
Letter from the JJAC Chair, Richard Gardell	2
About JJAC	3
2015 JJAC's Activities, Recommendations, and Partner Updates	5
JJAC Activities and Recommendations: Juvenile Life Without Parole	5
Cross-Over Youth Model	6
<u>JJAC Partner Updates:</u>	
DOC	7
MACPO	8
YIPA	8
MCA	9
MACCAC	11
JDAI	11
Hennepin County Girls Service Coordinator	12
Citizen's Council on Crime & Justice/2nd Chance	13
Children's Hospital and Clinics of MN	14
MN Department of Health's Safe Harbor Initiative	14
MN Youth Demographics	16
United States Department of Justice Allocation	25
2015 JJAC Grants	26

Contact: dps.mn.gov/entity/jjac

Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee

William Collins, Co-Vice Chair, Saint Paul
 Freddie Davis-English, Co-Chair, DMC Committee, Plymouth
 Christopher Downing, Youth Member, Princeton
 William Dykes, Youth Member, Saint Paul
 Richard Gardell, Chair, Minneapolis
 Sheila Kiscaden, Local Elected Official, Rochester
 Chief Scott Knight, Chaska
 Chong Lo, Co-Chair, DMC Committee, Saint Cloud
 Samantha Loe, Youth Member, Arden Hills
 Honorable Michael Mayer, Co-Vice Chair, Eagan
 Shelley McBride, Rochester
 Sirxavier Nash, Youth Member, Minneapolis
 Hao Nguyen, Co-Chair, Core Protections Committee, Brooklyn Center
 Kathryn Richtman, Co-Chair, Core Protections Committee, Saint Paul
 Saciido Shaie, Minneapolis
 Kathryn Smith, Chair, Juvenile Sentencing Committee, Spicer
 Richard Smith, Plymouth
 Antonio Tejada, Willmar

Ex Officio Members

Lynn Douma, Department of Employment and Economic Development
 Travis Gransee, Minnesota Corrections Association
 Kathy Halvorson, Department of Corrections
 Sara Hollie, Department of Health
 Nicole Kern Minnesota, Association of Community Corrections Act Counties
 James Schneider, Minnesota Association of County Probation Officers
 Curtis Shanklin, MN Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative

Department of Corrections Inspection Team

Lisa Cain Becking
 Greg Croucher
 Sarah G. Johnson
 Teresa Smith
 Julie Snyder
 Timothy Thompson

Department of Public Safety

Callie Aguilar, Juvenile Justice Specialist
 Greg Herzog, Grant Manager
 Rita Joyce, Office Administrator
 Dana Swayze, Juvenile Justice Analyst (transitioned)
 Carrie Wasley, Juvenile Justice Specialist (retired)



STATE OF MINNESOTA

Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee

Department of Public Safety, Office of Justice Programs
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 2300, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
Voice: 651-201-7348 – Fax: 651-296-5787

Richard Gardell, Chair

December, 2015

This has been a transformative year for Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC), earmarked with many key accomplishments. Through careful coordination with several key partners, we have significantly advanced the strategic mission of this work. Please see the Activities, Partners and Recommendations beginning on page 6.

I would like share a few highlights from our work over the past twelve months, as well actions we intend to take in the upcoming year to positively impact those involved in the juvenile justice system:

1. JJAC provided a series of recommendations to MN legislators during the 2015 session regarding the imposition of Life without Parole sentences on juvenile offenders. This committee will remain diligent in seeing that justified adjustments are issued to state policies in the New Year.
2. The urgent need for additional mental health service options for youth involved in the criminal justice system has motivated JJAC to issue a grant to Minnesota Corrections Association (MCA). This funding will address issues presented in the Juvenile Justice 21st Century Report and will enable providers to gather the critical information needed to develop ideal solutions to this growing problem.
3. The issue of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) remains on the forefront of our minds as we enter into a new calendar year. In light of protests involving law enforcement and “calls to action” by community organizations like Black Lives Matter, there’s no better time than now to implement a collaborative approach in addressing the disparate treatment of people of color. Last month, JJAC issued a grant to MN Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (MN JDAI) to refine programming in order to better serve minority youth.

Through collaboration and shared vision, we can develop creative and effective strategies to ensure that all youth succeed. Please see the full report for further recommendations and initiatives. JJAC’s hope is that you will reflect on the immense body of work that has already been accomplished and recognize the need for vigilance as we venture forward together.

Richard Gardell, Chair
Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee

About JJAC

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act was passed by Congress in 1974. The JJDP Act guarantees four core protections to America's youth when and if they become involved in the local juvenile justice system. The JJDP Act is currently before Congress for re-authorization. It has been before Congress since 2007. It provides the foundation for each state's committee work plan and responsibilities in juvenile justice.

The JJDP Act is comprised of four core requirements:

De-institutionalization of Status Offenders

Each state must ensure that juveniles who are charged with a status offense (truancy, curfew, running away, alcohol and tobacco possession/consumption) will not be placed in secure detention or in correctional facilities. Status offenses are those offenses which would not be an offense if committed by a person over the age of eighteen.

Sight and Sound Separation of Juveniles from Adult Offenders

Each state must ensure that a juvenile charged with a delinquent offense and who is detained or confined in an adult jail or lockup will not have verbal or visual contact with adult offenders.

Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups

Each state must ensure that no juvenile shall be detained or confined in a jail or lockup that is intended for adult offenders beyond specific proscribed time limits – six hours in a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) county and 24 hours in a non-MSA county. Minnesota has a combination of MSA and non-MSA counties and the designation is based on population.

Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)

Each state must make an effort to reduce DMC at all nine points along the juvenile justice continuum when each minority proportion exceeds that minority's representation in the overall population. The nine points of contact are:

1. Juvenile Arrests
2. Referrals to County Attorney's Office
3. Cases Diverted
4. Cases Involving Secure Detention
5. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)
6. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings
7. Cases Resulting in Probation Placement

8. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities
9. Cases Transferred to Adult Court

Please see Minnesota Youth Demographics section, pps 16-24 for current data.

For oversight on these requirements, the MN Governor appoints eighteen members to the supervisory Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC). JJAC reports annually to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) with current data required for compliance with the above four core requirements.

2015: Minnesota is in compliance on all four core requirements of the JJDP Act.

Additionally, JJAC has the responsibility to advise and make recommendations on juvenile justice to the MN Governor and the MN Legislature on issues, trends, practices and concerns in regard to all aspects of juvenile justice. JJAC serves as the supervisory entity with its central focus to provide an overall safeguard on the state's activities with youth in MN's juvenile justice system.

JJAC's specific responsibilities include:

- To develop a comprehensive three year plan for juvenile justice in MN.
- To report to the Governor and Legislature on MN's compliance with the JJDP Act's four core requirements.
- To advise the Governor and Legislature on recommendations for improvement of the MN juvenile justice system.
- To review, award and monitor federal juvenile justice funds appropriated by Congress under the JJDP Act specifically via Title II and the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) funds.

Title II provides funding for prevention, intervention and aftercare programs to youth-serving and community based organizations. JABG funding provides support for juvenile justice to local units of government. (see page 21 for current Title II and JABG grantees).

As a state wide committee, JJAC meets eight times annually in various sites around the state. This ever changing venue helps JJAC become familiar with local juvenile justice issues and to allow specific communities convenient access to the committee. In 2015 the committee met at the following MN sites: Bemidji, Minneapolis, Rochester, and St. Paul (5).

JJAC members represent all eight MN congressional districts and represent the following juvenile justice categories: youth, courts, law enforcement, private non-profit youth-serving agencies, public defense, prosecution and private citizens who have acquired special knowledge relating to juveniles. They represent MN's rural, suburban, and urban areas equally, and they also represent all major ethnic and racial groups residing in MN. They are a working board.

Additionally, the JJAC Chair has designated resource professionals who serve as Ex Officio Members for JJAC. They include representatives from other MN state departments which serve youth plus professional juvenile justice organizations focused on juveniles.

For 2015 Minnesota is in compliance on all four core requirements of the JJDP Act.

JJAC Activities, Partners and Recommendations

Juvenile Life Without Parole

In 2012, the United States Supreme Court held in *Miller v. Alabama* & *Jackson v. Hobbs*¹ that sentencing an offender to **mandatory** life without the possibility of parole, when that offender was under the age of 18 at the time of the crime, violated the constitutional ban on “cruel and unusual punishment.” While the Court did not ban life-without-the-possibility-of-parole sentences for juveniles, the Court held that in every case where this sentence is being considered, the sentencing court is required to consider factors related to the effect of the offender’s youth on his or her culpability and potential for rehabilitation. *Miller* did not address whether the decision would be retroactively applied to anyone currently serving sentences of life without the possibility of parole for crimes committed while a juvenile.

Based on the *Miller* decision, states are required to replace mandatory life-without-the-possibility-of-parole sentences with a sentencing process consistent with the factors set forth in the decision. Minnesota has yet to make this statutory change. However, as set forth in previous years’ reports, in 2013, in response to the *Miller* decision, JJAC formed a subcommittee to research possible responses, and to make recommendations to the Governor and Legislature on how to bring Minnesota law into compliance with the Supreme Court’s decision. Six months later, and with a great deal of involvement from a wide variety of juvenile justice professionals, JJAC developed its recommendation to the Governor and Legislature regarding the imposition of life-without-the-possibility-of-parole sentences on juvenile offenders. JJAC continues to support the recommendations made in 2013, which are as follows:

- 1. Minnesota laws should be amended to eliminate the sentence of life without the possibility of parole for juveniles.*
- 2. For the crimes that currently result in a sentence of life without the possibility of parole, juveniles should instead receive a sentence of life with the possibility of parole after serving a minimum of 20 years.*
- 3. To ensure meaningful review of a life with the possibility of parole sentence, Minnesota law should further provide that “The Commissioner of Corrections shall review the juvenile’s conduct in prison, participation in programming, the juvenile’s age at the time of the commission of the crime, the facts of the present offense, the juvenile’s prior offenses, educational and family background, the opinion of the victim(s) and any other factors relevant to rehabilitation and make the determination as to whether the juvenile should be paroled.”*
- 4. In the interests of fundamental fairness, JJAC further recommends that these statutory changes shall be applied retroactively to all individuals currently serving life sentences without parole for the applicable crimes committed when the individual was under the age of eighteen years.*

¹ ___ U.S. ___, 132 S.Ct. 2455 (2012)

FEDERAL UPDATE: On January 25, 2016 the Supreme Court held, in *Montgomery V. Louisiana*,² that *Miller* must be applied retroactively in all cases where a juvenile received the sentence of mandatory life without the possibility of parole.

MINNESOTA: It is important to note that JJAC’s fourth recommendation is consistent with the most recent United States Supreme Court decision.

² ___ S.Ct. ___, 2016 WL 280758 (2016). This ruling invalidates the Minnesota decisions holding that *Miller* should not be applied retroactively (See, *Chambers v. State*, 831 N.W.2d 311 (2013) and *Roman Nose v. State*, 845 N.W.2d 193 (2014)).

Cross-Over Youth Model

Fragmentation of youth services continues to challenge Minnesota’s juvenile justice professionals and community providers. On September 11, 2015, JJAC invited representatives from numerous organizations to present their agency’s or organization’s 2016 legislative priorities. During this Open Forum, multiple presenters identified the fragmentation of services and the lack of coordination amongst systems professionals as significant barriers to improving outcomes for youth involved in the juvenile justice system. This theme was echoed by JJAC members who, as subject-matter experts, have struggled for quite some time with the fragmentation of services for youth.

While research continues to support the efficacy of addressing the underlying needs of justice-involved youth, juvenile justice professionals struggle to make appropriate services readily available to the youth who need them. Juveniles under the justice system often have many needs that have remained unmet for years. When advocates and service providers attempt to provide timely and appropriate services, time delays, service gaps and barriers often stand in the way of appropriate care. The mental health, chemical health, education needs, as well as the emotional and physical wellbeing and trauma histories of these system-involved youth require a multidisciplinary, coordinated response.

One of the strongest models identified as addressing the problems of fragmentation of services is the “Cross-Over Youth Model.”¹ In this model, human service and juvenile justice professionals work as a multidisciplinary team to create an appropriate plan designed to address the youth’s needs, build on the youth’s strengths and improve the youth’s capacity and resiliency. Through this model, youths’ needs can be assessed and identified earlier, access to services is better coordinated, families are engaged, case management is collaborative between human services and juvenile justice providers, and access to services is more streamlined.

In its October meeting, JJAC heard a presentation from Olmsted County Corrections and Human Services professionals. Olmsted County is one of five Minnesota counties now implementing the Cross-Over Model. Their presentation clearly demonstrated that the Cross-Over Model can work.

Given the issues of fragmentation identified in our 2015 Open Forum, JJAC is eager to expand the implementation of the Cross-Over Model and we will explore the feasibility of promoting this model statewide. JJAC members firmly believe that, to the degree we can be timely, intentional and collaborative in meeting the needs of youth, we will be better able to improve youth and family well-being and promote long term public safety.

JJAC recommends the State fund the efforts of counties seeking to implement multidisciplinary team approaches such as the Cross-Over Youth model.

¹ In 2010, the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at Georgetown University announced the creation of the “Cross-Over Youth Practice Model.” It is designed to address the specific needs of youth moving between and known to both the child welfare and juvenile justice system. These youth are commonly referred to as “Cross-Over Youth.” Sometimes there are also referred to as “Dual Jurisdiction Youth,” which is a term used to describe you through our concurrently involved in both systems. “The Cross-Over Youth Practice Model focuses on reduction in the number of youth crossing over and becoming dually-involved; reduction in the number of youth placed in out-of-home care; reduction in the use of congregate care; and reduction in the disproportionate representation of youth of color, particularly in the Cross-Over population.” See. <http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/our-work/crossover-youth-practice-model/>.

COLLABORATION WITH OTHER JUVENILE JUSTICE AGENCIES

JJAC has made considerable outreach to other juvenile justice agencies and organizations. Consistent perspective and input to JJAC deliberations has come from the Minnesota Corrections Association (MCA) with Travis Gransee serving as a JJAC Ex Officio member, the Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties (MACCAC) with Nicole Kern as the Ex Officio member and the Minnesota Association of Correction Parole Officers (MACPO) with Jim Schneider traveling across the state to make sure MACPO views are included.

JJAC PARTNER UPDATES:

Ongoing Partnership with the Department of Corrections Inspection Unit

The Minnesota Office of Justice Programs in the Minnesota Department of Public Safety is the state administrative agency where JJAC is housed. Staff was successful in renewing the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Minnesota Department of Corrections Inspection Unit for inspections of juvenile facilities and secure jails and lockups through 2017. The Compliance Monitor and the DOC Inspection Unit work closely together to guarantee that MN's required inspections are completed each year.

DOC Inspection Unit - Tim Thompson:

Minnesota continues its status of being in compliance with the OJJDP Act's four core requirements, specifically De-institutionalization of Status Offenders, Sight and Sound Separation of Juveniles from Adult Offenders and Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups. The MOU guarantees that DOC Inspectors will inspect juvenile facilities or those facilities where juveniles are held temporarily following the tenets of the JJDP Act.

The federal requirements require annual or triennial inspections of facilities across the state to guarantee the core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act are met. In 2015, the responsibility to inspect facilities continued to be divided between the Minnesota Office of Justice Programs' Compliance Monitor and the

Minnesota DOC Corrections Inspection Unit. Specifically The DOC Inspection Unit inspects county jails and secure juvenile facilities. DOC inspectors who conduct inspections include: Timothy Thompson (Manager), Teresa Smith (Management Analyst), and Inspectors Lisa Cain Becking, Greg Croucher, Diane Grinde, Sarah Johnson and Julie Snyder. Due to staffing changes in the year 2016, the Inspection Unit will be hiring and training a new Inspector. Ms. Diane Grinde is no longer with the Inspection and Enforcement Unit, and it is anticipated that her replacement will be hired during the first quarter of 2016. In addition, Callie Aguilar has replaced Carrie Wasley as the JJDP Act Compliance Monitor who also serves JJAC as the Juvenile Justice Specialist for Minnesota.

Minnesota Association of County Probation Officers (MACPO) – Jim Schneider:

Minnesota Association of County Probation Officers (MACPO) makes up 26 counties in the state of Minnesota. We support the philosophy that our juvenile system is designed as a rehabilitative one. MACPO partners with the DOC to deliver probation services in these counties.

All counties in Minnesota are having difficulties finding placements for children with severe mental health diagnoses. The combinations of mental health and delinquent type behavior have caused private vendors to refuse to admit these types of children. The question we raise is what has become of the state's role in facilitating the counties' needs? The reduction of state run facilities to accommodate these children is ever present.

MACPO continues to support outcome based programming for children placed in facilities across the state of Minnesota. There are still programs licensed in Minnesota that do not track measured outcomes when children leave their facility. We support evidenced based measurements for all children who are placed out of home to determine the effectiveness of the placement and reintegration.

MACPO supports the elimination of life without the possibility of parole for juveniles. Sentencing should be revised to life with possibility of parole after serving a minimum sentence. Review of the life sentence should be performed by the Commissioner of Corrections and be based on relevant factors including background and conduct during imprisonment. MACPO fully supports the JJAC proposal and further recommends these statutory changes "shall be applied retroactively to all individuals currently serving life sentences without parole for the applicable crimes committed when the individual was under the age of eighteen years".

MACPO supports Minnesota convicted felony offenders who live in our communities be allowed to vote. We believe it is an avenue to increase positive engagement for offenders who are making better choices to engage their communities. We also support increasing community supervision infrastructure and enhanced funding as an alternative to prison expansion. Having offenders being supervised by a probation officer in the community is a more effective way to facilitate change with people placed on supervision/parole.

YIPA – Paul Meunier:

At-risk youth are either going to be consumers of our public services or contributors to the common good as adults and it's fiscally prudent to intervene at an early age. A three year survey conducted by the Minnesota Office of Justice Programs indicates that 90% of youth involved in a Youth Intervention program do not have any further involvement with the juvenile justice system while enrolled in the program. In the eyes of many youth serving professionals, the current judicial system allows at-risk kids to fall through the cracks when communities could keep them out of the juvenile justice system. Furthermore, the Minnesota Sheriffs' Association, the Minnesota Chief of Police Association, the Minnesota County Attorneys Association and the

Minnesota Juvenile Officers Associations have all formally passed resolutions supporting Youth Intervention as a viable means to improving public safety. In 2015, Minnesota Youth Intervention Programs Association (YIPA) held six legislative summits throughout the state where state legislators, county commissioners, county attorneys and county staff, city council members, mayors and city staff, police chiefs and sheriffs, as well as Youth Intervention professionals came together to discuss the broad support for community based Youth Intervention programs.

Minnesota Corrections Association (MCA) – Mark Bliven:

MCA supports JJACs Recommendation regarding imposition of Life Without Parole sentences on juvenile offenders.

Juvenile Predatory Offender Registration: MCA supports amending current predatory offender registration laws for juveniles in order to increase public safety while maximizing rehabilitative interventions that decrease recidivism.

Public safety is enhanced when the system is responsive to the specific risk and needs of offenders. Immediate public safety is enhanced when high risk offenders are under supervision, when their whereabouts are known, and authorities are able to track them. Long term public safety is enhanced when offenders can be treated, rehabilitated, and effectively transitioned to productive pro-social lives. In reviewing Minnesota's current laws regarding adolescent predatory offender registration, there is need for revision.

Under Minnesota law, juveniles are required to register as a predatory offender if they are adjudicated delinquent of committing an offense as outlined in Minn. Stat. 243.166. This casts a wide net and does not allow for managing offenders according to risk and public safety. Currently, attorneys and judges in multiple jurisdictions are reluctant to adjudicate some juveniles as delinquent in cases that require registration and instead are offering stays of adjudication or continuances for dismissal.

These strategies result in avoiding registration, create inconsistencies in prosecution, and limit the length of probation supervision and rehabilitative interventions thereby reducing public safety. Additionally, the statutes do not offer any legal criteria for the court regarding who should be registered as a predatory offender. The lack of legal criteria results in many jurisdictions responding differently to the same public safety risk. Lastly, Minnesota does not differentiate a juvenile in any way from

an adult when requiring predatory offender registration. This mandate runs contrary to the purposeful differences appropriately created between the delinquency and criminal court systems.

Minnesota is one of twelve states that require juveniles to register as predatory offenders without legal criteria to guide the courts. Finally, Minnesota is one of seven states that requires adjudicated juveniles to register as predatory offenders, does not provide registration criteria, and has no differences between offenses requiring registration for adults and juveniles. Based on these findings it would appear that MN law regarding predatory offender registration of juveniles should be amended. The amendments proposed would increase public safety by maximizing rehabilitative interventions that decrease recidivism.

Recommended Strategy: Amend Minnesota statutes to provide legal criteria for the court to consider in determining if a juvenile adjudicated delinquent for a predatory offense should be required to register. This change would increase public safety while also creating more consistent prosecution and judicial decision making across jurisdictions. Public safety would also be greatly enhanced by providing longer periods of probation supervision and allow sufficient time to complete sex offense specific treatment and other rehabilitative interventions. Consistency could be increased as the proposed amendments would address some of the current reluctance to adjudicate juveniles delinquent of these offenses.

MCA - Juvenile Justice 21

In 2012, the JJAC Disproportionate Minority Contact Committee sponsored a survey to be conducted within each of the ten judicial districts. The ten judicial districts were chosen as an inclusive state-wide structure to ascertain what was happening in juvenile justice in each district thus creating a snapshot of the whole state. Out of this foundation, JJAC funded the Minnesota Corrections Association (MCA) to host forums in each of the districts to further delineate what is going on in each district within the juvenile justice process and potential necessary reform.

MCA contracted with Mark Haase who devised the forum structure and presented the state of juvenile justice at each forum using the same structure and content thereby establishing a similar sounding board for local juvenile justice professionals to come together and discuss the current state of Minnesota's juvenile justice system and possible needed reforms. Attendees and other professionals throughout the state also received a detailed survey regarding juvenile justice reform. A final report of the project including recommendations will be made available on the JJAC website: dps.mn.gov/entity/jjac.

Juvenile Justice 21 – Mark Haase:

Since launching Juvenile Justice 21 (JJ21), we have convened juvenile justice professionals throughout the state through a research and literature review, implemented surveys, and hosted 10 forums throughout the state to identify issues and do some problem solving. The outcomes are included in a report that can be found on the MCA-MN website. Forum attendees reported a widespread lack of opportunity for different stakeholders to come together throughout the state and felt doing so regularly would be advantageous. We collected valuable feedback on specific policy changes in order to identify areas of concern. We produced the following series of recommendations:

- Increase involvement and support for families in the juvenile delinquency system
- Provide adequate juvenile diversion and alternatives to detention
- Improve and expand juvenile mental health and chemical dependency diagnosis
- Enhance collaboration and training with schools to better coordinate appropriate responses to behavior
- Support collaboration between the juvenile delinquency and child welfare systems
- Reform statewide policies that treat juvenile delinquency records like adult records and specific collateral consequences

Moving forward, the JJ21 team would like to focus strategically on each of those six issue areas, one or two per year for a number of years. Plans include information gathering via interviews and research, convening one or more forums to dig deeper into the issues, do some surveying, and reporting our findings. The intended outcome is to educate people more about specific issue

areas, share best and promising practices, support increased collaboration between system stakeholders, possibly develop policies, solutions or recommendations, produce a report and create a toolkit for each of these specific areas.

Mental health served as a major theme of the Juvenile Justice 21 project. We examined the drivers in the need for mental health services, state policy changes that have reduced treatment options, and the body of resources and training available to providers. At every angle, we are hearing mental health treatment is inadequate. The State's attempt to reform our mental health systems for juveniles and adults has proven inadequate. There just simply are not beds for the people struggling with difficult mental health issues. We are identifying that kids have more mental health needs than ever before and we don't have the facilities to treat those kids because of legislative cuts. This issue is present at all levels of the systems. Anoka is at capacity. There are people who don't need to be there, but the transition and community beds for those people to go are not there. The criminalization of mental health problems will continue to result in collateral lifelong consequences.

In developing legislative agendas, we must think holistically and have critical conversations involving comprehensive analyses of youth. Some jurisdictions uphold a Cross-Over Youth Model, which helps youth succeed and allows for increased information-sharing between key stakeholders, including mental health case workers who advocate for the young person by helping them avoid a criminal charge, when possible. We need to see the Cross-Over Youth Model or the PEW model go statewide.

Minnesota Association of Community Corrections Act Counties (MACCAC) – Ryan Erdmann:

MACCAC requests that Community Corrections funding from the state must be significantly increased and that the state maximize funding for community supervision rather than invest in new prison beds. Statewide funding for community supervision has not kept pace at the level required to provide progressive, effective correctional practices proven by research to keep incarceration rates low, reduce recidivism, and increase public safety. Effective supervision and offender programming in the community play a vital role in reducing prison growth, while producing preferable offender outcomes. MACCAC supports:

-MACCAC supports the expansion of CCA counties with full and ongoing state funding. MACCAC supports the removal of systemic or statutory requirements that act as barriers to counties in choosing the correctional delivery system that best meets their individual needs.

-MACCAC supports legislation that takes a strong statewide approach to sex offender supervision by effectively monitoring overall behavior and activities of offenders, rather than simply restricting where they reside.

-MACCAC recommends that the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines be reviewed relative to current sentencing practices and any potential changes that may be made to address prison overcrowding.

-MACCAC supports the development and implementation of comprehensive initiatives and expanded transitional housing to assist juvenile and adult offenders' reintegration back into their communities and reduce recidivism and its public costs.

-MACCAC supports revised juvenile sex offender registration requirements that focus on the appropriate group of the most serious offenders.

-MACCAC supports legislation to provide a continuum of effective mental health services for offenders suffering from mental health issues and increased state funding for implementation of the continuum of mental health services available to offenders at the local community level.

-If an alcohol impact fee is approved, MACCAC supports allocation of these funds in the health and public safety areas most impacted by costs related to alcohol and other drug abuse (including prescription and over-the-counter drugs) as well as alcohol and drug-related injuries. Additional state funding is needed in key areas of probation supervision and chemical dependency prevention, screening, treatment and aftercare services.

-MACCAC supports ongoing efforts to treat victims of human trafficking with trauma specific and trauma sensitive services rather than subjecting them to the criminal justice system.

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative – Curtis Shanklin

The Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) expanded the reform model to Rice County in 2015 with financial support from JJAC and the Minnesota State Legislature. Rice County represents our first expansion to a jurisdiction that does not have its own juvenile detention center and one that is primarily rural. Based on the success achieved in existing sites, JDAI also received additional funding from the Minnesota State Legislature in the amount of \$600,000 to support further JDAI expansion in the state. In 2016, JDAI will expand to two additional sites while continuing to work with the existing sites to achieve outcomes and further institutionalize the system reforms implemented.

Hennepin County Girls Service Coordinator

– Kristi Cobbs:

My role as the Girls Service Coordinator with Hennepin County is really looking at helping Human Services as well as our Department of Corrections in how we can improve services for girls. As part of that role, I am the co-chair of the Department of Corrections' (DOC) Girls Collaborative, which is a network of community-based agencies that come together monthly at the DOC to talk about promising and best practices for girls, what's working across the state and what's not working. For helpful information about this issue, visit The Sexual Abuse to Prison Pipeline website: http://www.law.georgetown.edu/academics/centers-institutes/poverty-inequality/upload/2015_cop_sexual-abuse_layout_web-2.pdf

The resources provided via this link do a really good job of describing who the girls are in the juvenile justice system and what some of the best practices are for working with this population. The number of youth in the juvenile justice system has steadily declined in large part to Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) over the last few years, but girls have not been a part of the decline. The proportion of girls detained continues to increase and the number of racial and ethnic disparities amongst girls in the juvenile justice system is stark. Girls of color are detained and sent to residential placement at higher proportions than their Caucasian counterparts.

Some of the recommendations that I would have and that would look for support from JJAC would be:

- Support of the reauthorization of the JJDP Act. Specifically looking at the valid court order exception, the loophole in the system that allows judges to lock up status offenders who are running away or not following court orders. The VCO really exacerbates the disparity for parole in the system.
- Have at least one state advisory group member to have expertise on gender specific issues such as sexual abuse and domestic child sex trafficking because those are the issues that we mainly see involved with girls in the juvenile justice system.
- Have states be required to have validated and comprehensive standard trauma screening and assessment tools for youth entering the system.
- Look at data collection; overall nationally we don't do a great job of collecting data on girls that that's disseminated by race and ethnicity.
- Providing comprehensive reproductive health care for system involved youth, based on this report we know that a large number of girls come into the system with sexual abuse histories and our systems do a really inadequate job of expressing what sort of sexual health trauma these girls have had and what sort of things can help them better take care of themselves. Because we don't have routine healthcare screens specifically designed for girls we sometimes miss things that can have long term impacts on their reproductive health.

I believe that sexual trauma and sexual victimization for girls involved in the system is a unique predictor of recidivism. Girls who go into programs are at most risk when they transfer out of a program. Intentional aftercare services that really address the healthcare needs of these girls is important; research has indicated that treating girls health holistically has positive impacts on reducing recidivism. Additionally, viewing sexually exploited youth as victims and survivors of a crime rather than criminals can greatly impact how we reframe this issue. We will continue our tireless work on prevention of sexual exploitation.

Citizen's Council on Crime & Justice/2nd Chance – Perry Moriearty, U of M & Josh Esmay:

Council on Crime and Justice is continuing work from last year on a Voting Rights Restoration Initiative which allows people to have their voting rights returned to them as soon as they are no longer in custody and drug sentencing reform to address issues around prison space. We are looking closely at our State's drug sentencing laws, as compared to many other states and the federal system, they are uncommonly harsh and include long sentencing periods, as well as eliminating mandatory prison sentences for repeat offenders and changing the threshold weight amounts that are required to trigger the higher level drug offenses, thereby reducing the number of people who will be charged with those higher level offenses. The Council will also continue to work on and support the package of Juvenile Justice reforms that it brought last year, including:

- A change to one word in the purpose clause of the juvenile code, to emphasize the rehabilitative nature of the juvenile justice system by recognizing that it is in the interest of public safety to reduce juvenile recidivism.
- Create language specifically authorizing police departments to create juvenile diversion programs. By creating specific statutory language authorizing those diversion programs more police departments would be willing to take that step.
- Create some discretion for district court judges when juveniles are facing mandatory minimum sentences after being certified into adult court (a special exception from the mandatory minimum for juvenile certification cases).
- Per JJAC's proposal, eliminate Juvenile Life without Parole; replace with 20 years to life in prison; have it apply retroactively (retroactivity is likely to have significant opposition)
- End indiscriminate shackling of juveniles when they are brought into court; require a judicial finding that there is a courtroom safety or a flight risk reason for juveniles to be shackled.

We need to have a conversation more broadly on where we have been with these initiatives in the last two years and what opposition there is and where there are places to compromise. The package of changes was heard and passed through the Senate judiciary committee in 2015, was included in the judiciary omnibus bill that made it to the Senate floor, and passed. Unfortunately, that is as far as it got. We did not receive a hearing at any point in the House. The most significant piece of opposition was from the County Attorney's Association. We have been working really hard as a group to come to a compromise with them and I think we do have a potential path to a compromise.

The major point of compromise on Juvenile Life without Parole would likely be retroactivity. We would leave that for the courts to decide. The other point of compromise would be the number of years before we look at parole. The number would likely be 20-25. Legislatively, there are 29 states in our situation. Approximately, 15-17 states have done something. About 7 states have abolished juvenile Life without Parole outright. Some have replaced it with something still pretty stringent, like 35 to 40 to Life at first look. Other states have not abolished it, but are looking at somewhere between 25 to Life. Other states have been much more progressive - somewhere between 12-15 years. It's important to note that these numbers mean first look at review, not release

Children's Hospital and Clinics of Minnesota

- Laurel Edinburgh:

Many LGBT youth experience victimization due to their sexual orientation or gender identity in school, home and community settings. A high proportion of LGBT youth are leaving home due to family conflict and rejection of their orientation or gender identity. LGBT youth are also at higher risk for abuse than heterosexual teens, and then further marginalization in residential or community settings. They often face more stigma than their heterosexual peers and further social marginalization in residential or community treatment programs that are unprepared to help LGBT youth feel safe exploring and disclosing their emerging identities. Juvenile justice professionals need policies and practices governing the care of LGBT youth in community treatment programs and in out of home placements.

Minnesota Department of Health's Safe Harbor Initiative – Lauren Ryan:

Sex trafficking and exploitation involves individuals receiving anything of value from the sexual exploitation of others, often resulting in brutal sexual assaults and devastating physical and psychological injuries. The Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) defines commercial sexual exploitation of juveniles as when someone under the age of 18 engages in a commercial sexual activity. A commercial sexual activity occurs when anything of value or promise of anything of value (e.g. money, drugs, food, shelter, rent or higher status in a gang) is given to a person by any means in exchange for any type of sexual activity. A third party, traditionally thought of as a trafficker or pimp, may or may not be involved.

Numbers and statistics on sex trafficking are very difficult to ascertain, given the clandestine nature of the crime and lack of victim identification. Yet the state does possess some limited data. Minnesota's Office of Justice Program (OJP) produces a Human Trafficking Report every two years to the legislature. According to the 2014 report, online surveys were completed by 99 service providers and 187 law enforcement officers across the state. Service providers reported working with 35 adult males, 202 adult females, 35 juvenile males and 119 juvenile female sex-trafficking victims during 2013. Additionally, according to the Safe Harbor First Year Evaluation report, over 150 sexually exploited youth were identified and provided with a variety of services in 2014. To reiterate, these

data are an under-representation of the extent of sex-trafficking in Minnesota as they only capture information about persons who contacted service providers.

People from various backgrounds are vulnerable to sex trafficking and exploitation, though it primarily affects women and girls. Both adults and juveniles are affected with research suggesting the average age of exploitation for juveniles is 13-14. Being young, in and of itself can be a risk or vulnerability for exploitation, in addition youth that are homeless or frequently runaway; whom have experienced neglect, domestic or sexual violence; lack positive social support systems; and youth that know a peer or family member whom is being exploited or involved in prostitution can be at-risk for trafficking and exploitation. However, Minnesota has learned these risk factors are not conclusive, a youth may experience all of these factors and never be trafficked or experience none, yet be trafficked. The traffickers usually exploit youth for some sort of commercial gain and could be a youth's boyfriend/girlfriend, parent, family member, gang member, peer, or on-line acquaintance. Traffickers use control tactics to ensure youth compliance in the exploitation including psychological and emotional coercion, threats of physical harm to youth and family members, isolation, physical and sexual abuse, inducing or enabling chemical addiction and financial control and dependence. Cont. on pg 15

In 2011, the state legislature passed Safe Harbor for Sexually Exploited Youth legislation, decriminalizing juveniles who engage in prostitution and adding sexually exploited youth to the child protection/welfare statutes. Youth who experience sexual exploitation and trafficking are victims of a crime, not criminals to be punished. This legislation also ordered the development of a service response model. In 2013, the Office of Justice Programs at Department of Public Safety (DPS) released No Wrong Door Report: A Comprehensive Approach to Safe Harbor for Minnesota's Sexually Exploited Youth, outlining recommendations for funding a statewide service and training model, not only identify sexually exploited youth, but also to provide youth with victim-centered, age appropriate, survivor-led, culturally responsive and trauma-informed services.

The State of Minnesota has invested over 8 million dollars in the development of No Wrong Door, which is tremendous step but falls short of fully funding the model at 13.5 million. Thus far three state agencies have received funding, including the Departments of Health (MDH), Human Services (DHS) and Public Safety (DPS). The MDH houses the statewide director who is responsible for implementation and coordination of statewide efforts of No Wrong Door. Currently, the MDH manages 10 grants to county, tribal and community agencies for Regional Navigators, who connect youth to appropriate services, amongst several other tasks. In addition, the MDH has 13 grantees providing a range of specialized services (legal, mental health, advocacy) for exploited youth across the state. In the last legislative session, the MDH received funding to implement Safe Harbor protocols and house a Safe Harbor training Coordinator. The DHS has 6 housing and shelter grantees, which provide a spectrum of shelter, transitional, and foster care options specifically for exploited youth in the state. And the Ramsey County Attorney's Office (RCAO), through the DPS funding, has trained thousands of front line police officers, investigators and prosecutors throughout the state. Additionally, RCOA in collaboration with the Minnesota Coalition against Sexual Assault has developed and in 2016 will release Safe Harbor

model protocols. These protocols give guidance, including best practices to multiple disciplines - highlighting complex issues for consideration, such as the use of locked facilities for exploited youth, to assist communities and regions develop their own customized protocols.

Minnesota is a national leader on implementing a statewide response for sexually exploited youth as dedicated stakeholders, professionals, grantees and community members have made outstanding contributions to the success and awareness of the trafficking and No Wrong Door. Yet, there is much work to be done. The crime of trafficking and exploitation is hidden, dark, violent and unfortunately widespread. Therefore the response, including systems and community services has to be vast, navigating the complex needs of individuals who have been repeatedly traumatized and brainwashed. We continue needing the engagement and contributions of all involvement to improve and strengthen our response.

For more information regarding Safe Harbor: No Wrong Door, the partners involved across the state, and how to refer a youth for services, please see the MDH's Safe Harbor website at <http://www.health.state.mn.us/injury/topic/safeharbor/>

SOURCES: Sex Trafficking Needs Assessment for the State of Minnesota, The Advocates for Human Rights, Mpls., 2008.

Human Trafficking in Minnesota, Report to the Minnesota Legislature, Minnesota Office of Justice Programs and Minnesota Statistical Analysis Center, 2014.

No Wrong Door: Providing Safe Harbor for Minnesota's Sexually Exploited Youth, Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Office of Justice Programs, 2013.

Safe Harbor First Year Evaluation, Wilder Foundation, 2015.

Minnesota Youth Demographics and Juvenile Justice System Involvement

Each year, the Juvenile Justice Analyst reports on the demographics of Minnesota's youth population and youth involved in the justice system. These data are to comply with the JJDP Act and support data-driven practices. The following section contains a summary of these data.

Minnesota Youth Population¹

Youth under age 18 presently account for approximately 1.28 million of Minnesota's 5.5 million residents (Table 1). The overall population of Minnesota rose between 2010 and 2014 (2.9%) while the number of youth under age 18 declined slightly (-0.1%). Presently, youth account for 23.5 percent of Minnesota's population. The number of youth ages 10-to-17 who, by Minnesota statute, can potentially enter the juvenile justice system is fundamentally the same in 2014 as it was in 2010.

Population	2010	2014	Numeric Change	Percent Change
Total MN Population	5,303,925	5,457,173	+ 153,248	+ 2.9%
MN Population Under Age 18	1,282,693	1,281,826	- 867	- 0.1%
Population Ages 10-17	572,472	571,681	- 791	- 0.001%
Youth as a Percentage of Total Population	24.2%	23.5%	-0.7%	- 2.9%

Racial and Ethnic Representation

Table 2 illustrates that Minnesota's youth population is more racially and ethnically diverse than the state population as a whole. 2014 population estimates show that more than one-quarter (26.4%) of all Minnesota youth under age 18 represent racial or ethnic minority groups. This is true of 17.5 percent of the state population as a whole. In the youth population, African Americans and Hispanics are the most populous minority groups in the state (9.8% Black or African American alone vs. 8.5% Hispanic of any race).

Race and Hispanic Ethnicity, 2014	Minnesota's Overall Population	Minnesota's Adult Population (over 18)	Minnesota's Youth Population (under 18)
Caucasian, non-Hispanic	82.5%	85.2%	73.6%
American Indian, non-Hispanic	1.2%	1.1%	1.7%
Asian, non-Hispanic	4.9%	4.5%	6.3%
Black or African American, non-Hispanic	6.3%	5.2%	9.8%
Hispanic (any race)	5.1%	4.0%	8.5%
Total Minority Population	17.5%	14.8%	26.4%



¹ Puzzanchera, C., Sladky, A. and Kang, W. (2014). Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2014. Online. Available at <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/>

Youth Contact with the Juvenile Justice System

2014 Arrests²

In 2014 there were a total of 152,470 arrests, of which juveniles accounted for 23,800. Juveniles, as a percentage of total arrests, have slowly declined from 26 percent in the year 2000 to 16 percent in 2014.

Just under three-in-10 juvenile arrests (27%) fall within the Part I offense category for the most serious person and property crimes.³ The majority of all juvenile arrests are for Part II offenses (64%), which are typically less serious person and property offenses, including liquor law violations. Arrests for the Status Offenses of Curfew/Loitering and Runaway make up the smallest percentage of juvenile arrests at 9 percent.⁴



Arrests by Gender

Since 2004, males have consistently accounted for about two-thirds of juvenile arrests. In 2013 and 2014, male arrests were a bit higher at 68 percent. In 2014, more males than females were arrested for Part I offenses (64% vs. 36%) and for Part II offenses (70% vs. 30%). While more males than females were arrested in 2014 for the status offenses of Curfew or Loitering (72% vs. 28%), arrests for the offense of Runaway involved more females than males (54% vs. 46%). Runaway is the only UCR arrest category for which females are often arrested in greater numbers than males.

² While the term “arrest” is used to describe juveniles in the Minnesota Crime Information Report, the term used in the juvenile justice system to describe the detaining or citing of juvenile offenders is “apprehension.” All juvenile arrest data included in this report are taken from the *Uniform Crime Report 2014*, published by the Minnesota Department of Public Safety Bureau of Criminal Apprehension. Available at <https://dps.mn.gov/divisions/bca/bca-divisions/mnjis/Documents/2014-MN-Crime-Book.pdf>



³ Information regarding offenses categorized by the FBI can be found at the website for the *2013 Crime in the United States* report. <https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/cius-home>

⁴ Curfew/Loitering and Runaway are the only status offenses counted for federal UCR reporting requirements. Other status offenses, such as underage consumption of alcohol, are counted in other UCR categories such as “liquor laws.” Law enforcement agencies are not required to report truancy to the BCA for federal UCR reporting.




Arrests by Race/Ethnicity

Within each arrest category (Part I, Part II and Status Offenses), unique racial distributions exist. While Hispanic ethnicity data is collected for the UCR, it is not currently published on juveniles. As such, youth of Hispanic ethnicity are included in the four primary racial categories reported. The racial category “Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander” is not collected separately and is included with data on Asian youth.

Caucasian youth, the majority of the Minnesota youth population (74%), represent the majority of 2014 arrests for Part I and Part II crimes (53% and 63%, respectively). When it comes to arrests for status offenses, however, Caucasian youth constitute just 42 percent of arrests.



Youth of color are over-represented compared to their percentage within the total juvenile population in all arrest categories, especially for the status level offenses of Curfew/Loitering and Runaway. Specifically, African American youth represent six-in-ten arrests for Curfew/Loitering (60%) and nearly four-in-ten arrests (37%) for Runaway.




Since the electronic publication of UCR data in 1997, the number of juvenile arrests has dramatically decreased from approximately 79,000 to 27,000. During this time, youth from communities of color as a percentage of total juvenile arrests have generally been

rising. In 1997, youth of color accounted for less than one-quarter of juvenile arrests (23%); in 2014, youth of color accounted for 42 percent of all juvenile arrests.

Cases Petitioned and Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings⁵

According to data compiled by the State Court Administrator’s Office, there were 14,146 delinquency petitions filed in 2013.⁶ Delinquency petitions include felony, gross misdemeanor and misdemeanor level charges. They do not include charges for petty misdemeanors or the status offenses of Curfew/Loitering or Runaway. In 2013, Caucasian youth accounted for 38 percent of all delinquency petitions filed where race is known. Youth of color as a whole in Minnesota are just over one-quarter of all youth (26%) but are 50 percent of delinquency petitions where race is known. Race is unknown in 12 percent of juvenile delinquency petitions.



District courts in 2013 yielded 4,870 cases resulting in delinquent findings. Caucasian youth are the greatest percentage of youth found delinquent (34% of all delinquency findings) followed by African American youth (33%), Hispanic youth (9%); American Indian youth (8%); “Other” or Mixed Race youth (6%); and Asian youth (2%). Race was not known in 8 percent of cases resulting in delinquent findings. As a whole, youth of color constitute 58 percent of delinquent findings in cases where race is known.



⁵ Juvenile case filing and disposition data provided by the Minnesota State Court Administrator’s Office, upon request.

⁶ 2013 court data are the most recent available with race information.

Youth in Secure Facilities

2013 juvenile admissions⁷ reported by the Minnesota Department of Corrections and select individual facilities document 8,165 secure juvenile detention events and 1,592 secure post-disposition juvenile placement events.⁸ These are not a count of individuals, rather events, as the same youth can be admitted to detention or placement multiple times in a calendar year. Additionally, youth can move from detention to post-disposition placement which will be counted as two separate admissions.

Statewide, youth of color account for over half of secure detention admissions (58%) and half of secure placement admissions following disposition (50%). Based on their percentage of the youth population (<2%), American Indians are most overrepresented in secure facilities (13% detention admissions and 11% post-disposition placements).



⁷ 2013 admissions data are the most recent available with race information.



⁸ These data are collected for the purpose of Minnesota's Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) reporting.

⁹ Minnesota Department of Corrections. (2015). *2014 Probation Survey*. Available at http://www.doc.state.mn.us/pages/files/7014/3526/2447/2014_Probation_Survey.pdf

Youth on Probation⁹

In 2014, there were 6,876 youth under probation supervision at year's end in Minnesota, accounting for 7 percent of all Minnesota probationers. The number of youth on probation has generally been declining since a peak of 17,460 in 2002. In 2014, males accounted for 74 percent of the juvenile probation population; females 26 percent.

Like arrests, the percentage of youth of color on probation has been rising while the number of youth on probation has been declining. Caucasian youth were two-thirds of probationers in 2002 (67%) but were closer to half in 2014 (51%). In Minnesota, the greatest percentage of youth are on probation for Status/Miscellaneous Offenses (13%), followed by theft (13%) and assault (13%).



JJDPA Core Compliance Requirements:

Data provided by the Minnesota Department of Corrections for Compliance Monitoring purposes indicates that 1,937 juveniles were securely held in adult jails or police lock-ups across the state in 2014. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) limits the holding of youth accused of delinquency to six hours in jails and police lock-ups in Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs). Youth requiring longer detention must be transferred to an appropriate juvenile facility. The JJDP prohibits the secure holding of status offenders for any length of time in adult facilities and limits holding in juvenile facilities to 24 hours. All juveniles are prohibited from having sight or sound contact with adult inmates in any secure setting.

Because much of greater Minnesota is rural, state statute allows for juvenile holds of up to 24 hours in adult facilities outside of MSAs. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) allows a Rural Removal Exception (RRE) for these facilities as well. In 2014, Minnesota had RREs for 53 county jails in greater Minnesota. The holding of status offenders in adult facilities is always prohibited under the JJDP.

Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO)

2014 admissions data show [74](#) instances where status offenders were detained in Minnesota's secure juvenile facilities in excess of the allowable federal time limits. Many of these holds met state criteria in terms of permissibility, but not federal requirements. In addition, facility inspections completed in 2014 revealed [six](#) instances where status offenders were admitted to a secure police or jail facility. [These 80 records resulted in an adjusted DSO violation rate of 6.23 per 100,000 youth under 18.](#) States with a DSO rate between 5.7 and 17.6 may be found in compliance provided they submit a detailed plan to address and reduce future DSO violations. Minnesota complied with this federal requirement.

Sight and Sound Separation

Facility audits completed by Minnesota's Compliance Monitor and the Department of Corrections' Inspection and Enforcement Unit resulted in no violations of the Sight and Sound Separation requirement. No violations of the Sight and Sound requirement were reported to the OJJDP in 2014.

Jail Removal

Of the 1,937 juvenile admissions to adult jails and lock-ups in 2014, 286 were found to be held in excess of the allowable six hours. However, 280 of these holds were allowable up to 24 hours with the Rural Removal Exception in place. Minnesota reported six Jail Removal violations resulting in an adjusted Jail Removal violation rate of 0.93 per 100,000 youth. States with a Jail Removal Rate under 9.0 are eligible for federal compliance.

Disproportionate Minority Contact¹⁰

Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) is measured using a Relative Rate Index (RRI) that compares outcomes for youth of color at various stages in the juvenile justice system to the outcomes of White youth at the same stage. In order to be analyzed using the RRI, a population must represent at least one percent of the total population at each stage in the system. In reading the following RRI matrix, a calculation of 1.0 means the outcomes for both White youth and minority group youth were the same. Calculations above 1.00 indicate overrepresentation, while RRIs below 1.00 indicate underrepresentation.

RRI data collected for calendar year 2013 demonstrates significant disparities in juvenile justice system outcomes both between White youth and minority youth, and between minority groups themselves.¹¹ The greatest disparities occur in Minnesota at the point of arrest where African American youth are more than five times more likely to be arrested (5.78) and American Indian youth are more than three times more likely to be arrested (3.32) than White youth.

A second highly disparate stage occurs immediately following arrest with admission to secure detention facilities, including adult jails and police lock-ups. American Indian youth are over four and one-half times more likely to be securely detained following an arrest as White youth (4.62) and Asian and Hispanic youth are more than one and one-half times more likely to be securely detained following an arrest than White youth (1.61 and 1.69, respectively).

Cases resulting in delinquent findings have the lowest levels of disparity across racial groups in Minnesota ranging from 0.91 to 1.43. Following case disposition, minority youth overall are less likely than White youth to receive probation supervision in the community (0.52) or placement in secure correctional settings (0.63). American Indian youth are twice as likely to have their case transferred to adult court (Certification) than White youth (2.05).

¹⁰ The DMC section uses the terms “White youth” and “minority youth” consistent with federal DMC data collection and reporting terminology.

Relative Rate Index (DMC)

Relative Rate Index Compared with : White								
State of Minnesota CY 2013	White	Black or African- American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders	American Indian or Alaska Native	Other/ Mixed	All Minorities
	2. Juvenile Arrests	1.00	5.78	1.10	0.40	*	3.32	*
3. Refer to Juvenile Court	**	**	**	**	*	**	*	**
4. Cases Diverted	**	**	**	**	*	**	*	**
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	1.00	1.23	1.69	1.61	*	4.62	*	1.60
6. Cases Petitioned	1.00	1.09	1.79	1.53	*	2.36	*	1.45
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	1.00	1.31	1.33	0.91	*	1.43	*	1.29
8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	1.00	0.54	0.64	0.72	*	0.64	*	0.52
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure	1.00	0.57	0.90	0.63	*	1.02	*	0.63
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	1.00	1.38	1.50	**	*	2.05	*	1.46
Group meets 1% threshold?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Key:								
Statistically significant results:			Bold font					
Results that are not statistically significant			Regular font					
Group is less than 1% of the youth population			*					
Insufficient number of cases for analysis			**					
Missing data for some element of calculation			---					

US Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Allocations to Minnesota by Fiscal Year: 2004-2015

Federal Fiscal Year	Amount	Percentage Change per year
2004	\$3,916,600	- 25%
2005	\$2,197,085	- 44%
2006	\$1,683,550	- 23%
2007	\$1,722,489	+ 2%
2008	\$1,674,760	- 3%
2009	\$1,841,786	+ 10%
2010	\$1,814,245	- 1%
2011	\$1,441,803	-20.5%
2012	\$836,490	- 42%
2013	\$753,720	-9.9%
2014	\$634,699	-15.8%
2015	\$630,804	-0.61%
Title II: Formula Grants		
2004	\$1,060,000	- 10%
2005	\$1,104,000	+ 4%
2006	\$932,000	- 16%
2007	\$962,000	+ 3%
2008	\$893,000	- 7%
2009	\$977,000	+ 9%
2010	\$934,000	- 4%
2011	\$769,114	- 17%
2012	\$455,587	- 40.8%
2013	\$461,583	+1.3%
2014	\$621,559	+34.7%
2014 PREA*	\$13,140	n/a
2015	\$630,804	+1.49%
Title V: Community Delinquency Prevention		
2004	\$0	NA
2005	\$246,000	NA
2006	\$56,250	- 77%
2007	\$75,250	+ 34%
2008	\$48,360	- 36%
2009	\$33,486	- 31%
2010	\$84,945	+ 154%
2011-Ended	\$50,000	- 41.1%
Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG)		
2004	\$2,644,600	- 23%
2005	\$847,085	- 68%
2006	\$695,300	- 18%
2007	\$685,239	- 1%
2008	\$733,400	+ 7%
2009	\$831,300	+ 13%
2010	\$795,300	- 4%
2011	\$622,689	- 21.7%
2012	\$380,903	-38.8%
2013 Ended	\$292,137	-23.3%

This amount represents the 5% penalty for Minnesota's 2014 non-compliance with the Prison Rape Elimination Act.

Note: The high point in OJJDP allocations to the states was in 2002. MN's total allocation that year was \$6,152,300. The decrease from that year is at 90%. However, all compliance mandates are still in effect.

2015 JJAC Grants:

Title II

Beltrami Area Service Collaborative (Bemidji)
Children's Health Care (Minneapolis)
Children's Hospital and Clinics of Minnesota (Minneapolis)
Evergreen Youth and Family Services (Bemidji)
Faribault Youth Services Center (Faribault)
Life Work Planning Mankato
Minneapolis American Indian Center (Minneapolis)
Minnesota Correctional Facility – Red Wing (Red Wing)
Opportunity Neighborhood (Saint Paul)
Resource, Inc. (Brooklyn Center)
Stearns County Human Services (St. Cloud)
Urban Boat Builders (Saint Paul)

Juvenile Accountability Block Grants

Anoka County Community Corrections (Anoka)
Carver County Court Services (Chaska)
Dakota County Community Corrections (Hastings)
Hennepin County (Minneapolis)
Martin County Corrections (Fairmont)
Minneapolis Health Department (Minneapolis)
Ramsey County Attorney's Office (Saint Paul)
Rice County Attorney's Office (Faribault)
Saint Paul Police Department (Saint Paul)
Wright County Human Services (Saint Cloud)

Featured on Front Cover:

***Upper right photo, left to right –
Nicole Kern, Shelley McBride, Scott Knight***

***Lower left photo, left to right –
Curtis Shanklin, Antonio Tejada, Greg Herzog,
Kathryn Richtman, Callie Aguilar, Richard Gardell, James Schneider,
Richard Smith, Michael Mayer, Freddie Davis-English, Kathy Halvorson***