

DARYL FOX: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to today's webinar, "Youth and the Justice System," hosted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. So, at this time, it's my pleasure to introduce Derek Mueller, statistician with the Prisons Corrections Statistics Unit of BJS, to begin the presentation and introductions. Derek.

DEREK MUELLER: Thank you, Daryl. Welcome, everybody. We are excited to have everyone in attendance today for the Youth and Justice System webinar. My name is Derek Mueller and I'm a statistician at the Bureau of Justice Statistics. I'll be speaking today alongside my colleagues from several different program offices in the Office of Justice Programs. Before I get to introductions, though, I wanted to give everyone a brief rundown of the structure of today's events. First, I'd like to begin with a very brief introduction of our presenters, then we're going to jump right on in to the presentations, and we will conclude with a brief Q&A session. But, certainly, feel free to submit any questions in the Q&A box as Daryl described.

Here, we have listed everyone that will be presenting today and in the order in which they will be speaking. Today, I'm joined by several of my Bureau of Justice Statistics colleagues. So we're going to kick things off with Lexy Thompson, followed by Lizzy Remrey, Emily Buehler, and Michael Field. And then we're also going to be joined today by two of our National Institute of Justice colleagues in Ben Adams and Kaitlyn Sill. We'll conclude today's event with a brief presentation by Andrea Coleman from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. I'm going to turn things over to Lexy.

ALEXANDRA THOMPSON: Thank you, Derek. And thank you all for attending this presentation. We have a lot in store for you. I'm going to be talking today about Measuring Reported and Unreported Crime Among Youth as it relates to victimization. And starting off my presentation, I'll be going over a brief overview of the National Crime Victimization Survey, or NCVS, and also the School Crime Supplement or SCS. Those are the two data sources I'll be focusing on during my presentation. I'll also talk about select findings from the Crimes Involving Juveniles report that was released back in April, and then also additional outlets where you can find victimization data among youth.

In case you're not familiar with the National Crime Victimization Survey, or NCVS, it's the nation's primary source of information on criminal victimization, sponsored by BJS and was first administered in 1972 as the National Crime Survey. So it's been going on for more than 50 years. It was last redesigned in 1992 and is actually currently

undergoing a redesign that will be fully featured in 2025. And we also collect information on crimes both reported and not reported to police, and the NCVS was developed as a complement to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting program, which Lizzy will talk more about in her presentation.

The U.S. Census Bureau collects the data for us from a national sample of persons aged 12 or older living in U.S. households. Respondents can be interviewed both by telephone and in-person and they're interviewed every six months over the course of three and a half years before they're out of the sample. When we interview respondents, if they do report a victimization incident, we collect more details about that incident so we have incident-level data as well.

These are the different types of crime that we collect in the NCVS. All nonfatal crimes, violent crime, personal larceny, and property crime. We also collect certain demographics to examine crime victimization by different subgroups. And we're also one of the main sources of national data on topics like intimate partner violence and crimes against persons with disabilities, among other characteristics such as reporting to police.

There's also the SCS, which is a supplement to the NCVS, and it's one of five supplements. And this supplement, in particular, is also cosponsored by the Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics, or NCES, and this survey has been administered since 1989, about every two years. So it's periodically in the field. Most recently, it was administered in 2022 and will again be administered in 2025. This supplement is only administered to respondents between ages 12 and 18 if they complete an NCVS interview and they're interviewed on different characteristics of school crime and crime that occurred at school, such as questions regarding school safety measures, bullying, availability of drugs and alcohol at school, gang activity, and more.

Then I'll talk about findings from the Crimes Involving Juveniles report which was released back in April. It can be found on BJS's website. This report is specifically just NCVS data, not a SCS data, for what I'm going to be talking about.

Looking over time, from 1993 through 2022, we found that for all the age groups examined, the rate of nonfatal violent victimization decreased at kind of different magnitudes depending on the age group. So for those ages 12 to 17, the rate of

nonfatal violent victimization decreased by 85% over this time period, but it also decreased for those 18 to 24 and those 25 and older.

Looking at more recently, in 2022, the rate of nonfatal violent victimization for persons aged 12 to 17 was about 27.4 nonfatal violent victimizations per 1,000 persons. This rate in 2022 was higher than it was in 2020 and 2021, which do correlate with the COVID-19 pandemic. But it's worth noting that when you compare the 2022 rate to the rates in 2018 and 2019, those rates are not significantly different. And that trend is consistent across the other age groups as well, with the 2022 rate being higher than the rates in 2020 and 2021 but generally not significantly different than the rates in 2018 or 2019.

We also looked at nonfatal violent incidents by perceived age of the offender. The age is reported by the victim that we interview in the survey. And in 2022, about 9.3% of offenders of nonfatal violent incidents were perceived to be somewhere in the age range of 12 to 17, and this percentage is not significantly different between the years 2020 and 2021.

There are also some additional outlets where you can find information on youth that we regularly publish on different avenues, one being the Criminal Victimization annual bulletin. This is released every year and it's the first release of new NCVS data. So most recently was Criminal Victimization 2023. And such as the table shown presents, you can find data on rates of violent victimization, rate and percent of violent victimization reported to police, percent of violent incidents via victim and offender demographics, and also prevalence of violent crime by different ages.

As I mentioned with the SCS, it is cosponsored by also NCES and so they do a report with every new release of SCS data called the Students Reports of Bullying series, and that looks at prevalence of bullying by a number of different student and school characteristics, as well as student victimization, and fear and avoidance.

There's also the Report on Indicators of School Crime and Safety report. This is a joint report between BJS and NCES. And it features both NCVS data, which is pictured here on the chart, but is also showcases different data from the SCS and a number of other indicators from different federal data sources as well related to school crime and safety.

There's also America's Children, which is another interagency report. This one is more broadly about youth. So there's not only youth victimization data but there's also health

data or different economic data like poverty, measures, or vaccination. But for BJS, the two indicators that we do are youth victimization by victim demographics and also youth-perpetrated victimizations as perceived by the victim.

I'm sure you hear this from a lot of our presenters, but, if you want to stay updated with BJS, you can subscribe to JUSTSTATS, follow us on our socials, or also email the AskBJS email for more information. You can also contact me with any questions. I'm happy to answer stuff at the end of this webinar. And I'll turn it over back to Derek.

DEREK MUELLER: Thanks, Lexy. Next, we're going to have Lizzy talking to you all about NIBRS.

LIZABETH REMREY: Thanks, Derek. Hello, everyone. As Derek said, my name is Lizzy Remrey and I will be discussing victimizations and arrests involving juveniles, using data from the National Incident-Based Reporting System, or NIBRS Estimation Program.

So, first, I'm going to discuss a little bit about the NIBRS Estimation Program to give you just a brief background. In 2021, NIBRS became the national standard for law enforcement crime data. The data are voluntarily submitted to the FBI by law enforcement agencies. And some states, I believe 36, have requirements that law enforcement agencies report their crime data to the state but the federal program itself is voluntary. And then BJS manages the estimation program, which uses imputation and weighting to produce national and subnational estimates of crime based on NIBRS data.

So the NIBRS Estimation Program produces these estimates of crime based on the number of reporting agencies and the population they cover. You'll see here a coverage map for 2018 on the left and 2023 on the right, and you can see that coverage has increased over time. In 2018, nearly 7,500 agencies submitted three or more months of NIBRS data and that covers 38% of the U.S. population. And in 2023, this number rose to nearly 14,000 agencies covering 83% of the U.S. population. Now, I won't get too far into the specific details of the NIBRS Estimation methodology today but please check out the BJS website for further information about that methodology and, of course, reach out if you have questions.

So, using the NIBRS estimates, we can gain insight into a variety of information about criminal events, including victimization and arrest involving juveniles. Today, I'm going to talk about some of the findings from a recent publication which Lexy talked about, the

NCVS findings from that publication. And I will also talk about some additional key statistics involving juveniles.

So starting with victimization. First, just looking at the total number of homicides, this has fluctuated over the past 10 years, increasing from over 14,000 in 2013 to more than 21,000 in 2022, which you'll see in the figure on the left. Of these total homicides in 2022, persons aged 17 or younger, or juveniles, accounted for a little over 2,000 of those homicides. That translates to juveniles accounting for around 10% of all homicides in 2022, which you'll see in the figure on the right which shows the percent of all homicides that involved victims aged 17 or younger over the same 10-year period. And that percentage in 2022, again around 10%, was not statistically different from the percent in 2021.

Focusing on firearm-involved victimization specifically, here, we present the percent of homicides involving by a firearm by the age of the victim from 2013 to 2022. In 2022, 80% of all homicides involved a firearm. That total is represented by the orange line. In the same year, persons aged 17 or younger, the blue line, and those aged 18 or older, the gray line, had similar percentages of firearm-involved homicides. So that's 74% for juveniles and 80% for adults. The 10-year trend of firearm-involved homicides for adults was similar to the overall trend, around 70% in 2013 and around 80% in 2022. For juveniles, 46% of homicide victimizations in 2013 involved a firearm and 74% involved a firearm in 2022.

Now, looking at the rate of violent crime victimization and focusing on those ages 17 or younger, this next figure presents the rate of victimization by both violent crime offense type and age for 2022. We see that persons aged 15 to 17 had the highest rate of violent crime victimization at 651.5 per 100,000 and that's shown by the blue bar on the left side of the figure. This is compared to those aged 12 to 14 who had a violent victimization rate of 413 per 100,000 and compared to those 11 or younger whose violent victimization rate was 143.3 per 100,000. For the individual violent crimes of homicide, robbery, and aggravated assault, juveniles aged 15 to 17 also had the highest rates of victimization compared to those aged 12 to 14 and those 11 or younger.

And now I will present some key statistics on arrests involving juveniles from the NIBRS estimates. Starting with the total number of arrests for violent crime, we see that the total remains around 390,000 over the 10-year period from 2013 to 2022 and that's shown in the figure on the left. Of these total violent crime arrests, juveniles aged 17 or younger accounted for 37,370 arrests in 2022. That is to say, persons aged 17 or

younger accounted for nearly 10% of all violent crime arrests in 2022, which can be seen in the figure on the right. And this was statistically higher than the percent in 2021, which was around 9%.

This slide breaks down the percent of arrests that were of persons aged 17 or younger by offense type, comparing 2021 to 2022. Starting with violent crime arrests on the left, juveniles made up a larger percentage of arrests in 2022 than in 2021 for total violent crime, as well as for the individual categories of homicide, aggravated assault, and simple assault. In both 2021 and 2022, juveniles accounted for a larger percentage of arrests than for carjacking than for any other violent crime. And for property crime arrest, which is on the right, from 2021 to 2022, the percentage of persons arrested who were juveniles increased for total property crime and the individual categories of burglary, larceny-theft, and destruction or vandalism.

My final figure today presents the rate of violent crime arrest by offense type and age in 2022. The violent crime arrest rate of persons aged 17 or younger was 53.8 per 100,000 in 2022, which is shown by the blue bar in the far left of the figure. The arrest rate for persons aged 18 or older, the gray bar, was 142.7 per 100,000, which is more than 2.5 times the rate for juveniles. The arrest rate for persons aged 18 or older was also significantly higher than the rate for those aged 17 or younger for the individual categories of homicide, robbery, and aggravated assault.

So, this has really been just a snippet of the type of data and information we have available in the NIBRS estimates, and I encourage you to check out the data for more and reach out if you have questions. Thank you.

DEREK MUELLER: Thanks, Lizzy. I'm going to quickly cover a Justice Stats publication that we released in June of 2023. It was titled Juveniles Incarcerated in U.S. Adult Jails and Prisons between 2002 and 2021.

As you may be aware, persons aged 17 or younger who are arrested or convicted for a criminal offense may be sanctioned to serve time in either juvenile detention centers or residential placement facilities. It's also possible that juveniles may be sanctioned to serve time in adult jails or prisons based on state statute, judicial discretion, and federal law.

Today, I'm going to specifically focus on recent trends of juveniles that were held in adult facilities.

Here we can see the reported number of juveniles held in the custody of adult jails or prisons between the referenced period. The number of juveniles incarcerated in all U.S. adult prisons or jails declined from a peak of 10,420 in 2008 to a low of 2,250 in 2021, and that can be noted by the blue line. In the same year, local jails held 1,960 juveniles, which can be seen in the gray line. And then, lastly, we have juveniles that were held in state and federal adult prisons and that was 290. And just note the dramatic decline that began around 2009 and continued through 2021. With a few blips here and there, but for the most part, that pattern was a downward trajectory during that timeframe.

Lastly, I just wanted to cover real quick a visual of the juveniles as a percent of the incarcerated populations of adult jails and prisons. Obviously, the numbers are going to be quite smaller. The percentages are going to be quite small here. So the percent of the total jail population who are juveniles declined from 0.9% in 2002 to 0.3% in 2021. And you can see that referenced in the gray line. And then the percent of the total prison population who were juveniles declined from 0.2% in 2002 to 0.02% in 2021. So, again, following a very similar pattern to the previous figure that I showed, a downward trajectory beginning in about 2009.

Just to kind of wrap things up, I just wanted to quickly note kind of the sources of where people can get this information from. So part of this, the adult correctional facilities, the counts there that were provided come from the National Prisoner Statistics program. There's links of that in this presentation. The jail data came from the Annual Survey of Jails and the Census of Jails. You can access the full report on our website as well.

And then real quick, I just wanted to note that we have a data analysis tool, a web tool that folks can access. It's the CSAT Prisoners tool. It stands for the Corrections Statistical Analysis Tool. And, essentially, folks can kind of gather some of the information that were provided from these tables and kind of manipulate it or cut it in different ways depending on how they would like. In using the Advanced Query, you would go to the annual counts, the year-end population. You can filter by sex or kind of have the count be a total and then you would just want to filter it by the individuals who are held in these facilities that are under the age of 18. I'm going to turn things over to my colleague, Emily.

EMILY BUEHLER: Thank you, Derek. My name is Emily Buehler and I'm going to be talking about BJS's PREA program, or the Prison Rape Elimination Act and then some

findings about youth who are held in juvenile justice facilities with regard to sexual victimization.

So, first, PREA is the Prison Rape Elimination Act. It was passed in 2003 and the purpose of that was to end sexual abuse and harassment in custodial settings. So BJS, specifically, was called upon by this legislation to do three things. The first was to generate annual statistics on the incidence of prison rape. Second was to identify facilities, both adult correctional facilities and juvenile justice facilities, that have high and low incidence of prison rape. And third was to identify common characteristics of victims, perpetrators, and the facilities in which these types of incidents occurred.

So BJS measures prison rape in several ways. So to do these three things, we have a dual data collection approach, very similar to what you saw with the NCVS and the NIBRS. We use interviews of adults in custody and youth in custody, as well as administrative records maintained by facilities to measure sexual victimization. So periodically BJS administers the National Inmate Survey or NIS to incarcerated adults in both prisons and jails. And then we also administer the National Survey of Youth in Custody, or NSYC, to youth who are in juvenile justice facilities. Those are our interview-based data collection modes. And then we have administrative records which are collected through the Survey of Sexual Victimization, or SSV. It is an annual data collection and it includes all allegations and incidents that have been recorded by facilities or state systems nationwide.

So, the SSV has been administered every year since 2004. So following the passage of PREA, we've been collecting data from the field. And we're currently collecting data for the 2023 calendar year. Given the scope and the burden of an in-person data collection, both the NIS and the NSYC have only been administered a handful of times since PREA was passed. The NSYC, specifically, was conducted for the first time in 2008 and 2009, then again in 2012, and most recently in 2018.

So the NSYC and the SSV are really designed to fulfill different purposes but to complement each other so we can best understand sexual victimization in juvenile facilities. The SSV contains only victimization that is reported to authorities and it estimates allegations and provides some details about victims, perpetrators, and characteristics of substantiated incidents. The ones that have been investigated and then an investigation concluded that it occurred, then those data are collected. However, the NSYC measures victimization that is both reported to juvenile justice

authorities as well as victimization that was not reported. It estimates rates of victimization based on a representative sample of youth in custody.

So, following that overview of the BJS PREA program, now I'm going to highlight some results from their most recent report of SSV juvenile data that covers years 2013 through 2018. These data are from our substantiated incidents of sexual victimization. So, as I mentioned, those in which an allegation was reported to the juvenile justice authorities, it was then investigated, and it was determined to have occurred based on a preponderance of evidence. So for every substantiated incident in either a state juvenile system or within one of the sampled local or private juvenile facilities who we include in the SSV, they provide the general details of that incident. So this includes things, general, just the location, the time of day, who reported the incident, the nature of it. Then we also collect details about the outcomes for those who are involved, the victims, the perpetrator, whether there was an injury, if there were sanctions for the perpetrator, if there were some changes in their housing or their custody, as well as any legal action. And, finally, we collect demographic details of the individual victims and perpetrators. Specifically, we collect three pieces of information, their sex, their gender, their age, and their race or ethnicity.

So some results. Annually, since 2013, which was the year following the release of some national standards to implement PREA. So these were some guidelines that all facilities then had access to properly implement PREA. So following that year and up to 2018, between 17% and 22% of all reported allegations were substantiated following investigation. So in 2013, that first year following the release of these standards or rules, there were 1,883 allegations of sexual victimization and 394 of those were substantiated. Up through 2018, there were 3,692 allegations and 626 were substantiated.

So throughout the rest of this presentation, I'm going to be focusing on this six-year period. All results have been aggregated over that time period to be able to provide for reliable estimates. So, first, looking at the location of where these incidents occurred within the juvenile facilities, nearly 40% of youth-on-youth perpetrated incidents were in a common area such as a bathroom, a shower, or a dayroom. Another one quarter or so of incidents occurred in kind of the personal sleeping areas of the youth, either the victim's room, the perpetrator's room, or a dormitory.

When it came to incidents that were perpetrated by staff at the juvenile facility, about 32% of those incidents occurred in a common area, so that same list of places such as

bathrooms, showers, dayrooms. Other common places for a staff-on-youth victimization to have occurred included program areas, so that was 17%, as well as the victim's room. Another 17% staff-perpetrated incidents occurred in the victim's room.

This is the graph for who reported the incident. In 23% of youth-perpetrated incidents and 21% of staff-perpetrated, it was a number of the front line staff who was the one who initially reported the allegation that was then substantiated. However, for the majority of the time, the victim was the most common person to have reported sexual victimization. This occurred in 60% of youth-on-youth incidents and 50% of staff-on-youth incidents.

This graph is about where the incident occurred and whether that area was under video surveillance. In 57% of youth-perpetrated incidents, it did occur in an area that was under video surveillance compared to 45% of staff perpetrated incidents. So some discrepancies in that metric there. And nearly half of incidents, both youth-perpetrated and staff-perpetrated, the victim was provided with some sort of counseling or mental health treatment. However, in another one-third of incidents, there was no medical treatment that was offered or provided to the victim, and that was the case whether it was perpetrated by another youth or perpetrated by a staff member.

This finding relates only to staff-perpetrated types of victimization. Those who committed sexual misconduct, which is a more serious form of abuse, were twice as likely to have been employed at the facility for less than six months. So 25% of all incidents of sexual misconducts were someone employed for less than six months, compared to sexual harassment incidents, which 13% of those had been employed for less than six months at the facility. In cases of staff sexual harassments, about 25% of those incidents involve someone who had been employed at the facility for more than five years. The types of staff who are most likely to have perpetrated different types of sexual victimization, 21% of sexual misconduct incidents and 12% of staff sexual harassment incidents involve program staff. That includes people like instructors, teachers, volunteers, other types of program-related staff. However, the majority of both types of staff-perpetrated victimization were committed by supervisory or front line staff with the facility.

In terms of the outcomes for staff perpetrators of sexual victimization in juvenile facilities, they were terminated in about half of the substantiated incidents and there was some form of legal action in 31%. That legal action could have been that they were

arrested, which is about 30% of them, 21% were indicted, and 12% of incidents resulted in that staff member being convicted or having plead guilty to in a sense.

Related to the demographics of sexual victimization during this period, 63% of victims and 73% of perpetrators were male during this time. Another 63% of victims in cases of staff sexual victimization were male, 36% were female, and less than one percent were transgender/intersex.

Fifty-seven percent of the victims of a staff sexual victimization incident were between the ages of 16 and 17 and 23% were in the age range of thirteen to fifteen.

There were some significant differences in the gender of staff perpetrators based on the type of sexual victimization. Staff perpetrators who committed a sexual misconduct incident were more likely to be female. So 61% were female. But in cases of staff sexual harassment, 71% of males were the perpetrators in those of types of incidents.

So this is just a snippet of these data. The full report is available on the BJS website. You can always contact me or consult the website for more information. And now I'm going to send it back over to Derek.

DEREK MUELLER: Thank you, Emily. We're going to kind of keep it in the same lane here and Michael is going to talk about the National Survey of Youth in Custody.

MICHAEL FIELD: Thanks, Derek. Hello, everyone. I'm Michael Field, statistician from BJS. I will be following up Dr. Buehler's presentation with the other piece of our PREA work, the National Survey of Youth in Custody.

Now, before we get into things, let me tell me what's in store for this presentation. First, I'll provide some background on where the data come from and how they were collected. And I'll go through three abbreviated sets of findings: youth reported sexual victimization; drug and alcohol use prior to entering custody; and youth substance and alcohol use disorder. I'll also point you to where you can find more details and the data itself, but now we'll start with some background and what these data actually are.

Without rehashing everything you've just heard about BJS and PREA, I'll just say the National Survey of Youth in Custody, or NSYC, fulfills the requirements of PREA in juvenile facilities. It does this by sampling 10% of all juvenile facilities and, at least, one from each state. The NSYC was designed to protect responding confidentiality. The first

way it does this is by using a touchscreen, ACASI. That is Audio Computer-Assisted Self-Interviewing survey instrument, meaning that no one but the respondent knows what questions they're answering any given time or how they're answering it.

Second level of protection is randomizations built into the survey itself. Ninety percent of our respondents are randomly assigned to receive a questionnaire on sexual victimization in their facility but 10% are given an alternative survey on a variety of other topics such as mental health, living conditions in the facility, education, and drug and alcohol use. No one at the facility but the youth themselves even notice which questionnaire they received.

We administer the NSYC three times in 2008 and '09, 2012 and 2018. The sexual victimization findings come primarily from the 2018 administration, while the drug and alcohol findings are generally aggregated across all three surveys. Over 25,000 youth have participated in NSYC over the three surveys, while the number of facilities varies across runs of NSYC and some facilities may have been visited in multiple rounds.

The sexual victimization questionnaire contained a two-level setup in which all respondents were asked about sexual victimization in the facility in the 12 months prior to the survey. Those respondents who indicated they had been sexually victimized were then asked additional follow-up questions what we call most-serious incidents. Those were determined by ranking incidents reported by youth into one of four categories you see here and the youth was asked about the most recent incident from the highest ranked category.

The alternative questionnaire asks youth if they had ever used alcohol or any variety of drugs. You can see the full list of drugs here. This section began with a message, "The next questions are about drugs you may have taken on your own. That is without a doctor telling you to take them. Have you ever used" and then yes-no questions for each of these drug types. The specific questions include several alternative names for each drug. And most of the items on the right side of your screen here from opiates through cough syrup specified nonmedical use. Alcohol is asked about separately. And that question gave examples of types of alcoholic drinks and then also specified that the youth not include it if they only ever had a few sips.

To the extent possible, measures of SUD and AUD were created using the three NSYC surveys by matching survey items to the DSM-5. The DSM-5 defines the severity of SUD or AUD based on how many of 11 criteria are met. Severity is measured the same

way in these analyses. I should note here, the items for the first two rounds of NSYC were developed based on the DSM-4 that predated the DSM-5. While they remain largely consistent, they weren't developed with the specifics of DSM-5 in mind, and so these analyses only use the 10 common items across the three surveys to create the measures rather than all 11 criteria. In the interest of time, for more details on the specifics of these measures and on methodology in general, I'll just refer you to the reports on the BJS webpage.

So to start off with the data, I'll start with data from the sexual victimization questionnaire. And this shows the overall sexual victimization rates reported by youth in juvenile facilities, as well as the staff sexual misconduct rates and the youth-on-youth victimization rates. And the main takeaway here is a steady decrease in youth reporting sexual victimization over time and all three rates show a significant decline from 2012 to 2018. You can see the bulk of sexual victimization in juvenile facilities is staff sexual misconduct, the middle line here in yellow. In 2018, 5.8% of youth reported staff sexual misconduct with 1.9% reported youth-on-youth victimization, the light blue line at the bottom. And I want to note that some youth reported both types of victimization.

We also examine sexual victimization by a variety of youth characteristics. The first one we look at here is the sex of the youth. You can see in the first set of the bars that a slightly higher portion of male youth and female youth reported sexual victimization but that difference isn't statistically significant. When we look at youth-on-youth victimization and staff sexual misconduct separately, however, you can really see a picture start to take shape.

Female youth were more likely than male youth to report youth-on-youth victimization but male youth were more likely to report staff sexual misconduct than a female youth. So we can see the male and female youth in these facilities have really different experiences as it relates to sexual victimization.

We also see some interesting differences when it comes to the sexual orientation of the youth. A higher percentage of LGBQ+ youth reported sexual victimization than heterosexual youth. This difference is driven almost entirely by youth-on-youth victimization where LGBQ+ youth were between seven and eight times more likely to report victimization than heterosexual youth.

A similar story plays out when looking at the gender identity of the youth. Transgender youth were nearly three times as likely as cisgender youth to report any sexual

victimization and nearly nine times as likely to report youth-on-youth sexual victimization.

And I'll wrap up this sexual victimization portion with something we've really consistently found in NSYC but that surprises most people who are new to youth PREA data. We asked those youth who had reported staff sexual misconduct about the sex of the perpetrator or perpetrators and the use of force or coercion in the most-serious incidents of staff sexual misconduct, and then the majority of these incidents, just over 60%, the staff perpetrator was female and the youth did not report force or coercion. And, altogether, female staff are the perpetrator in almost 95% of the most-serious incidents of staff sexual misconduct.

Switching things up to the alternative survey on drug and alcohol use, I'll start here with one of the few times these data are not actually aggregated across years. I'm looking at overall youth reporting of drug and alcohol use across time. More youth and juvenile facilities reported never using drugs or alcohol, totally abstaining. The line at the bottom here in 2018, then in 2008 and '09. You can see declines in both youth reporting any drug, the dark blue line at the top, which is down about four percentage points and youth reporting alcohol use, the yellow line in the middle, which is down about fifteen percentage points. Across the three surveys combined, 84% of youth reported ever using drugs and 76% ever using alcohol. The majority of whom, nearly 71%, reported ever using both. Altogether, about 88% of youth in juvenile facilities reported ever using drugs or alcohol before entering custody.

We can also look individually at the different drugs the survey asked about. About 81% of youth reported ever using marijuana. About four in ten youth reported ever using hallucinogens, opiates without a prescription, or cough syrup to get high. About a quarter reported using cocaine and almost nine percent heroin. We can also look at these details by youth characteristics. So, for example, female youth are more likely than male youth to report having ever used nine of the thirteen drug types measured. From 2008 to 2018, about half the female youth reported ever using hallucinogens or ever using opiates or anti-anxiety drugs or tranquilizers without a prescription.

The next set of findings covers substance use disorder and alcohol use disorder. A smaller portion of youth met the criteria for AUD in 2018, 26%, and in 2008 and '09, 41%. I don't show the numbers for all the different severities here but what that appears to be driven by are significant declines in the rates of youth meeting the criteria for moderate or mild AUD while the rate for severe AUD remained about the same over

that time period. The SUD numbers here don't show many significant differences. That kind of matches what we saw just a few slides ago, which showed that alcohol use declined greater than drug use over that time period.

From 2008 to 2018, about 60% of youth in juvenile facilities met the criteria for SUD, about half of whom or 32% of youth had enough symptoms for severe SUD. Thirty-six percent of youth met the criteria for AUD and about one-third of them had enough symptoms for severe AUD. Overall, about 62% of youth in the facilities met the criteria for either SUD or AUD.

Similar to before, we can examine this by youth characteristics. From 2008 to 2018, female youth were more likely than male youth to have met the criteria for SUD or AUD. These differences seem likely to be driven by severe disorder for both, which female youth were significantly more likely to meet. Transgender youth at 41% were less likely than cisgender youth at 60% to meet the criteria for SUD, but they were about equally likely to meet the criteria for AUD. There weren't really any significant differences here for severity level nor were there really any significant differences by sexual orientation.

And now to quickly wrap things up, all of the NSYC data is available at the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data. I'll say that due to the extremely sensitive nature of the questions and the age of the respondents, the data on sexual victimization are only available on site in Ann Arbor and only for approved research projects. You can find a variety of publicly available NSYC data online on their website. Also, all the findings I showed and many, many more are available on various reports on the BJS website.

And with that, I'll just thank you all for listening. I'll put my email up here if you have any questions after the webinar. I'll take questions in the Q&A also and thank you.

DEREK MUELLER: Thanks, Michael. I'm going to turn things over to our colleagues at the National Institute of Justice, Ben Adams and Kaitlyn Sill.

BENJAMIN ADAMS: All right. Thank you so much, Derek, and good afternoon, everyone. Again, my name is Ben Adams and I'm a Supervisory Social Science Analyst in our Office of Crime Prevention and Youth Justice. As Derek mentioned today, my colleague Dr. Kaitlyn Sill, and I will be presenting data on trends and characteristics of youth court caseloads and juvenile residential placements, drawing on three federally sponsored data collections. Before I jump in, I did just want to remind everyone where NIJ fits into this work. As the research, development, and evaluation agency at the

department, we work to improve knowledge and understanding of crime and justice issues through science. And we do that really in partnership with many of our sister offices and bureaus at OJP, including the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

So, beginning in fiscal year 2019, NIJ has managed the research evaluation and statistical programs at OJP related to youth justice topics. And this includes overseeing related statistical data collections, jointly producing statistical publications with OJJDP and supporting dissemination resources like OJJDP's Statistical Briefing Book. And if you're not familiar with the Statistical Briefing Book, we would encourage you to check it out. This is OJJDP's resource for disseminating statistical data on youth in the justice system. And it includes answers to many frequently asked questions, various data analysis tools, and statistical publications. Much or all of the data presented today are available in various forms throughout the briefing book website. The first data source I'd like to introduce this afternoon from the NIJ side is the National Juvenile Court Data Archive.

This is a grant-funded project that collects, maintains, and makes accessible the nation's primary source of detailed information on juvenile court case processing of delinquency and status offense cases. The juvenile court data actually go back to the 1920s. Actually in 1929, the Children's Bureau at that time within the U.S. Department of Labor published the first Juvenile Court Statistics Report, which presented delinquency and dependency case information from calendar year 1927 based on data reported by 42 courts in 15 states. Much later on, OJJDP assumed responsibility for the collection and reporting of juvenile court data shortly after the agency was established in 1974. And currently, the archive is managed through a grant to the National Center for Juvenile Justice.

And it generates annual estimates of juvenile court caseloads and case processing decisions based on voluntary data contributions from juvenile courts across the country. Currently, the most recent estimates of delinquency cases in 2022 are based on analyses of individual case records from nearly 2,100 courts and aggregate court-level data on cases from nearly 300 courts. And together, those courts have jurisdiction over about 81% of the U.S. juvenile population in 2022. In addition to generating national estimates, the archive preserves administrative datasets from original court submissions and helps to facilitate data access and permission for secondary analysis projects by independent researchers. So, a little bit about the court data and the unit of count for the national estimates available from the archive.

The archive calculates case counts based on cases disposed where a case is a youth process by a juvenile court on a new referral. A case can contain multiple law violations and saying that the case has been disposed is when a definite action was taken as a result of the referral, such as a treatment plan was initiated, but it doesn't necessarily indicate that all contact between the youth and the courts has concluded. The offenses presented are based on the most serious offense in a referral. And here we're looking at summary offense groups, which you can see increased for all summary offense groups between 2021 and 2022 but remain below the pre-pandemic levels and substantially below 2005. Here you'll see the number of property offense cases in juvenile court decreased 75%.

During that period from 2005 to 2022, public order offense cases decreased 72%. Drug offense cases decreased 68%. In-person offense cases decreased 49%. There were increases between 2021 and 2022, as I mentioned. Those ranged between 15% and 34%, which is the largest increase being with the person offense cases. And that is primarily driven by those large volume offenses that fall under the summary category like simple and aggravated assault.

Here in this next slide, we're looking at the distribution of summary offense groups over time. You can see the cases where a person offense is the most serious offense have become a larger proportion of the juvenile court caseloads in recent years. In 2022, person offenses were 40% of the national caseload compared to 26% in 2005.

In addition, the proportion of property offense cases declined from 2005 to 2022 from 37% to 27%. And public order offenses, the proportion declined from 26% to 22%. The proportion of drug offense cases has remained relatively constant during the period, although there was a slight uptick in the proportion between 2010 and 2019. And finally, this slide looks at the juvenile case outcomes for adjudicated delinquency cases by summary offense group. Of the cases disposed by juvenile courts in 2022, 52% were handled formally through petitioning or waiver to criminal court, while the rest were handled informally. Of those, the cases that were petitioned, 47% resulted in a delinquency adjudication. And here in this figure, you can see of the cases where there was a delinquency adjudication, the majority is 67%, received a probation disposition. That's the green portion of that first bar. And 28% of the subset of cases that were handled formally and resulted in adjudication were sent that out of home placement.

That's the dark portion of the first bar. The percentage of adjudicated cases that resulted in the probation disposition was similar across person, property, and public order offenses, but higher for drug offenses. There you can see 77% of adjudicated drug offense cases resulted in a probation disposition as compared to 18% of those resulting in an out of home placement disposition. So that concludes my brief overview of the juvenile court data and I will pass it to Kaitlyn to discuss the juvenile residential facility data. Thanks.

KAITLYN SILL: Thanks, Ben. So OJJDP sponsors and NIJ manages the Juvenile Facilities Census Program, which collects information from all secure and non-secure residential placement facilities that house persons younger than age 21 for a delinquency or status event.

In 2022, there were 1,777 residential placement facilities housing youth. This program does not collect information from adult jails or prisons, non-residential facilities or residential facilities use exclusively for youth for purposes other than law violating offenses. The Juvenile Facilities Census Program includes two separate but related data collections that are administered in alternating years. The Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement collects a one-day account information on youth and residential placement, including demographics and legal attributes. So it provides a snapshot of facility populations on a representative day. The Juvenile Residential Facility Census collects information on facilities that hold youth, including their operation and the services they provide.

Both of these data are collected by the Census Economic Reimbursable Survey Division, and the statistical estimates are produced by the National Center for Juvenile Justice. In 2021, we saw the number of youth decreased to its lowest—youth and residential placement decreased to its lowest number, which was a 76% decrease since the collection began in 1997. We saw a 10% increase from 2021 to 2022 with about 27,500 youth and residential placement, which is now reflected on this slide. We also just received the 2023 data and we'll begin analyzing it to see whether there were continued increases, counts leveled or resume declining. Facilities could hold youth for detention purposes. So while awaiting adjudication or dispositional hearings or after disposition while awaiting placement or youth can be committed to a facility as part of a court-ordered sanction.

Youth who are committed to facilities comprise 53% of youth in residential facilities compared to 44% for youth being detained. For youth, however, the difference has

decreased over time as the decline in the number of committed youth has outpaced the decline and attained youth. So you can see that the gap between committed and attained youth has narrowed. The proportion of youth in placement for a person offense has increased. While the number of youth in placement decreased across all offenses between 1991 and 2021. However, the relative decline has varied across the offenses. So the largest declines include a 91% decrease in youth in placement for drug offenses, 85% decrease in property offenses, and an 83% decrease in youth for status offense cases.

Smaller declines were observed in the number of youth in residential facilities for public order offenses and person offenses. As a result of these uneven declines, you see the increase in the proportion of youth and placement for a person's offense. So the proportion of youth and placement for a person or public order offense increase, while all other offenses make up a smaller proportion in 2021 compared to 2019. Data from the Juvenile Residential Facility Census show us changes in the size of facilities that hold youth and where most youth are held. Since 2000, the proportion of our large facilities and the proportion of youth held in large facilities has dropped, which is the dark blue. The proportion of facilities that were small grew, which is green, and the proportion of youth held in small facilities more than doubled. So from 12% to 30%. However, despite the proportion of medium-sized facilities decreasing, the proportion of youth held in medium-sized facilities grew to 51% of youth being held in medium-sized facilities or facilities that hold between 21 and 100 youth in 2020. While the 2022 data are not displayed here, they're available on the JRFC Databook, which there's QR codes on the screen. And they show that the proportion of facilities that are medium-sized grew between 2020 and 2022. And 55% of youth were held at medium-sized facilities in 2022. From 2020 to 2022, the proportion of facilities that are small and youth held at small facilities decreased. The Juvenile Residential Facility Census also asked questions about service needs screenings conducted by facilities.

Of facilities that reported that they evaluated youth for service needs, the proportion of facilities evaluating all youth for service needs increased between 2000 and 2022. The proportion of facilities evaluating all youth for educational needs increased from 78% in 2000 to 89% in 2022. The proportion of facilities evaluating all youth for substance use needs also increased from 2000 to 2022. Likewise, the proportion evaluating all youth for mental health needs increased from 47% to 69% in 2022.

So, from this brief overview of these three key data collections, there's some clear takeaways. Over the past 20 years, juvenile court caseloads and the number of youth

and residential facilities has decreased. Person offenses has grown as a proportion both of the juvenile court caseloads and as the most serious offense of youth held in residential facilities.

Youth are predominantly held in medium-sized facilities despite the increase in the proportion of small facilities. And facilities are largely screening youth for educational, substance use, and service needs. And if there are any questions, we're happy to take them at the end.

DEREK MUELLER: Thanks, Kaitlyn. All right. Next up, I have Andrea Coleman from Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention speak on the programmatic side of things.

ANDREA COLEMAN: Thank you so much, Derek. And again, welcome everyone. And I'm so glad to be a part of this webinar with my colleagues at OJP from the Bureau of Justice Statistics and particularly NIJ, who OJJDP works very closely with to support the data collections that Ben and Kaitlyn just discussed.

So today, I'm going to sort of give a unique perspective on what these data, how these data can inform policy and practice. So that's one of the activities at OJJDP that we've really been working on is, so what do these data and the research tell us for programmers and practitioners, which I hope are joining us today on the webinar. So with that, I'll just jump right in. So what do these data and research tell us for policy and program implications? Since OJJDP, as you all know, funds everything on the continuum of care from delinquency prevention to intervention and those kids that are deep in the system. How can we use data collections like from BJS and of course what we support through NIJ with our Statistical Briefing Book? So what we believe at OJJDP is that data research should inform, guide, and impact policy and practice, which I know sometimes is hard for practitioners to sort of marry the two, if you will.

Policy and practice informed and guided by data and research include, these are just a few examples that I'll talk about a little bit, changes in state laws and juvenile codes and applying adolescent brain development as aggravating and mitigating factors as kids go through court proceedings in the juvenile justice system, particularly for those kids that get transferred to the adult system. Of course, there also should always be, in OJJDP's view, more focused on individualized treatment and rehabilitation, graduated sanctions, and validated risk, needs, and responsivity assessments, which OJJDP, I'm going to do a shameless plug here, can provide training and technical assistance to folks out there

on making sure that those risk, needs, and responsivity assessments are validated, and they're usually used in a detention and probation settings. And then implementing high quality and evidence-based programs and best practices, including trauma-informed care based on the data and research.

So, I'm just going to give a couple examples of some programs across the country that has been informed by NIBRS data, those estimates that Dr. Remrey talked about, and then of course, local and state data. So for purposes of time, there was a lot of data submitted on NCVS, of course, and as Dr. Thompson presented, but we just picked a few of those datasets to talk about how they can inform and guide and impact policy and practice. So many of you may have heard of Florida Civil Citation and Pre-Arrest Diversion Program. And so these are sort of the latest data that have come from the state. Police issued citations to 67% of 17,835 eligible youth statewide from October 2022 to September 2023.

And so one of the issues, because this program has now become statewide, one of the concerns, of course, was net widening, right? And so I'll talk a little bit about that. But a study that they did and cost analysis found that this program could reduce the cost of prosecution, saving between \$1,467 and \$4,614 per pre-arrest diversion in four years, which is huge, right? So that means that these kids that were in this pre-arrest diversion program were not going through the adjudication process and that were able to benefit from diversion instead of going further into the juvenile justice system and having potentially deeper contact. Community-based arrests decreased by 52% statewide, also from 2018 to 2022. And some of that may be showing up in some of those NIBRS estimates that were discussed earlier. So while the study, the same study found that there was variation implementing the programs, of course, statewide diverting youth from arrest was more significant than net widening, which I said, which only occurred in seven of Florida 67 counties, and only one showed a long-term effect.

So one of the concerns, of course, with any diversion program is that it's just going to be that easy gateway to send kids and refer kids to them. And then there will be kids that don't belong in those programs because it's just the easy go-to to send them. But of course, Florida was sort of on the forefront of that and doing the study to examine the impact of net widening and based on the results, it was very low. Because these counties only represented 7% [INDISTINCT] also concluded that this program largely, again, avoided net widening compared to previous pre-diversion programs that the state had implemented. So some pretty good preliminary findings. And, of course, the

program has been around sort of for a decade, but its statewide implementation has been more recent.

So, of course, the state still continues to study to look at net widening and making sure that kids are not going further into the system and also looking at racial and ethnic disparities, is also a part of their study.

So, another program is in Shelby County, Tennessee, which is Memphis, Tennessee. So if we have anyone from Memphis on there, great barbecue. I always go to Beale Street when I'm there. So similar to Florida's program, the Summons Review Program has been cited in their studies as contributing to the decrease in petitions of youth for youth of color, which is really huge, and the fact that they set out with that intentionality of looking at disparities. This program deferred first-time offenders by reviewing the summons, and this is a police summons, before a formal court referral and offering services to youth and families when needed.

Between 2017 and 2021, those summonses decreased by 67% compared to the control group, which fell by 32%. And the juvenile court attributed this program to reduced offending as 88% of youth had no additional referrals within at least one year.

So, as I said, so those data from NIBRS and the state arrest data really informed those programs in Tennessee and in Florida. So we're going to talk about adult jails. And I think Dr. Mueller talked about that. And so using BJA's annual surveys and adult jails, how can those data inform getting kids out of facilities as much as possible? And one of the things that we, of course, like the [INDISTINCT] OJJDP based on the survey is this huge decline in kids that are in adult facilities. And while those numbers are declined, you still see that they're around 2,100 or so, I believe, from that slide that are still there.

So, how can we continue on that downward trajectory to get those kids out of adult jails and lockups? So, of course, the goal is to, again, fewer youth placed in these facilities and even non-secure placements in these facilities for kids. And of course, at OJJDP from the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act side, as removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups and sight and sound separation are two core requirements of that act. We also look at non-secure placements in these facilities as well. Even though, in a lot of instances, kids have the ability to walk out of these facilities because they're non-secure. We still want to make sure that there are fewer of those in adult facilities. I just mentioned two of the four core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

So briefly, OJJDP awards Title II Formula Grant monies to states to implement the Title II Formula Grant Program, which includes four core requirements. The other two are the institutionalization of status offenders and also reducing racial and ethnic disparities. So when we look at how the Annual Survey of Jails can inform, guide, and impact policies and practice, we really would like to make sure that states are aware of the Annual Survey of Jails so it can help them and their planning when they go out and inspect facilities and making sure that kids are moved to alternative placements. And not only that, when they are in adult facilities, adult jails and lockups, that they are definitely sight and sound separated from adult inmates. And then also, of course, with reducing racial and ethnic disparities, OJJDP's goal is to look at everything and all the programming that we do through a racial and ethnic lens.

Training for all staff and facilities on the JJDP Act Core requirements. We need more demographic and offense data. So while the survey is helpful for planning, we really need to sort of drill down more and to look at why kids are in these adult jails by gender, by race and ethnicity again, and then also pursuant to the JJDP Act interest of justice requirement, which was just added in the 2018 Reauthorization. And so if you're interested in that, reach out to me and I can give you more information on the IOJ's requirement, and expanding high-quality and evidence-based community-based services and civil citation and pre-arrest diversion programs as I talked about on the previous slides to make sure that kids stay out of those adult facilities as much as possible.

So Ben and Kate talked about our Juvenile Facility Census Program, which of course includes the Census of Juveniles and Residential Placement and Juvenile Residential Facility Census that is a part of OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book. So how can those data inform policy and practices? And these are just examples and some of the TTA that we're providing to states and facilities across the country in using these data. So developing safe and appropriate alternatives to solitary confinement and isolation. OJJDP will hopefully soon roll out some guidance on that. Closing and repurposing secure detention and correctional facilities, which is happening in some communities. Again, it's always about expanding high quality and evidence-based community services, not just making sure that they're there, but that they're based and rooted in the research and the data.

Again, it's sort of the same thing as the previous slide, focusing on the individualized treatment and rehabilitation, graduated sanctions, and those validated needs, responsiveness assessments. And recognizing the course adolescent brain development

as not only just a legal, but a mitigating factor as to why kids do what they do. And I don't have to tell this group about the role of adolescent brain development and decision-making and impulsivity of young people, which [INDISTINCT] is a huge contributing factor to their delinquent involvement. Again, our data archive as a part of our Statistical Briefing Book can inform how kids are transferred to adult court. Some of the policy implications here are most of the states who needed to raise the age have done that.

I think we've only got maybe two or three states, off the top of my head, where the age of criminal responsibility is still under the age of 18. I think it's two, if I'm thinking correctly. And so that can be a huge impact in not treating kids as adults, particularly if they are under the age of criminal responsibility, like I said, in most states, which is 18. Reducing those eligible offenses that could kids transferred certified ways into the adult courts, examining reverse and remand waiver provisions. If anyone works in the juvenile justice system in this country in courts, it's sometimes with these reverse and remand waiver provisions, it is a mishmash of sort of stuff about when kids go and then if those charges get downgraded, they can then reverse and remand them back to the juvenile justice system.

And so, really having an examination of what's happening there. Again, recognizing adolescent brain development, not just as a legal factors, but as mitigating factors as to why kids do what they do. And we definitely need more data and research on what happens after the transfers. We've got really good data on kids being transferred by race, by gender, but we really don't know yet what happens once they get there, right? How many of the reverse and remand waivers are happening and those things. So, from OJJDP's perspective, that is how we looked at how these data BJS collects and through our Statistical Briefing Book can inform policy, practice, and procedures. So thank you.

DEREK MUELLER: Thank you so much to all the presenters. Now we have about 15 minutes left.

We've been seeing a number of questions come in and we've been doing our best to try to answer them, but it seems like there's a couple of ones that came up a number of times. So I think at this point, maybe we'll just touch on a few of those and have the panelists maybe speak to some of those questions. One that I've seen come in a number of times in several different ways was specifically asking about the data collections that we have between our different offices that capture characteristics of

justice-involved youth and/or victims. These may include things such as mental health status, educational attainment, substance misuse, disability status. Would you all mind just kind of each unmute and maybe speaking about the relevant data collections that you oversee or you're aware of that maybe capture some of those additional details that folks are looking at, whether they want to break them out by offenses and/or victimizations.

But just a number of questions came up about that. There's no particular order here, so if you want, just whoever can jump in, please.

ALEXANDRA THOMPSON: I can start and then someone else—I'll be quick—for the National Crime Victimization Survey, or NCVS, we collect a number of different demographics on the survey. We collect victim gender, sexual orientation, gender identity specifically for those 16 or older, but for everyone we collect disability status, race and Hispanic origin. We don't collect mental—we collect disability, we don't collect mental health, per se. We do ask questions if they experienced a victimization, how the victimization may have affected them if they experienced more, anxiousness or problems with friends or family, which do relate to mental health, we don't have a mental health screener, per se. And you can find all of the demographics that we collect on our public use file, which is through the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data if you want to do some analysis on your own. We also have the NCVS Dashboard or N-DASH that has a number of our victim demographics. And you can create your own graphics using NCVS data with different sections of that site. For the SES, we link all of the demographics from the NCVS to the SES data files. So any demographics on the NCVS you can find on the SES data file. And then for offenders, we do ask what the victim perceived the offender to be such as perception of offender gender or perception of offender race as well and offender age. And then I'll pass it onto whoever wants to go next.

KAITLYN SILL: I can talk a little bit about the juvenile collection. So currently right now we aren't collecting data on educational status or attainment or disability status or IEP status or special education status. However, one of the things that we've been doing over the last, I guess, six years now is really doing a comprehensive evaluation and redesign of our two juvenile collections data collections.

So the Juvenile Facility Census Program and some of what we're doing on that is revisiting content. And we're changing our reference data in our mail out so we can produce more timely estimates. Part of this has been adding new content so—and then

also—so we're adding content so we can generate length of stay estimates, so how long youth are in facilities that will be able to break down by demographic characteristics such as offense type, adjudication status, facility type, and demographics, including race and ethnicity, age, gender. So that's part of our first cut and that's going to be rolled out with our 2025 data collection. What we're also continuing to do is explore additional content. And what we have been exploring is the ability to—we've been exploring and testing the ability to add questions about the number of youth and facilities that have an IEP.

That have a diagnosed learning disability or a disability. And so we're considering it. There's a lot of considerations that go into it, specifically the ability of jurisdictions to report. A lot of communications are going on with the jurisdictions to find out what states are collecting this data. How are these data living in case management systems that will inform whether or not we, as a federal agency, are able to collect this data and report it on the national level. Beyond that, that type of data are, in terms of who's in facilities right now and the prevalence, that really is state by state or jurisdiction by jurisdiction and reporting, again, it can be kind of spotty. I will also add that the OJJDP's Model Programs Guide has a literature review on disability status that includes information on what's known on promising practices and evidence-based interventions.

MICHAEL FIELD: I'll quickly jump in here for the National Survey of Youth in Custody, NSYC. We collected data on sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, how long they've been in the facility, a variety of physical disabilities and mental health conditions and not just overall disability and mental health, but very specific details, which we sort of conceptually have aggregated in various places. We also had a sort of psychological distress screener built into the survey, so some of the mental health talk we have. We collect race and ethnicity data and I saw this got asked a couple of times, I think. So we all follow the SPD, Statistical Policy Directive 15 guidelines put up by OMB on how to collect race and ethnicity data. So we're all collecting race and ethnicity data separately and that is going to exist in the underlying data that's published.

The reason you might see it combined in reports and some of the data put out like this, it could be a variety of reasons. It could be sample size, right? Or if you're talking about something you might need to combine folks just to get enough numbers. It might be, "Hey, this is how someone did it 10 years ago and I need to maintain this trend." And so that's kind of how I'm stuck doing it. I mean, I'll say you're likely aware that when we put out a revision to SPD 15 last year. So that combines race and ethnicity into one question, into one concept. So what we will all be revising how we handle that in the

next handful of years, we will not be separating out. But that is collected separately, at least, and can be accessed in some way separately.

LIZABETH REMREY: So, I'll jump in for the NIBRS data. NIBRS collect demographic information on victims, offenders, and arrestees, and that includes age, race, and sex. There are—you won't see a lot of—the estimates right now do not include offender information because there tends to be a higher amount of missing data there. So we did not produce estimates. So, for some of these things estimates are produced. NIBRS also collects ethnicity information. I don't know if I said that the first time. But again, ethnicity estimates are not currently public or even estimated at all because of the high incidence of missing data for those. But we are currently going through the process of evaluating how we can produce reliable estimates for ethnicity. In terms of disability or sexual orientation or gender identity, NIBRS does not collect that for the victim unless they reported they thought their victimization was the result of a bias.

So, that's an anti-gender identity bias or sexual orientation or disability bias, be that mental or physical, but it does not collect specifically, what that gender identity of the person is.

EMILY BUEHLER: And I can follow up for demographic details really to the survey of sexual victimization. So previously there were only three demographic indicators collected for victims and perpetrators of sexual victimization in these facilities. That was sex or gender, race, ethnicity, and age. However, starting with the 2023 data collection, we've added some demographic details. So we're now collecting information about the citizenship status of the victim, as well as a known disability for the victim. So we do anticipate more data coming from these administrative records in the future.

DEREK MUELLER: And regarding the prison and jail data that was presented on, really, those come from a census. So really what you can get there is just sex of the individual. So there's not many ways you can slice that. But, we have several other kind of prison-related collections that gather more information, whether that being the National Corrections Reporting Program or the Survey of Prison Inmates, but not sure how much you would get on the youth side of things from either of those collections.

Anyone else have anything to add there? All right. And just real quick another question came in about youth maybe that were currently over the age of 18, that they're in custody but begin their sentence or committed their offense while under 18. I just happened to scroll past this one. And, you would probably be able to get some

information, albeit somewhat limited from the National Corrections Reporting Program. So you would be able to see whether an individual was admitted to a prison facility for those states that report administrative level data on their admissions, see whether someone was under the age of 18 when they were admitted and be able to kind of track them. But that would require you to go through our standard application process and apply for the restricted use file.

I did see a question here that pertains to OJJDP. I don't know, Andrea, you were talking, I believe, when it came in, so I just wanted to give you a chance to respond to this. And it's, "Does OJJDP keep track of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act exceptions to the DSO requirement by type? I'm assuming that's the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders. For example, the JJDPA contains an exemption for status offenders held in secure facilities pursuant to the interstate compact for juveniles who are waiting to return to their homestay. Does OJJDP keep track of the state reported stats for exceptions for this specific population?"

ANDREA COLEMAN: Right, thank you for that question. Interstate compact. Informally, we do. So it's sort of yes and no for our internal purposes, we tracked it. But as a part of our national data collections for the Statistical Briefing Book, we do not. We have had some discussions and we have not talked this over with our colleagues at NIJ yet.

But we have had some discussions about how we could potentially add all the exceptions to DSO, including the valid court order exception, which we have discussed data to some of our national and public-facing data collection, so internally we collected, but we do not have external public-facing data collection as of yet.

DEREK MUELLER: Thank you all. And with that, we have just a couple of minutes here. Again, we really appreciate all the questions and comments that have come in along the way. I provided here for everyone just the contact information. So again, if we didn't get a chance today to either respond to your question in the Q&A box or kind of in this Q&A session here discussion at the end, please feel free to reach out to us.

You can email us directly at the Bureau of Justice Statistics at askbjs.usdoj or @usdoj.gov. National Institute of Justice has a contact form, so you can simply just fill that out, put in your question, and they will route it to the appropriate person. And then the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has a really robust contact directory that kind of breaks things out by category. So please feel free to reach out to us, if you all have questions, either specific to this or any of the other data collections or

programs that we're working on. So again, we really thank you all for being in attendance today, and hope you found this informative and useful to the work that you all are doing. Thank you.

DARYL FOX: Great. So on behalf of BJS, NIJ, and OJJDP, and all of our panelists, we want to thank you for joining today's webinar. This will end today's presentation.