DETENTION ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT MANUAL

JEFFERSON PARISH
CHILDREN & YOUTH PLANNING BOARD
JUVENILE DETENTION ALTERNATIVES INITIATIVE

BACKGROUND

In 2007, Jefferson Parish was among five Louisiana parishes selected to participate in the Annie E. Casey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI), a national juvenile detention reform effort. Major thrusts of the JDAI effort are conditions of confinement, alternatives to detention, reduction of disproportionate minority confinement, and development of objective detention management instruments. In early 2008, the Jefferson Parish Children & Youth Planning Board (CYPB) commissioned the JDAI Committee, whose goals aligned with the national JDAI effort. One of its first accomplishments was the development of a Detention Assessment Instrument (DAI) – an objective actuarial instrument used to determine the necessity of detaining youth. Since July, 2008 this instrument has been the cornerstone of detention population management.

Prior to beginning work with JDAI, Jefferson Parish was also chosen to be part of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation's Models for Change Initiative in October of 2006 and identified the reduction of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) as one of its Targeted Areas of Improvement. The MacArthur DMC work dovetailed with the work of the JDAI Committee in the development of detention screening based on objective criteria. As a result, Jefferson Parish became members of the DMC Action Network, a project of the Models for Change Initiative staffed by our National Resource Bank consultants from the Center for Children's Law and Policy (CCLP), in October of 2007. Being a part of the DMC Action Network afforded Jefferson Parish technical assistance and additional funding specifically for DMC reduction strategies. One of the strategies or strategic innovations chosen by Jefferson Parish was the continued development of the DAI by way of validation by an external source, a contracted program evaluator. The DAI also has undergone an internal validation by the Department of Juvenile Services which is described later in the manual. The DAI not only has proven to be a reliable and valid screening instrument but also provides valuable data regarding the origin of offenses, types of offenses, and demographical information about arrested youth.

DEVELOPMENT

Under the umbrella of the Jefferson Parish CYPB, membership of the JDAI Committee, referred to as the Committee later in this document, was composed of a comprehensive group stakeholders from law enforcement, prosecutors, public defenders, detention home administration, probation, public schools, and juvenile court. The initial format of the DAI was an amalgamation of several previously developed DAI's from more mature JDAI sites. Considerable effort was invested to target specific cultural and local philosophies about

detaining youth with the overall focus remaining consistent with JDAI detention utilization principles. Two purposes for detention were the basis for deciding item development – risk to the community and failure to appear for court. From these two ideals, a list of five items was developed. Three focused on propensity toward endangering the community and two focused on likelihood of failing to appear for court. In addition, two items were added to account for mitigating and aggravating factors. Scores for each item were decided upon by the JDAI committee and reflect the committee's consideration of public safety. Each item was scored according to an established rubric and total scores determined whether youths were detained, released, or released to an alternative to detention program.

Another important aspect of the DAI development was the timeframe for prediction. Detention is most frequently used to detain arrested youth until the Continued Custody Hearing, usually 72 hours following arrest, and for violations of probation. A key time period for public safety is the time between arrest and the first court hearing. The DAI provides an objective screening of youth that are likely to commit an offense within 60 days of arrest. Sixty days was determined to be the time period that 90% of arrested youth will be petitioned to Court by prosecution when the decision is made to petition the charge.

Once the format and items were finalized by the Committee, a pilot study of 300 cases was conducted. Comparing the Actual DAI Decision to arrest histories, results of the pilot study showed 93% of arrested youth that were indicated for release were not re-arrested within 60 days. The established standard by the national JDAI effort is less than10%. Recidivism for released juveniles in Jefferson Parish DAI hovers around 7%.

With the pilot study showing favorable results, an external validation was commissioned to provide external evaluation of the DAI. The study was conducted in 2009 on 1,846 completed DAI's that were completed between September 2007 and December 2008. The validation focused on the ability of the seven items to predict subsequent arrests within 60 days of the initial arrest. Results showed that the Total Indicated Score was a significant predictor of re-arrest. Also, when all seven items were considered together, they were significant predictors of re-arrest. The study further showed possible improvements to the predictive ability of the DAI. The external validation also provided key information for future enhancements to the DAI. Statistical analysis showed that two items could be removed from the DAI to improve its ability to predict re-arrest.

ADMINISTRATION

The DAI is administered by the Juvenile Intake Center (JIC) and Rivarde Detention Center staffs on all arrested youth to determine their suitability for placement in detention, release to an alternative, or release to a parent or guardian. When scoring the instrument, a copy of the juvenile's arrest history and history of court appearances are key pieces of information needed to accurately score the DAI. The DAI consists of several areas discussed in greater detail below. Action steps are indicated by the "▶"symbol.

Demographics: The top of the first page contains demographic information about the juvenile and information regarding the arrest. Completion of the DAI should be performed using the following steps.

► Step 1: Write the juvenile's last name, first name and date of birth in the spaces provided.

According to the National Council on Juvenile Justice and Children's Center for Law and Policy publication, "Guidelines for Recording Race and Ethnicity," the preferred source of information for collecting racial data is self-identification during an interview with the youth, parent or guardian.

► Step 2: Check the appropriate box whether or not race and ethnicity data was collected through Juvenile Self-Identification or by Identification by Observer or other Source.

Federal guidelines recommend asking two separate and distinct questions when collecting race and ethnicity data. Hispanic/Latino has been identified as an ethnicity, not a race. Therefore, staff administering the DAI should circle "yes" or "no" in response to asking the youth, "Are you Hispanic or Latino?"

► Step 3. Check the appropriate box next to the juvenile's self-identified or observer-identified race. Note that this racial category is what the juvenile most identifies with and not necessarily the race the observer sees. The five major racial categories are:

- American Indian or Alaska native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White

► Step 4. Write the letter "M" for Male and "F" for Female in the space next to Gender.

► Step 5: Write the date and time of intake in the spaces provided. Time is recorded as military time (i.e., 2:00 p.m. is recorded as 1400).

► Step 6: Enter the Screener's first initial and last name in the space provided.

► Step 7. If the juvenile is arrested at school or while in secure custody, the name and location of the school or place of custody are to be recorded on the line provided.

► Step 8: Indicate whether the DAI is being completed on a youth to determine whether or not to detain the youth upon arrest (Detention Decision) or part of a follow-up assessment (e.g., admission due to violation of probation) by placing a check mark in the appropriate box..

► Step 9: Write the name of the arresting agency (parish/county, municipal or state law enforcement agency), the arrest date and time (in military hours).

Risk Item: The remainder of the first page of the DAI contains seven risk items with scores assigned to levels of severity. Scores are obtained by determining facts related to the juvenile's arrest history, current offense, aggravating factors, and mitigating factors. A total score is the sum of scores from the seven risk items. The total score can range from zero (0) to thirty-five (35) and will be discussed in greater detail below.

Section 1: Most Serious Current Offense

►Step 10: Record the most serious current offense in the space provided next to "**LIST OFFENSE**:" using the statute number rather than the name of the offense.

►Step 11: Using the categories of offenses listed on Page 2 of the DAI, determine the category of the most serious current offense. Enter the score next to the corresponding category under this Section in the blank space provided. Only one score can be given. For convenience, categories are listed below in order of severity:

- Category A – "Very Violent" offense against persons. The types of offenses in this category are: Solicitation for Murder, 1st Degree Murder, 2nd Degree Murder, Manslaughter, Aggravated Rape, Forcible Rape, Aggravated Kidnapping, 2nd Degree Kidnapping, Aggravated Burglary, Armed Robber, Assault by Drive-by Shooting, Aggravated Crime Against Nature, Carjacking, Terrorism, Disarming of a Peace Officer, Aggravated Assault Upon a Peace Officer with a Firearm and Aggravated Assault with a Firearm…..Score: 17

- Category B – Other "Assaultive / Violent" offense against persons. The types of offenses in this category are: Aggravated Battery, 2nd Degree Battery, Mingling Harmful Substances, Sexual Battery, Intentional Exposure to AIDS Virus, Simple Kidnapping, Aggravated Criminal Damage to Property, 1st Degree Robbery, Simple Robbery, Illegal Use of Weapons of Dangerous Instrumentalities, Stalking, Aggravated Flight from an Officer, Aggravated Incest, Simple Rape, 2nd Degree Sexual Battery, Aggravated Arson, Purse Snatching, Aggravated 2nd Degree Battery and 2nd Degree Robbery…Score: 14

- Category C – Felony Narcotics. The types of offenses in this category are distribution or possession of Schedule I, II, III, IV or V drugs…Score: 7

- Category D – Other Felonies. The types of offenses in this category are all other felony charges not specifically enumerated in Categories A, B or C…Score: 6

- Category E – Major Misdemeanors Against Persons. The types of offense in this category are: Aggravated Assault, Battery of a Police Officer Without Injury, Battery of a School Teacher, Battery of a Child Welfare Worker, Simple Battery of the Infirm, Domestic Abuse Battery, Assault on a School Teacher, Assault on a child Welfare Worker, Negligent Injuring, Vehicular Negligent Injuring and False Imprisonment…Score: 5

- Category F – Other Misdemeanors. The types of offenses in this category are all other misdemeanor charges no specifically enumerated in Category E…Score: 3

- Category G – Violations of Probation of Contempt of Court Order. The types of offenses in this category are specific charges for violation of probation usually arrested by the Department of Juvenile Services (local), the Office of Juvenile Justice (state) or contempt of court orders…Score: 2

Section 2: Additional Current Offenses

►Step 12: Not including the most serious current offense taken into account in Section 1, all other current offenses are taken into account to score Section 2. Using the current Juvenile Arrest Report (JAR) or suitable substitute, count the number of additional felony and misdemeanor offenses, if applicable. Enter the corresponding score for the most appropriate number of additional current offenses, if any, in the blank provided for Section 2. Only one score can be given. Scoring is as follows:

- The juvenile has two of more additional current felony offenses…Score: 3

- The juvenile has one additional current felony offense…Score: 2

- The juvenile has one or more additional misdemeanors or violation(s) of probation / parole…Score: 1

- The juvenile has one or more status offenses or no additional current offense…Score: 0

Section 3: Prior Criminal History

►Step 13: Obtained the prior criminal history from the criminal history database and any available criminal history data from neighboring parishes/counties and the state. The current charge(s) scored in Sections 1 and 2 are not included in this Section.

►Step 14: Using the Category lists on Page 2 of the DAI, determine the number and severity of prior arrests. Enter the number corresponding to the number and severity of prior arrests in the space provided for Section 3. Scores are as follows:

- The juvenile has two or more prior arrests for a Category A or Category B offense…Score: 6

- The juvenile has one prior arrest for a Category A or Category B offense…Score: 4

- The juvenile has two or more prior arrests for any other felonies…Score: 3

- The juvenile has one prior felony arrest…Score: 2

- The juvenile has one or more prior misdemeanor arrests…Score: 1

- The juvenile has no prior arrests. …Score: 0

Section 4: History of Failure to Appear

►Step 15: History of failure to appear (FTA) in court is obtained by reviewing the local criminal history database along with any available criminal history data from neighboring parishes/counties and the state for warrants or contempts of court for failing to appear.

►Step 16: Enter the number corresponding to the number of warrants/detention orders for failing to appear within the past 12 months in the blank space provided for Section 4. Scores are as follows:

- The juvenile has had two or more warrants / detention orders for failure to appear in the past twelve (12) months…Score: 3

- The juvenile has had one warrant / detention order for failure to appear in the past twelve (12) months…Score: 1

- The juvenile has had no warrant / detention order for failure to appear in the past twelve (12) months…Score: 0

Section 5: History of Escape / Runaway

►Step 17: Obtained the history of escape/runaway by reviewing the local criminal history database along with any available criminal history data from neighboring parishes/counties and the state.

►Step 18: Enter the number corresponding to the history of escape/runaway in the blank space provided in Section 5. Only one score can be given. Scores are as follows:

- One or more documented escapes from secure confinement or custody within the past twelve (12) months…Score: 4

- Two or more instances of absconding from non-secure, court-ordered placements within the past twelve (12) months…Score: 3

- Three or more runaways from home within the past twelve (12) months…Score: 1

- No history of escape / runaway within the past twelve (12) months…Score: 0

Section 6: Aggravating Factors

Aggravating Factors account for facts that are not considered in Sections 1 through 5 to be considered in the detention decision. They are to be scored when circumstances surrounding the youth at the time of intake may impact public safety. Each Aggravating Factor adds one point for a maximum of two total points regardless of the number of aggravating factors that apply. Aggravating Factors considered on the DAI are:

- Significant mental health issues
- Significant substance abuse issues
- Under the influence of drugs or alcohol
- Considerable flight risk
- Released from detention within the past thirty (30) days
- Currently on probation

►Step 19: Determine which Aggravating Factors apply to the arrested youth. Place a check mark in the box in front of the corresponding factor(s).

►Step 20: Count the number of check marks. Following the list below, enter the score for Aggravating Factors in the blank space provided for Section 6. **Note: Regardless of the number of check marks, there is a maximum of two (2) points for this Section.**

Scoring is as follows:

- Zero checkmarks: Section 6 score is 0
- One checkmark: Section 6 score is 1
- Two check marks: Section 6 score is 2
- Three checkmarks: Section 6 score is 2
- Four checkmarks: Section 6 score is 2
- Five checkmarks: Section 6 score is 2
- Six checkmarks: Section 6 score is 2

Section 7: Mitigating Factors

Mitigating Factors account for facts that are not considered in Sections 1 through 5 to be considered in the detention decision. They are to be scored when circumstances surrounding the youth at the time of intake are likely to not impact public safety. Each Mitigating Factor *subtracts* one point for a maximum of two total points regardless of the number of mitigating factors that apply. Mitigating Factors considered on the DAI are:

- Less than twelve (12) years of age
- No prior record
- Minimal involvement in the offense
- Guardian is able or willing to provide the appropriate supervision

►Step 21: Determine which Mitigating Factors apply to the arrested youth. Place a check mark in the box in front of the corresponding factor(s).

►Step 22: Count the number of check marks. Following the list below, enter the score for Mitigating Factors in the blank space provided for Section 7. **Note: Regardless of the number of checkmarks, there is a maximum of two (2) points for this Section.**

Scoring is as follows:

- Zero checkmarks: Section 7 score is 0
- One checkmarks: Section 7 score is Minus 1
- Two checkmarks: Section 7 score is Minus 2
- Three checkmarks: Section 7 score is Minus 2
- Four checkmarks: Section 7 score is Minus 2

Total Indicated Score: The Total Indicated Score is the sum of Sections 1 through 7.

►Step 23. Add the scores written in the blanks on the right side of Page 1 and write the sum in the blank provided next to Total Indicated Score.

Indicated Decision: The Indicated Decision is the detention decision when all factors accounted for in Sections 1 through 7 have been calculated. This score is referred to as "Indicated" because the Actual Decision may be different than what the DAI score indicates. This will be discussed later in the manual. The Total Indicated Score yields the Indicated Decision.

Total Indicated Score	Indicated Decision
0 – 9	**Release**: Juvenile is released without conditions to the parent or legal guardian
10 – 14	**Alternative**: Juvenile is released with special conditions, which may include intense supervision by staff or electronic monitoring until the court date
15 – 35	**Detain**: Juvenile is detained at the secure detention facility until the court date

The Indicated Decision contains three decisions each with a corresponding numeric range. Decisions and their corresponding ranges are as follows:

►Step 24: Place a checkmark in the Indicated Decision that corresponds to the number of points in the Total Indicated Score.

Overrides: On the bottom of Page 2, there are two override items. They are Mandatory Overrides and Administrative Overrides.

Mandatory Overrides

A mandatory override is best defined as the decision to override the Indicated Decision as the result of local policies to detain youth under specific circumstances. These "policy

holds" are not quantified and do not have scores. The presence or absence of a Mandatory Override serves to finalize the detention decision. If there is no Mandatory Override, the Indicated Decision applies. However, if there is a Mandatory Override, the override applies.

The types of Mandatory Overrides listed below must be detained regardless of the Indicated Decision:

- Use or possession of a firearm during the current offense
- Escapee from secure custody
- Taken into custody via extradition or is a fugitive from another jurisdiction
- Juvenile is on electronic monitoring or is already in secure custody at the time of the offense
- Juvenile is currently on parole
- Arrested on a "JU" or court docketed contempt order (excluding Traffic or FINS) or arrested on an officer's warrant
- Juvenile is identified as a serious habitual offender by the local police department

►Step 25: Check any boxes in front of the justification for Mandatory Override.

Administrative Overrides

An Administrative Override is defined as the decision to override the Indicated Decision as the result of circumstances not accounted for in other parts of the DAI. Administrative Overrides can be either to detain the youth or to release the youth contrary to the Indicated Decision. Such circumstances warranting detaining the youth include the following:

- Parent, guardian or responsible relative cannot be located
- Parent, guardian refuses or is unable to take custody of juvenile

Reasons for discretionary overrides that can either detain or release a juvenile when the Indicated Decision is otherwise are listed in the space provided below choice "C" under Administrative Overrides. The reason to detain or release a youth and disregard the Indicated Decision on the DAI must be clearly written and approved and signed by a supervisor.

►Step 26: Check any boxes in front of the justification for Administrative Override.

►Step 27: If Indicated Decision is overridden due to Administrative Override item "C", write the reason and obtain a supervisor's signature.

Actual Decision: The Actual Decision is defined as the actual placement of the youth. Juveniles can be released to a parent or guardian, released with conditions to one of several Alternatives to Detention, or detained in a secure facility. If the youth was released by local law enforcement, check "JPSO Release". If the youth was released under authority of a Juvenile Court judge, check "Judge Release". If the youth was sent to an Alternative to

Detention program, check "Alternative". If the youth was placed in secure detention, check "Secure".

► Step 28: Place a checkmark in the box corresponding to the Actual Decision.

PROCEDURE FOR ALTERNATIVE PLACEMENT

The Alternatives to Detention (ATD) Probation Officer will maintain frequent communication with the Detention Probation Officer (DPO), the Juvenile Intake Center (JIC), and Rivarde Detention Home intake personnel. Referrals to the ATD Program will typically come from the DPO once the juvenile has been released by the JIC to Rivarde. Following release by the JIC and after receiving a referral by the DPO, the ATD Probation Officer shall complete the ATD Supervision Intake Sheet for each juvenile. The parent or guardian shall be given a copy of the signed Conditions of Release/Bond form before taking custody of the juvenile. The ATD Probation Officer shall create and maintain a file for each juvenile containing the following:

- Pre-Trial Supervision Intake Sheet;
- Conditions of Release/Bond Form;
- Detention Assessment Instrument;
- Activity Notes Form

From the day the juvenile is referred to the ATD, the ATD Probation Officer or Tracker shall maintain daily, random verbal or visual contact with the juvenile, including weekends and holidays. Phone calls may include conversations with parents/guardians; however, require communication directly with juveniles. Contact times are to be random enough to prevent predictable patterns. The juvenile will remain on the front-end alternative (Phase I) until they attend a Court hearing at which point they will either be released from ATD supervision or continued on Phase II of the ATD as ordered by the court.

Any juvenile who violates the conditions of the signature bond or who violates any conditions of release shall be sanctioned by the following:

- ✓ Placement into a higher level ATD of supervision (i.e., Trackers Program or Electronic Monitoring Program)
- ✓ Revocation of Conditions of Release/Bond by the Court, or by recommendation to the Court by the Detention Probation Officer or parent/guardian and remanding to secure detention.

Upon termination of supervision, the ATD Probation Officer shall complete the ATD Intake Sheet and submit it to the Chairman of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Committee, or his/her designee for data collection purposes.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY ASSESSMENTS

The DAI is intended to measure the likelihood of an arrested juvenile to re-offend before the first subsequent court date (in the interest of public safety) and the likelihood of the juvenile to fail to appear in court for the first subsequent court date. A key assumption

regarding use of detention assessment instruments is assumed that the Court assumes jurisdiction upon the youth's first appearance to court. With legislative authority granted by the Louisiana Children's Code, the juvenile judicial system initiates authority over the youth upon the youth's first involvement with the court – typically the Continued Custody Hearing for detained youth and the Answer Hearing for non-detained youth. Based on evidence presented at these hearings, the Court may take several actions to address issues related to public safety and failure to appear for court.

Reliability and validity of the DAI are key to utilizing the instrument. These psychometric properties refer to the ability of the instrument to repeatedly obtain the same result and the ability of the instrument to measure what it is intended to measure. Internal and external studies have been collected to measure these properties.

Reliability: To establish the inter-rater reliability of the instrument, 60 cases were scored by two officers and the scores were compared for consistency. Two officers from the Jefferson Parish Sheriff's Office (JPSO) at the Juvenile Intake Center (JIC) who routinely manage the intake of juvenile arrestees (one from the AM shift, one from the PM shift) were given the same set of 60 Juvenile Arrest Reports (JARs) and corresponding rap sheets. The officers were asked to complete the DAIs using these documents because they contain all relevant information on current offenses, and prior history of arrests, FTAs and runaways/escapes.

Fifty-six of the 60 DAIs were completed by both officers and were considered in the analysis. The data were analyzed by Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) staff using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences statistical software using the *Intra-Class Correlation Coefficient* (ICC) calculation. The ICC score can range from zero to 1, with 0 indicating a total lack of reliability and 1 indicates perfect reliability. The resulting coefficient value suggested that the instrument is very highly reliable with an ICC rating of 0.89. By comparison, the Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth, a highly regarded assessment for at-risk youth showed an ICC score of .81. Although the constructs and scoring of these instruments are different, use of an assessment that measures similar aspects of at-risk youth is most appropriate for this comparison.

When reviewing differences between pairs of raw scores obtained in this reliability assessment, 42.9% had perfect agreement, 76.8% differed by one point or were in perfect agreement, 80.4% differed by two points or less or perfectly agreed, and 87.5% differed by three points or less or perfectly agreed. A three-point difference was selected as the cut-off point because if a juvenile scores even the lowest detainable score (15), a three-point margin of error would still score the youth well-within the alternative custody range (10-14) which would keep the youth under careful scrutiny.

Validity: Validity refers to the ability of the DAI to measure what it is intended to measure. Two constructs scored by the DAI are likelihood of re-offending within a 60 day period after the arrest and failure to appear for the next court hearing. Three types of validity were assessed. Concurrent validity was assessed to compare the DAI to the previously used "Decision Tree". Although the Decision Tree was not validated, it was in

use for many years and was viewed as the parish-wide standard for detention assessment. Construct validity was assessed using the known-group method of using the DAI to score known groups of offenders. Predictive validity was performed internally and externally by comparing DAI decisions to actual outcomes.

Concurrent Validation:

A sample of 934 DAIs dating from 9/18/07 to 2/8/08 were completed by JPSO personnel at the JIC, and entered into a database by DJS staff. The total score on the DAI was recorded, and the actual decision (release or detain) made by the JPSO instrument was also recorded. The sample was restricted to only those who were indicated by the DAI for release and were actually released either immediately by the Decision Tree or released within the statutory 72-hour time limit by the Magistrate. This was done so that so that released arrestees had a true opportunity to re-offend or to FTA. The DAI indicated 405 releases that were in fact given liberty to re-offend or FTA while the Decision Tree actually released 346 youths.

Unequal sample sizes were allowed in order to most stringently and conservatively test the validity of the DAI—that is, *all juveniles* indicated for release by the DAI who had the opportunity to re-offend or FTA were considered in the study as not to eliminate potential failures of the DAI to identify those who *truly did re-offend or FTA*. To eliminate those released by the Magistrate and not by the Decision Tree might artificially reduce the number of potential failures of the DAI thus inflating the success rate.

Through consultation with ranking juvenile-division representatives of the Jefferson Parish District Attorney's (JPDA) Office, it was determined that sixty days is sufficient time for a juvenile to make the first court appearance (or to FTA) and further, was ample time to re-offend before the first court appearance. These two criteria were measures of the intention of the DAI— to accurately predict the risk of re-offense and also the risk of flight within the nationally accepted, 10% standard margin of error.

Sixty days after the last *released arrestee* in the sample was arrested, the number of juveniles who re-offended were collected by counting subsequent arrests. The FTAs were also counted by researching the Jefferson Parish Juvenile Court (JPJC) database (AS400 platform) for court records of failures to appear. A comparison of the actual Decision Tree outcomes and the theoretic DAI outcomes revealed the following: both had a very acceptable FTA rate, 4.3% for the Decision Tree and 4.7% for the DAI. Also, as regards re-offense rates, the Decision Tree had a 9.25% re-offense rate of released arrestees and the DAI had only a 7.9% rate of re-offense of released juveniles.

The DAI, if in use, would have detained only 112 while the Decision Tree actually detained 296. Therefore, in comparison to the Decision Tree, the DAI released more arrestees who were *truly not in need of detention* (reducing expensive and inappropriate detentions by 62%), and it would do so *with a 14% lower re-offense rate* than the Decision Tree re-offense rate. In essence, the DAI would release fewer re-offenders than the

Decision Tree (increasing public safety) while releasing many more juveniles who were not in need of detention.

Construct Validity:

Construct validity assessment was conducted to *statistically* determine if the DAI is capable of identifying for detention those who are definitely appropriate for detention and identifying for release those that should be released. The *Known-Group* method was employed by having local experts from law enforcement and detention identify JARs and corresponding rap sheets of arrestees that such experts *know* belong to the "Definitely Detainable" and "Definitely Releasable" *groups*. Every effort was made by law enforcement staff to include a wide variety of severity among the offenders selected for the Definitely Detainable group ranging from the clearly dangerous to the merely troubled and in need of detention. The Releasable Group was similarly selected with a wide range of offenses.

These JARs and rap sheets (also used simultaneously in the reliability assessment mentioned above) were given code numbers only known to two DJS staff who were in no other way involved in the study beyond the handling of the rap sheets and JARs. All names and other identifying personal data were blacked out so neither the raters nor the researchers knew the identity of the youth nor to which group the youth belonged. In the above process of completing the DAIs for the reliability assessment by the JPSO officers, the data for this validity assessment were simultaneously gathered. The data were entered into the database and were transferred to the two DJS staff holding the identity codes who then assigned the proper known-group labels (release or detain) to each of the DAIs.

From a technical standpoint, this assessment is designed to statistically ensure that the Definitely Detainable group's average score is *truly higher* than the Definitely Releasable group's average score and that differences are not due to chance, or random variance among the juveniles sampled (called sampling error). The SPSS statistical software *Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test* revealed that the group averages were indeed different and that the differences were in the *expected direction*. That is to say, because detainability should correspond to a higher score and releasability to a lower one, Detainable group scores *were expected to be higher* than the Releasable group scores.

The *ANOVA* analysis revealed that the Detainable group average of 11.85 *is statistically significantly higher* than the Releasable group average score of 6.84 (with an F-value of 28.085, $p > 0.0001$). This means the odds of this difference in scores being due to sampling error (or chance) are *less than one in ten thousand.*

Predictive Validity:

Predictive validity refers to the ability of the DAI to predict whether or not a juvenile will be arrested within 60 days or will fail to appear for the next court hearing. An internal study conducted comparing DAI decisions and arrests showed 93% of youth that scored Release on the DAI were not re-arrested within 60 days. Re-arrest data for detained youth

was not calculated because it is assumed that youth were either in detention or under jurisdiction of the juvenile court.

An external study of predictive validity enhanced internal results by comparing each score of the DAI to recidivism. Results showed when all seven sections are considered together, they significantly predict re-arrest within 60 days. Further, all but two of the seven sections scored were significantly correlated to re-arrest. In addition, the external study made recommendations for removing two items, which will be considered in future revisions of the DAI.