



Juvenile Justice Information System

Data & Evaluation Report

Racial and Ethnic Disparities Relative Rate Index (RRI) Douglas County (2025)

JJIS Steering Committee
JJIS Data & Evaluation Sub-Committee

JJIS – A Shared Information System



Oregon Youth Authority

Oregon Juvenile Department Directors' Association





Juvenile Justice Information System Steering Committee

Mission ♦ Vision ♦ Goals ♦ Values

JJIS Mission

To promote public safety and youth accountability, and to offer opportunities for rehabilitation to youth, through the development and sustainability of a statewide juvenile justice information system.

JJIS Vision Statement

Goals in Support of Vision Statement

♦ Provides a comprehensive view of information about youth across Oregon's state and county juvenile justice agencies.	♦ Sustain JJIS as a statewide juvenile justice information system that supports the partnership of the OYA, the 36 county juvenile departments, and approved external partners; ♦ Sustain JJIS as the primary information system used by the OYA and county juvenile departments to manage and report information about youth in their agency; and ♦ Enhance electronic access to data among users, partners and stakeholders.
♦ Provides comprehensive support for managing individual youth cases and tracking youth through the justice process.	♦ Support the assessment of risks and needs of youth; ♦ Support individual case plans; ♦ Track youth through the entire justice process so that individual status, program involvement, progress, and outcomes can be determined; and ♦ Expand provider/partner access to individual youth records.
♦ Provides the capacity for and aids in the overall planning, development, and evaluation of programs designed to reduce youth crime.	♦ Provide data and information to evaluate the benefit of programs aimed at reducing youth crime; ♦ Expand the capacity of JJIS for efficient data collection, analysis, and dissemination; ♦ Provide data to researchers and incorporate new research and evidence into policy and practice; and ♦ Identify and implement standardized outcome indicators that measure investment return, including recidivism, positive youth outcomes and other appropriate indicators tied to specific criminogenic risk factors.
♦ Recognizes and supports the common business needs of juvenile justice partnership agencies.	♦ Provide a statewide standard for entry of information into JJIS; ♦ Maintain confidentiality and protection of information contained in JJIS; ♦ Maintain the energy and enthusiasm of the Steering Committee and the partner agencies needed to keep JJIS vital; ♦ Seek opportunities to support business practice changes and respond to emerging business requirements; ♦ Cultivate innovative and forward thinking solutions to improve JJIS; ♦ Continue to prioritize and manage JJIS resources efficiently; ♦ Ensure consistent data integrity; ♦ Ensure consistent training of JJIS users; ♦ Ensure continuity of knowledge of both OYA and county juvenile department business practices within OYA's Information System Department to support leadership and data integrity; and ♦ Create and implement a JJIS Steering Committee Communication Plan.

Revisions adopted 9/20/2017

JJIS Partnership Values

Representatives of the OYA and OJDDA serve on the JJIS Steering Committee and form the JJIS partnership. The JJIS partnership:

- ♦ Represents the best interests of Oregon's juvenile justice system as a whole;
- ♦ Is entered into in good faith by all parties with integrity and honesty, and in the spirit of mutual support and collaboration;
- ♦ Promotes the ethical use of JJIS information and uses the data with respect, professionalism, and sensitivity toward the partners whose data is represented in the information;
- ♦ Adopts and maintains the JJIS Vision and Goals, keeping them current with juvenile justice needs;
- ♦ Uses the Vision and Goals as guiding principles for JJIS decision making.



JJIS Steering Committee

The JJIS Steering Committee is the governance body providing guidance to oversight of JJIS activities. The committee represents Oregon's 36 counties, the Oregon Youth Authority, and other statewide partners.

Oversight responsibilities include monitoring appropriate use of JJIS and its data, prioritizing development of software features, making policy decisions, and authorizing access to statewide data for research and program evaluation.

The committee meets monthly to ensure that JJIS is on task to accomplish the vision and goals of the JJIS partnership.

Members (March 2026)

Molly Rogers, Director

Wasco County Youth Services

JJIS Steering Committee Co-Chair

Deborah Martin, Interim Government Relations Manager

Oregon Youth Authority

JJIS Steering Committee Co-Chair

Jennifer Cearley, Director

Washington County Juvenile Department

Denessa Martin, Interim Assistant Director

Oregon Youth Authority, Facility Services

Ted Martinez, Director

Malheur County Juvenile Department

Patti Robb, Director

Lane County Juvenile Department

Sandra Santos, Assistant Director

Oregon Youth Authority, Community Services

Matthew Thenell, Director

Tillamook County Juvenile Department

External partners and other interested parties frequently attend meetings and participate in discussions, but do not have voting rights on committee recommendations.

OYA Staff

Aparna Thomas, Chief Information Officer

Oregon Youth Authority Information Services

Sachin Prajapati, Manager

JJIS Development & Reports, OYA Information Services

Douglas Thomas, Manager

JJIS Policy & Implementation, OYA Information Services

JJIS Data and Evaluation Subcommittee

The JJIS Data and Evaluation Subcommittee is a standing committee of the JJIS Steering Committee, contributing to local and statewide research initiatives, program and system evaluations, and policy recommendations regarding the use of data. The subcommittee supports the juvenile justice system by ensuring consistency, accuracy and appropriateness of the data, guiding the development of routine and annual reports and statistics, and interpreting relevant data analyses.

*THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
FOR PURPOSES OF 2-SIDED PRINTING*

Introduction

Oregon's juvenile justice community is committed to providing effective and efficient services to promote public safety and prevent youth from returning to criminal behavior. The juvenile justice system in Oregon, and around the nation, is focused on improving the equitable treatment for youth of all races and ethnicities who encounter the system. An important foundation to understand disparate treatment in the system is to know the Relative Rate Index for a county.

What is Relative Rate Index (RRI)?

The Relative Rate Index (RRI) is a way to compare experiences of different groups of youth, typically broken down by race or ethnicity, within the juvenile justice system. In the context of this report, "youth of color" refers to African American, Asian American, Native American, and Hispanic youth. If groups are treated equally, both groups will have an RRI equal to 1. The focus is on proportional rates, so the groups don't need to have the same number of occurrences, just the same rate of occurrence. When the RRI is not equal to 1, one group of youth is receiving different treatment than the other group.

For example:



Contents of this report

This document contains county specific data regarding the RRI for youth of color. The RRI is calculated at six decision points in the juvenile justice system:

- **Referred to juvenile department:** A report to a juvenile department, typically by law enforcement, that a youth is alleged to have committed an act that if done by an adult would constitute a crime. RRI calculations are based on unique referrals.
 - RRI Referrals are assigned to the County that originally processed the referral, regardless of where the crime occurred.

- **Cases Involving secure detention:** Youth may be held in a county juvenile detention facility, per statute, for pre-adjudication holding, as a sanction for an adjudicated offense, or for a probation violation. RRI calculations are based on unique admissions to detention.

Note: The four decision points listed below are based on dispositions.

Note: Dispositions may not directly connect to referrals received in an earlier decision point. There may be cases where a referral is received in one year but won't be disposed until the next, or where a youth escalates to a higher intensity of disposition on the same referral for a prior year.

Note: Youth with dispositions within the reporting period are only included in one of the categories below. RRI calculations are based on dispositions for unique youth per county per year (youth are assigned to their most intense disposition per county per year).

- **Cases not petitioned:** A case that is dismissed or handled through informal means
- **Cases petitioned (charges filed):** A referral that is charged in a petition, usually by the county district attorney's office, and is filed with the court
- **Cases resulting in confinement:** A disposition order of an adjudicated petition that results in a youth being placed in a youth correctional facility
- **Cases transferred to adult court:** A case that is transferred to adult court through a waiver hearing process

Every county in the state is represented, but not every county has enough instances to adequately report data. Some counties can report an RRI in one area or decision point, but not an RRI in every area or decision point, for the same reason.

Notes about the information

Statewide Data: Because RRI needs to be viewed at a county, not state, level to provide the most meaningful data, statewide data is not presented as RRI.

Real Number of Occurrences: The actual number of occurrences are reported for each county for each area and decision point. While there are limitations in reporting the RRI for every category, the JJIS Steering Committee recognizes that all youth from all races and ethnic backgrounds count and should be reported.

Missing Data: When an asterisk (*) is seen in the report, it indicates the numerator in the calculation was 5 or less or the denominator was 50 or less. Therefore, there is not enough data for counties to report reliable data.

Race and Ethnicity: The JJIS Steering Committee defines Race and Ethnicity reporting categories based on available data. Race is recorded by the juvenile department based on police reports and youths' self-reporting. These reports categorize youth by the race that is recorded in JJIS unless the recorded ethnicity is Hispanic. When the recorded ethnicity is Hispanic, the youth is categorized as Hispanic, regardless of race.

The JJIS Steering Committee respects all races and ethnicities and acknowledges that we cannot accurately represent everyone based on the need to comply with federal reporting standards.

Cautions regarding RRI data

The population estimates* used in the current RRI reports are typically from the previous year; however, the release of current estimates has been delayed. The 2025 RRI reports apply the most recent available estimate from 2022; we believe this will have a negligible effect on the calculation of referral rates.

- There is some level of inconsistency in the reporting of Hispanic as a race on referrals by law enforcement, dependent on how race and ethnicity is recorded. Therefore, there is potential for under-reporting of Hispanic youth within the data. For example, some law enforcement agencies may use census guidelines for collecting race. In this case, Hispanic youth are identified as being white or non-white, with Hispanic as a cultural identification rather than race. Other agencies may identify Hispanic as a racial group.
- The RRI report can provide the data for actual occurrences and areas of disparate treatment for youth of color in the juvenile justice system in Oregon. This report cannot describe or tell the reasons for the data in any county.

**Population data estimates are provided by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.*


March 2026

Youth in contact with juvenile justice system — racial disparities

Douglas County

Criminal behaviors only

At Risk Population (Youth 10-17)



In comparison to white youth contacts with the juvenile justice system, other groups experience contact at the following rates:

Juvenile Justice System Path Decision Point	Relative Rate Index (RRI) Compared to White Youth			
	African American	Hispanic	Asian	Native American
Referred to Juvenile Department	*	0.46	*	*
Cases Involving Secure Detention	0.91	*	*	*
Cases Not Petitioned	*	*	*	*
Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)	*	*	*	*
Cases Resulting in Confinement	*	*	*	*
Cases Transferred to Adult Court	*	*	*	*

KEY: * Insufficient numbers to provide reliable results

RRI
is desirable

RRI
is area for improvement

The Relative Rate Index (RRI) is a helpful way to compare the experiences of different groups of youth (ages 10-17) within the juvenile justice system. When groups are treated equally, they have an RRI equal to "1". This is true even when one group is larger than another group. When the RRI is not equal to "1", one group is receiving different treatment relative to the other. In most cases, an RRI of 1 or less is designated as desirable. The exception is the "Cases Not Petitioned" category, where RRIs of "1" or greater are desirable because dismissed or informally handled is considered a positive outcome.


Source Data: 2025 Relative Rate Index (RRI) Review - JJIS BIS Reports System;
2022 population data provided by Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Youth in contact with juvenile justice system — racial disparities

Douglas County

Criminal behaviors only

At Risk Population (Youth 10-17)



2025 Relative Rate Index (RRI) Review - JJIS BIS Reports System

2022 Population Data provided by Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

	Total	White	African American	Hispanic	Asian	Native American
Number of actual occurrences by decision point						
Population At Risk (ages 10 through 17)	10,126	8,408	175	1,109	176	258
Percent of total population		83.0	1.7	11.0	1.7	2.5
Referred to Juvenile Department	232	133	5	8	5	1
Cases Involving Secure Detention	115	88	3	9	6	4
Cases Not Petitioned	112	50	2	4	0	1
DA Declined / Insufficient Evidence / Rejected	35	16	1	1	0	0
Closed at Intake / Warning / Review and Close	17	8	1	0	0	0
Alternative Process	3	1	0	0	0	1
Allegations Not Petitioned but Informally Supervised	57	25	0	3	0	0
Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)	63	45	3	5	1	1
Cases Resulting in Delinquency Findings	45	33	1	5	1	1
County Probation	29	23	1	1	1	0
OYA Probation & OYA Commitment for Community Placement	2	2	0	0	0	0
OYA Commitment for YCF	6	3	0	2	0	1
Other	8	5	0	2	0	0
Allegations Transferred to Adult Court	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dismiss, Plea Bargain, or Alternative Process	18	12	2	0	0	0