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**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.

**Vision Statement**
- Provides a comprehensive view of information about youth across Oregon’s state and county juvenile justice agencies.
- Provides comprehensive support for managing individual youth cases and tracking youth through the justice process.
- Provides the capacity for and aids in the overall planning, development, and evaluation of programs designed to reduce youth crime.
- Recognizes and supports the common business needs of juvenile justice partnership agencies.

**Goals in Support of Vision Statement**
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

**JJIS Partnership Values**
Representatives of the OYA, OJDDA, and external partners with an interest in juvenile justice 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.
**JJ IS Steering Committee**

The JJ IS Steering Committee provides oversight to the JJ IS project. It meets regularly to ensure that JJ IS is on task to accomplish the vision and goals of the JJ IS partnership.

The Steering Committee prioritizes the development of software features, makes policy decisions, and allocates resources to the project.
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  JJ IS Policy & Implementation

- **Don Crossley**, Manager
  JJ IS Development & Reports

**JJ IS Data and Evaluation Subcommittee**

The JJ IS Data and Evaluation Subcommittee is a standing committee of the JJ IS 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.
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 come into contact with 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 or RRI?

The Relative Rate Index or 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 number is looking at proportional rates, so the groups do not have to be the same in number of occurrence, just the same in 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White Youth Rate</th>
<th>Youth of Color Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="White Youth Rate Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Youth of Color Rate Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **RRI is greater than 1.0**

- **RRI equals 1.0**

- **RRI is less than 1.0**

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has done extensive work on RRI. For more detailed information, go to OJJDP’s National Disproportionate Minority Contact Databook: [https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/dmcdb/](https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/dmcdb/)
This document contains county specific data regarding the Relative Rate Index for youth of color. The RRI is calculated at six different decision points in the juvenile justice system. The six decision points and definitions include:

- **Referral to juvenile court**: 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.

  NOTE: To be more consistent with national standards for reporting RRI data, this definition has been changed from the one used for the previous RRI report. Specifically, the following language has been removed from the definition: “youth alleged to have committed a violation of the law or referred for a dependency status offense such as Runaway or Beyond Parental Control.”

  However, to avoid confusion and to provide a smooth transition to the revised definition, this report includes three versions of RRI calculations based on three definitions of “referral to juvenile court” and are labeled as follows:

  - **Report A — Criminal behaviors only**: (referrals for crimes, such as criminal mischief or assault)
  - **Report B — Criminal and non-criminal behaviors only**: (referrals for violations, such as minor in possession of alcohol)
  - **Report C — Criminal, non-criminal, and dependency/status behaviors**: (referrals for dependency behavior, such as runaway or beyond parental control)

- **Case diverted from court or formal handling**: a case that is handled through informal means, such as a diversion program or sole sanction.

- **Use of secure detention**: a 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.

- **Case petitioned to court**: a referral that is charged in a petition, usually by the county district attorney’s office, and is filed with the court.

- **Case resulting in secure confinement in a youth correctional facility**: a disposition order of an adjudicated petition that results in a youth being placed in a youth correctional facility.

- **Case transferred to adult court**: a case that is transferred to adult court, either through a waiver process or through an automatic waiver of a Measure 11 charge.

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.

The 11 counties that have RRI data to report in 2017 are: Clackamas, Deschutes, Hood River, Jackson, Lane, Linn, Malheur, Marion, Multnomah, Umatilla, and Washington.
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 race and ethnic backgrounds count and should be reported.

**Missing Data:** When * is seen in the report, it is indicating the numerator in the calculation was 50 or less or the denominator was 5 or less. Therefore, there is not enough data for counties to report out 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.

Limitations of the Data

- 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 Relative Rate Index 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 “why” for the data in any particular county.
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Youth in contact with juvenile justice system — racial disparities

Umatilla County
Report A — Criminal behaviors only

At Risk Population (Youth 10-17) 1/1/2017 – 12/31/2017

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Justice System Path Decision Point</th>
<th>Relative Rate Index (RRI) Compared to White Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Juvenile Court</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Diverted</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Involving Secure Detention</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Resulting in Confinement</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Transferred to Adult Court</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- * Insufficient numbers to provide reliable results
- N/O No occurrences
- RRI is desirable
- RRI is area for improvement

Data Source: JJIS Report #00471d — Data for Relative Rate Index (RRI) Review

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.
## Umatilla County
### Report A — Criminal behaviors only

### At Risk Population (Youth 10-17) 1/1/2017 – 12/31/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,822</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total population</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Referred to Juvenile Court**: 307  
  - White: 174  
  - African American: 8  
  - Hispanic: 77  
  - Asian: 0  
  - Native American: 47
- **Cases Diverted**: 437  
  - White: 236  
  - African American: 6  
  - Hispanic: 124  
  - Asian: 0  
  - Native American: 68
- **Cases Involving Secure Detention**: 81  
  - White: 35  
  - African American: 2  
  - Hispanic: 20  
  - Asian: 0  
  - Native American: 23

### Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)

#### Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings

- **Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities**: 1  
  - White: 1  
  - African American: 0  
  - Hispanic: 0  
  - Asian: 0  
  - Native American: 0
- **Cases Resulting in Probation Placement**: 33  
  - White: 19  
  - African American: 2  
  - Hispanic: 5  
  - Asian: 0  
  - Native American: 6
- **Other**: 16  
  - White: 10  
  - African American: 1  
  - Hispanic: 3  
  - Asian: 0  
  - Native American: 2

**Sub-Total for Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings**: 50  
- White: 30  
- African American: 3  
- Hispanic: 8  
- Asian: 0  
- Native American: 8

- **Cases Transferred to Adult Court**: 6  
  - White: 3  
  - African American: 0  
  - Hispanic: 3  
  - Asian: 0  
  - Native American: 0

- **Dismiss, Plea Bargain or Alternative Process**: 32  
  - White: 21  
  - African American: 0  
  - Hispanic: 7  
  - Asian: 0  
  - Native American: 3

**Total for Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)**: 88  
- White: 54  
- African American: 3  
- Hispanic: 18  
- Asian: 0  
- Native American: 11

*Data Source: JJIS Report #00471d — Data for Relative Rate Index Review*
In comparison to white youth contacts with the juvenile justice system, other groups experience contact at the following rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Justice System Path Decision Point</th>
<th>Relative Rate Index (RRI) Compared to White Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Juvenile Court</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Diverted</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Involving Secure Detention</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Resulting in Confinement</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Transferred to Adult Court</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- * Insufficient numbers to provide reliable results
- N/O No occurrences
- RRI is desirable
- RRI is area for improvement

**Data Source:** JJIS Report #00471d — Data for Relative Rate Index (RRI) Review

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.
### Umatilla County

**Report B — Criminal and non-criminal behaviors only**

**At Risk Population (Youth 10-17)**

| Data Source: JJIS Report #00471d — Data for Relative Rate Index Review |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population At Risk</strong></td>
<td>8,822</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total population</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referred to Juvenile Court</strong></td>
<td>531</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases Diverted</strong></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases Involving Secure Detention</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Cases Resulting in Probation Placement</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total for Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Transferred to Adult Court</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismiss, Plea Bargain or Alternative Process</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)</strong></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In comparison to white youth contacts with the juvenile justice system, other groups experience contact at the following rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Justice System Path Decision Point</th>
<th>Relative Rate Index (RRI) Compared to White Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Juvenile Court</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Diverted</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Involving Secure Detention</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Resulting in Confinement</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Transferred to Adult Court</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- * Insufficient numbers to provide reliable results
- N/O No occurrences

**Data Source:** JJIS Report #00471d — Data for Relative Rate Index (RRI) Review

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.
**Youth in contact with juvenile justice system — racial disparities**

**Umatilla County**

**Report C — Criminal, non-criminal, and dependency/status behaviors**

At Risk Population (Youth 10-17)  
1/1/2017 – 12/31/2017

![Map of Umatilla County showing racial demographics](image)

**Number of actual occurrences by decision point**

*Data Source: JJIS Report #00471d — Data for Relative Rate Index Review*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population At Risk</td>
<td>8,822</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total population</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Juvenile Court</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Diverted</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Involving Secure Detention</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Cases Resulting in Probation Placement</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total for Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Transferred to Adult Court</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismiss, Plea Bargain or Alternative Process</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>