



# EQUITY EFFORTS SURVEY RESULTS **REPORT**

March 2021



Indiana Criminal Justice Institute  
402 West Washington Street, Room #W469  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
317-232-1233  
[www.in.gov/cji](http://www.in.gov/cji)



Prepared by Meagan Brant, Research Manager

Edited by Christine Reynolds, Research & Planning Division Director  
Ben Gavelek, Communications Director  
Kaitlyn Christian, Research Associate  
Manpreet Kaur, Youth Equity Program Manager  
Renee White, Juvenile Compliance Monitor

Guided by a Board of Trustees representing all components of Indiana's criminal and juvenile justice systems, the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) serves as the state's planning agency for criminal justice, juvenile justice, traffic safety, and victim services. The ICJI develops long-range strategies for the effective administration of Indiana's criminal and juvenile justice systems and administers federal and state funds to carry out these strategies.

The ICJI also serves as Indiana's Statistical Analysis Center (SAC). The SAC's primary mission is compiling, analyzing, and disseminating data on a variety of criminal justice and public safety-related topics. The information produced by the SAC serves a vital role in effectively managing, planning, and creating policy for Indiana's many public service endeavors.

#### **Acknowledgments**

A big thanks to Steve Luce with the Indiana Sheriff's Association, Stephen Balko with the Indiana Department of Education, and Chase Lyday with the Indiana School Resource Officer's Association for connecting the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute with the participants of this survey. This report would not have been possible without the contributions of all juvenile judges, law enforcement professionals, probation officers, prosecutors, school resource officers, and school superintendents who participated in this survey. As professionals continue to assess the Indiana juvenile justice system through the lens of diversity, inclusion, and cultural competency, it is crucial that all stakeholders are involved in every step of the way. Thank you for serving our Hoosier youth and being dedicated to continuously creating a fair and equitable justice system.



# TABLE *of* CONTENTS



|                            |    |
|----------------------------|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY          | 4  |
| BACKGROUND                 | 5  |
| METHODOLOGY                | 6  |
| LIMITATIONS                | 7  |
| AGGREGATED SURVEY RESULTS  | 8  |
| SURVEY RESULTS BY POSITION | 12 |
| JUVENILE JUDGES            | 12 |
| LAW ENFORCEMENT            | 14 |
| PROBATION OFFICERS         | 17 |
| PROSECUTORS                | 19 |
| SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS   | 21 |
| SUPERINTENDENTS            | 24 |
| CONCLUSION                 | 27 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS            | 28 |



204

RESPONDENTS



86

COUNTIES

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Indiana Criminal Justice Institute distributed a survey to prominent juvenile justice stakeholders to better understand racial and ethnic disparities (RED) reduction efforts that are happening across the State of Indiana. There were 204 respondents to the survey representing 86 of Indiana’s 92 counties.

Respondents were generally somewhat confident in explaining and/or knowledgeable of what RED is, why Indiana collects and analyzes data pertaining to RED, and how it can be interpreted to inform RED reduction efforts. Overall, participants were the least confident in their ability to interpret data relative to other elements (defining RED, RED data collection, and RED data reporting). The average confidence/knowledge score across all positions was a 3.1 out of a possible 5. Prosecutors had the highest score (3.7), and school resource officers had the lowest score (2.4) relative to other positions.

Overall, respondents said that their agencies were most dedicated to diversity and inclusion in recruiting, hiring, retention, and promotion; holding management at all levels accountable to diversity and inclusion policies and procedures; and having a leadership-approved and supported diversity and inclusion policy. These held true across all positions. Reporting progress on diversity and inclusion measures and having a dedicated diversity and inclusion staff member were among the least selected items. Reporting was always in the bottom two no matter the position, however publishing information pertaining to the agency’s diversity and inclusion efforts fell beneath dedicated staff for juvenile judges, probation officers, and prosecutors. Providing diversity and inclusion education and training fell to the bottom two for superintendents. Additionally, there were only five respondents (2%) who claimed that their respective agencies were not participating in any of the outlined diversity and inclusion commitments.

When respondents were asked to select which RED reduction efforts their agency had undergone in the last five years, the top three selections were training/educating staff, ensuring data integrity, and assessment – all of which the Youth Equity Program Manager at the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute highly encourage. Even though “training/educating staff” was the most reported RED reduction effort, not many agencies mandate this training. When broken out by position, these top three RED reduction efforts were the same for juvenile judges, law enforcement professionals, and probation officers, but changed for prosecutors, school resource officers, and superintendents. They reported more hands-on efforts such as program implementation and community training. Seeking grant opportunities and applying for grants were among the least selected items, which held true across all positions.

Respondents were given the option to give a more detailed description of their RED reduction effort selections. They generally took this opportunity to describe



The focus of the fourth core requirement, racial and ethnic disparities, is to ensure equal and fair treatment for every youth in the juvenile justice system regardless of race or ethnicity.

their involvement with the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI); how they ensure RED data integrity and why that (and assessment, generally) is important for choosing the right programs to implement; what those implemented programs look like; and what trainings their staff are taking advantage of as they relate to diversity, inclusion, and cultural competency.

Finally, participants were asked how their respective agencies ensure that youth of color have the same access to services as their white youth counterparts. Most respondents indicated that their agencies work to ensure services are available for everyone, where often, they discussed exactly how this was happening. Agencies housing probation officers seem to be performing the best in this category relative to other positions, where agencies housing school resource officers may need some assistance.

## BACKGROUND

Signed into law by President Gerald Ford on September 7, 1974, and most recently reauthorized in 2018, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) is based on a broad consensus that children, youth, and families involved with the juvenile and criminal courts should be guarded by federal standards for care and custody, while also upholding the interests of community safety and the prevention of victimization. Reauthorization of the JJDPA took place in 2018 after more than 15 years of work on the part of advocates across the country.

The JJDPA charges the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) with the administration of the Title II, Part B, Formula Grants Program. As a part of their responsibilities under the program, OJJDP awards annual grants to participating states to support the development and implementation of programs to address juvenile delinquency and to improve the juvenile justice system. Every year, states must satisfy 28 state plan requirements described in section 223 of the JJDPA to receive the grant. Within the 28 requirements, 4 are deemed to be “core” because, by statute, OJJDP must reduce a state’s annual award by 20% for each requirement with which the state is out of compliance. The four core requirements are 1) the deinstitutionalization of status offenders, 2) jail removal, 3) sight and sound separation, and 4) racial and ethnic disparities. The focus of the 4<sup>th</sup> core requirement, racial and ethnic disparities (previously known as disproportionate minority contact or DMC), is to ensure equal and fair treatment for every youth in the juvenile justice system regardless of race and ethnicity.

Indiana is responsible for assessing and addressing both racial and ethnic disparities throughout the juvenile justice system. The Youth Equity Program Manager at the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute manages these responsibilities with guidance from the Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group (JJ SAG) and in

collaboration with key juvenile justice and school stakeholders. A strategic plan for reducing racial and ethnic disparities is revisited and implemented each year as part of the requirements of the federal grant. The goals laid out in this plan are informed by locally gathered data.

In 2016, Indiana enacted Administrative Rule 1 G requiring all of Indiana’s 92 counties to submit local data reflecting the number of cases within each decision point in the juvenile justice system (juvenile arrests, referral to juvenile court, diversion, secure detention, petitioned (charge filed), found delinquent, probation placement, secure confinement, and transferred to adult court) disaggregated by race and ethnicity. A submission portal was created – the Racial and Ethnic Disparities Application – in the Indiana Court Information Technology Extranet (INcite) where stakeholders made their first submission on October 1, 2016. Data is submitted on behalf of the county and approved by the judge on a quarterly basis, where each quarter’s report is cumulative (e.g., the first quarter reflects period 10/1-12/31, the second quarter reflects period 10/1-3/31, etc.).

Data is pulled from this application by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI), then analyzed. Researchers at the ICJI employ a singular bias measurement – the Relative Rate Index (RRI) – to help determine the magnitude, if any, of a disparity in the system. This analysis is distributed to the localities after approval from the Executive Director of the ICJI and the Juvenile Justice Improvement Committee for records keeping and, if applicable, racial and ethnic disparities reduction substantiation. Additionally, the analysis supports the Racial and Ethnic Disparities Reduction Plan as well as the application for federal funding.

After analyzing and distributing this information over the past four years, juvenile justice stakeholders expressed interest in collecting information which supplements the RRI. Therefore, the ICJI devised a survey that was distributed to prominent juvenile justice stakeholders to better understand racial and ethnic disparities (RED) reduction efforts that are happening across the State of Indiana.

## METHODOLOGY

Surveys were distributed directly to stakeholders via email in August of 2020 with the exception of school resource officers who received the survey from the President of the Indiana School Resource Officers Association (INSROA). The email outlined the project goals and included a link to complete the survey through SurveyMonkey. Stakeholders were given four weeks to complete the survey and reminder emails were sent each week. The collection period lasted from August 3, 2020 to August 28, 2020. Stakeholders could identify as one of the following professions (identified as positions throughout this report):



The relative rate index is the rate of activity involving minority youth divided by the rate of activity involving majority youth.

juvenile judge, law enforcement, school resource officer, prosecutor, probation officer, superintendent, or other.

The first question of the survey asked respondents to self-select their position. Next, they were asked to select which county their agency was housed in. Then, each respondent was led through a series of questions gauging how well they understand racial and ethnic disparities. They were also asked to report how well their agencies were adhering to diversity, inclusion, and cultural competency standards adapted from the National Alliance of Mental Health (NAMI) and the National Association of Colleges and Employers Diversity & Inclusion Committee's Diversity and Inclusion Self-Assessment Tool. They were then asked to report what, if any, RED reduction efforts their respective agencies have worked on in the past five years (August 2016 to August 2020). They selected all applicable options from a list and had the opportunity to explain their selections in more detail. If they noted that "staff training" was a RED reduction effort, they were asked to report whether this training is mandatory. Finally, respondents were asked to describe how their agency ensures that youth of color have the same access to services as white youth.

## LIMITATIONS

Survey results represent a sample of juvenile justice stakeholders, therefore are not representative nor generalizable. Additionally, survey questions were designed to gather information about RED reduction efforts occurring in schools and local justice systems which may not be exhaustive and may have missed other issue areas.

Survey participants were able to self-select a position where "Other" was an option. These respondents' selections are included in the "Aggregated Survey Results" section however are not discussed in the "Survey Results by Position" section.

Finally, in instances where respondents were given the opportunity to expand upon their previous selections and/or describe an experience in detail, attention was paid to language used and language which was absent. A diversity and inclusion lens was used during analysis. Scores and rankings created from these responses are relative and may not fully depict the intentions of the respondents.



## AGGREGATED SURVEY RESULTS

### AGENCY DEMOGRAPHICS

There were 204 respondents to the survey where a majority completed the survey in full. Most counties had at least one respondent except for Fayette, Knox, Spencer, Starke, Tipton, and Washington counties. The county with the most respondents was Marion County with 9%. Under the rural-urban county classification system provided by the United States Census Bureau, 11 (5%) respondents represent completely rural counties, 75 (37%) represent mostly rural counties, and 118 (58%) represent mostly urban counties. Respondents representing completely rural and mostly rural counties are underrepresented when compared to state urbanicity proportions, and respondents representing mostly urban counties are overrepresented – 5% compared to 11%; 37% compared to 49%, and 58% compared to 40%, respectively.

Respondents were able to self-select which of six roles best described their position in the juvenile justice system. Forty-five (22%) respondents were juvenile judges, 38 (19%) were superintendents, 34 (17%) were probation officers, 30 (15%) were school resource officers (SRO), 25 (12%) were law enforcement professionals, 20 (10%) were prosecutors, and the remaining respondents identified as another profession – judges who do not have juvenile caseloads, school personnel, and behavioral health/child services representatives.

### RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES

Participants were asked to report how confident they would be explaining (three-point weighted scale: extremely confident (5), somewhat confident (3), or not at all confident (1)) or how knowledgeable they were (three-point weighted scale: extremely confident (5), somewhat confident (3), or not at all confident (1)) for the following questions:

1. How confident would you be explaining the phrase “racial and ethnic disparities” in the juvenile justice context to someone?
2. How confident would you be explaining why racial and ethnic disparities data is collected in your county?
3. How knowledgeable are you about the racial and ethnic disparities data reporting process in your county?
4. How confident would you be interpreting racial and ethnic disparities data in your county?

The majority of respondents were somewhat confident or knowledgeable about RED and the associated data collection and interpretation processes. A higher proportion of juvenile justice stakeholders understand the concept of RED and why the data is collected than how to interpret the data and even more than the data reporting process. Stakeholders are most unclear about the data reporting process where almost 40% said they are not at all confident in explaining how data is reported. See the table below for more details.

Table 1 | Confidence in Explaining and Knowledge of RED – All Stakeholders

|                     | Extremely | Somewhat | Not at all | Total  |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|------------|--------|
| Phrase              | 64        | 111      | 28         | 204    |
|                     | 31.4%     | 54.4%    | 13.7%      | 100.0% |
| Data Collection     | 53        | 113      | 37         | 204    |
|                     | 26.0%     | 55.4%    | 18.1%      | 100.0% |
| Data Reporting      | 36        | 92       | 75         | 204    |
|                     | 17.6%     | 45.1%    | 36.8%      | 100.0% |
| Data Interpretation | 50        | 107      | 46         | 204    |
|                     | 24.5%     | 52.5%    | 22.5%      | 100.0% |

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means not at all confident or knowledgeable and 5 means extremely confident or knowledgeable, stakeholders scored a 3.4 in confidence of explaining RED, 3.2 in explaining why RED data is collected, 2.6 in knowledge of the RED reporting process, and 3.0 in confidence of interpreting RED data. Overall, stakeholders are a little more than somewhat confident and knowledgeable (3.1 out of a possible 5) of RED and its corresponding elements and processes.

### INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Participants were asked to reflect upon whether the agency they work within is committed to the following (answer options: yes, no, unsure, and not applicable):

1. includes diversity and inclusion considerations in both employment and contracting as an important part of its strategic plan for recruiting, hiring, retention, and promotion (employment),
2. has a practiced diversity and inclusion policy that is approved and supported by senior leadership (leadership),
3. conducts self-assessments of its diversity policies and practices annually (assessment),
4. has a dedicated official who oversees and directs the entity’s diversity and inclusion efforts (dedicated staff),
5. utilizes measurements to assess its workforce diversity and inclusion efforts (e.g., applicant tracking, hiring, promotions, separations, career development, and retention across all levels and occupations of the entity, including the executive and managerial ranks) (measurement),
6. holds management at all levels accountable for diversity and inclusion efforts (accountability),
7. provides regular progress reports to the board and senior management concerning diversity and inclusion efforts (reporting),
8. regularly conducts training and provides educational opportunities on equal employment and diversity and inclusion (training), and
9. publishes information pertaining to its diversity and inclusion efforts (transparency).

Almost half of the respondents indicated that their agency is committed to diversity and inclusion in their recruiting, hiring, retention, and promotion decisions. About 4 in 10 respondents said their agency holds management at all levels accountable for diversity and inclusion efforts. A little more than 1/3 of respondents report that they have a practiced diversity and inclusion policy that is approved and supported by senior leadership, and a little less than 1/3 of respondents express that their agency supports diversity and inclusion training. Only about 1 in 5 respondents reported that their agency utilizes measures to assess its workforce diversity and inclusion efforts, and even less claimed that their

agency is dedicated to regularly reporting their progress utilizing these measures. See the table below for more information.

Table 2 | Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion – All Stakeholders

|                 | Yes         | Other        |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Employment      | 98<br>48.0% | 106<br>52.0% |
| Accountability  | 79<br>38.7% | 125<br>61.3% |
| Leadership      | 73<br>35.8% | 131<br>64.2% |
| Training        | 56<br>27.5% | 148<br>72.5% |
| Assessment      | 46<br>22.5% | 158<br>77.5% |
| Measurement     | 37<br>18.1% | 167<br>81.9% |
| Transparency    | 35<br>17.2% | 169<br>82.8% |
| Dedicated Staff | 31<br>15.2% | 173<br>84.8% |
| Reporting       | 17<br>8.3%  | 187<br>91.7% |

## EQUITY EFFORTS

Participants were asked to share what RED efforts their agency has undergone in the past 5 years (August of 2016 – August of 2020) where a “RED effort” was defined as an effort which “actively ensures youth in the justice system are treated equitably based on race and ethnicity.” Participants were able to select any of the following:

1. assessment,
2. strategic planning,
3. ensuring data integrity,
4. quality improvement,
5. seeking grant opportunities,
6. applying for grants,
7. implementing programs,
8. training/educating staff,
9. training/educating community,
10. other,
11. none, and
12. unsure.

The most common RED reduction effort performed in the last five years was staff training at 35% of respondents, followed by ensuring RED data integrity at 22%, and assessment at 19%. Seeking and applying for grants to fund RED reduction programs were among the least performed efforts. Respondents who identified staff training as an applicable effort were asked to report if this training was mandatory. Of these 71 respondents, almost 79% chose not to answer this question, followed by 15% who indicated that it was mandatory, 4% who indicated it was not, and 1% who were unsure. The four of the five respondents who selected “Other” reported that their county was involved in the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). Additionally, about a quarter of respondents indicated that they did not perform, or were unsure if they did perform, a RED reduction effort in their agency. See the table below for more information.

Table 3 | RED Reduction Efforts – All Stakeholders

|                        | Count | Percent |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Staff Training         | 71    | 34.8%   |
| Data Integrity         | 44    | 21.6%   |
| Assessment             | 38    | 18.6%   |
| Community Training     | 31    | 15.2%   |
| Quality Improvement    | 30    | 14.7%   |
| Program Implementation | 30    | 14.7%   |
| Strategic Planning     | 28    | 13.7%   |
| Seeking Grants         | 25    | 12.3%   |
| Applying for Grants    | 24    | 11.8%   |
| Other                  | 5     | 2.5%    |

There were 86 survey participants who chose to expand upon their selections above, where 66 of those responses were substantive. Many respondents used this space to discuss their involvement with the JDAI – either that their county had completely embraced the program, their agency participated in a JDAI-led training opportunity about implicit bias or other another diversity, inclusion, and cultural competency topic, their involvement in an advisory group/committee that benefits JDAI, or some combination therein. Others discussed how they ensure RED data integrity and how that data, as well as associated assessment data, is informing how they move forward in reducing RED. More participants discuss what trainings their staff are participating in (if not through JDAI) and what programs they are implementing in their communities.

Finally, participants were asked how their respective agencies ensure that youth of color have the same access to services as their white youth counterparts, and 123 people responded or about 60% of the total number of respondents. Seventeen percent of respondents indicated that their agency disregards proportionate access to services and/or their response is harmful for youth of color (e.g., “unsure;” “we are 100% colorblind;” and “we don’t have these issues”). Forty-five percent of respondents indicated that their agencies work to ensure services are available for everyone, but don’t outline specific ways they ensure youth of color have proportionate access. Finally, 38% of respondents discuss the specific ways they are reaching youth of color to ensure they are proportionately being met with services (e.g., “services are offered on a case-by-case basis;” “offering low to no cost services in their communities;” “utilizing JDAI;” “increase the pipeline of students of color to post-secondary education”).

# SURVEY RESULTS BY POSITION

## JUVENILE JUDGES

### RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES

There were 44 juvenile judges who answered this set of questions. The majority of respondents were somewhat confident or knowledgeable about RED and the associated data collection, reporting, and interpretation processes. A higher proportion of juvenile judges understand the concept of RED and why the data is collected than the reporting process and how to interpret the data. Juvenile judges are most unclear about the data reporting process. See the table below for more details.

Table 4 | Confidence in Explaining and Knowledge of RED – Juvenile Judges

|                     | Extremely | Somewhat | Not at all | Total  |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|------------|--------|
| Phrase              | 18        | 24       | 2          | 44     |
|                     | 40.0%     | 53.3%    | 4.4%       | 100.0% |
| Data Collection     | 18        | 25       | 1          | 44     |
|                     | 40.0%     | 55.6%    | 2.2%       | 100.0% |
| Data Reporting      | 10        | 26       | 8          | 44     |
|                     | 22.2%     | 57.8%    | 17.8%      | 100.0% |
| Data Interpretation | 9         | 31       | 4          | 44     |
|                     | 20.0%     | 68.9%    | 8.9%       | 100.0% |

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means not at all confident or knowledgeable and 5 means extremely confident or knowledgeable, juvenile judges scored a 3.7 in confidence of explaining RED, 3.8 in confidence of explaining why RED data is collected, 3.1 in knowledge of the RED reporting process, and 3.2 in confidence of interpreting RED data. Overall, juvenile judges have a little more than average confidence and knowledge (3.5 compared to 3.1) of RED and its corresponding elements and processes ranking 2<sup>nd</sup> of six positions.

Table 5 | Confidence/Knowledge Score – Juvenile Judge

|                     | Juvenile Judge | All        | Difference   |
|---------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| Phrase              | 3.7            | 3.4        | + 0.3        |
| Data Collection     | 3.8            | 3.2        | + 0.6        |
| Data Reporting      | 3.1            | 2.6        | + 0.5        |
| Data Interpretation | 3.2            | 3.0        | + 0.2        |
| <b>Average</b>      | <b>3.5</b>     | <b>3.1</b> | <b>+ 0.4</b> |

## INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

About 38% of juvenile judges indicated that their agency is committed to diversity and inclusion in their recruiting, hiring, retention, and promotion decisions. Almost a quarter said that they have a practiced diversity and inclusion policy that is approved and supported by senior leadership and about 1 in 5 said their agency holds management at all levels accountable for diversity and inclusion efforts. Less than 7% of respondents reported that their agency utilizes measures to assess its workforce diversity and inclusion efforts, and even less (2%) claimed that their agency is dedicated to regularly reporting their progress utilizing these measures. It is also unlikely for agencies to house a staff member dedicated to RED. See the table below for more information.

Table 6 | Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion – Juvenile Judges

|                 | Yes         | Other       |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Employment      | 17<br>37.8% | 28<br>62.2% |
| Leadership      | 11<br>24.4% | 34<br>75.6% |
| Accountability  | 10<br>22.2% | 35<br>77.8% |
| Training        | 6<br>13.3%  | 39<br>86.7% |
| Assessment      | 5<br>11.1%  | 40<br>88.9% |
| Measurement     | 3<br>6.7%   | 42<br>93.3% |
| Dedicated Staff | 2<br>4.4%   | 43<br>95.6% |
| Transparency    | 2<br>4.4%   | 43<br>95.6% |
| Reporting       | 1<br>2.2%   | 44<br>97.8% |

## EQUITY EFFORTS

The most common RED reduction effort performed by juvenile judges in the last five years was ensuring RED data integrity at 32% of respondents, followed by staff training at 25%, and assessment at 10%. Program implementation and quality improvement were among the least performed efforts.

Respondents who identified staff training as an applicable effort were asked to report if this training was mandatory. Of these 11 respondents, one indicated that it was mandatory and the remaining didn't respond. Additionally, almost 30% of juvenile judges indicated that they did not perform a RED reduction effort in their agency. See the table below for more information.

Table 7 | RED Reduction Efforts – Juvenile Judge

|                        | Count | Percent |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Data Integrity         | 14    | 31.8%   |
| Staff Training         | 11    | 25.0%   |
| Assessment             | 10    | 22.7%   |
| Community Training     | 8     | 18.2%   |
| Strategic Planning     | 7     | 15.9%   |
| Seeking Grants         | 7     | 15.9%   |
| Applying for Grants    | 7     | 15.9%   |
| Program Implementation | 6     | 13.6%   |
| Quality Improvement    | 5     | 11.4%   |

Finally, juvenile judges were asked how their respective agencies ensure that youth of color have the same access to services as their white youth counterparts and 26 responded. Nineteen percent of respondents indicated that their agency disregards proportionate access to services and/or their response is harmful for youth of color (e.g., “there are no policies;” “there is no assurance;” and “I don’t believe this is an issue for us”). Forty-two percent of respondents indicated that their agencies work to ensure services are available for everyone, but don’t outline specific ways they ensure youth of color have proportionate access. Finally, 38% respondents discuss the specific ways they are reaching youth of color to ensure they are proportionately being met with services (e.g., “individual case services;” “youth are referred using screening tools;” “utilizing JDAI;” “need is prioritized”).

LAW ENFORCEMENT

**RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES**

There were 25 law enforcement professionals who answered this set of questions. The majority of respondents were somewhat confident or knowledgeable about RED and the associated data collection and interpretation processes then not at all confident in their ability to explain the data reporting process. A higher proportion of law enforcement professionals understand the concept of RED and why the data is collected than the reporting process and how to interpret the data. Law enforcement professionals are most unclear about the data reporting process. See the table below for more details.

Table 8 | Confidence in Explaining and Knowledge of RED – Law Enforcement

|                     | Extremely | Somewhat | Not at all | Total  |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|------------|--------|
| Phrase              | 6         | 15       | 4          | 25     |
|                     | 24.0%     | 60.0%    | 16.0%      | 100.0% |
| Data Collection     | 3         | 13       | 9          | 25     |
|                     | 12.0%     | 52.0%    | 36.0%      | 100.0% |
| Data Reporting      | 2         | 9        | 14         | 25     |
|                     | 8.0%      | 36.0%    | 56.0%      | 100.0% |
| Data Interpretation | 2         | 15       | 8          | 25     |
|                     | 8.0%      | 60.0%    | 32.0%      | 100.0% |

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means not at all confident or knowledgeable and 5 means extremely confident or knowledgeable, law enforcement professionals scored a 3.2 in confidence of explaining RED, 2.5 in confidence of explaining why RED data is collected, 2.0 in knowledge of the RED reporting process, and 2.5 in confidence of interpreting RED data. Overall, law enforcement professionals have less than average confidence and knowledge (2.6 compared to 3.1) of RED and its corresponding elements and processes ranking 5<sup>th</sup> of six positions.

Table 9 | Confidence/Knowledge Score – Law Enforcement

|                     | Law Enforcement | All        | Difference   |
|---------------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|
| Phrase              | 3.2             | 3.4        | - 0.2        |
| Data Collection     | 2.5             | 3.2        | - 0.7        |
| Data Reporting      | 2.0             | 2.6        | - 0.6        |
| Data Interpretation | 2.5             | 3.0        | - 0.5        |
| <b>Average</b>      | <b>2.6</b>      | <b>3.1</b> | <b>- 0.5</b> |

### INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Sixty-eight percent of law enforcement professionals indicated that their agency is committed to diversity and inclusion in their recruiting, hiring, retention, and promotion decisions. Over half said their agency holds management at all levels accountable for diversity and inclusion efforts and almost half report that they have a practiced diversity and inclusion policy that is approved and supported by senior leadership. A little over a third of respondents reported that their agency utilizes measures to assess its workforce diversity and inclusion efforts, and far less claimed that their agency is dedicated to regularly reporting their progress utilizing these measures. See the table below for more information.

Table 10 | Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion – Law Enforcement

|                 | Yes         | Other       |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Employment      | 17<br>68.0% | 8<br>32.0%  |
| Accountability  | 13<br>52.0% | 12<br>48.0% |
| Leadership      | 12<br>48.0% | 13<br>52.0% |
| Assessment      | 11<br>44.0% | 14<br>56.0% |
| Measurement     | 9<br>36.0%  | 16<br>64.0% |
| Training        | 9<br>36.0%  | 16<br>64.0% |
| Transparency    | 9<br>36.0%  | 16<br>64.0% |
| Dedicated Staff | 8<br>32.0%  | 17<br>68.0% |
| Reporting       | 2<br>8.0%   | 23<br>92.0% |

## EQUITY EFFORTS

The most common RED reduction effort performed by law enforcement professionals in the last five years was staff training at 32% of respondents, followed by ensuring RED data integrity and assessment at 20%. Seeking and applying for grants to fund RED reduction programs and quality improvement were among the least performed efforts.

Respondents who identified staff training as an applicable effort were asked to report if this training was mandatory. Of these eight respondents, 63% chose not to answer this question, followed by 25% who indicated that it was mandatory and 13% who were unsure. Additionally, 16% of respondents indicated that they did not perform a RED reduction effort in their agency. See the table below for more information.

Table 11 | RED Reduction Efforts – Law Enforcement

|                        | Count | Percent |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Staff Training         | 8     | 32.0%   |
| Data Integrity         | 5     | 20.0%   |
| Assessment             | 5     | 20.0%   |
| Community Training     | 4     | 16.0%   |
| Program Implementation | 4     | 16.0%   |
| Strategic Planning     | 3     | 12.0%   |
| Seeking Grants         | 3     | 12.0%   |
| Applying for Grants    | 3     | 12.0%   |
| Quality Improvement    | 2     | 8.0%    |
| Other                  | 1     | 4.0%    |

Finally, law enforcement professionals were asked how their respective agencies ensure that youth of color have the same access to services as their white youth counterparts, and 13 responded. Eight percent of respondents indicated that their agency disregards proportionate access to services and/or their response is harmful for youth of color (e.g., “we don’t see these issues”). Sixty-two percent of respondents indicated that their agencies work to ensure services are available for everyone, but don’t outline specific ways they ensure youth of color have proportionate access. Finally, 31% of respondents discuss the specific ways they are reaching youth of color to ensure they are proportionately being met with services (e.g., prioritized resource allocation; specific programming; and “utilizing JDAI;”).

**RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES**

There were 34 probation officers who answered this set of questions. Most respondents were somewhat confident or knowledgeable about RED and the associated data collection process. A higher proportion of probation officers understand the RED data reporting process and why that data is collected than the concept of RED and how to interpret the data. Probation officers are most unclear about the data interpretation process. See the table below for more details.

Table 12 | Confidence in Explaining and Knowledge of RED – Probation

|                     | Extremely   | Somewhat    | Not at all | Total        |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| Phrase              | 8<br>23.5%  | 19<br>55.9% | 7<br>20.6% | 34<br>100.0% |
| Data Collection     | 11<br>32.4% | 21<br>61.8% | 2<br>5.9%  | 34<br>100.0% |
| Data Reporting      | 13<br>38.2% | 15<br>44.1% | 6<br>17.6% | 34<br>100.0% |
| Data Interpretation | 10<br>29.4% | 16<br>47.1% | 8<br>23.5% | 25<br>100.0% |

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means not at all confident or knowledgeable and 5 means extremely confident or knowledgeable, probation officers scored a 3.1 in confidence of explaining RED, 3.5 in confidence of explaining why RED data is collected, 3.4 in knowledge of the RED reporting process, and 3.1 in confidence of interpreting RED data. Overall, probation officers have a little more than average confidence and knowledge (3.3 compared to 3.1) of RED and its corresponding elements and processes ranking 3<sup>rd</sup> of six positions.

Table 13 | Confidence/Knowledge Score – Probation

|                     | Probation  | All        | Difference   |
|---------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Phrase              | 3.1        | 3.4        | - 0.3        |
| Data Collection     | 3.5        | 3.2        | + 0.3        |
| Data Reporting      | 3.4        | 2.6        | + 0.8        |
| Data Interpretation | 3.1        | 3.0        | + 0.1        |
| <b>Average</b>      | <b>3.3</b> | <b>3.1</b> | <b>+ 0.2</b> |

**INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION**

Forty-one percent of probation officers indicated that their agency is committed to diversity and inclusion in their recruiting, hiring, retention, and promotion decisions and holds management at all levels accountable for diversity and inclusion efforts. A little less than 1/3 reported that they have a practiced diversity and inclusion policy that is approved and supported by senior leadership. About 12% reported that their agency utilizes measures to assess its workforce diversity and inclusion efforts, and half of those said their agency is dedicated to regularly reporting their progress utilizing these measures. See the table below for more information.

Table 14 | Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion – Probation

|                 | Yes         | Other       |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Employment      | 14<br>41.2% | 20<br>58.8% |
| Accountability  | 14<br>41.2% | 20<br>58.8% |
| Leadership      | 10<br>29.4% | 24<br>70.6% |
| Training        | 9<br>26.5%  | 25<br>73.5% |
| Dedicated Staff | 6<br>17.6%  | 28<br>82.4% |
| Assessment      | 5<br>14.7%  | 29<br>85.3% |
| Measurement     | 4<br>11.8%  | 30<br>88.2% |
| Transparency    | 4<br>11.8%  | 30<br>88.2% |
| Reporting       | 2<br>5.9%   | 32<br>94.1% |

## EQUITY EFFORTS

The most common RED reduction effort performed by probation officers in the last five years was staff training at 44% of respondents, followed by assessment at 35%, and ensuring RED data integrity at 32%. Program implementation, strategic planning, and seeking/applying for grants to fund RED reduction programs were among the least performed efforts. Respondents who identified staff training as an applicable effort were asked to report if this training was mandatory. Of these 15 respondents, almost 87% chose not to answer this question followed by 7% who indicated that it was mandatory and 7% who indicated it was not. Additionally, about a quarter of respondents indicated that they did not perform a RED reduction effort in their agency. See the table below for more information.

Table 15 | RED Reduction Efforts – Probation

|                        | Count | Percent |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Staff Training         | 15    | 44.2%   |
| Assessment             | 12    | 35.3%   |
| Data Integrity         | 11    | 32.4%   |
| Community Training     | 6     | 17.6%   |
| Quality Improvement    | 6     | 17.6%   |
| Program Implementation | 3     | 8.8%    |
| Strategic Planning     | 3     | 8.8%    |
| Seeking Grants         | 3     | 8.8%    |
| Applying for Grants    | 3     | 8.8%    |
| Other                  | 1     | 2.9%    |

Finally, probation officers were asked how their respective agencies ensure that youth of color have the same access to services as their white youth counterparts, and 25 responded. Twelve percent of respondents indicated that their agency disregards proportionate access to services and/or their response is harmful for youth of color (e.g., “no measures are in place”). Fifty-two percent of respondents indicated that their agencies work to ensure services are available for everyone, but don’t outline specific ways they ensure youth of color have proportionate access. Finally, 36% of respondents discuss the specific ways they are reaching youth of color to ensure they are proportionately being met with services (e.g., offering services free of charge; basing services off needs/risk assessments; “using services in the communities where youth live;” “monitoring data;” and “utilizing JDAI;”).

## PROSECUTORS

### RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES

There were 20 prosecutors who answered this set of questions. The majority of respondents were extremely confident or knowledgeable about RED and the associated data collection process. A higher proportion of prosecutors understand the concept of RED and why the data is collected than the reporting process and how to interpret the data. Prosecutors are most unclear about the data reporting and interpretation processes. See the table below for more details.

Table 16 | Confidence in Explaining and Knowledge of RED – Prosecutor

|                     | Extremely | Somewhat | Not at all | Total  |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|------------|--------|
| Phrase              | 12        | 7        | 1          | 20     |
|                     | 60.0%     | 35.0%    | 5.0%       | 100.0% |
| Data Collection     | 10        | 7        | 3          | 20     |
|                     | 50.0%     | 35.0%    | 15.0%      | 100.0% |
| Data Reporting      | 7         | 9        | 4          | 20     |
|                     | 35.0%     | 45.0%    | 20.0%      | 100.0% |
| Data Interpretation | 9         | 7        | 4          | 20     |
|                     | 45.0%     | 35.0%    | 20.0%      | 100.0% |

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means not at all confident or knowledgeable and 5 means extremely confident or knowledgeable, prosecutors scored a 4.1 in confidence of explaining RED, 3.7 in explaining why RED data is collected, 3.3 in knowledge of the RED reporting process, and 3.5 in confidence of interpreting RED data. Overall, prosecutors have more than average confidence and knowledge (3.7 compared to 3.1) of RED and its corresponding elements and processes ranking 1<sup>st</sup> of six positions.

Table 17 | Confidence/Knowledge Score – Prosecutor

|                     | Prosecutor | All        | Difference   |
|---------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Phrase              | 4.1        | 3.4        | + 0.7        |
| Data Collection     | 3.7        | 3.2        | + 0.5        |
| Data Reporting      | 3.3        | 2.6        | + 0.7        |
| Data Interpretation | 3.5        | 3.0        | + 0.5        |
| <b>Average</b>      | <b>3.7</b> | <b>3.1</b> | <b>+ 0.6</b> |

## INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Sixty percent of prosecutors indicated that their agency is committed to diversity and inclusion in their recruiting, hiring, retention, and promotion decisions and holds management at all levels accountable for diversity and inclusion efforts.

Half of respondents report that they have a practiced diversity and inclusion policy that is approved and supported by senior leadership. Thirty percent of prosecutors reported that their agency utilizes measures to assess its workforce diversity and inclusion efforts, and only 10% claimed that their agency is dedicated to regularly reporting their progress utilizing these measures. See the table below for more information.

Table 18 | Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion – Prosecutor

|                 | Yes         | Other       |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Employment      | 12<br>60.0% | 8<br>40.0%  |
| Accountability  | 12<br>60.0% | 8<br>40.0%  |
| Leadership      | 10<br>50.0% | 10<br>50.0% |
| Assessment      | 8<br>40.0%  | 12<br>60.0% |
| Measurement     | 6<br>30.0%  | 14<br>70.0% |
| Training        | 6<br>30.0%  | 14<br>60.0% |
| Dedicated Staff | 5<br>25.0%  | 15<br>75.0% |
| Transparency    | 4<br>20.0%  | 16<br>80.0% |
| Reporting       | 2<br>10.0%  | 18<br>90.0% |

## EQUITY EFFORTS

The most common RED reduction effort performed by prosecutors in the last five years was staff training at 40% of respondents, followed by strategic planning at 35%, and program implementation at 30%. Seeking and applying for grants to fund RED reduction programs were among the least performed efforts.

Respondents who identified staff training as an applicable effort were asked to report if this training was mandatory. Of these eight respondents, all respondents chose not to answer this question. Additionally, about a fifth of respondents indicated that they did not perform a RED reduction effort in their agency. See the table below for more information.

Table 19 | RED Reduction Efforts – Prosecutor

|                        | Count | Percent |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Staff Training         | 8     | 40.0%   |
| Strategic Planning     | 7     | 35.0%   |
| Program Implementation | 6     | 30.0%   |
| Assessment             | 5     | 25.0%   |
| Data Integrity         | 4     | 20.0%   |
| Community Training     | 4     | 20.0%   |
| Quality Improvement    | 4     | 20.0%   |
| Seeking Grants         | 4     | 20.0%   |
| Applying for Grants    | 3     | 15.0%   |
| Other                  | 2     | 10.0%   |

Finally, prosecutors were asked how their respective agencies ensure that youth of color have the same access to services as their white youth counterparts and 10 responded. No respondent indicated that their agency disregards proportionate access to services and/or their response is harmful for youth of color. Forty percent of respondents indicated that their agencies work to ensure services are available for everyone, but don't outline specific ways they ensure youth of color have proportionate access. The remaining 60% of respondents discuss the specific ways they are reaching youth of color to ensure they are proportionately being met with services (e.g., offering services free of charge; offering services at a time and place that is convenient for the child; data analysis; "seeking out less privileged populations for focused services;" basing services off needs/risk assessments; and "utilizing JDAI;").

## SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS

### RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES

There were 30 school resource officers (SRO) who answered this set of questions. The majority of respondents were somewhat confident or knowledgeable about RED and the associated data collection and interpretation processes. A higher proportion of SROs understand the concept of RED and how to interpret the data than the data collection and reporting processes albeit low. SROs are most unclear about the data reporting process. See the table below for more details.

Table 20 | Confidence in Explaining and Knowledge of RED – SRO

|                     | Extremely | Somewhat | Not at all | Total  |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|------------|--------|
| Phrase              | 4         | 22       | 4          | 30     |
|                     | 13.3%     | 73.3%    | 13.3%      | 100.0% |
| Data Collection     | 1         | 17       | 12         | 30     |
|                     | 3.3%      | 56.7%    | 40.0%      | 100.0% |
| Data Reporting      | 0         | 12       | 18         | 30     |
|                     | 0.0%      | 40.0%    | 60.0%      | 100.0% |
| Data Interpretation | 3         | 18       | 9          | 30     |
|                     | 10.0%     | 60.0%    | 30.0%      | 100.0% |

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means not at all confident or knowledgeable and 5 means extremely confident or knowledgeable, SROs scored a 3.0 in confidence of explaining RED, 2.3 in confidence of explaining why RED data is collected, 1.8 in knowledge of the RED reporting process, and 2.6 in confidence of interpreting RED data. Overall, SROs have less than average confidence and knowledge (2.4 compared to 3.1) of RED and its corresponding elements and processes ranking last.

Table 21 | Confidence/Knowledge Score – SRO

|                     | SRO        | All        | Difference   |
|---------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Phrase              | 3.0        | 3.4        | - 0.4        |
| Data Collection     | 2.3        | 3.2        | - 0.9        |
| Data Reporting      | 1.8        | 2.6        | - 0.8        |
| Data Interpretation | 2.6        | 3.0        | - 0.4        |
| <b>Average</b>      | <b>2.4</b> | <b>3.1</b> | <b>- 0.7</b> |

**INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION**

Around 43% of school resource officers indicated that their agency is committed to diversity and inclusion in their recruiting, hiring, retention, and promotion decisions. Thirty percent of respondents report that they have a practiced diversity and inclusion policy that is approved and supported by senior leadership. A little over 1/4 said their agency holds management at all levels accountable for diversity and inclusion efforts and supports diversity and inclusion training. Only 13% of SROs reported that their agency utilizes measures to assess its workforce diversity and inclusion efforts and 3% claimed that their agency is dedicated to regularly reporting their progress utilizing these measures. See the table below for more information.

Table 22 | Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion – SRO

|                 | Yes         | Other        |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Employment      | 13<br>43.3% | 17<br>56.7%  |
| Leadership      | 9<br>30.0%  | 21<br>70.0%  |
| Accountability  | 8<br>26.7%  | 125<br>61.3% |
| Training        | 8<br>26.7%  | 22<br>73.3%  |
| Assessment      | 6<br>20.0%  | 24<br>80.-%  |
| Transparency    | 5<br>16.7%  | 25<br>83.3%  |
| Measurement     | 4<br>13.3%  | 26<br>86.7%  |
| Dedicated Staff | 3<br>10.0%  | 27<br>90.0%  |
| Reporting       | 1<br>3.3%   | 22<br>73.3%  |

## EQUITY EFFORTS

The most common RED reduction effort performed by school resource officers in the last five years was staff training at 30% of respondents followed by quality improvement at 17%. Community training, program implementation, and strategic planning tied for third place at 10%. Ensuring RED data integrity and seeking grants to fund RED reduction programs were among the least performed efforts.

Respondents who identified staff training as an applicable effort were asked to report if this training was mandatory. Of these nine respondents, almost 67% chose not to answer this question, and the remaining 33% indicated that it was mandatory. Additionally, a little more than a quarter of respondents indicated that they did not perform, or were unsure if they did perform, a RED reduction effort in their agency. See the table below for more information.

Table 23 | RED Reduction Efforts – SRO

|                        | Count | Percent |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Staff Training         | 9     | 30.0%   |
| Quality Improvement    | 5     | 16.7%   |
| Community Training     | 3     | 10.0%   |
| Program Implementation | 3     | 10.0%   |
| Strategic Planning     | 3     | 10.0%   |
| Assessment             | 2     | 6.7%    |
| Applying for Grants    | 2     | 6.7%    |
| Data Integrity         | 1     | 3.3%    |
| Seeking Grants         | 1     | 3.3%    |

Finally, school resource officers were asked how their respective agencies ensure that youth of color have the same access to services as their white youth counterparts, and 16 responded. Forty-four percent of respondents indicated that their agency disregards proportionate access to services and/or their response is harmful for youth of color (e.g., “race does not come into play when determining an arrest;” “we don’t look at color;” “color doesn’t matter;” and “we are 100% colorblind”). Thirty-eight percent of respondents indicated that their agencies work to ensure services are available for everyone, but don’t outline specific ways they ensure youth of color have proportionate access. The remaining 19% of respondents discuss the specific ways they are reaching youth of color to ensure they are proportionately being met with services (e.g., youth-specific programs; ensuring program use is proportionate).

**RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES**

There were 38 superintendents who answered this set of questions. The majority of respondents were somewhat confident or knowledgeable about RED and the associated data collection process, then not all knowledgeable of the data reporting process. A higher proportion of superintendents understand the concept of RED and how to interpret the data than the data collection and reporting processes. Superintendents are most unclear about the data reporting process. See the table below for more details.

Table 24 | Confidence in Explaining and Knowledge of RED – Superintendent

|                     | Extremely   | Somewhat    | Not at all  | Total        |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Phrase              | 12<br>31.6% | 19<br>50.0% | 7<br>18.4%  | 38<br>100.0% |
| Data Collection     | 6<br>15.8%  | 25<br>65.8% | 7<br>18.4%  | 38<br>100.0% |
| Data Reporting      | 2<br>5.3%   | 17<br>44.7% | 19<br>50.0% | 38<br>100.0% |
| Data Interpretation | 14<br>36.8% | 15<br>39.5% | 9<br>23.7%  | 38<br>100.0% |

On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means not at all confident or knowledgeable and 5 means extremely confident or knowledgeable, superintendents scored a 3.3 in confidence of explaining RED, 2.9 in confidence of explaining why RED data is collected, 2.1 in knowledge of the RED reporting process, and 3.3 in confidence of interpreting RED data. Overall, superintendents have a little less than average confidence and knowledge (2.9 compared to 3.1) of RED and its corresponding elements and processes ranking 4<sup>th</sup> of six positions.

Table 25 | Confidence/Knowledge Score – Superintendent

|                     | Superintendent | All        | Difference   |
|---------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| Phrase              | 3.3            | 3.4        | - 0.1        |
| Data Collection     | 2.9            | 3.2        | - 0.3        |
| Data Reporting      | 2.1            | 2.6        | - 0.5        |
| Data Interpretation | 3.3            | 3.0        | + 0.3        |
| <b>Average</b>      | <b>2.9</b>     | <b>3.1</b> | <b>- 0.2</b> |

**INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION**

About 45% of superintendents indicated that their school is committed to diversity and inclusion in their recruiting, hiring, retention, and promotion decisions and about 42% said their agency holds management at all levels accountable for diversity and inclusion efforts. About 40% report that they have a practiced diversity and inclusion policy that is approved and supported by senior leadership. Almost 1 in 5 respondents reported that their agency utilizes measures to assess its workforce diversity and inclusion efforts and less claimed that their agency is dedicated to regularly reporting their progress utilizing these measures. See the table below for more information.

Table 26 | Institutional Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion – Superintendent

|                 | Yes         | Other       |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Employment      | 17<br>44.7% | 21<br>55.3% |
| Accountability  | 16<br>42.1% | 22<br>57.9% |
| Leadership      | 15<br>39.5% | 23<br>60.5% |
| Transparency    | 14<br>36.8% | 24<br>63.2% |
| Assessment      | 9<br>23.7%  | 29<br>76.3% |
| Measurement     | 7<br>18.4%  | 31<br>81.6% |
| Dedicated Staff | 6<br>15.8%  | 32<br>84.2% |
| Training        | 6<br>15.8%  | 32<br>84.2% |
| Reporting       | 6<br>15.8%  | 32<br>84.2% |

### EQUITY EFFORTS

The most common RED reduction effort performed by superintendents in the last five years was staff training at 42% of respondents, followed by ensuring RED data integrity and program implementation at 18%. Strategic planning, applying for grants to fund RED reduction programs, and assessment were among the least performed efforts. Respondents who identified staff training as an applicable effort were asked to report if this training was mandatory. Of these 16 respondents, 75% chose not to answer this question, followed by 19% who indicated that it was mandatory and 6% who indicated it was not. Additionally, 16% of respondents indicated that they did not perform, or were unsure if they did perform, a RED reduction effort in their agency. See the table below for more information.

Table 27 | RED Reduction Efforts – Superintendent

|                        | Count | Percent |
|------------------------|-------|---------|
| Staff Training         | 16    | 42.1%   |
| Data Integrity         | 7     | 18.4%   |
| Program Implementation | 7     | 18.4%   |
| Community Training     | 5     | 13.2%   |
| Quality Improvement    | 5     | 13.2%   |
| Seeking Grants         | 5     | 13.2%   |
| Strategic Planning     | 4     | 10.5%   |
| Applying for Grants    | 4     | 10.5%   |
| Assessment             | 3     | 7.9%    |
| Other                  | 1     | 2.6%    |

Finally, superintendents were asked how their respective agencies ensure that youth of color have the same access to services as their white youth counterparts and 24 responded. Eight percent of respondents indicated that their agency disregards proportionate access to services and/or their response is harmful for youth of color (e.g., no programs; “unsure”). Forty-two percent of respondents indicated that their agencies work to ensure services are available for everyone, but don’t outline specific ways they ensure youth of color have proportionate access. The remaining 50% of respondents discuss the specific ways they are reaching youth of color to ensure they are proportionately being met with services (e.g., at-risk/marginalized youth get different services; systems and processes serve youth of color; the school was “founded to increase the pipeline of students of color to post-secondary education;” data collection and tracking).



## CONCLUSION

Overall, juvenile justice stakeholders are somewhat confident in explaining and knowledgeable about racial and ethnic disparities as it relates to the data collection, reporting, and interpretation processes in their counties. More often than not, agencies include diversity and inclusion considerations in both employment and contracting as an important part of its strategic planning for recruiting, hiring, retention, and promotion; have a practiced diversity and inclusion policy that is approved and supported by senior leadership; and hold management at all levels accountable for diversity and inclusion efforts. However, agencies often report that they do not have a dedicated staff member who oversees and directs diversity and inclusion efforts; they do not utilize measures to assess their diversity and inclusion efforts and therefore are not able to perform meaningful self-assessments of their workforce, track their progress, and report/publish their findings to interested parties; and they do not reevaluate their diversity and inclusion policies and procedures on a regular basis. It is crucial that agencies are utilizing a diversity and inclusion lens in their work, constantly assessing their ecosystems and monitoring and evaluating their commitment to diversity and inclusion. Presently, this is not occurring on a standard basis.

In direct alignment with the suggestions of the Youth Equity Program Manager, agencies are off to a good start, operationalizing their red reduction efforts as staff training (which may or may not be mandatory), assessing their agency and local systems, and ensuring integrity in RED data reporting and collection. Many sites also discussed their collaboration with JDAI which has expanded over the years and directly supports RED reduction. These are considered the pre-requisite or capacity building steps for sites to eventually springboard from. The State of Indiana seems to be moving in the right direction, striving for (and in some instances are in the process of) strategic planning and action, the implementation of evidence-guided reduction programs, and community outreach. However, we still need to help some of our neighbors get on board, as 30% of respondents reported that their agency had not participated in a *single* RED reduction effort in the last 5 years.

Finally, while the majority of our respondents used neutral or positive language to discuss how their agencies were ensuring that youth of color were given proportionate access to services, many still discussed how they've adopted a "color-blind" approach and/or don't seem to acknowledge the environmental factors that disproportionately guide black and brown Hoosier youth into the juvenile justice system. Even worse, sometimes professionals claimed that they just ignored the issue outright.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Disparities are multifaceted. When we examine our history, we discover that disparities were intentionally woven through our systems to ensure the preferential treatment, opportunities, and justice of a single group. Therefore, we must work intentionally and strategically to recreate a fair and just system for all. Below are recommendations provided by the ICJI's Youth Equity Program Manager for next steps:

1

Utilize resources at one's discretion to learn more about the RED federal and state requirements. The Indiana Courts Education Network hosts a training which reviews these requirements located [here](#). Members of the Indiana judiciary are either given an account or may request one, depending on the situation.

2

Budget for staff and partners to receive implicit/explicit biases trainings regularly.

3

Have quarterly meetings to review local RED data. Track trends over time. Ensure data integrity and ask questions of the data to understand root causes of the issues.

4

Craft goals to make policy and procedural changes that diminish the adverse impact on youth of color. Reserve seats at the table for families and communities when working on reform efforts.

5

Establish RED reduction as a long-term priority for your agency and the corresponding system.