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I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Federal regulations under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act, states are required to conduct an analysis of the extent of overrepresentation of minority youth in their juvenile justice systems. The JJDP Act requires states to examine disproportionate minority contact (DMC) at each stage of processing with their system (i.e. arrest, court referral, detention, etc.). Specifically, states are required to identify the extent that disproportionality exists and conduct an assessment to determine possible contributing factors. The analysis is required to be conducted on a statewide basis and for those counties with a higher concentration of minority youth.

Based on the most recent population data (2010 Census), only 4 of North Dakota's 53 counties, excluding reservation counties, have more than 1,000 minority youth -- Burleigh, Cass, Grand Forks, and Ward. The other 49 counties have a minority youth population of 500 or less, of which 38 have less than 100 minority youth. With the majority of the state’s minority youth population in 4 counties, and because these counties are geographically located in a way that represents the four quadrants of the state – one in each of the four judicial units, North Dakota’s DMC Plan focuses on these counties.

North Dakota's most recent DMC analysis shows that disproportionality is the most significant at the point of arrest. The rates of arrest of minority youth are in some cases over five times that of white youth. Therefore, it was determined that assessment of DMC should initially focus on the higher rates of arrest that may drive rates at later stages of the system. Assessments are being conducted in Burleigh and Cass Counties with possible replication in Grand Forks and Ward Counties.

The assessments are intended to learn more about the reasons behind the disproportionality through a combination of population-based crime data and self-reported survey data. The assessment for Cass County consisted of two parts: 1) a quantitative analysis of juvenile crime data provided by the Fargo Police Department for the years 2008 – 2012; and 2) a quantitative and qualitative of survey responses from 66 officers of the Fargo Police Department. The juvenile crime data analysis looks at arrest data to determine if factors such as location, time, seasonality, or offense types help explain the disparity in rates. The survey of law enforcement officers employed by the Fargo Police Department provides insight into the practices, perceptions, and attitudes of law enforcement to determine if any of these factors may be driving the higher rates.
II. Juvenile Crime Data Analysis Summary

The following summary is based on crime statistics for juveniles under the age of 18 collected by the Fargo Police Department, which includes arrests for felony and misdemeanor offenses. Data were cleaned prior to analysis, which consisted of the removal of a small number of cases. See the methodology section of this report for more information on the methods used to clean and analyze these data.

Overview of all Incidents

Between 2008 and 2012 the Fargo Police Department had 4,059 incidents (i.e., cases) where one or more juveniles were arrested. These incidents resulted in 5,203 juvenile arrests for 6,460 separate offenses. The number of arrests is higher than the number of incidents because some incidents involved multiple juveniles and the number of offenses is higher than the number of arrests because some juveniles were arrested for multiple offenses.

According to these data the number of juvenile incidents, arrests, and total arrest offenses involving the Fargo Police Department declined steadily over the five year time period, with a 43.0% reduction in the number of arrests between 2008 and 2012 (Figure 1).

Demographics of Juveniles Arrests

- According to the 2010 Census, Native Americans and Blacks account for roughly 2% and 5%, respectively, of all juveniles in Fargo; however, they accounted for about 8% and 17%, respectively, of the juvenile arrests in Fargo between 2008 and 2012. On the flip side, Whites accounted for 84% of all juveniles in the city and 75% of the juvenile arrests.
- Males accounted for roughly 3 in 5 arrests (62.7%) compared to females accounting for 2 in 5 arrests (37.3%).
- Those 15-17 years old accounted for two-thirds (68.2%) of all arrests under the age of 18.
- The percentage of arrests occurring among a juvenile of a minority race was similar for females under 15 years of age (23.0%), females 15-17 years old (20.5%), and males 15-17.
years old (22.4%). However, among males under 15 years of age, 36.1% of all arrests involved a juvenile of a minority race, which included 29.1% occurring among black juveniles and 5.8% among Native American Juveniles.

- Table 1 provides a demographic breakdown of all juvenile arrests during 2008-2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Demographics of Juvenile Arrests*, 2008-2012 Combined

- The sharpest decline in the number of juvenile arrests between 2008 and 2012 occurred among Native Americans, who declined from 125 arrests to 43 arrests for a 65.6% decline, compared to an 18.6% decline among Black juveniles (from 183 to 149 arrests) and a 45.8% decline among White juveniles (from 960 to 520 arrests) (Figure 2).

![Figure 2: Number of Juvenile Arrests Per Year, by Race, 2008-2012](image-url)

*Represents the number of juvenile arrests, and not the unique number of juveniles arrested, meaning that a juvenile may be counted more than once if they were arrested more than one time, and their arrests may have included more than one offense.

Source: Fargo Police Department
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**Juvenile Crime Data Analysis**

**Arrest Type**

Arrests were categorized into one of three categories including arrested, on-view, and pickup order. As used in this description of arrest types, “arrested” represents encounters with youth where the officer made an arrest but did not have first-hand evidence that the individual committed the crime, “on-view” represents arrests where the officer saw the crime occur or has first-hand evidence the individual committed the crime, and “pickup order” is when a juvenile is taken into custody pursuant to a court order. The following analysis was restricted to years 2011 and 2012 combined as a result of the dramatic difference in distribution of arrest type between 2011 and 2012 (where roughly half of arrests were on-view) compared to years 2008-2010 (where 9 in 10 arrests were on-view).

- During 2011 and 2012 combined, the most common arrest type was on-view, followed by arrested and pickup order (Figure 3). Breakdown of arrest type for individual years 2011 and 2012 was nearly identical.

![Figure 3: Percentage of Juvenile Arrests by Arrest Type, 2011-2012 Combined](image)

There was little difference by race for the distribution of juvenile arrests by arrest type during 2011 and 2012 combined (Figure 4). When looking at difference by race and gender, Native American females compared to Native American males had a higher percentage for on-view, while the opposite occurred for Blacks and Whites.

![Figure 4: Percentage of Juvenile Arrests by Arrest Type, by Race, 2011-2012 Combined](image)

---
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Juvenile Crime Data Analysis

Arrest Status

Arrest dispositions were categorized into four arrest status categories including attendant care, juvenile referred, detention, and held. The following analysis was restricted to years 2011 and 2012 combined as a result of arrests status being unavailable for years 2008-2010. Arrest status information was missing from 18.7% of arrests in 2011 and 0.7% in 2012.

- During 2011-2012 combined, 4 in 5 arrests were juvenile referred, making it the most common arrest status category, followed by detention and attendant care (Figure 5).

![Figure 5: Percentage of Juvenile Arrests by Arrest Status, 2011-2012 Combined](image)

*Includes database categories cited/released, PR, and juvenile referred
Missing 154 cases (10.1% of arrests)

- Native American juveniles were more likely than Black and White juvenile to end up in attendant care or detention following an arrest and less likely to be referred during 2011 and 2012 combined. The distribution for arrest status by Black and White juveniles was similar (Figure 6). The percentage of arrests ending up in detention was substantially higher for males than for females across all three racial groups.

![Figure 6: Percentage of Juvenile Arrests by Arrest Status, by Race, 2011-2012 Combined](image)

*Includes database categories cited/released, PR, and juvenile referred
Missing 154 cases for arrest status overall (10.1% of arrests)
Arrest Month of the Year

- During the combined time period of 2008-2012, the percentage of juvenile arrests by month of the year increased from January until June before leveling off over the summer months of July-September, and then declining from October-December. June had the highest number of arrests for any month (482 arrests, 9.3%) while January had the lowest number of arrests (354 arrests, 6.8%) (Figure 7).

Figure 7: Percentage of Juvenile Arrests by Month of the Year *, 2008-2012 Combined

- When looking at juvenile arrests by three-month seasons during 2008-2012 combined, summer (29.1%) was the most common season for arrests to have occurred among Native American juveniles. Except for winter having at percentage of 19.5%, Black juveniles had a stable percentage at around 27%. White juveniles had the most stable percentage across the four seasons (Figure 8).

Figure 8: Percentage of Juvenile Arrests by Season,* by Race, 2008-2012 Combined

*Reflected the month of the year when the arrest occurred, which is not necessarily reflective of the month when the crime was committed.
Missing 0 cases (0% of arrests)

*Jan-Mar = Winter; April-June = Spring; July-Sept = Summer; Oct-Dec = Fall. Data reflect the month when the arrest occurred, and not necessarily the month when the crime was committed.
Arrest Day of the Week

- During the combined time period of 2008-2012, arrests were most likely to have occurred on Friday (16.1%) and least likely to have occurred on Sunday (11.3%). The percentage of arrests occurring during each of the five week days was higher than the percentage occurring on Saturday and Sunday (Figure 9).

![Figure 5: Percentage of Juvenile Arrests by Day of the Week*, 2008-2012 Combined](image)

*Reflects the day of the week when the arrest occurred, which is not necessarily reflective of the day when the crime was committed. Missing 0 cases (0% of arrests)

- Arrests were less likely to have occurred on weekend days than on week days for all races. Native Americans had the highest percentage of their arrests occurring on Wednesday (20.4%), which was the highest percentage for any day for any race. The percentage of arrests that occurred per day of the week for White juveniles, compared to Native American and Black juveniles, was more consistent across all seven days (Figure 10).

![Figure 10: Percentage of Juvenile Arrests by Day of the Week*, by Race, 2008-2012 Combined](image)

*Reflects the day of the week when the arrest occurred, which is not necessarily reflective of the day when the crime was committed.
Time of the Day when Crime Occurred

- During the combined time period of 2008-2012, the proportion of arrest that occurred by time of day increased gradually from morning to early evening and then began to decline (Figure 11). When looking at separate one hour time blocks the three most common hours of the day for arrests to occur were 4:00-5:00 p.m. (6.5%), 5:00-6:00 p.m. (6.2%), and 6:00-7:00 p.m. (6.2%). Overall, 3 in 5 arrests (58.3%) occurred during the day shift of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. while 2 in 5 (41.7%) occurred during the evening shift of 7:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m.

Figure 11: Percentage of Juvenile Arrests by Time of the Day*, 2008-2012 Combined

*Reflects the time of the day when the arrest occurred in two hour time blocks, which is not necessarily reflective of the time when the crime was committed.
Missing 796 cases where the time was exactly 0:00 (15.3% of arrests)

- When looking at the time of day when arrests occurred comparing weekdays (Monday-Friday) to weekend days (Saturday and Sunday) results showed substantial variation. Though arrests were most common on weekdays between 3:00-9:00 p.m., a greater proportion of arrests during weekdays occurred in the morning/mid-day between 7:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. On the flip side, a much greater proportion of arrests during the weekend occurred late evening and overnight between 11:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m. (Figure 12).

Figure 12: Percentage of Juvenile Arrests by Time of the Day*, by Weekday vs. Weekend, 2008-2012 Combined

*Reflects the time of the day when the arrest occurred in two hour time blocks, which is not necessarily reflective of the time when the crime was committed.
Missing 796 cases where the time was exactly 0:00 (15.3% of arrests)
When looking at the time of day when arrests occurred by race, Black juveniles had a slightly higher percentage of their arrests, compared to other races, occur during the morning/mid-day hours of 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on the week days. During the week days the distribution of arrests by time of day was similar for Native American and White juveniles with the majority of arrests occurring between 3:00-9:00 p.m. During the weekend days the percentage of arrests by time of day was fairly similar across the three races, and each race had a considerably higher percentage of their weekend arrests (compared to their week day arrests) occurring during the late evening and early morning hours of 11:00 p.m.–5:00 a.m. It should be noted that the number of weekend arrests for Native American juveniles was small (N=82) and the corresponding percentages should be viewed with caution (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Time of Day in Two Hour Time Blocks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon-Friday (N=3,249)</td>
<td>0700-0859 0900-1059 1100-1259 1300-1459 1500-1659 1700-1859 1900-2059 2100-2259 2300-0059 0100-0259 0300-0459 0500-0659 24-hour period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon-Sun. (N=1,158)</td>
<td>3.4% 7.7% 8.1% 10.8% 13.9% 14.5% 11.9% 7.9% 7.9% 7.4% 5.1% 1.5% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Days (N=4,407)</td>
<td>3.4% 7.7% 8.1% 10.8% 13.9% 14.5% 11.9% 7.9% 7.9% 7.4% 5.1% 1.5% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects the time of the day when the arrest occurred in two hour time blocks, which is not necessarily reflective of the time when the crime was committed.

Note: Overall missing for time of day when the crime occurred was 796 cases where the time was exactly 0:00 (15.3% of arrests)

When looking at the percentage of arrests across all seven days and all 24 hour time blocks (which includes 168 separate one hour time blocks), Sunday between midnight and 1:00 a.m. had the highest percentage for crime occurring during any of the 168 one hour blocks (1.4%). This time block was followed by 8:00-9:00 p.m. on Friday (1.4%), 4:00-5:00 p.m. on Thursday, and 6:00-7:00 p.m. on Wednesday (1.3%) and 5:00-6:00 p.m. on Saturday (1.3%). Due to the relatively small number of arrests among Native American and Black juveniles results by race should be viewed with caution due to the influence that one to two arrests have on the percentages for specific blocks. That said, the two most common blocks for Native American juveniles were Monday from 4:00-5:00 p.m. (2.6%) and Sunday from 1:00-2:00 a.m. (1.9%). For Black juveniles the two most common blocks were 6:00-7:00 p.m. on Tuesday (2.1%) and 6:00-7:00 p.m. on Monday (1.7%). For White juveniles the two most common blocks were Sunday between midnight and 1:00 a.m. (1.5%) and a tie between 8:00-9:00 p.m. on Friday (1.4%) and 3:00-4:00 on Saturday (1.4%).
The following summary of arrest offenses is based on 6,460 records, each representing an offense that a juvenile was arrested for by the Fargo Police Department between 2008 and 2012. The 6,460 records consisted of 209 individual arrest offense categories. Results include a breakdown of the most common individual offenses (out of the 209) as well as a breakdown of seven common juvenile offenses that were compiled by combining some of the 209 individual offenses together.

- The most common individual offense (out of the 209 possible offenses) was shoplifting less than $250 (17.9%), followed by minor in possession/consumption, runaway, drug paraphernalia/possession (misdemeanor), and disorderly conduct (Figure 13).

- When breaking down seven of the more common arrest offenses, theft was the most common, accounting for more than 1 in 5 offenses (22.7%), followed by alcohol and drug-related offenses, assault, and disorderly conduct (Figure 14).
When looking at differences by race for the most common individual juvenile arrest offenses that occurred between 2008 and 2012, shoplifting less than $250 was the most common offense for all races. Runaway was in the top three for all races but accounted for a higher percentage of offenses among Native American juveniles. Minor in possession/consumption was in the top three for both Native American and White juveniles, but number nine for Black juveniles. Disturbance of public school was the second most common individual offense among Black juveniles, and not in the top ten for either Native American or White juveniles. Table 3 ranks the top ten individual offenses for each race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N**</td>
<td>%***</td>
<td>N**</td>
<td>%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SHOPLIFTING &lt;$250</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>SHOPLIFTING &lt;$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JUV RUNAWAY TAKE CUSTODY OF</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>DISTURBANCE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MP/MCA UNDER INFLUENCE</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>JUV RUNWAY TAKE CUSTODY OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ASSAULT SIMPLE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>ASSAULT SIMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>DISORDERLY CONDUCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JUV DEL CHILD TAKE CUSTODY OF</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (SIMPLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DRUG PARAPHERNALIA/POS (A MSD)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>JUV DEL CHILD TAKE CUSTODY OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DISORDERLY CONDUCT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>JUV CURFEW/B/LOITERING/TRUANCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FALSE INFO/REPORT TO LAW ENF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>MP/MCA UNDER INFLUENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RESISTING POLICE OFFICER</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>RESISTING POLICE OFFICER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>All Other Offenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>All Offenses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Out of 209 separate offense categories that were part of juvenile arrest between 2008-2010
**The number of offenses
***The percentage out of all offenses

When breaking down seven common juvenile arrest offenses by race, theft was the most common for each race during 2008-2012 combined. Native American juveniles, compared to Black and White juveniles, had a higher percentage for runaway. Black juveniles had a much higher percentage for assault and disorderly conduct offenses and a much lower percentage for alcohol and drug-related offenses. Whites were the most likely to be arrested for drug-related offenses and the least likely for runaway (Figure 15).

Figure 15: Breakdown of Seven Common Juvenile Arrest Offenses*, by Race, 2008-2012 Combined

*Consists of seven common juvenile arrest offenses created by combining multiple individual offenses together; see methods for a breakdown of the offenses that make up each category.
Crime Occurring during the Typical School Operating Period

- When selecting the time period when school is most likely to occur and juveniles are coming and going to and from school (Sept-May, Monday-Friday, 7:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.) disturbance of public school was the most common individual juvenile offense overall, and the most common among Black juveniles, during the combined years of 2008-2012. Shoplifting less than $250 remained a common offense during this time period for all races, as did simple assault and disorderly conduct (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Offense N**</th>
<th>%***</th>
<th>Offense N**</th>
<th>%***</th>
<th>Offense N**</th>
<th>%***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SHOPLIFTING &lt;$250</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>DISTURBANCE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DISTURBANCE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>ASSault SIMPLE</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ASSault SIMPLE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>DISORDERLY CONDUCT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DISORDERLY CONDUCT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>SHOPLIFTING &lt;$250</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JUV RUNAWAY TAKE CUSTODY OF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>RESISTING POLICE OFFICER</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CRIMINAL MISCHIEF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>JUV DEL CHILD TAKE CUSTODY OF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MIP/MCA UNDER INFLUENCE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (SIMPLE)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TERRORIZING</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>JUV RUNAWAY TAKE CUSTODY OF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DRUG PARAPHERNALIA/POSS (MSD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>THEFT OF PROPERTY &lt;$250</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>JUV DEL CHILD TAKE CUSTODY OF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>CRIMINAL TRESPASS (FC)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>All Other Offenses</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>All Other Offenses</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>All Offenses</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>All Offenses</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The Ten Most Common Individual Juvenile Arrest Offenses during Typical School Operating Period*, by Race, 2008-2012 Combined

*Occurred during the months of Sept-May, weak days of Monday-Friday, and between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.
**The number of offenses
***The percentage out of all offenses

- When breaking down seven common juvenile arrest offenses by race during the typical school operating period, theft remained the most common for Native American and White juveniles, slightly ahead of disorderly conduct (which includes disturbance of public school). Among Black juveniles, disorderly conduct was overwhelmingly the most common category, accounting for more than one-third of all offenses. Assault offenses were also more common among Black juveniles. Drug-related offenses were common among White juveniles while alcohol and drug-related offenses were very uncommon among Black juveniles during this period (Figure 16).
Key Findings of Juvenile Crime Data Analysis

Both Native American and Black youth were overrepresented in juvenile arrests in Fargo for the years 2008-2012 based on the 2010 Census.

The percentage of arrests among juveniles of a minority race was similar for older and younger female juveniles and for older male juveniles, ranging from 20.5% to 23.0%. Among younger males (those in the “under 15” age category), however, 36.1% of all arrests involved a juvenile of a minority race; 29.1% of those were black.

The sharpest decline in the number of juvenile arrests between 2008 and 2012 occurred among Native Americans, who declined from 125 arrests to 43 arrests for a 65.6% decline. The reason for this decline could not be explained based on the data available. Further review may be needed to make sure the decline is not related to miscoding or other factors unrelated to actual frequencies of arrests.

“On-view” arrests accounted for 54.3% of arrests for 2011-2012 combined. Native American females compared to Native American males had a higher percentage for on-view, while the opposite occurred for Blacks and Whites.

During 2011-2012 about 1 in 5 juvenile arrests resulted in a juvenile being held or placed in either attendant care or detention. Native American juveniles were more likely than Black and White juvenile to end up in attendant care or detention following an arrest. The higher incidence of detention or attendant care for Native American youth correlates with the type of offenses for which these youth are commonly arrested (runaway). In these situations youth may typically be held until they can be released to parents or juvenile authorities. Difficulty in locating parents of Native American youth is often cited by police as a factor in the need for temporary detention or placement.

During the combined time period of 2008-2012, June had the highest number of arrests for any month (482 arrests, 9.3%) while January had the lowest number of arrests (354 arrests, 6.8%).

When looking at juvenile arrests by three-month seasons during 2008-2012 combined, the most common season for arrests among Native American juveniles was summer (29.1%). The least common season for arrests of Black youth over the time period was winter (19.5%).

During the combined time period of 2008-2012, arrests were most likely to have occurred on Friday (16.1%) and least likely to have occurred on Sunday (11.3%). Native Americans had the highest percentage of their arrests occurring on Wednesday (20.4%), which was the highest percentage for any day for any race. (See Figures 9 and 10)

During the combined time period of 2008-2012, the most common hours of the day for arrests occurred between 4 and 7 PM (18.9%). During the weekdays, a higher proportion of arrests occurred between 7 AM and 1 PM, while a much greater proportion of arrests occurred on the weekend during the late evening and overnight hours of 11 PM to 5 AM.
Theft was the most common offense listed, accounting for more than 1 in 5 offenses (22.7%), followed by alcohol and drug-related offenses, assault, and disorderly conduct.

When breaking down seven common juvenile arrest offenses by race, theft was the most common for each race during 2008-2012 combined. **Native American juveniles, compared to Black and White juveniles, had a higher percentage for runaway.** Black juveniles had a much higher percentage for assault and disorderly conduct offenses and a much lower percentage for alcohol and drug-related offenses. Whites were the most likely to be arrested for drug-related offenses and the least likely for runaway (Figure 15).

When selecting the time period when school is most likely to occur and juveniles are coming and going to and from school (Sept-May, Monday-Friday, 7:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.) **disturbance of public school was the most common individual juvenile offense overall, and the most common among Black juveniles,** during the combined years of 2008-2012.

When breaking down seven common juvenile arrest offenses by race during the typical school operating period, theft remained the most common for Native American and White juveniles. Among Black juveniles, disorderly conduct was overwhelmingly the most common category, accounting for more than one-third of all offenses. Assault offenses were also more common among Black juveniles.
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Demographics of Survey Respondents

- More than 4 in 5 respondents were male (83.9%).
- Slightly more than half of all respondents were under 35 years of age (55.5%), while three-quarters were under 45 years of age (74.6%).
- All respondents reported their race as White (100.0%) and no respondents reported being of Hispanic or Latino origin.
- All respondents had some level of post high school education, with nearly 3 in 5 (76.6%) having a bachelor’s degree.
- Their years of service in law enforcement varied with 2 in 5 respondents (42.9%) reporting five or fewer years compared to 1 in 6 (15.9%) reporting 20 or more years.
- The majority of respondents reported working as patrol officers (95.4%) compared with one as a school resource officer (1.5%), one as patrol/swat (1.5%), and one other unspecified (1.5%).

Table 1 provides a breakdown of the demographics of survey respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Demographics of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing: 4 cases for gender (6.1% of respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing 1 case for race (1.5% of respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic/Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing 2 cases for ethnicity (3.0% of respondents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contact with Racial/Ethnic Minority Groups

- Native American was listed as the racial/ethnic minority group that officers reported having the most contact with, listed by 3 in 5 respondents (59.4%). Native American was followed by African American, Middle Eastern, Hispanic, and four respondents wrote in Bosnian on the 'other’ response option (Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Racial/Ethnic Minority Groups that Officers have the Most Contact With](image)

Note: Some respondents selected more than one race, so the percentages do not equal 100%
*Were written into the 'other' response option category
**Selected all racial/ethnic groups, suggesting they have equal contact with all groups
Missing 2 cases (3.0% of respondents)

- When asked if there were immigrant populations that they have contact with, 57 of 66 respondents (86.4%) wrote in a response to the survey question, indicating that at least this percentage have contact with immigrant populations. The most commonly listed population groups were Bosnians, Somalis, Sudanese, Liberians, and Hispanics (Figure 2). Overall, 9 in 10 respondents (89.5%) listed population group from an African country.

![Figure 2: Immigrant Populations that Officers have Contact With](image)

Note: Some respondents listed more than one population, so the percentages do not equal 100%
*Included some responses of Asian, Middle Eastern, Indian, and general regions such as a continent
Missing 9 cases (13.6% of respondents who did not write an answer for survey question 2)
Barriers to Effectively Dealing with Minority/Immigrant Youth in the Community

- When asked if they feel there are barriers to effectively dealing with minority/immigrant youth in the community they work, 4 in 5 (81.8%) respondents indicated that there are barriers while 1 in 5 (18.2%) indicated that there are no barriers (n=55, missing 11 respondents, 16.7%). The most commonly listed barriers included language barriers, cultural differences, poor parenting or lack of supervision of youth, and little respect for or trust in law enforcement by parents or youth.

![Figure 3: Perceived Barriers to Effectively Dealing with Minority/Immigrant Youth in the Community (responses to open-ended question)]

- Language barrier (youth or adult): 51.1%
- Cultural differences: 35.6%
- Poor parenting, lack of supervision: 31.1%
- Lack of respect/trust for law enforcement: 20.0%
- Other or Unspecific: 11.1%

Note: Some respondents listed more than one barrier, so the percentages do not equal 100%
Missing 0 cases for respondents who indicated barriers exist; missing 11 cases (16.7%) overall for Q3

Contacts with Minority Youth during the Past Full Month

- Most officers had relatively few calls for service or contacts with minority youth during the past month; with 2 in 5 (42.4%) reporting that they had 5 or fewer contacts and three-quarters (77.3%) reporting that they had 10 or fewer contacts. In contrast, about 1 in 8 (12.1%) reported having 15 or more contacts (Figure 4).

![Figure 4: Approximate Number of Calls for Service or Contacts during the Past Month that involved a Minority Youth]

- 0-5: 42.4%
- 6-10: 34.8%
- 11-15: 10.6%
- 15-20: 4.5%
- 20+: 7.6%

Missing 1 cases (1.4% of respondents)
• Of the calls for service that officers had during the past month involving minority youth, close to half of respondents (45.3%) reported that 50% or more of those calls involved contact only compared to 3 in 10 (29.7%) reporting that just 0-10% of those calls involved contact only (n=64, missing 2 respondents, 3.0%).

• Of the calls for service that officers had during the past month involving minority youth, three-quarters of respondents (73.4%) reported that 0-10% of those calls resulted in referral.

• An average of 45.7% of the contacts made with minority youth during the past month occurred on the streets, making streets the most common location where contact occurred. Streets was followed closely by residential, and then by retail businesses, institutions such as group homes, shelters, and detention centers, and schools (Figure 5).

![Figure 5: Approximate Percentage of Contacts with Minority Youth during the Past Month by Location*](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets, alleys, or other public areas</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (homes)</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail businesses</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions (group homes, shelter, detention)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Missing 9 cases (13.6% of respondents)
*Among respondents who answered Q4d with responses that allowed for a sum of 100% across locations

Overall Attitudes Related to Interacting with and Managing Minority Youth

• There were seven survey questions that asked about officers attitudes related to interacting with and managing minority youth in their work and department. Each of these seven questions included the same five response options, which ranged from 1=not at all to 5=very much.
  
  o The responses receiving the highest overall score (most positive answers) included the responding officers personally being comfortable interacting with minority youth and their confidence managing situations involving minority youth.

  o The ability for them and their fellow officers and department to meet the needs of minority youth ranked slightly lower, followed by having adequate experience and training relate to the needs of minority youth. The lowest score related to their department keeping minority youth from being referred to juvenile court.

  o Table 2 provides a breakdown of the responses for each of the seven questions.
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Narrative Responses Related to Interacting With and Managing Minority Youth

Note: The following results reflect the responses among those who wrote in an explanation to their answers on survey questions 5-11. Missing data for narrative responses across the seven questions (out of all respondents) ranged from a high of 79% to a low of 62%. As a result of the large amount of missing data the following synopsis of the written in responses should be viewed with caution as it may not reflect the views of all survey participants.

Level of comfort interacting with minority youth (n=22, survey Q5):

- Reasons for comfort:
  - They spend time in communities and work to build relationships with community leaders and parents (2 respondents who gave a response of 5 on Q5)
  - Having an understanding or experience with youth (2 respondents)
  - Treat all youth equally (2 respondents)
  - A feeling that youth are generally cooperative (2 respondents)
  - Early involvement from parents (1 respondent)

- Reasons for lack of comfort:
  - Cultural and/or language barriers (5 respondents)
  - Parent barriers (3 respondents)
  - Youth lack respect for law enforcement (2 respondents)
  - Difficulty dealing with youth, not just minority youth (1 respondent)

Table 2: Attitudes Related to Interacting with and Managing Minority Youth, answers based on a five point scale ranging from 1=not at all to 5=very much*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>n**</th>
<th>Average Score (between 1-5)</th>
<th>% who Answered 5 (Very Much)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5 I am comfortable interacting with Minority Youth</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 I am confident in my abilities to meet the needs of Minority Youth</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 I am confident in my fellow officers' abilities to meet the needs of Minority Youth</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 I feel I can manage situations involving Minority Youth</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 I feel I have had adequate experience and/or training related to the needs and circumstances of Minority Youth</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 My department is meeting the needs of youth from minority racial groups</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 My department is effective in keeping Minority Youth from being referred to juvenile court</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response options ranged from 1=not at all, 2 (blank), 3=somewhat, 4 (blank), 5=very much

**Number who answered the question, out of a possible 66 survey respondents
Level of confidence in their own ability to meet the needs of minority youth (n=18, Q6):

- Reasons for confidence in their own ability (supporting more self-efficacy):
  - They have resources to provide youth (general, interpreters, etc.) (3 respondents)
  - Treat all youth equally (2 respondents)
  - Training (1 respondent)

- Reasons for lack of confidence in their own ability (restricting self-efficacy):
  - Officer restrictions and inability as officers to meet all the needs of minority youth (3 respondents)
  - Poor parenting/lack of supervision of youth (3 respondents)
  - Youth lack of respect for law enforcement/authority (3 respondents)
  - Cultural and/or language barriers (2 respondents)

Level of confidence in fellow officers’ abilities to meet the needs of minority youth (n=17, Q7):

- Reasons for confidence in fellow officers’ ability:
  - Officers are polite and courteous (1 respondent)
  - Training (1 respondent)

- Reasons for lack of confidence in fellow officers’ ability:
  - Officer restrictions, lack of time spent with youth, and/or inability as officers to meet all the needs of minority youth (4 respondents)
  - Cultural and/or language barriers (3 respondents)
  - Lack of resources (1 respondent)
  - Lack of training (1 respondent)
  - Poor parenting/lack of supervision of youth (1 respondents)
  - Youth lack of respect for law enforcement/authority (1 respondents)

Belief in their own ability to manage situations involving minority youth (n=14, Q8):

- Reasons for belief in their own ability to manage situations:
  - Do necessary and appropriate enforcement for each situation (5 respondents)
  - Treat all youth equally (4 respondents)
  - Understanding youth or experience with youth (2 respondents)
  - Give extra time to repeat offenders (1 respondent)

- Reasons for lack of belief in their own ability to manage situations:
  - Do not see youth all the way through a situation (1 respondent)
  - Lack of resources (1 respondent)
  - Youth lack of respect for law enforcement/authority (1 respondents)
Belief that they personally have adequate experience and/or training to meet the needs and circumstances of minority youth (n=17, Q9):

- Responses among those with higher belief (answered 4 or 5 on Q9):
  - On the job experience (2 respondents)
  - Training from multicultural liaison officer (2 respondents)
  - Treat all youth equally (1 respondent)
- Responses among those with less belief (answered 3 or less on Q9):
  - No training or lack of training on minority youth/youth in general (9 respondents)
  - Experience is more important than training (2 respondents)
  - Lack of resources and/or awareness of resources (2 respondents)

Perception that their department is meeting the needs of youth from minority racial groups (n=21, Q10):

- Reasons that support meeting the needs of minority youth:
  - Multicultural liaison officer is helpful (5 respondents)
  - Treat all youth equally (2 respondent)
  - Department is extremely accommodating to minorities (1 respondent)
  - Having a school resource officer helps support this (1 respondent)
  - Sufficient staffing (1 respondent)
- Reasons that inhibit meeting the needs of minority youth:
  - Poor parenting/lack of supervision of youth (2 respondents)
  - Inability as officers to meet all the needs of minority youth (1 respondent)
  - Lack of minority officers (1 respondent)
  - Lack of support/assistance from minority community (1 respondent)
  - Unsure what the department does for them (1 respondent)

Perception that their department is effective in keeping minority youth from being referred to juvenile court (n=25, Q11):

- Two of the responses among those with a very positive perception (answered 5 on Q11):
  - Very active with community groups (1 respondent)
  - Try to keep the parents involved and only do referrals when required or needed (1 respondent)
- 16 respondents (of 25 who answered the question) indicated that youth are referred as they should be when they commit a crime, and that they are treated the same regardless of their race
Greatest Level of Resistance encountered, Greatest Level of Force used, and the Condition of the Subject and Officer as a result of the Last Enforcement Encounter with a Minority Youth

Of the 66 survey respondents who answered question 12 or 13, 3 (4.5%) reported that they have never had an enforcement encounter with a minority youth. As a result, these individuals were removed from the analysis of survey questions 12-16, leaving 63 valid respondents.

- About one-quarter reported that the greatest level of resistance encountered during their last enforcement encounter with a minority youth was non-threatening behavior (25.4%). The most common type of resistance resulted from the subject being verbally abusive (34.9%). About 1 in 10 (9.5%) included some level of struggling or combative behavior (Figure 6).

![Figure 6: Greatest Level of Resistance Encountered during their Last Enforcement Encounter with a Minority Youth, Among those who have Ever had an Encounter with a Minority Youth](image)

- Half reported that there was no force used during their last enforcement encounter with a minority youth (50.8%). In contrast, about one-third indicated that the greatest level of force used was verbal commands (3.4%) followed by a resistance technique and impact method (Figure 7).

![Figure 7: Greatest Level of Force Used during their Last Enforcement Encounter with a Minority Youth, Among those who have Ever had an Encounter with a Minority Youth](image)
• No youth sustained injury during the last enforcement encounter with a minority youth (n=63, no missing cases among those who have had an enforcement encounter with a minority youth).
• No responding officers were injured during their last enforcement encounter with a minority youth (n=62, missing 1 case among who have had an enforcement encounter with a minority youth).

**Estimated Breakdown of the Disposition of Contacts with Minority Youth**

• Two-thirds of respondents (65.1%) reported that the last enforcement encounter with a minority youth was contact only. About 1 in 5 resulted in the youth being referred and released to a parent/guardian or placed in attendant care, and 1 in 8 being referred and placed in secure detention (Figure 8).

![Figure 8: Greatest Level of Disposition resulting from their Last Enforcement Encounter with a Minority Youth, Among those who have Ever had an Encounter with a Minority Youth](image)

- Contact only: 65.1%
- Referred, released to parent/guardian or placed in attendant care: 22.2%
- Referred, placed in secure detention: 12.7%

*Missing 0 case among those who have had an enforcement encounter (0% of respondents)*

*Note: Percentages reflect the greatest level noted for those who noted more than level of disposition*
Demographic Differences

The following is a summary of differences by length of service, comparing officers with less experience (those who have worked for five or fewer years in law enforcement) to officers with more experience (those who have worked for six or more years in law enforcement). There were 27 respondents who reported having five or fewer years of experience and 36 respondents who reported six or more years of experience. Due to the relatively small number of survey respondents within each of the comparison groups some caution should be used when interpreting the following findings. As a side note, differences by age (younger officers compared to older officers) had similar findings to the length of service findings as a result of age and length of service being highly correlated.

- There was little difference by length of service for the different racial/ethnic minority groups and immigrant groups that officers have contact with during their work. The only significant difference occurred for the Middle Eastern population, where 25.9% of less experienced respondents noted Middle Eastern as one of the racial/ethnic minority groups they have the most contact with in their work, compared to 2.9% of more experienced respondents.

- The types of barriers to effectively dealing with minority/immigrant youth in the community that were noted on the survey were similar by length of service.

- There was little difference by length of service for the number of calls and contacts during the past month involving minority youth, and the percentage of those calls that were contact only and the percentage that resulted in referral. However, less experienced respondents, compared to more experienced respondents, reported that a higher percentage of their contacts with minority youth occurred on the streets, alleys, or other public areas (52.9% and 37.9%, respectively), while a lower percentage occurred in schools (1.0% and 7.5%, respectively) and in institutions (1.8% and 8.8% respectively); the percentages for residential and retail businesses were similar (Figure 9).

Figure 9: Approximate Percentage of Contacts with Minority Youth during the Past Month by Location*, by Length of Service

- Streets, alleys, or other public areas: 52.9% (6+ years) vs 37.9% (<6 years)
- Residential (homes): 1.0% (6+ years) vs 7.5% (<6 years)
- Retail businesses: 37.0% (6+ years) vs 36.4% (<6 years)
- Institutions (group homes, shelter, detention): 1.8% (6+ years) vs 8.8% (<6 years)
- Schools: 7.2% (6+ years) vs 9.4% (<6 years)

Missing 9 cases overall for survey Q4d (13.6% of respondents)
*Among respondents who answered Q4d with responses that allowed for a sum of 100% across locations
Respondents with less experience, compared to those with more experience had more positive responses related to interacting with and managing minority youth in their work and by their department. In particular, less experienced respondents reported more positive responses for their own confidence and their confidence in their fellow officers to meet the needs of minority youth and their department meeting the needs of minority youth (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>&lt;6 Years Worked in Law Enforcement</th>
<th>6+ Years Worked in Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5 I am comfortable interacting with Minority Youth</td>
<td>27 4.26 33.3%</td>
<td>35 4.14 31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 I am confident in my abilities to meet the needs of Minority Youth</td>
<td>27 4.07 29.6%</td>
<td>36 3.50 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 I am confident in my fellow officers' abilities to meet the needs of Minority Youth</td>
<td>27 4.00 25.9%</td>
<td>36 3.53 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 I feel I can manage situations involving Minority Youth</td>
<td>27 4.19 37.0%</td>
<td>36 4.11 19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 I feel I have had adequate experience and/or training related to the needs and circumstances of Minority Youth</td>
<td>27 3.48 14.8%</td>
<td>36 3.53 13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 My department is meeting the needs of youth from minority racial groups</td>
<td>26 4.00 23.1%</td>
<td>36 3.58 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 My department is effective in keeping Minority Youth from being referred to juvenile court</td>
<td>22 3.14 9.1%</td>
<td>32 2.47 0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response options ranged from 1=not at all, 2 (blank), 3=somewhat, 4 (blank), 5=very much
**Number who answered the question, out of a possible 27 respondents with <6 years experience and 36 survey respondents with 6+ years experience

The greatest level of resistance encountered and the greatest level of force use during their last enforcement encounter with a minority youth varied little by length of service.

Though not significant, respondent with less experience, compared to those with more experience, had a slightly higher percentage of their last enforcement encounters with minority youth result in contact only with no referral (Figure 10).

Figure 10: Greatest Level of Disposition resulting from their Last Enforcement Encounter with a Minority Youth, Among those who have Ever had an Encounter with a Minority Youth, by Length of Service

- <6 years experience (n=26) 69.2%
- 6+ years experience (n=35) 60.0%

Missing 0 case overall among those who have had an enforcement encounter (0% of respondents)
Note: Percentages reflect the greatest level noted for those who noted more than level of disposition
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Key Findings of Law Enforcement Survey Analysis

Survey respondents were not a very diverse group. All were White and over 80% were male. Just over 40% reported having 5 or fewer years of experience.

Officers reported having more contact with Native American youth than with any other minority.

A substantial number of respondents reported having contact with immigrant populations. The most commonly listed population groups were Bosnians, Somalis, Sudanese, Liberians, and Hispanics.

Over 80% responded that there are barriers to effectively dealing with minority/immigrant populations. The most commonly listed barriers included language barriers, cultural differences, poor parenting or lack of supervision of youth, and little respect for or trust in law enforcement by parents or youth.

An average of 45.7% of the contacts made with minority youth during the past month occurred on the streets, making streets the most common location where contact occurred. Streets was followed closely by residential homes (35.6%).

Respondents generally considered themselves to be comfortable in interacting with minority youth and confident in their ability to manage situations involving minority youth. They were least confident in the effectiveness of the department in keeping minority youth from being referred to juvenile court.

The respondents listed a number of positives in describing their comfort and confidence in managing situations involving minority youth. These included such things as: relationships officers have developed with community leaders and parents; availability of resources for youth; access to interpreters; training and experience; assistance from the multicultural liaison officer; and assistance from school resource officer. Some negatives listed by respondents included: cultural and language barriers; poor parenting and lack of parental supervision; lack of respect for authority; officer restrictions and lack of time to spent with youth; inadequate training in working with minority youth; lack of diversity in the department; and lack of assistance/support from the minority community.

Respondents reported that most of their encounters with minority youth involved contact only; about 35% result in a referral and/or placement in either attendant care or detention.

Respondents with less experience, compared to those with more experience had more positive responses related to interacting with and managing minority youth in their work and by their department. In particular, less experienced respondents reported more positive responses for their own confidence and their confidence in their fellow officers to meet the needs of minority youth and their department meeting the needs of minority youth. (See Table 3)
IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Youth Crime Data

The **Youth Crime Data** analysis substantiated disproportionate contact of Native American youth and Black youth at the point of arrest in the Cass County justice system. According to the 2010 Census, Native Americans and Blacks account for roughly 2% and 5%, respectively, of all juveniles in Fargo; however, they accounted for about 8% and 17%, respectively, of the juvenile arrests in Fargo between 2008 and 2012. On a positive note, arrests of Native American youth and Black youth have declined over the five years of data analyzed, with the sharpest percentage decline among Native American youth.

The assessment indicated that Native American juveniles were more likely than Black and White juvenile to end up in attendant care or detention following an arrest. One of the most frequent offenses listed for Native American youth in the assessment was “Runaway.” In these cases youth are likely to be held until they can be picked up by their parents or other authorities. Information on residence of arrested youth was not available so it was not possible to determine what proportion of youth arrested and held were nonresidents.

The assessment looked at such factors as time, day of week, and month of arrests to better understand when arrests were occurring, particularly for Native American and Black youth.

More arrests of Native American youth occurred in summer months than in other seasons. The reason for this seasonal difference was not apparent from the data. Several plausible explanations could include an influx of Native American youth into the community to attend events or to stay with relatives over the summer (increasing the overall number of Native American youth in the community); less involvement in structured summer recreational activities (leaving more free time to get involved in inappropriate activities); and/or inadequate parental supervision due to working or absent parents. A further look into the reasons for the seasonal differences could help identify potential strategies to prevent behavior leading to arrests.

The highest percentage of Native American youth arrests occurred on Wednesdays and Thursdays. Most Native American arrests occurred during the weekday between 3:00 and 9:00 pm. The most common offenses for which Native American youth were arrested were shoplifting, runaway, and minor in possession of alcohol. This pattern points to a potential lack of parental supervision and/or a lack of involvement in positive youth activities during this time period.

Most arrests of Black youth also occurred during the weekdays, however they were more likely to be arrested during the daytime period of 7:00 am to 5:00 pm. Most common arrest offenses included shoplifting, disturbance at school, runaway, and simple assault. This would suggest that Black youth would be more likely to be getting into trouble at school.
Law Enforcement Officer Survey

The Law Enforcement Officer survey offered a number of insights into the attitudes and perceptions of law enforcement officers relating to their encounters with minority youth. The survey respondents indicated they had the most contact with Native American youth among minority youth overall. They also reported substantial contact with new immigrant youth which included a number of youth from African nations who would fall into the Black racial category.

The confidence of officers in managing interactions with minority youth was apparent in their responses. The officers utilize a number of resources available, including a multicultural liaison officer, school resource officers, and interpreters in their engagement with minority youth. A number of challenges were also apparent, mostly related to working with immigrant populations. Language and cultural barriers were most commonly reported, along with lack of support from parents, and attitudes of youth toward law enforcement.

Recommendations

Native American and Black youth are the primary minority groups that are overrepresented in the justice system at the point of arrest. Based on the law enforcement survey responses, many Black youth are among the new immigrant population in the community. New immigrant populations present unique challenges to law enforcement in dealing with youth from those minority communities. Some of them apply to the Native American community as well.

- Immigrant groups may have a distrust of police and judicial systems carried over from their countries or origin, particularly those who come from countries with corrupt and violent police forces;

- It is typical for there to be cultural misunderstanding and language barriers that inhibit communication with public safety and justice services. Immigrant populations are made up of ethnically, culturally, and socio-economically diverse sub-groups. This is true of the various Native American Tribes represented in the community as well. Police must engage a wide range of minority groups to understand their interests and needs;

- Immigrants may also come from countries that are accustomed to resolving disputes informally or they may have a distorted view as to what is truly dangerous or unacceptable behavior based on their past experiences. This may also be true of Native American youth and their families who are part of Tribes with traditional ways of handling disputes or who are used to a higher tolerance for misbehavior on the Reservation compared to the city.

- Community organizations representing new immigrant groups may have limited resources and may be unable to contribute to trust-building efforts to the degree police may wish. This may require more effort and resources on the part of police to build these essential relationships.

The following recommendations are intended to address the overrepresentation issue for both Native American and Black youth (many of which are included in the new immigrant population) at the point of arrest. The recommendations are intended to reflect a broad-based approach to
addressing the overrepresentation issue and, as such, may include initiatives or approaches that are being implemented. It should be noted that the Fargo Police Department is already addressing some of these recommendations.

1. Enhance the effectiveness of the police department in working with Native American and other minority youth.
   - Establish diversity goals in police recruitment. Proactively recruit Native American and other minority individuals to work in both sworn and non-sworn positions in the police department.
   - Provide opportunities for representatives from minority communities to teach officers about the cultures of the local minority populations and to talk about needs and concerns.
   - Provide additional training to increase the effectiveness of law enforcement in their interactions with youth, particularly Native American youth and other minorities. The “Effective Police Interactions with Youth” training program is an example of a curriculum available through OJJDP designed to reduce the likelihood that interactions between police officers and young people will have negative outcomes and/or result in police action.
   - Provide officers with easy access to language interpretation and translation through multilingual and multicultural staff and contracts with local interpreting/translation services. Obtain language tools for officers such as booklets to help identify the language of non-English speaking persons and on-line translation applications.

2. Enhance the level of trust among minority youth and their families of law enforcement.
   - Identify community leaders and organizations that advocate for and serve minority and immigrant populations. These entities can provide information on needs, assist in sharing accurate information with immigrants and other minorities about law enforcement services, and provide a contact for immigrants and other minorities when they have crime-related concerns.
   - Establish and conduct regularly scheduled forums for youth and families of the various minority and immigrant populations to learn about the community, laws, customs, services, and opportunities. Presenters who are able to present the information in the immigrants’ native languages should be available at these forums.
   - Programs that create opportunities for positive personal contact between police and minority youth should be implemented or enhanced to increase trust and opportunities for positive experiences. Examples of programs that have demonstrated promise in other jurisdictions include:
     - Programs in which law enforcement officers help juveniles make the transition into the community following secure confinement.
     - Recreational programs in which police provide an array of youth activities such as police explorers, police youth academy, police-led athletics, police participation with youth in adventure programs, skill training, etc.
Conclusions and Recommendations

- Programs in which police officers serve as mentors and role models, focusing on the academic achievement of at-risk students.
- Programs in which police officers spend time with at-risk youth attending recreational and cultural events and participating in community activities.

- Conduct focus groups with families of Native American and other minority youth to identify their needs and concerns, to get their ideas on what the law enforcement and other agencies could do to better respond to their concerns, and share ways in which to more effectively engage minority families in the process. An example of questions and responses of such a focus group is provided in Appendix III.

3. Utilize objective criteria in determining the use of detention and other placement of youth at arrest.

- Design and implement an objective screening instrument to guide detention decisions.

4. Establish a juvenile court minority liaison to work with minority youth and their families. The liaison would be available to help youth and their families understand and navigate through the juvenile court process, facilitate access to services, and assure that culturally appropriate approaches are understood and considered during each stage of the case process. The liaison would also work with court officials and service providers to promote increased understanding of the culture and unique needs of minority youth and their families.

5. Develop and implement programs and services designed to prevent involvement or reduce further involvement of youth in the juvenile justice system. There are a number of evidenced based programs that have been shown to be effective including,

- Mentoring
- Afterschool/recreation programs
- Leadership and youth development programs
- Parent training and support

6. The youth crime data provided for this assessment did not include data required to assess the impact of recidivism or residency on arrests of minority youth on overrepresentation. Follow-up study by the crime analysis unit of the police department in these areas is recommended.

- The extent to which a number of arrests may be attributed to a smaller number of chronic offenders would help explain some portion of the overrepresentation and could provide the basis for developing specific strategies that would impact recidivism.

- With regard to the residency issue, nonresident Native American and Black youth could explain some of the overrepresentation. Further assessment should consider residency along with seasonality to determine the relationship of community activities and event to increased arrests of nonresidents. The extent to which arrests of minority youth from the adjacent community of Moorhead across the state line contribute to overrepresentation should also be further studied.
• An assessment of incident location as it relates to arrest of minority youth may also be useful. The impact of deployment policies and enforcement priorities in particular neighborhoods or locations where minority youth live or congregate can be assessed. The findings may provide the basis for policy changes or development of strategies to prevent or reduce unlawful behavior by youth in those areas.
Appendix I. Methodology

Youth Crime Data Analysis

The Fargo Police Department provided a database that contained 6,532 records for juvenile offenses where the arrest occurred during calendar years 2008-2012. Data were cleaned and a total of 185 records were deleted prior to final analysis, leaving 6,460 records for the analysis included in this report. All 129 records with the first four digits of the case number being less than 2008 were deleted. These 129 records had an arrest time of exactly 0:00:00 and 116 of the 129 records were for some form of criminal mischief, of which the vast majority appeared to be duplicate records. Another 56 records were deleted due to having a high probability of being duplicate records. Of the 56 records deleted 45 were for some form of criminal mischief, while the remaining 11 were from some other offense; and 41 of the records were for arrests from 2008 while 15 of the records were from 2009. It is possible that some additional duplicate records may exist in the database that were not identified during the clearing process.

The number of records per year for 2008, 2009, and 2010 was substantially higher than for 2011 and 2012. The reason for this decline could not be explained based on the data available. Further review may be needed to make sure the decline is not related to miscoding or other factors unrelated to actual frequencies of arrests.

The database contained 209 separate offenses under the variable “description”. These offenses represented the actual offenses that resulted in the arrest and not the broader offense categories. For example, there were multiple offenses included that all related to theft, such as shoplifting <$250, shoplifting >$250 <$500, theft by deception <$250, theft of services <$250, and so on, rather than just an offense for theft. Due to having insufficient information available the offenses listed in the database could not be grouped into standard offense categories for reporting, such as NIBRS Group A and Group B offenses. However, to generate results for some of the more common offenses that occur among juveniles, the appropriate offenses in the data were linked, to the best of our ability, with seven broad offense categories including assault, theft (larceny), drug-related, alcohol-related, disorderly conduct, runaway, and curfew violations. The offenses that made up each of these seven categories are listed below.

Assault:

- assault a misd; assault aggravated; assault firearm; assault peace officer/simple; assault simple; child neglect/abuse/agg/<6; disarming law enf officer; domestic violence 2nd or more; domestic violence assault a misd; domestic violence threat intim; domestic violence(aggravated); domestic violence(simple)

Theft:

- shoplifting <$250; shoplifting >$250 <$500; shoplifting >500 <10000; theft by deception <250; theft by deception >250 & <500; theft by deception >500 <10000; theft from building <$500; theft from building >$500; theft from vehicle <$500; theft from vehicle >$500; theft of bicycles; theft of credit card/checks; theft of prescription medications; theft of property; theft of property <$250; theft of property >250 <500; theft of property >500 <10000; theft of property lost/mislaid; theft of services <$250
Alcohol-Related:

- alcohol sell/consume veh pub; minor delivery of alcohol to; minor in liquor establishment; minor misrepresenting age; mip/mca/under influence; open container in mv; dui/apc; dui/apc 1 or 2 offense in 5 yrs

Drug-Related:

- delivery control sub to minor; delivery of a controlled subst; drug paraphernalia/poss-felony; drug paraphernalia/poss(a msd); drugs sched i ii iii poss; drugs sched iv v poss; ecstasy poss; hallucinogen possession; imitations drugs mfg/poss/dist; imitations drugs use/possess; ingesting controlled substance; inhaling intoxicating vapors; marijuana delivery by school; marijuana poss oper motor veh; marijuana possession <1/2 oz; marijuana possession 1/2-1 oz; marijuana sale/poss/intent; meth sale/poss/intent; synthetic narc sale/poss/int; synthetic narcotics possession

Disorderly Conduct:

- disorderly conduct; disturbance of public school; urinating in public

Runaway:

- juv runaway take custody of

Curfew:

- curfew violation; juv curfew/loitering/truancy

There were 978 records in the cleaned database that had an arrest time of exactly 0:00:00. It is unlikely that this number of arrests occurred at exactly midnight, and more likely that these cases were coded as 0:00:00 due to missing or unknown information. These 978 records were removed from the analysis of time of arrest, but remained valid records in the database for other analysis.

The arrest month of the year, day of the week, and time of the day results presented in this report reflect when the arrest occurred and not when the offense actually occurred. Though arrest time and offense occurrence are believed to be similar there are likely some instances where the offenses occurred during a different day, a different time, and possibly a different month.

The database included race/ethnicity categories representing a cross-tabulation of race and Hispanic ethnicity. For example, there were 458 Native American, non-Hispanic records, and 34 Native American, Hispanic records. Given the small number of Hispanic records across all races Hispanics and non-Hispanics records were combined for each race (e.g., 492 records for Native American), resulting in the reporting of data by race without factoring in Hispanic ethnicity. Due to the small number of records for other racial categories, reporting of data by race was restricted to Native American, Black, and White juveniles for this report.
The number of juvenile arrests in this report represents the actual number of times that juveniles were arrested and not the number of unique persons. This was determined by separating the number of juveniles within each case number. If there were multiple records for a case number and those records had different demographics (gender, age, or race) it was determined that the records were for separate juveniles. Furthermore, if there were multiple records for a case number where the demographics were identical but the same offense was listed multiple times it was determined that the records were for separate juveniles. When the demographics were identical but the offenses were different it was determined that the records were for the same juvenile, and were coded accordingly. It is possible that this method may have resulted in some instances where the records for the same juvenile were coded as separate juveniles or that records for separate juveniles were coded as one juvenile, though we believe this was rare if it occurred at all. It is likely that some of the juveniles included in the database were repeat offenders during the five year time period reported and as a result the actual number of unique juveniles would be less than the number of arrests. Arrests should also not be confused with the number of offenses. Each arrest is counted once regardless of the number of offenses committed.

Population-based arrest rates were not presented in this report due to their availability in the UCR format.

**Law Enforcement Officer Survey**

Officers of the Fargo Police Department were requested to complete a survey relating to their contact with minority youth. The survey was administered over a three day period in August of 2012 at the beginning of each shift during briefings (three shifts per day). Sixty-six responses were received. Responders were almost exclusively patrol officers.

The data from the completed surveys were entered onto a spreadsheet file and forwarded to MJM. The data were cleaned, formatted and analyzed using SPSS the *Statistical Program for the Social Sciences*.

The survey contained a large number of open-ended questions. The responses to these questions were grouped into themes which were presented in this report. Respondents were more likely to skip the open-ended questions compared to the closed-ended questions, and in some instances they provide a response that was not specific to the question being asked. As a result, the results from these open-ended questions should be viewed with caution as they may not represent the views of all survey participants.

Survey question 4d asked respondents to provide an approximate amount of their contacts that occurred within five different locations. Some respondents answered the question by providing a number while others provided a percentage response. All responses were converted to percentages to allow for standardized reporting. If the respondent gave a percentage response for say 2 locations and nothing else, and the percentages summed to 100% they were kept as valid and 0% was added to the other locations, but if the given percentages summed to less than or greater than 100% they were coded as invalid. If the respondent gave numeric values they were converted to percentage. For example, if a respondent listed 1 for streets and 1 for
schools, then streets got 50% and schools got 50% and all other locations got 0%. As a result, analysis of survey question 4d was restricted to respondents who had answers that summed to 100 across the five locations.

One possible limitation of the survey is that responding officers interpreted ‘minority youth’ differently when answering questions pertaining to minority youth. Narrative survey responses suggest that this may have been the case for some respondents, with some thinking about newer immigrants and others thinking about long-standing minority populations in the community.

During the cleaning and analyzing of the survey data open-ended comments were occasionally re-phrased to allow for simplicity in reporting and to combine like responses together. However, special attention was given to not change the meaning or intent of the given response when doing this.

Survey question 11 appears, based on narrative responses, to have caused confusion among survey respondents. It was unclear as a result of this question if the department had a goal to prevent minority youth from being referred to juvenile court. As a result, the responses to this question should be viewed with caution.
Appendix II. Law Enforcement Officer Survey

Disproportionate Minority Contact
Law Enforcement Officer Survey

1. Which minority racial/ethnic groups do you have the most contact with?
   
   (1) Native American
   (2) African American
   (3) Hispanic
   (4) Asian American
   (5) Middle Eastern
   (6) Other, please specify ____________________

2. Are there immigrant populations that you have contact with? If so, please specify.

3. Do you feel that there are barriers to effectively deal with minority/immigrant youth in the community in which you work? If so, please specify.

4. In the past month:
   
   • Approximately how many calls for service or contacts involved a minority youth?
     
     (1) 0-5
     (2) 6-10
     (3) 11-15
     (4) 15-20
     (5) More than 20
   
   • Approximately what percentage of those calls involved contact only?
     
     (1) 0-10 percent
     (2) 11-25 percent
(3) 26-49 percent
(4) More than 50 percent

- What percentage of those calls resulted in a referral?
  (1) 0-10 percent
  (2) 11-25 percent
  (3) 26-49 percent
  (4) More than 50 percent

- Approximately how many of those contacts occurred in the following locations:
  (1) Streets, alleys, and other public places
  (2) Schools
  (3) Residential (homes)
  (4) Institutions (group homes, shelter, detention, etc.)
  (5) Retail businesses

5. I am comfortable interacting with minority youth.

   1  2  3  4  5
   not at all somewhat very much

Please explain:

6. I am confident in my abilities to meet the needs of minority youth.

   1  2  3  4  5
   not at all somewhat very much

Please explain:

7. I am confident in my fellow officers’ abilities to meet the needs of minority youth.

   1  2  3  4  5
   not at all somewhat very much
Please explain:

8. I feel I can manage situations involving minority youth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain:

9. I feel I have had adequate experience and/or training related to the needs and circumstances of minority youth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain:

10. My department in meeting the needs of youth from minority racial groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain:

11. My department is effective in keeping minority youth from being referred to juvenile court.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain:

**Use of Force**

In your last enforcement encounter with a minority youth, please describe the level of force, if any, that the situation necessitated.

(1) No force used (Officer Presence)

(2) Verbal commands

(3) Restraint techniques (Empty Hands)
Impact methods (Intermediate Weapons)

No force was necessary (youth was totally compliant)

I have not had an enforcement encounter with a minority youth

If force was used, please describe how it was used in the encounter:

**Violence by minority youth**

Please select the statement that best describes the type of resistance that you encountered during your last enforcement action with a minority youth:

(1) No threatening behavior

(2) Subject was upset/angry/agitated

(3) Subject was verbally abusive

(4) Subject was mild struggling

(5) Subject displayed combative/assaultive behavior

(6) I have not had an enforcement encounter with a minority youth

**Injuries**

What was the condition of the subject during as a result of your last contact with minority youth?

(1) No force was used

(2) Subject not injured as result of use of force

(3) Subject was injured but in no need of medical care

(4) Subject was in need of medical care but no overnight hospital stay

(5) Subject was in need of medical care requiring overnight hospital stay

(6) Subject was deceased
Please select the statement that best describes your own injuries during this same encounter with minority youth:

(1) I was not injured

(2) I was injured but in no need of medical care

(3) I was in need of medical care but no overnight hospital stay

(4) I was in need of medical care requiring overnight hospital stay

Arrests

Please select the statement that best describes the disposition of your last enforcement encounter with a minority youth (mark more than one if appropriate):

(1) Contact only

(2) Referred, released to parent/guardian or placed in attendant care

(3) Referred, placed in secure detention

Demographic Information

1. Are you male or female?

   (1) Male
   (2) Female

2. What is your current age?

   (1) Under 25
   (2) 25-34
   (3) 35-44
   (4) 45-54
   (5) 55 or older

3. Which of the following best describes your racial background?

   (1) White
   (2) Native American
   (3) African American
   (4) Asian American
   (5) Middle Eastern
   (6) Other, please specify ____________________________
4. Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin?
   (1) Yes
   (2) No

5. What is your highest level of education attained?
   (1) GED/High school diploma
   (2) Some college
   (3) Bachelor’s degree
   (4) Master’s degree
   (5) Doctorate degree
   (6) Other, please specify _____________________________

6. How many years have you worked in law enforcement?
   (1) Less than 1
   (2) Between 1 and 5
   (3) Between 6 and 10
   (4) Between 11 and 15
   (5) Between 15 and 20
   (6) More than 20

7. Please indicate the Section or Division within the Police Department that you are assigned.
   (1) Patrol
   (2) Traffic
   (3) Investigations
   (4) School Resource Officer
   (5) Crime Prevention
   (6) Other _____________________________
Appendix III. Example of Focus Group of Minority Community Members

The following focus group questions and responses are excerpted from a county juvenile services plan where a planning study was conducted by the author in a community impacted by an influx of new immigrant workers and their families.

Focus Group – Hispanic Community Members. The Planning Team conducted a focus group meeting for Hispanic workers in the Family learning Center at the Excel Meat Processing Plant. Approximately ten individuals participated in the meeting. Their responses to the questions posed are summarized below:

1. What kinds of concerns are facing Hispanic youth in your community?

   - Children are difficult to discipline. Children are often interpreters when explaining incidents to police. They often do not accurately portray the situation to authorities.
   - Language difficulties – not enough Spanish speaking teachers
   - Hispanic youth appear to be scrutinized more closely than non-Hispanic youth by authorities. Some feel Hispanic youth harassed by law enforcement. Creates a negative image of law enforcement for youth.
   - Hispanic youth fall behind in school because they are asked to tutor other Hispanic youth
   - Lack of communication on cultural issues (between parents and authorities and between youth and their parents)
   - Lack of Spanish speaking professionals in all human service sectors (law enforcement, medical community, probation, school, etc.). Makes it difficult for non-English speaking parents to communicate with professionals about their children.
   - Disrespect seems to be promoted among peers
   - Some parents are slow to adapt to American beliefs and culture. Creates conflict for youth as they encounter differing expectations
   - Lack of acceptance by some Hispanics and non-Hispanics
   - Not enough recreational activities to engage you outside of school
   - Not enough emphasis in Hispanic families on importance of speaking English properly
   - Concerned about impact of small group of people responsible for bringing drugs into the community

2. Which of the concerns you shared need the most urgent attention?

   - Overcoming language barriers (short term – increase availability of Spanish speaking professionals; long term – improve English language skills of non-English speaking Hispanics)
   - Increasing availability of recreational activities for Hispanic youth to provide constructive outlets during non-school hours
   - Building positive relationships between Hispanic youth and authorities (particularly law enforcement)
   - Enhancing the understanding of laws, consequences, and community norms (Would benefit both youth and their parents)
3. Please suggest what you would like agencies to do differently to be of more assistance to Hispanic youth in responding to these concerns? If you can, name the agency and what you would like them to do differently.

- Become more culturally aware
- Provide opportunities to educate families in their native language about how the community and its various systems function (e.g. juvenile justice system, educational system, etc.).
- Provide opportunities to educate youth about community norms, expectations, laws, etc. Also about consequences for inappropriate behavior
- Educate youth and families about their rights as well
- To law enforcement – find opportunities for positive contact with youth to build relationships
- Provide mentoring programs tailored to serving Hispanic youth (e.g. Big Brother/Big Sister)
- Provide culturally appropriate family counseling
- Publicize services and how to access them
- To the schools – Assure that counselors attend to needs and interests of Hispanic youth (e.g. many scholarships available specifically for Hispanic youth)
- To the schools – Find ways to help educate parents about the importance of school in helping their children succeed in life
- To the schools – Set high expectation for Hispanic students
- To the schools – Invite successful Hispanic role models from the community to talk with the youth to emphasize the importance of school
- To probation – Hire Spanish speaking probation officer/tracker

4. What do you think you or your family could do to help accomplish the suggestions you have made?

- Participate in the community and activities involving their youth
- Seek Hispanic representation on boards, councils, planning groups, etc. to get involved
- Be positive role models
- Work on language skills
- Work to understand and adapt to the American culture
- Support youths’ participation in available recreational activities to get them involved in constructive activities in the community
- Motivate their youth to go to school and encourage them to take school seriously
- Instill work ethic but don’t give the message that work is more important than school before they are adults
- Use good programs that are available to become more integrated into the community
- Encourage their youth to get involved in school activities

5. What is the best way for community leaders to learn about and better understand the needs and concerns of Hispanic youth and their families?

- Include Hispanic youth and adults in community planning groups and processes
- Go to where the people are. Don’t sit back and expect families to come to official business meetings
- Be sensitive to scheduling to avoid adults missing work
- Make an effort to break the ice. Go to activities primarily attended by Hispanics to meet and greet (soccer, Mass, etc.)
- Advertise and promote community events in Spanish as well as English to encourage participation
- Provide opportunities to share around meals