

12-2000

State Custody Rates, 1997

US Department of Justice

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/ojdp>



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), and the [Juvenile Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

US Department of Justice, "State Custody Rates, 1997" (2000). *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. 42.
<https://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/ojdp/42>

This Government Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Government Documents at GGU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Juvenile Justice Bulletin by an authorized administrator of GGU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jfischer@ggu.edu.

J 32-10: C96
718-A-09



FEB 15 2001

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY
LAW LIBRARY



John J. Wilson, Acting Administrator

December 2000

JUVENILE JUSTICE BULLETIN

State Custody Rates, 1997

Melissa Sickmund

In 1974, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) began collecting information about juvenile detention and corrections facilities through the Census of Public and Private Juvenile Detention, Shelter, and Correctional Facilities, better known as the Children in Custody (CIC) census. An assessment conducted by OJJDP in 1993 concluded that CIC did not fully meet the information needs of the juvenile justice community. As a result, OJJDP developed the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP) and inaugurated it as the successor to CIC in October 1997.

This Bulletin draws on 1997 CJRP statistics to analyze State custody rates for juvenile offenders, with a focus on types of facilities used (public versus private) for delinquent and status offenders.

Better data give insight into the use of private facilities

CJRP improves custody rate statistics in several ways. CIC data did not support State-specific custody rates for private facilities because the only State identifier collected was the State where the facility was located. The fact that an unknown number of juveniles in private placement were held in out-of-State facilities meant that rates based on facility location were meaningless or even misleading.

CJRP data include two State identifiers for each juvenile in residential placement: the

State where the offense was committed and the State where the facility is located. Consequently, CJRP data can be used to calculate State custody rates for both public and private placements. The data show that, although nationally just 2% of juveniles were held in out-of-State private facilities in 1997, in some States the proportion approached 30%. In this Bulletin, custody rates are calculated for each State based on the State where the offense occurred. Custody rates represent the number of juveniles assigned a bed (because of an offense) on October 29, 1997, per 100,000 juveniles in the general population age 10 through the upper age of juvenile court jurisdiction in each State.

Private facilities are an important custody resource

Whereas most delinquents are held in public facilities, most status offenders are held in private facilities. Including status offenders and private facilities in the calculation of custody rates affects State rankings based on these rates.

If only delinquents in public facilities are considered, California tops the list of State custody rate rankings in 1997, with 498 delinquents in public facilities per 100,000 juveniles in the general population age 10 through the upper age of juvenile court original jurisdiction. Half of the States had rates that were less than 209 per 100,000.

From the Administrator

Obtaining sound information is essential to arriving at a clear understanding of any situation. To that end, OJJDP inaugurated its annual Children in Custody (CIC) census in 1974 to assess the status of juveniles held in detention or corrections facilities.

While the CIC census served an important role for more than two decades, practitioners increasingly have required more detailed information to understand how facilities are used, particularly differences in the use of public and private facilities. In response to this need, OJJDP launched the more comprehensive Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP) in 1997.

Using 1997 CJRP findings, this Bulletin compares the role of private facilities, where most status offenders are held, with that of public facilities, where most delinquent offenders are detained. For example, California leads the United States in custody rates based on delinquents held in public facilities, but when public and private facility data for both delinquent and status offenders are combined, the District of Columbia tops the list.

The detailed State-by-State data on juveniles held in public and private facilities provided in these pages will enable readers to better understand the role these facilities play in their own States and across the Nation.

John J. Wilson
Acting Administrator

HV 9103 .S53 2000 DEC. 2000

NON-CIRCULATING

Custody rates of delinquents in public facilities

State	Rate	Rank
California	498	1
Nevada	446	2
South Dakota	416	3
District of Columbia	412	4
Georgia	397	5
South Carolina	368	6
Louisiana	368	7
Connecticut	361	8
Virginia	358	9
New Mexico	325	10

Note: Rates are per 100,000 juveniles age 10 through upper age of juvenile court jurisdiction.

Including status offenders and offenders held in private facilities in the calculations drops California to fourth place. Virginia and New Mexico drop out of the top 10. Half of the States had rates that were less than 338 per 100,000.

Custody rates of all offenders in public and private facilities

State	Rate	Rank
District of Columbia	662	1
Louisiana	583	2
South Dakota	559	3
California	549	4
Wyoming	513	5
Connecticut	508	6
Georgia	480	7
Nevada	460	8
South Carolina	427	9
Alaska	419	10
Virginia	400	13
New Mexico	343	25

Note: Rates are per 100,000 juveniles age 10 through upper age of juvenile court jurisdiction.

Use of private facilities varies substantially by State

Several States used private facilities for less than 10% of offenders in residential placement in 1997, but many States relied quite heavily on private facilities, placing as many as 66% of offenders in them. Most States made limited or no use of out-of-State private facilities; some States, however, did make significant use of these facilities, placing as many as 29% of offenders in them.

Of course, several factors influence variations in State custody rates, including

The proportion of juvenile offenders held in public facilities ranges from 34% to 99%

State	Public Facilities	Percentage of Juvenile Offenders Held In—	
		Private Facilities	
		In-State	Out-of-State
Total United States	74%	23%	2%
Alabama	54	46	0
Alaska	75	25	0
Arizona	86	13	1
Arkansas	59	41	0
California	91	8	1
Colorado	48	41	12
Connecticut	74	24	2
Delaware	68	5	28
District of Columbia	65	32	3
Florida	47	52	2
Georgia	85	15	0
Hawaii	83	9	7
Idaho	69	14	16
Illinois	93	5	2
Indiana	65	33	2
Iowa	38	60	3
Kansas	67	32	0
Kentucky	71	29	0
Louisiana	63	36	0
Maine	80	16	4
Maryland	51	48	1
Massachusetts	34	66	0
Michigan	53	42	5
Minnesota	58	34	8
Mississippi	99	0	1
Missouri	81	19	0
Montana	57	14	29
Nebraska	69	22	10
Nevada	97	3	0
New Hampshire	65	29	5
New Jersey	97	3	0
New Mexico	95	4	0
New York	56	44	1
North Carolina	89	10	0
North Dakota	35	58	7
Ohio	91	8	0
Oklahoma	65	35	0
Oregon	78	22	0
Pennsylvania	37	58	5
Rhode Island	80	20	0
South Carolina	88	12	0
South Dakota	82	16	1
Tennessee	57	43	0
Texas	87	13	0
Utah	52	42	6
Vermont	44	36	20
Virginia	93	7	0
Washington	94	6	0
West Virginia	54	29	18
Wisconsin	69	31	0
Wyoming	50	49	2

Note: State is where the offense occurred. Throughout the United States, there were 3,401 juveniles in private facilities (12%) for whom State of offense was not reported. All but 91 juveniles in public facilities were held in-State.

Most delinquents are in public facilities; most status offenders are in private facilities

	Upper Age of Juvenile Court Jurisdiction	Number of Offenders Oct. 29, 1997	Custody Rate									
			All Offenders				Delinquent Offenders				Status Offenders	
			Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rate		
Total United States		105,790	368		260		85		6	18		
Alabama	17	1,685	349	23	178	32	129	9	9	33		
Alaska	17	352	419	10	314	12	82	23	0	21		
Arizona	17	1,868	345	24	292	16	39	39	4	9		
Arkansas	17	603	198	44	115	42	68	28	2	13		
California	17	19,899	549	4	498	1	44	32	2	6		
Colorado	17	1,748	380	17	179	31	189	3	1	10		
Connecticut	15	1,326	508	6	361	8	123	13	17	7		
Delaware	17	311	403	12	272	18	128	11	0	0		
District of Columbia	17	265	662	1	412	4	232	1	15	0		
Florida	17	5,975	394	14	198	27	193	2	1	2		
Georgia	16	3,622	480	7	397	5	68	27	10	4		
Hawaii	17	134	106	50	83	49	14	48	5	5		
Idaho	17	242	146	49	101	47	43	33	0	0		
Illinois	16	3,425	286	33	266	19	18	45	1	1		
Indiana	17	2,485	366	19	209	26	94	18	34	29		
Iowa	17	1,064	308	31	112	44	156	7	4	36		
Kansas	17	1,242	387	16	256	20	59	31	4	67		
Kentucky	17	1,079	244	40	180	29	40	38	2	22		
Louisiana	16	2,776	583	2	368	7	186	4	1	28		
Maine	17	318	220	41	162	35	42	36	15	4		
Maryland	17	1,498	273	34	139	39	128	10	1	4		
Massachusetts	16	1,065	194	47	69	50	124	12	0	1		
Michigan	16	3,710	375	18	186	28	148	8	11	29		
Minnesota	17	1,522	258	37	147	37	84	22	3	25		
Mississippi	17	756	219	42	214	25	2	51	1	1		
Missouri	16	1,401	248	38	180	30	29	40	20	18		
Montana	17	302	267	35	146	38	85	20	5	29		
Nebraska	17	741	354	22	236	24	86	19	6	24		
Nevada	17	857	460	8	446	2	13	49	0	2		
New Hampshire	16	186	154	48	97	48	42	35	2	12		
New Jersey	17	2,251	266	36	255	21	4	50	4	4		
New Mexico	17	778	343	25	325	10	15	47	1	3		
New York	15	4,661	323	30	176	33	84	21	4	60		
North Carolina	15	1,204	196	45	174	34	16	46	2	5		
North Dakota	17	272	338	26	115	43	101	15	4	115		
Ohio	17	4,318	333	28	297	15	22	41	7	6		
Oklahoma	17	808	196	46	125	40	60	30	4	8		
Oregon	17	1,462	390	15	310	14	73	25	2	6		
Pennsylvania	17	3,962	302	32	107	46	164	5	4	27		
Rhode Island	17	426	412	11	325	11	78	24	3	6		
South Carolina	16	1,583	427	9	368	6	43	34	8	8		
South Dakota	17	528	559	3	416	3	70	26	44	25		
Tennessee	17	2,118	358	21	156	36	103	14	47	53		
Texas	16	6,898	327	29	279	17	41	37	4	3		
Utah	17	768	248	39	123	41	99	16	6	20		
Vermont	17	49	70	51	34	51	22	43	4	9		
Virginia	17	2,879	400	13	358	9	22	42	12	7		
Washington	17	2,216	335	27	310	13	20	44	4	0		
West Virginia	17	398	201	43	107	45	65	29	0	29		
Wisconsin	16	2,013	359	20	241	23	97	17	10	11		
Wyoming	17	340	513	5	244	22	163	6	9	95		

Note: State is where the offense occurred. The total for the United States includes 3,401 juveniles in private facilities for whom State of offense was not reported. Rates are per 100,000 juveniles age 10 through upper age of jurisdiction. State ranks are based on unrounded rates.



3 5127 00157 3401

PERMIT NO. G-91



differences in States' upper age of juvenile court jurisdiction, extended age of jurisdiction (i.e., how long the juvenile justice system has jurisdiction over youth for dispositional purposes), and provisions for transfer to criminal court; jurisdictions' demographic composition; offenders' offense profiles; and bedspace availability in custodial facilities. Thus, State custody rate comparisons should be interpreted with caution.

Conclusion

These data show that information on the relative use of public and private facilities from State to State is important in understanding State-specific custody rates. Knowing what types of offenders are placed in what types of residential facilities can be useful in comparing States and making program development decisions within States. Readers no doubt will find many other ways to employ these data to better understand the use of custody as a sanction in their own State and in other States.

A note on confidentiality

By statute and regulation, OJJDP must protect the privacy of individuals included in

its surveys. To comply with this requirement, OJJDP requires all published data from CJRP to be rounded to the nearest multiple of three. These data are rounded after a table has been produced from the underlying data. Each cell is rounded independently, without consideration as to row or column totals. As a result, in many tables, the internal cells do not add to the marginal totals. Rates and percentages presented from CJRP are also based on rounded totals. More information on this rounding rule is available on the CJRP Databook Web site (see below).

For further information

This Bulletin is based on analysis of data from the 1997 CJRP. OJJDP also supports the online CJRP Databook, a component of OJJDP's Statistical Briefing Book (visit www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org and click on JJ Facts & Figures). The Databook allows users to access thousands of State and national CJRP data displays interactively online.

Related publications are also available online at OJJDP's Web site (www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org) and may be ordered from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse by telephone at 800-638-8736; by mail at P.O. Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20849-6000; or by e-mail at www.ncjrs.org/puborder.

This Bulletin was prepared under grant number 1999-JN-FX-K002 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of OJJDP or the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

Acknowledgments

This Bulletin was written by Melissa Sickmund, Ph.D., Senior Research Associate at the National Center for Juvenile Justice. The author gratefully acknowledges the efforts of the many public and private residential placement facilities that contribute data to CJRP.