

AN EVALUATION

Secure Juvenile Detention

99-13

September 1999

1999-2000 Joint Legislative Audit Committee Members

Senate Members:

Gary R. George, Co-chairperson
Judith Robson
Brian Burke
Peggy Rosenzweig
Mary Lazich

Assembly Members:

Carol Kelso, Co-chairperson
Stephen Nass
John Gard
Robert Ziegelbauer
David Cullen

LEGISLATIVE AUDIT BUREAU

The Bureau is a nonpartisan legislative service agency responsible for conducting financial and program evaluation audits of state agencies. The Bureau's purpose is to provide assurance to the Legislature that financial transactions and management decisions are made effectively, efficiently, and in compliance with state law and that state agencies carry out the policies of the Legislature and the Governor. Audit Bureau reports typically contain reviews of financial transactions, analyses of agency performance or public policy issues, conclusions regarding the causes of problems found, and recommendations for improvement.

Reports are submitted to the Joint Legislative Audit Committee and made available to other committees of the Legislature and to the public. The Audit Committee may arrange public hearings on the issues identified in a report and may introduce legislation in response to the audit recommendations. However, the findings, conclusions, and recommendations in the report are those of the Legislative Audit Bureau. For more information, write the Bureau at 131 W. Wilson Street, Suite 402, Madison, WI 53703, call (608) 266-2818, or send e-mail to Leg.Audit.Info@legis.state.wi.us. Electronic copies of current reports are available on line at www.legis.state.wi.us/lab/windex.htm.

State Auditor - Janice Mueller

Editor of Publications - Jeanne Thieme

Audit Prepared by

Don Bezruki, Director and Contact Person
David Varana
Cherry Hill

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	1
SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	7
Funding Secure Detention Facilities	11
State Oversight of Secure Detention Facilities	12
THE CHANGING ROLE OF SECURE DETENTION FACILITIES	15
Recent Trends in the Use of Secure Detention	15
The Use of Secure Detention as a Punishment	16
DIFFERENCES IN COUNTY APPROACHES TO SECURE DETENTION	21
Authorization by County Boards	21
Influence of Judicial Practices	23
The Role of Intake Workers and Caseworkers	24
Secure Detention in Milwaukee County	26
EFFECTIVENESS OF SECURE DETENTION AS PUNISHMENT	29
Description of Recidivism Rates	29
Other Benefits of Secure Detention as a Punishment	33
SECURE DETENTION DATA	35
Data Collection	35
APPENDIX I - SECURE DETENTION PLACEMENTS BY COUNTY AND UNDERLYING OFFENSE	
APPENDIX II - COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST- ADJUDICATORY PLACEMENTS	
APPENDIX III - SECURE DETENTION FACILITY PROFILES	



State of Wisconsin \ LEGISLATIVE AUDIT BUREAU

JANICE MUELLER
STATE AUDITOR

131 W. WILSON ST., STE. 402
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53703
(608) 266-2818
FAX (608) 267-0410
Leg>Audit.Infor@legis.stae.wi.us

September 14, 1999

Senator Gary R. George and
Representative Carol Kelso, Co-chairpersons
Joint Legislative Audit Committee
State Capitol
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Dear Senator George and Representative Kelso:

We have completed an evaluation of the effect of secure detention on the recidivism of juvenile offenders, as directed by 1997 Wisconsin Act 205. This act and other measures, including the creation of the Juvenile Justice Code in 1996, mark a transition in the use of secure juvenile detention facilities. Before July 1996, when the Juvenile Justice Code took effect, secure detention facilities were used primarily as a means to hold juveniles before court hearings relating to offenses. Since July 1996, they have increasingly become a means to punish juveniles who have committed offenses or been adjudicated delinquent. Judges may now place juveniles in secure detention for up to 30 days as an original disposition, while intake workers may place juveniles in secure detention for up to 72 hours to investigate or punish violations of prior court orders.

Sixteen counties in Wisconsin operate juvenile detention facilities to hold their residents and juveniles from other Wisconsin counties. In 1998, these facilities, which have a total of 519 beds, had 16,937 admissions, which averaged 7.8 days each. Counties estimate the operating cost of the facilities was \$14.3 million in 1998. Juvenile detention facilities are funded almost entirely by local revenues.

Of our sample of 907 juvenile delinquents in four counties, we found that 71.5 percent were rearrested before the expanded use of secure detention, and 69.7 percent were rearrested afterwards. Our results are consistent with national recidivism studies and with the beliefs of most county staff and judges, who hold that placements in secure detention do not significantly reduce the likelihood of recidivism. Nevertheless, most county staff with whom we spoke strongly support the use of secure detention because they believe it establishes accountability for juveniles' actions.

We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to us by the Office of Justice Assistance and by county officials in Eau Claire, Outagamie, Ozaukee, and Racine counties.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice Mueller
State Auditor

JM/DB/bh

SUMMARY

In recent years, the Legislature has enacted a series of measures that reflect a more aggressive response to juvenile crime. These measures provide more options for juvenile courts, allow juveniles to be waived to adult court at an earlier age, and increase both the amount of time and the reasons for which juveniles may be placed in secure detention facilities. They include 1995 Wisconsin Act 77, which created the Juvenile Justice Code that went into effect in July 1996, and 1997 Wisconsin Act 205, which increased the number of reasons for which juvenile intake workers and caseworkers could place juveniles in secure detention without a court hearing. 1997 Wisconsin Act 205 also requested that the Legislative Audit Bureau determine the typical length of secure detention placements, the underlying reasons for those placements, and whether the use of secure detention as a punishment reduced recidivism by juvenile offenders.

Secure juvenile detention facilities are similar to county jails, although some important differences exist, such as the requirement to provide educational programming. Operated by county staff and funded almost exclusively by local tax revenues, these facilities hold juveniles in a secure setting separate from any adult offenders also detained by county authorities. Sixteen counties operate secure detention facilities, which must be licensed by the Department of Corrections. These 16 facilities together have the capacity to hold a total of 519 juveniles. An additional 25 counties are allowed to briefly hold juveniles in separate areas within their county jails that are reserved for juveniles. The remaining 31 counties do not have juvenile facilities that meet federal requirements and, therefore, place juveniles in an approved facility and pay a fee for this service, which is typically \$130 per juvenile per day.

Policies on the use of secure detention are made by county boards, courts, and caseworkers. If caseworkers or the courts believe that secure detention is the most appropriate setting, juveniles may be held while awaiting court hearings to determine whether offenses have been committed. Increasingly, however, juveniles are placed in secure detention after being adjudicated delinquent by a court. Such a placement gives local officials an intermediate option between a non-secure community placement, such as a diversion program, and longer-term placement in a juvenile correctional institution operated by the State Department of Corrections.

Most counties have taken advantage of the increased authority to use secure detention as a punishment, and an increasing number of juvenile delinquents are being held in secure detention. In 1998, counties placed

juveniles in secure detention on 16,937 occasions, for an average of 7.8 days. Because the expanded use of secure detention is financed by local revenues, its use must be approved by county boards. Since the Juvenile Justice Code was enacted, 63 counties have chosen to allow judges, caseworkers, or both to exercise the expanded authority. Statewide, post-adjudicatory placements of juvenile delinquents have increased by 46.6 percent over a five-year period, from 13,214 in the 2.5 years before the new Juvenile Justice Code took effect to 19,369 in the same period after it took effect.

Four different types of placements are available as punishment. Judges may place juveniles in secure detention for up to 30 days as a disposition or direct punishment for an offense, and for up to 10 days as a sanction for violating the terms of an earlier non-secure detention disposition, such as a requirement to attend school regularly and perform community service. Caseworkers may place juveniles in secure detention for up to 72 hours for a variety of reasons, including punishment for violating the terms of a disposition or for an investigation.

We gathered information from four counties concerning 907 juvenile offenders and combined this information with criminal history data provided by the Department of Justice. From these data, we established recidivism rates for delinquent juveniles held in secure detention before and after the new Juvenile Justice Code took effect. We found that recidivism rates did not change significantly for the four counties as a group. The overall rate for juvenile delinquents who were held in secure detention in the 12 months before July 1996 was 71.5 percent; in the 12 months after July 1996, the overall rate was 69.7 percent. It should be noted, however, that while it is possible to compare trends in the use of secure detention and recidivism, it is not possible to draw a causal connection between any trends in use of secure detention and recidivism rates, both because of limitations in the available data and because recidivism is affected by many factors in a juvenile's life.

Despite their limitations, available data are consistent with the beliefs of many judges and county staff, who hold that placements in secure detention may deter a small proportion of juveniles from future criminal activity, although they do not deter most juveniles. Similarly, national evaluation literature suggests that placing a juvenile in secure custody does not significantly reduce the likelihood of recidivism. Nevertheless, judges and county staff with whom we spoke strongly support the use of secure detention as a punishment because they believe it establishes accountability for juveniles' actions. For example, some believe that secure detention provides juvenile court judges and caseworkers with a method to promptly establish accountability for a juvenile's ongoing delinquent behavior that does not require sending the juvenile away to a state-run facility. In addition, they believe there are advantages for

parents and juveniles when juveniles are held in local secure detention facilities, rather than in juvenile correctional institutions that might be located at a considerable distance from a juvenile's family.

While state and local officials in recent years have developed a variety of responses to juvenile crime, including increased use of secure detention, the ability of policymakers to determine which approaches are most effective is undermined by the absence of consistent and reliable information. The Office of Justice Assistance requires counties to submit data on secure detention placements each month—including reasons for placement and demographic information such as the juvenile's race, gender, and age—in order to satisfy federal reporting requirements. However, while a large amount of data on secure detention for juveniles has been collected statewide, most of these data cannot be used to answer basic questions about individuals, types of placements, and underlying offenses. The reporting form and directions for completing it have been out of date, and consistency of reporting has not been checked. During the course of our audit, the Office of Justice Assistance began implementing a series of efforts that should significantly improve the quality of the data in the future. However, even with the planned improvements, it will not be possible to determine recidivism rates because the Office does not maintain data to track individuals. Consequently, if the Legislature believes accurate recidivism data would be useful in establishing future policies, the Office would need to be directed to collect and maintain such information from the detention facilities.

INTRODUCTION

Between 1993 and 1997, the Legislature enacted a series of measures in response to a doubling of juvenile arrests between 1988 and 1993. Taken together, these changes reflect a more aggressive approach to addressing juvenile crime that includes providing more options for juvenile courts, waiving juveniles to adult court at an earlier age, and increasing both the amount of time and the reasons for which juveniles may be placed in local secure detention facilities. Included in these measures was 1995 Wisconsin Act 77, which created the Juvenile Justice Code in July 1996. Under this act, the State's approach to holding juveniles shifted from the "least restrictive" philosophy contained in the prior Children's Code to a "balanced" approach, which increases the emphasis on a juvenile's accountability for his or her actions. In addition, the authority of local judges and county caseworkers to place juveniles in secure detention as a punishment for committing offenses or for violating court orders was increased.

A subsequent bill, 1997 Wisconsin Act 205 increased the number of reasons for which juvenile intake workers and caseworkers could place juveniles in secure detention without a court hearing. Act 205 also requested that the Legislative Audit Bureau determine the typical length of secure detention placements, the underlying reasons for these placements, and whether counties' use of secure detention as a punishment reduced recidivism by juvenile offenders.

16 counties currently operate secure detention facilities.

In Wisconsin, 16 counties currently operate secure juvenile detention facilities. These facilities are licensed by the Department of Corrections and are similar to county jails in several respects, although some important differences exist. Operated by county staff and funded almost exclusively by local revenues, they are used to hold juveniles in a secure setting that is separate from adult offenders. Federal requirements under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act specify that juveniles may not have contact with adult offenders while they are held in secure detention.

As shown in Figure 1, an additional 25 counties are allowed, under federal law, to temporarily place juveniles in separate portions of their county jails that are reserved for juveniles until the juveniles can be transferred to secure detention facilities in other counties. The remaining 31 counties are not allowed to hold juveniles because their facilities do not meet federal requirements, and must promptly transport juveniles to approved facilities in other counties.

Intake workers can place a juvenile suspected of committing an offense in secure detention.

One reason juveniles may be held in secure detention facilities is because county authorities have reason to believe they have committed delinquent acts. Typically, these juveniles are taken into custody and brought to the secure detention facilities by law enforcement officers. There, county intake staff make determinations, based upon the circumstances of the alleged incidents and the records of the juveniles, to either release the juveniles to their parents or guardians or hold them in secure detention until a court hearing can be held. If an intake worker decides to hold a juvenile in secure detention, a hearing is held before a judge within 24 hours to confirm the placement or to release the juvenile to a parent or guardian until a court hearing is held on the alleged offense.

Secure detention is an intermediate option between placement in the community and placement in a juvenile correctional institution.

While counties have long had authority to hold juveniles in secure detention before court hearings, the creation of the Juvenile Justice Code in 1996 significantly expanded the authority to place juveniles in secure detention as a form of punishment, much as adults are sentenced to serve time in jail upon conviction. Formerly, once a court determined a juvenile had committed an offense, and thereby adjudicated the juvenile as delinquent, alternatives for punishment were limited largely to non-secure community placements or to placement at a state-operated juvenile correctional institution. The expanded availability of secure detention as a punishment was intended to provide counties with punishment options less severe than long-term placement in a correctional facility, but more restrictive than non-secure placement in the community.

Placement in secure detention after a juvenile has been adjudicated delinquent can be an original disposition, or it can be imposed as punishment if the juvenile violates an original disposition, such as a requirement to attend school regularly or to remain in a group home. Table 1 presents the most typical post-adjudicatory secure detention placements.

Table 1

Post-Adjudicatory Secure Detention Placements

<u>Person Authorizing Placement</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Maximum Length</u>	<u>Year Enacted</u>	
Juvenile Court Judge*	Sanction	10 days	1987	
	Disposition	30 days	1996	
Intake Workers and Caseworkers	Violation of Intensive Supervision Program**	Requirements:		
		Investigation	72 hours	1993
	Sanction	72 hours	1998	
	Violation of any dispositional order:			
		Investigation	72 hours	1996
		Sanction	72 hours	1998

* In many counties, juvenile court judges stay part or all of dispositions and sanctions, which may then be applied at the discretion of intake workers and caseworkers if doing so is warranted by the subsequent actions of the juvenile.

** Intensive supervision programs are operated by county staff and involve placement of juveniles in the community, with the county providing community-based treatment services and at least daily face-to-face contact between the juvenile and the caseworker.

The ten-day sanction for violation of court orders placed on juvenile delinquents, which enabled judges to punish juveniles who failed to follow initial court orders, was introduced in 1987 Wisconsin Act 27. In 1993 Wisconsin Act 16, the Legislature expanded the use of secure detention as a sanction for continued delinquent behavior by allowing intake workers and caseworkers to order a juvenile held for up to 72 hours while an investigation determined whether the juvenile had violated the requirements of his or her participation in an intensive supervision program.

Judges may place juveniles in secure detention facilities for up to 30 days.

The use of secure detention was further expanded by 1995 Wisconsin Act 77, which authorized judges to place a juvenile in secure detention for up to 30 days as a direct disposition. Consequently, juveniles no longer had to be either suspected or found in violation of an earlier disposition in order to be placed in secure detention. Act 77 also authorized caseworkers to place juveniles in secure detention without a

court order for up to 72 hours so the potential violations of any disposition—not just of potential violations of an intensive supervision programs—could be investigated. The authority of caseworkers was further expanded by 1997 Wisconsin Act 205, which authorized them to hold juvenile delinquents for up to 72 hours as punishment for violating earlier dispositions. This authority was in addition to caseworkers’ authority to order 72-hour holds during the investigation of potential violations.

County boards must authorize the expanded use of secure detention by judges and caseworkers.

The Legislature recognized that increased use of secure detention would increase local costs, because the State does not reimburse counties for costs related to operating secure detention facilities. While judges are directly authorized by statutes to exercise their authority to impose the ten-day sanction for violating a court order, all subsequent expansions in the use of secure detention have required county board approval before they may be used by judges and county staff. Section 938.34(3)(f)(3), Wis. Stats., requires that county boards authorize judges to impose the 30-day direct disposition. Similarly, s. 938.355(6d)(e), Wis. Stats., requires that county boards authorize caseworkers to exercise the 72-hour hold for investigations and sanctions.

As part of this evaluation of the use of secure detention and the effect of secure detention on recidivism, we gathered data on the number and types of placements and supplemented our analyses with evidence collected through interviews. We visited 8 of the 16 secure detention facilities and interviewed facility staff, as well as caseworkers and juvenile court judges. In addition, in order to develop trend information, we reviewed data from the Office of Justice Assistance on the use of secure detention before and after the recent expansion of judges’ and caseworkers’ authority. We also reviewed the arrest records of 907 juvenile delinquents from four counties to measure recidivism before and after the major expansion of judges’ and caseworkers’ authority in 1996. However, even though it is possible to compare trends in the use of secure detention and recidivism, it is not possible to definitively connect trends in the use of secure detention and recidivism rates. Correlations cannot be identified because of limitations in the available data and because recidivism is affected by many factors in a juvenile’s life.

Funding Secure Detention Facilities

Secure detention facilities are funded almost entirely by county tax revenue.

Funding secure detention placements and the construction and operation of secure detention facilities is nearly entirely the responsibility of the counties. Section 301.26(2)(c), Wis. Stats., prohibit Community Youth and Family Aids, which are the State’s primary means of supporting county juvenile delinquency services, from funding most secure detention facility costs. Community Youth and Family Aids may be

used to fund treatment and programming within secure detention facilities, but county staff indicated use of such funding for this purpose is typically minimal. While no information is available regarding total county expenditures on secure detention placements, we estimate that the 16 counties with secure detention facilities spent approximately \$14.3 million in FY 1998-99 to hold juveniles securely.

Local school districts, rather than counties, are responsible for providing educational services to juveniles in the secure detention facilities. They may seek reimbursement through the Department of Public Instruction for education provided to juveniles whose parents or guardians reside outside the school district in which the facility is located. However, the Department of Public Instruction does not track funding provided to school districts for this purpose separately from other types of state reimbursements for district expenditures. Therefore, we were unable to determine district expenditures to provide educational programming at secure detention facilities. Counties that operate their own secure detention facilities may raise revenue by contracting to accept placements from other counties. In FY 1998-99, the daily rate typically charged by facilities was \$130 per juvenile per day.

State Oversight of Secure Detention Facilities

While counties are responsible for the funding and operation of secure detention facilities, the State exercises regulatory oversight of the facilities to ensure that minimum standards are met. The Department of Corrections conducts annual inspections of the facilities and of juvenile portions of county jails to ensure compliance with DOC 346, Wisconsin Administrative Code, regarding both the physical environment of the facilities and policies and procedures related to the custody of juveniles. For example, Corrections staff review requirements for facility staff work assignments, allowable property and clothing for juveniles, religious and educational programming, discipline, nutrition, personal hygiene and health care, and visitation. In addition, they arrange annual meetings, which include training sessions, for superintendents of juvenile detention facilities. The Department also provides technical assistance to counties. For example, Corrections staff help counties that are considering developing secure detention facilities to ensure that plans conform to all relevant laws.

Two of the 16 secure detention facilities experienced overcrowding in 1998.

Recently, overcrowding has not been a significant problem for most counties that operate secure detention facilities. As shown in Table 2, only the Dane and Brown county secure detention facilities were over capacity during 1998, when their average daily populations were compared with the maximum capacity approved by the Department of Corrections. According to data received from the Department of

Table 2

Average Daily Population at Wisconsin's Secure Detention Facilities
 Estimated, 1998

<u>Facility Location</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Average Daily Population</u>	<u>Average Daily Population as a Percentage of Capacity</u>
Brown County	12	14	116.7%
Dane County	18	19	105.6
Outagamie County	26	22	84.6
Milwaukee County	120	99	82.5
Manitowoc County	21	16	76.2
Eau Claire County	28	21	75.0
Fond du Lac County	17	12	70.6
Oconto County	10	7	70.0
Sheboygan County*	9	6	66.7
La Crosse County	26	17	65.4
Ozaukee County**	14	9	64.3
Portage County	14	9	64.3
Rock County	35	21	60.0
Waukesha County	18	10	55.6
Racine County	131	59	45.0
Marathon County	<u>20</u>	<u>8</u>	40.0
State	519	349	67.2

* The Sheboygan County facility holds juveniles on an intermittent basis.

** Ozaukee County holds only male juveniles at its detention facility.

Corrections, the statewide annual average daily population at secure detention facilities was an estimated 349, or 67.2 percent of the maximum capacity of 519.

In July 1996, 1995 Wisconsin Act 27 lowered the age of adult court jurisdiction from 18 to 17. County staff indicated that many 17-year-olds are now being held in adult areas of county jails. Additionally, some counties with juvenile detention facilities, including Milwaukee and Racine, have reviewed their intake policies during the past several years and have restricted the number of placements in order to lower populations at the juvenile facility.

In addition to the oversight provided by the Department of Corrections, the state Office of Justice Assistance collects monthly data on secure detention placements to track county compliance with the requirements of the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Protection Act. Under this act, the Office has also provided federal grant funds to counties for the purpose of starting up new secure detention facilities, and for the development of educational and other structured activities.

THE CHANGING ROLE OF SECURE DETENTION FACILITIES

Placement data collected by the Office of Justice Assistance show that total placements of juvenile delinquents increased in 64 counties after July 1996, when the Juvenile Justice Code was enacted. Almost 40,000 juvenile placements were made in the 2.5 years following this change. Outside of Milwaukee County, the use of secure detention before and after adjudication increased by 19.5 percent, in part because of a 54.1 percent increase in the use of secure detention as a punishment. In Milwaukee County, which substantially reduced its use of secure detention before adjudication, total placements declined by 25.1 percent. However, Milwaukee County's use of secure detention as a punishment increased by 19.1 percent.

Recent Trends in the Use of Secure Detention

The use of secure detention has increased by 4.2 percent since the 1996 statute change.

As shown in Table 3, the number of placements in secure detention increased statewide by 4.2 percent during the second half of the five-year period whose mid-point marks the date the new Juvenile Justice Code took effect. However, the statewide increase would have been much higher were it not for the reduction in the number of placements in Milwaukee County after July 1996. In contrast, total placements in the rest of the state increased by 19.5 percent.

Table 3

Total Secure Detention Placements*
Before and After July 1, 1996 Statutory Changes

	Placements <u>January 1994 – June 1996</u>	Placements <u>July 1996 – December 1998</u>	Percentage <u>Change</u>
Milwaukee County	13,105	9,822	(25.1)%
Rest of State	<u>24,970</u>	<u>29,843</u>	19.5
Total	38,075	39,665	4.2

* Includes some juveniles who were held more than once.

Source: Office of Justice Assistance

Total juvenile placements in the Milwaukee County secure detention facility declined largely due to efforts by the Milwaukee Juvenile Court to eliminate an overcrowding problem that had existed before 1996. County staff indicated that the juvenile court conducted a comprehensive review of intake policies, with the goal of lowering the number of juveniles held in detention. Additionally, the shifting of most 17-year-old offenders to adult jails by 1995 Act 27 reduced the number of Milwaukee placements.

In contrast to Milwaukee County, total placements in the rest of the state increased after July 1996, largely because counties increased their use of secure detention for punishing juvenile delinquents. This trend was in contrast to the prior period, when the largest share of placements was for juveniles who were awaiting adjudication. Data limitations prevent a precise determination of which specific kinds of placements, such as 10-day sanctions, 72-hour caseworker holds, or 30-day dispositional placements, made up the increase in post-adjudicatory placements. Also, it should be noted that not all post-adjudicatory placements are intended as punishment; for example, some juvenile delinquents are held after disposition until they can be sent to another out-of-home placement, such as the state-operated Ethan Allen or Lincoln Hills schools.

The Use of Secure Detention as a Punishment

The number of juveniles held in secure detention as a punishment has increased.

While there has been a slight increase in total placements in secure detention facilities on a statewide level, the most significant trend after the July 1996 statutory changes is the increase in the use of secure detention as a punishment for juvenile delinquents. Table 4 shows that, statewide, placements of juveniles after adjudication increased by 46.6 percent after July 1, 1996. Outside of Milwaukee County, county staff attributed the increase in post-adjudicatory placements to greater use of ten-day sanctions by judges and of 72-hour holds by intake workers and caseworkers. Other county staff indicated that juvenile court judges are making increased use of 30-day dispositional placements. Imprecise coding of records by county staff prevents a determination of how many of these post-adjudicatory placements were for dispositions, how many for sanctions, and how many for other reasons. However, juvenile court judges and county staff indicated that the use of secure detention as a punishment is increasing.

Table 4 also shows that during this same time period, pre-adjudicatory placements decreased by 18.4 percent statewide. While a significant reduction in the number of pre-adjudicatory placements in Milwaukee County accounted for a large share of this decline, counties in the rest of the state also reported a 5.1 percent decline in pre-adjudicatory placements.

Table 4

Trends in Secure Detention Placements

<u>Placement Type by County</u>	<u>January 1994- June 1996</u>	<u>July 1996- December 1998</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Milwaukee County				
Before adjudication	10,256	6,430	(3,826)	(37.3)%
After adjudication	<u>2,849</u>	<u>3,392</u>	<u>543</u>	19.1
Total	13,105	9,822	(3,283)	(25.1)
Rest of State				
Before adjudication	14,605	13,866	(739)	(5.1)
After adjudication	<u>10,365</u>	<u>15,977</u>	<u>5,612</u>	54.1
Total	24,970	29,843	4,873	19.5
Statewide				
Before adjudication	24,861	20,296	(4,565)	(18.4)
After adjudication	<u>13,214</u>	<u>19,369</u>	<u>6,155</u>	46.6
Total	38,075	39,665	1,590	4.2

Source: Office of Justice Assistance

Policy decisions made by counties, rather than juvenile arrest rates, are important factors in determining whether the use of secure detention increases or declines. For example, between 1994 and 1997, the overall arrest rate for juveniles in Milwaukee County increased by 7.6 percent, excluding arrests for offenses that apply only to juveniles, such as curfew violations and liquor laws. However, placements at the Milwaukee County secure detention facility fell by 34.5 percent during the same period. On the other hand, some counties experienced simultaneous increases in juvenile arrest rates and in the use of their secure detention facility.

According to the data reported by the counties, and as shown in Table 5, property crimes are the most common reason juveniles are placed in secure detention. Property crimes commonly include motor vehicle theft, burglary, damage to property, and theft. Violent crimes are the second most common reason juveniles are placed in secure detention. Violent crimes most commonly include battery, robbery, possession of a dangerous weapon, sexual assault, and knowingly putting another's life in a dangerous situation. Violent crimes are the most common type of

pre-adjudicatory offense. County staff indicated that after adjudication, juveniles who commit violent crimes are more frequently placed in juvenile correctional institutions, such as the Lincoln Hills School, the Ethan Allen School, or the Southern Oaks Girls School, than placed in secure detention facilities.

Table 5

Offenses Resulting in Secure Detention Placement
Total Placements 1994-1998

<u>Type of Offense</u>	<u>Pre-Adjudicatory</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Post-Adjudicatory</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>
Property	13,424	29.7%	9,657	29.6%	23,081	29.7%
Violent	13,632	30.2	5,315	16.3	18,947	24.4
Not Identified	5,589	12.4	11,817	36.3	17,406	22.4
Public Order & Safety	5,591	12.4	3,941	12.1	9,532	12.2
Other	4,039	8.9	611	1.9	4,650	6.0
Drugs	<u>2,882</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>1,242</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>4,124</u>	<u>5.3</u>
Total	45,157	100.0%	32,583	100.0%	77,740	100.0%

Source: Office of Justice Assistance

Offenses against public order and safety most commonly include disorderly conduct, resisting or obstructing an officer, driving violations, and drinking violations. Of the 4,650 placements from 1994 through 1998 shown in the “Other” category, 3,585 were juveniles being held on warrants to ensure their appearance at court hearings. Milwaukee County reported most of these placements during this five-year period. Drug violations include both possession and distribution violations. Data regarding the underlying offenses for which juveniles are placed in secure detention are not entirely reliable because some counties did not complete the reporting form, or they did not complete it properly. Nevertheless, these data represent the best available information on the types of crimes that have led to juveniles being placed in secure detention facilities.

The average length of placement has been 7.8 days.

On a statewide level, the average period of time spent in secure detention fell after July 1996, although we found important differences between Milwaukee County and counties in the rest of the state. Pre-adjudicatory placements in Milwaukee County have consistently been longer than in other counties, as shown in Table 6. For all counties, the average length of placement declined from 8.5 days during the period before July 1996 to 7.8 days in the following period.

Table 6

Average Length of All Placements in Secure Detention
(Number of days)

<u>Placement Type</u>	<u>Milwaukee County</u>	<u>Rest of the State</u>	<u>Statewide</u>
Before adjudication			
Pre-July 1, 1996	10.6	8.1	9.1
Post-July 1, 1996	12.3	7.9	9.3
After adjudication			
Pre-July 1, 1996	7.5	7.3	7.3
Post-July 1, 1996	6.2	6.3	6.2
Totals			
Pre-July 1, 1996	9.9	7.7	8.5
Post-July 1, 1996	10.2	7.0	7.8

Source: Office of Justice Assistance

Increased use of 72-hour holds appears to be influencing the average length of placement. For example, in 1998, 52.5 percent of all placements were for three days or less. In counties other than Milwaukee, the average length of placement has fallen since the creation of the Juvenile Justice Code, even though counties were given the authority to hold juveniles in secure detention facilities for longer periods through the 30-day disposition.

Milwaukee County staff indicated that their detention periods for pre-adjudicatory placements are longer than in other counties because:

- there are more cases pending in the Milwaukee juvenile court than in other counties, and it takes longer to hear them;
- Milwaukee County has more juvenile cases of a serious nature, which take longer to resolve, than other counties do; and
- there are more juveniles who do not have suitable living arrangements.

DIFFERENCES IN COUNTY APPROACHES TO SECURE DETENTION

The State plays a limited role in the use of secure detention. While state statutes authorize a variety of ways in which it may be used, policy decisions about its use are made locally by county boards, courts, and caseworkers. As a result, approaches to the use of secure detention vary significantly among counties and differ depending on the county board resolutions that have been passed, local judicial practices and guidelines, and the role of the intake workers and caseworkers in each county.

Authorization by County Boards

By statute, county boards rather than the judiciary have control over the extent to which most secure detention placements will be available as a punishment for juveniles in their counties. Statutes require county board approval for all types of punitive secure detention placements that have been introduced or revised since the introduction of a Juvenile Justice Code separate from the prior Children's Code. These include the use of the 30-day disposition and 72-hour caseworker holds but exclude most 10-day sanctions for violations of dispositional orders. Counties requested this statutory requirement because of the potential for increased costs associated with wider use of secure detention by judges and caseworkers.

Since the introduction of the 30-day disposition in July 1996, 63 of the 72 counties have authorized its use. As shown in Figure 2, a majority of the counties that have not are located in the southern part of the state. Information about resolutions authorizing 72-hour holds was not available on a statewide basis. Among the 16 counties that have secure detention facilities, 11 have passed resolutions authorizing the use of one or more of the 72-hour holds.

Figure 2

**Counties' Use of the 30-day Dispositional Placement
1998**



White = County Board has authorized disposition
Grey = County Board has not authorized disposition

Some counties are concerned about the cost of expanded use of secure detention.

A variety of factors influence whether county boards consider or pass resolutions regarding secure detention. County staff indicated three primary reasons for limiting the use of secure detention:

- financial reasons; for example, according to staff in Columbia County, the board passed the necessary resolution but has limited use of secure detention by restricting the amount of funding available for placements intended as punishment;
- philosophical approach; for example, Dane County staff indicated that they prefer to rely on treatment programs or other community placement options, rather than to use secure detention placements as a punishment; and
- concern about overcrowding; for example, Milwaukee County has instituted stricter guidelines for use of its facility because of overcrowding problems experienced in the past.

Influence of Judicial Practices

In counties that have passed resolutions authorizing dispositions of secure detention, judicial practices influence how secure detention is used as a punishment. Judges' philosophical approaches to dealing with juvenile crime and their opinions about the effectiveness of secure detention as a punishment affect how frequently and under what circumstances they impose secure detention.

Judges in a number of counties commonly order a disposition of secure detention and conditionally suspend, or stay, some or all of the days of the sentence. The conditionally suspended days are imposed if the juvenile violates the orders of his or her supervision. Statutes require that the juvenile receive a hearing before conditionally suspended dispositions are imposed, unless the juvenile signs a waiver. In these cases, judges often grant intake workers and caseworkers the authority to impose conditionally suspended dispositions at their discretion. This resembles judiciary practices in the adult justice system: if a probationer waives his or her right to administrative hearings, the probation officer may impose a stayed sentence as a sanction for violating conditions of probation. Judges also conditionally suspend the imposition of secure detention sanctions, or portions of secure detention sanctions, and allow them to be imposed at the discretion of a juvenile's intake worker or caseworker.

Judicial practice influences the use of secure detention.

Where judges frequently rely on intake workers and caseworkers to impose the conditionally suspended disposition or sanction, it is important for strict guidelines and oversight to be in place to ensure that the authority granted by judges is not misused. County staff, for example, indicated they knew of some instances in which intake workers or caseworkers had attempted to impose or had imposed unused secure detention time available on a prior dispositional order to punish a juvenile for a new offense.

In other counties, judges choose to maintain tighter control over the use of secure detention dispositions and sanctions and rarely grant discretion to intake workers and caseworkers. One judge suggested that the relationship between the courts and the county department or departments responsible for secure detention may affect judges' willingness to conditionally suspend dispositions or sanctions of secure detention. Another judge believed that returning to court and appearing before the judge emphasized the seriousness of the offense to the juvenile.

Judges also differ regarding their preference to impose dispositions and sanctions of consecutive weekends or consecutive days. In many counties, it is more common for judges to impose a series of consecutive weekends in secure detention, rather than consecutive days. According to county staff, judges might view secure detention served on weekends, which are usually considered leisure time for juveniles, as a more severe punishment than secure detention served during the school week. County staff also indicated that judges might believe that juveniles' regular school schedules should not be disrupted. One superintendent noted that the population in the secure detention facility often peaks during the weekends.

The Role of Intake Workers and Caseworkers

In some counties, intake workers and caseworkers play a significant role in ordering placements to punish juvenile delinquents, often independent of the juvenile court judge. In other counties, intake workers and caseworkers are more restricted in their ability to order a juvenile delinquent into secure detention. This is the result of differences in judicial preferences and in the organizational relationships between the juvenile court, the secure detention facility, and the county human services department.

While statutes set out the powers and duties of secure detention intake workers, the role of intake workers and caseworkers varies across counties, in part because of differences in the organization of county agencies. Statutory requirements include both minimum professional and training requirements for employment, as well as standards such as the requirement that intake workers must be available to provide

screening services 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Intake workers provide screening services for secure detention facilities to ensure that juveniles are properly held in custody. In comparison, caseworkers are assigned to individual juvenile cases and assist the juvenile court in determining an appropriate response to an individual juvenile's delinquent behavior. In some counties, such as Racine County, these two roles are performed by the same staff, or staff from the same county agency. In other counties, such as Milwaukee County, these functions are separated.

Caseworkers may place a juvenile in secure detention for up to 72 hours without judicial review.

An important difference between counties is the extent to which intake workers and caseworkers are allowed to place juveniles in secure detention without a hearing, under the authority of one of four types of 72-hour holds. As noted, statewide information regarding the number of counties that have passed resolutions authorizing the use of one or more of the 72-hour holds is not available. In counties where county boards have passed the required resolutions, intake workers and caseworkers have the power, without a hearing in juvenile court, to place juveniles under court-ordered supervision into secure detention for violating or allegedly violating one of the orders of their supervision. Just as the use of secure detention varies depending on county board decisions and judicial practices and guidelines, the use of 72-hour holds also differs based on the guidelines established within the intake- and caseworkers' unit and on how strictly these guidelines are enforced.

The Legislature enacted several statutory guidelines intended to ensure a standard of oversight for caseworkers. Statutes require that a juvenile who is placed in secure detention on a 72-hour caseworker hold be allowed to make a written or oral statement concerning the possible placement and the course of conduct for which the juvenile was taken into custody. For placements in secure detention imposed by a caseworker as a punishment, statutes require that a supervisor who is qualified to provide intake services review the juvenile's statement and either approve the placement or release the juvenile from custody. While most county staff and judges we spoke with indicated that intake workers and caseworkers use 72-hour holds appropriately, some also recognized that the potential exists for this type of placement to be used inappropriately. For example, intake workers or caseworkers might impose a 72-hour hold on a Friday evening to avoid reviewing the case beyond their regularly scheduled work hours. County staff also told us that intake workers and caseworkers might impose a 72-hour hold as a punishment when the county board has authorized only the use of investigative holds.

Some counties use standardized placement assessment forms.

Some counties have taken steps to ensure more consistent actions by caseworkers dealing with juvenile delinquents. For example, some counties mandate or recommend use of the Wisconsin Juvenile Delinquency Classification System. As required by statutes, the Department of Corrections makes this assessment tool available to all counties for assessment of the risk level of each juvenile. As of April 1996, 24 counties used this assessment tool, either as their only classification tool or in conjunction with other tools. Counties may also develop their own systems to identify the most appropriate treatment or placement option for juveniles, as was the case in Milwaukee County. Intake workers and caseworkers who must use a formal assessment system to recommend or determine treatment or placement options will be more likely to impose 72-hour holds in a more consistent manner than those who do not use Wisconsin Juvenile Delinquency Classification System or a comparable tool. The use of these assessment tools also provides caseworkers with justification for their decisions to impose secure detention placements.

Counties differ in the extent to which they require supervisory approval of placements.

Even with these assessment tools in place, some have noted that there are differences among counties in how caseworkers impose secure detention placements. This is because counties differ from one another in the extent to which caseworkers are required to obtain supervisory approval before imposing some types of placements. For example, staff in Outagamie County indicated that supervisory approval is needed before a caseworker may impose either the 72-hour investigative hold or the 72-hour hold as a punishment. Given that the potential exists for inappropriate use of these placements, requiring and ensuring that caseworkers obtain supervisory approval before using them offers additional safeguards against inappropriate use.

Secure Detention in Milwaukee County

While there are variations among counties' approaches to secure detention, most counties have increasingly used secure detention to punish juvenile delinquents. Milwaukee County is a notable exception to this trend. Milwaukee County has not approved the use of secure detention as a disposition by judges or the use of any 72-hour holds by caseworkers. Milwaukee County officials said they prefer using secure detention for the more traditional purposes of detaining juveniles awaiting hearings or transfer to another placement or program in the community or, to a lesser extent, as a sanction for violating conditions of their dispositions. As noted, Milwaukee County had 9,822 total placements after July 1996, which represents a 25.1 percent decline from its 13,105 placements during the two-and-a-half years before July 1996.

**Milwaukee County
reduced its use of secure
detention to reduce
overcrowding.**

In the early 1990s, the Milwaukee County secure detention facility had peak occupancy levels approaching 170 juveniles in a facility with 88 beds. This overcrowding problem prompted the staff to develop ways to limit placements, including participating between 1992 and 1994 in a pilot project to reduce overcrowding. Juvenile court judges in Milwaukee with whom we spoke indicated limited interest in the use of secure detention as a punishment for juvenile delinquents because of the history of overcrowding at the facility. Additionally, the Milwaukee County juvenile court increasingly emphasized placing juveniles in community settings, including non-secure out-of-home placements, drug and alcohol treatment programs, and the intensive supervision program, rather than secure detention.

Other changes instituted in Milwaukee County in 1996 included the development and implementation of a uniform scoring method to ensure all intake workers used the same checklist to determine whether a juvenile should be placed in secure detention. Also, beginning in November 1996, the Milwaukee juvenile court no longer detained juveniles on warrants in order to ensure their appearance at court hearings. Furthermore, Milwaukee County officials indicated there are significantly fewer 17-year-olds in secure detention as a result of 1995 Act 27. Placements of 17- and 18-year-old juveniles accounted for 23.7 percent of all Milwaukee County placements during the 2.5 years before July 1, 1996, but only 12.0 percent afterward. However, because total placements fell by 25.1 percent, it appears likely that a combination of factors, including the policy changes mentioned above and a decline in the juvenile arrest rates for property and violent offenses, have worked together to reduce the number of secure detention placements in Milwaukee County.

EFFECTIVENESS OF SECURE DETENTION AS PUNISHMENT

We found that the creation of the Juvenile Justice Code, and subsequent increased use of secure detention as a punishment, does not appear to have greatly reduced recidivism rates among juvenile delinquents. We compared recidivism rates before and after the July 1996 creation of the Juvenile Justice Code that significantly expanded the use of secure detention and found that they declined only slightly. Because statewide data on juvenile recidivism are not readily available, we gathered information on 907 juveniles directly from four counties and combined it with criminal history data provided by the Department of Justice's Crime Information Bureau to determine recidivism rates for those individuals who had been sent to secure detention as a form of punishment between 1995 and 1997. Recidivism rates were high; a significant majority of juveniles included in our study returned to secure detention or were arrested by a Wisconsin law enforcement agency within one year of their initial placements.

Description of Recidivism Rates

After July 1996, three of the four counties in our analysis increased their use of secure detention as a punishment; one did not. The number of post-adjudicatory placements increased by 37.1 percent in Outagamie, Ozaukee, and Racine counties. Eau Claire County, on the other hand, decreased the number of post-adjudicatory placements by 10.2 percent. While judges in all four counties have the same authority to place juveniles in secure detention, caseworkers in Eau Claire County have not been authorized to use 72-hour short-term holds, as have caseworkers in the other three counties.

Because the selection of the 907 individuals was not based on a controlled research design, but rather on the availability of data from those four counties, the results of this analysis cannot be projected to the state as a whole. Further, because counties do not consistently record the reason for a secure detention, we could not separately measure the effect of the 30-day disposition, 10-day sanction, and 72-hour caseworker holds on recidivism.

Recidivism fell 1.8 percentage points after use of secure detention as a punishment increased.

As shown in Table 7, we found that the overall recidivism rate was high but declined slightly after the introduction of the Juvenile Justice Code. While the overall use of secure detention as a punishment increased among the four counties, the recidivism rate among the 907 juveniles fell 1.8 percentage points, from 71.5 percent before 1996 to 69.7 percent after 1996. The recidivism rate increased in Eau Claire and Outagamie

counties and fell in Ozaukee and Racine counties. For this analysis, recidivism is defined as returning to secure detention or being arrested by a law enforcement agency within one year of initial post-adjudicatory placement in a secure detention facility.

Table 7

**Recidivism Rate for Juvenile Delinquents
Before and After July 1, 1996 Statutory Changes**

<u>County</u>	Initial Release July 1995-June 1996		Initial Release July 1996-June 1997	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage Recidivating*</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage Recidivating*</u>
Eau Claire	102	65.7%	54	68.5%
Outagamie	73	67.1	79	69.6
Ozaukee	37	73.0	31	61.3
Racine	<u>293</u>	74.4	<u>238</u>	71.0
Total	505	71.5	402	69.7

* Within one year of initial release

**Judges and county staff
strongly support use of
secure detention as a
means of ensuring
accountability for a
juvenile's actions.**

While limited, these data appear consistent with the beliefs of many county staff with whom we spoke, who hold that while placement in secure detention may deter a small proportion of juveniles from future criminal activity, it does not deter most juveniles. Similarly, national evaluation literature suggests that placing a juvenile in secure custody, such as secure detention, does not significantly reduce the likelihood of recidivism. Nevertheless, county staff and others with whom we spoke strongly support the use of secure detention as a punishment because they believe it establishes accountability for juveniles' actions and because it enhances public safety by temporarily removing delinquents from the community.

As shown in Table 8, three of the four counties in our sample increased their use of secure detention as a form of punishment, compared with placements for a hold before a hearing. For example, in Outagamie County, the use of secure detention as a punishment increased from 42.0 to 55.2 percent of all placements. However, even though the Eau Claire County board has authorized the use of the 30-day secure detention disposition by judges, its use of secure detention as a form of

punishment fell in the first 18 months after the establishment of the Juvenile Justice Code in 1996, compared to its use in holding juveniles before hearings. Staff in Eau Claire County have speculated that the decrease may be the result of some judges' decisions to place some juvenile offenders who would have been sent to secure detention in the past in juvenile correctional facilities.

Table 8

Change in the Types of Secure Detention Placements
Eau Claire, Outagamie, Ozaukee and Racine Counties

	Placements January 1994 – <u>June 1996</u>	Placements July 1996 – <u>December 1998</u>
Eau Claire County		
Before Adjudication	29.1%	34.0%
After Adjudication	70.9	66.0
Outagamie County		
Before Adjudication	58.0	44.8
After Adjudication	42.0	55.2
Ozaukee County		
Before Adjudication	46.9	33.1
After Adjudication	53.1	66.9
Racine County		
Before Adjudication	46.7	35.3
After Adjudication	53.3	64.7
Total		
Before Adjudication	46.7	37.1
After Adjudication	53.3	62.9

The average age of juveniles in secure detention has decreased slightly.

While the use of secure detention as a punishment increased as a percentage of all placements in three of our four sample counties after the creation of the Juvenile Justice Code in 1996, the average age of juveniles in secure detention decreased slightly in three counties and increased in one. As shown in Table 9, the average age of juveniles in our recidivism sample decreased in Eau Claire, Outagamie, and Racine counties, but it increased slightly in Ozaukee County. Most county staff speculated that the slight decreases in age were the result of statutory changes that lowered the age of juvenile court jurisdiction from 17 to 16.

Table 9

Change in the Average Age of Recidivism Study Participants
Eau Claire, Outagamie, Ozaukee and Racine Counties

<u>County</u>	<u>Average Age (years)</u> <u>July 1995 – June 1996</u>	<u>Average Age (years)</u> <u>July 1996 – June 1997</u>
Eau Claire	15.3	15.0
Outagamie	15.3	14.8
Ozaukee	15.2	15.6
Racine	15.1	14.9

Finally, our study identified few significant differences in the types of offenses committed by the juveniles in our recidivism study. In each of the four counties, the most common offense was a property offense, as shown in Table 10. Drug offenses were the least-common offenses committed by the juveniles in our recidivism study. The types of offenses committed by the juveniles in our sample were generally consistent with statewide information on juvenile offenses.

Table 10

Offenses Committed by Recidivism Study Subjects

<u>Offense Type</u>	<u>Eau Claire</u>	<u>Outagamie</u>	<u>Ozaukee</u>	<u>Racine</u>	<u>Total</u>
Property	45.5%	42.8%	33.8%	34.1%	37.5%
Violent	17.3	26.3	17.6	27.9	25.0
Not Identified	24.4	7.9	22.1	21.1	19.5
Public Order and Safety	9.0	19.1	17.7	12.4	13.4
Drugs	<u>3.8</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>8.8</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.6</u>
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Other Benefits of Secure Detention as a Punishment

In addition to potentially affecting recidivism, county staff cited other benefits of using secure detention as a response to delinquent behavior. Other criteria for judging the effectiveness of secure detention include whether a balance between protection of the public and protection of the juvenile has been served, and whether greater accountability for delinquent behavior has been established. As mentioned previously, all county staff with whom we spoke agreed that it is best to have as many available options as possible when attempting to respond to a juvenile delinquent’s behavior, including the use of secure detention as punishment.

Some county staff cited advantages for parents and the juvenile when a juvenile is held in the local secure detention facility, rather than incarcerated in a juvenile correctional institution that might be a considerable distance from the juvenile’s family. They believe that secure detention appropriately serves as an intermediate step in punishment that bridges a gap between non-secure options and the juvenile correctional institutions. As discussed, the cost to a county is greater when a juvenile is held locally, because the State does not reimburse counties for secure detention placements. Nevertheless, of those we spoke with, no juvenile court judges and few county staff argued that the statutory changes that authorized wider use of secure detention should be reversed.

The introduction of 72-hour holds has allowed caseworkers and intake workers to punish juvenile delinquents for violating conditions of their delinquency disposition in a prompt fashion, and thus to avoid delays associated with the court system. For example, in Outagamie County,

detention facility staff indicated that caseworkers made frequent use of 72-hour investigative holds to detain juvenile delinquents. Staff suggested that some caseworkers use these holds when they believe the juvenile delinquent has committed a new offense, in order to avoid the delay involved in setting up a hearing in juvenile court. In this situation, caseworkers appear to be using investigative holds as a *de facto* sanction.

Some county staff approve of the change in focus of the Juvenile Justice Code to a “balanced approach” in the use of secure detention that places greater emphasis on accountability and protection of the public than had been the case when juvenile delinquency provisions were contained within the Children’s Code. Some believe that while using secure detention as a punishment may not be effective in reducing recidivism rates over the long term, placement in a secure detention facility does provide juvenile court judges and caseworkers with a way to establish accountability for a juvenile’s ongoing delinquent behavior that does not require sending the juvenile away to a state-run facility.

While a great deal of data on secure detention have been collected, these data have not been collected in a way that allows them to be used to answer basic questions about types of placements and underlying offenses. To satisfy federal reporting requirements, the Office of Justice Assistance requires counties to submit data on secure detention placements each month. However, the federal reporting requirements have not included data such as names of individuals, which are necessary for analysis of the effectiveness of secure detention and consideration of state policy decisions regarding its use. In addition, we identified several problems with the collection and management of secure detention data that undermine the usefulness of existing information. However, during the course of our audit, the Office of Justice Assistance implemented a number of changes that should significantly improve the usefulness of the data in the future.

Data Collection

Data collected in recent years have been inconsistent.

The reporting form used by counties was originally developed in October 1994 and has not been regularly updated to reflect the changes in state law. As a result, counties have not been able to accurately report secure detention placement data. For example, the form has not contained a discrete code number to record a 30-day disposition, or codes to differentiate between any of the four 72-hour caseworker holds or between these and 10-day sanctions. The current form also cites Chapter 48, Wisconsin Statutes, when discussing specific attributes of secure detention such as sanctions, even though these sections of the Children's Code were transferred to Chapter 938, the Juvenile Justice Code, effective July 1, 1996.

As a result, county staff have had to improvise when reporting 30-day dispositional placements, 72-hour caseworker holds, and 10-day sanctions. In addition, county staff had not been provided adequate training on completing the form, and data they submitted were not adequately monitored for consistency or accuracy. Consequently, we found significant differences in how each county interpreted the reporting form. These differences have prevented analysis of secure detention data that can indicate the actual number of 30-day dispositional placements, 72-hour caseworker holds, and 10-day sanctions.

The Office plans improvements in data collection.

During the course of our audit, the Office of Justice Assistance began implementing a number of changes that should significantly improve the quality and consistency of the data it collects in the future. In March 1999, the Office created and filled a project position to improve data collection methods. The staff person has been working with county officials to revise the reporting form and to provide training to staff on following consistent methods and interpretations in submitting data. Current working drafts of the proposed reporting form include discrete codes for the various types of placement into secure detention, including 30-day dispositions, 10-day sanctions, and 72-hour holds, as well as other improvements. Office officials estimate that the new form should be implemented in January 2000. Office staff also indicate that while the project position is established for only 18 months, regular updating of the reporting form and providing training to county staff will be an ongoing responsibility in the Office.

Once fully implemented, the changes begun by the Office will significantly improve the accuracy of the data it currently collects. However, because the Office does not currently maintain data on individuals, conducting recidivism studies requested by the Legislature will still not be possible. While some detention facilities currently collect and retain such information, other facilities do not. Consequently, if the Legislature believes accurate recidivism data would be useful in establishing future policies, the Office would need to be directed to collect such information from the detention facilities.

APPENDIX I

Secure Detention Placements by County and Underlying Offense 1998

The Office of Justice Assistance requires counties to submit data on secure detention placements each month, in order to satisfy federal reporting requirements. In addition to requiring that county staff report the reason a juvenile has been placed in secure detention and the underlying offense, the Office also requires counties to report demographic information, such as the juvenile's race, gender, and age.

Data regarding the underlying offenses for which juveniles are placed in secure detention are not entirely reliable because some counties did not complete the reporting form, or they did not complete it properly. Nevertheless, these data represent the best available information on the types of crimes committed by juveniles that have led to placement in secure detention facilities.

<u>County</u>	<u>Total Placements</u>	<u>Theft</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Disorderly Conduct</u>	<u>Battery</u>	<u>Drugs</u>	<u>Property Damage</u>	<u>Weapon</u>	<u>Sexual Assault</u>	<u>Warrant</u>
Adams	30	33.4%	10.0%	33.3%	16.7%	-	3.3%	3.3%	-	-
Ashland	91	42.8	12.1	17.6	12.1	2.2%	2.2	-	1.1%	-
Barron	124	39.5	14.5	5.7	4.9	8.9	12.9	3.2	3.2	-
Bayfield	25	36.0	-	20.0	16.0	24.0	-	-	4.0	-
Brown	475	36.0	18.8	6.1	12.6	1.9	3.2	4.6	2.1	-
Buffalo	40	37.5	12.5	17.5	2.5	7.5	5.0	10.0	5.0	-
Burnett	18	38.9	22.2	-	5.6	-	-	16.7	-	-
Calumet	61	32.8	11.5	8.2	14.8	4.9	6.6	1.6	8.2	-
Chippewa	151	41.1	13.9	13.9	18.5	3.3	2.0	2.0	-	-
Clark	26	46.2	3.8	3.9	23.1	-	11.5	-	3.8	-
Columbia	78	44.9	10.2	10.3	11.5	2.6	5.1	6.4	1.3	-
Crawford	56	39.3	17.9	8.9	5.4	19.6	5.3	3.6	-	-
Dane	851	16.4	21.4	10.8	20.0	5.5	2.7	7.4	6.5	-
Dodge	74	29.7	33.8	9.5	9.5	2.7	4.1	2.7	1.3	-
Door	21	42.8	9.5	4.7	4.8	14.3	14.3	-	4.8	-
Douglas	88	43.2	8.0	2.3	15.9	1.1	6.8	2.3	-	-
Dunn	67	26.9	16.4	14.9	14.9	10.4	1.5	3.0	-	-
Eau Claire	331	37.5	20.2	10.3	9.7	5.1	1.2	1.5	1.8	-
Florence	7	28.6	-	14.3	42.8	-	-	-	-	-
Fond du Lac	253	28.9	4.3	22.1	17.8	3.9	9.1	2.8	6.3	-
Forest	56	21.4	28.6	19.7	8.9	7.1	-	8.9	-	-
Grant	27	29.7	29.6	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	11.1	-	-
Green	32	34.4	40.6	6.3	6.3	6.2	3.1	-	-	-
Green Lake	50	40.0	-	22.0	8.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	-	-
Iowa	19	36.8	26.3	26.3	5.3	5.3	-	-	-	-
Iron	11	-	81.8	18.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jackson	35	37.1	11.4	14.3	14.3	8.6	2.9	-	5.7	-
Jefferson	146	28.8	32.2	11.6	15.1	3.4	2.7	4.1	-	-
Juneau	26	46.2	7.7	11.5	11.5	7.7	3.8	3.9	3.9	-
Kenosha	402	27.6	23.6	12.7	19.2	4.2	3.2	1.5	2.2	-
Kewaunee	32	25.0	12.5	21.9	-	12.5	12.5	3.1	6.3	-
La Crosse	570	34.0	1.8	24.6	14.6	6.1	4.7	3.7	2.6	-
Lafayette	15	13.3	53.4	13.3	13.3	-	6.7	-	-	-
Langlade	174	21.3	54.6	7.5	4.0	5.2	2.9	1.1	0.6	-
Lincoln	97	41.2	7.2	4.1	17.5	5.2	6.2	4.1	8.2	-
Manitowoc	664	34.9	3.2	24.1	8.1	6.6	11.9	2.3	3.5	-
Marathon	352	40.6	18.5	10.5	13.4	4.5	2.6	2.8	2.8	-
Marinette	122	20.5	39.3	12.3	12.3	0.8	6.6	3.3	2.5	-
Marquette	30	50.0	3.3	6.7	13.3	-	3.3	3.3	3.4	-
Statewide	16,937.0	25.4	22.7	13.0	11.0	5.9	3.6	3.4	3.3	2.9

<u>Robbery</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Recklessness</u>	<u>Trespass</u>	<u>Fraud</u>	<u>Traffic</u>	<u>Arson</u>	<u>Assaultive</u>	<u>Homicide</u>	<u>Non-Assaultive Sex Crime</u>	<u>County</u>
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Adams
-	1.1%	2.2%	2.2%	1.1%	-	3.3%	-	-	-	Ashland
-	2.4	-	3.2	0.8	-	-	-	0.8%	-	Barron
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Bayfield
4.6%	-	2.3	1.9	0.9	1.7%	-	2.7%	0.4	0.2%	Brown
-	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Buffalo
-	-	5.5	-	-	11.1	-	-	-	-	Burnett
-	1.6	-	-	6.6	1.6	-	-	1.6	-	Calumet
-	2.0	-	0.6	-	0.7	-	0.7	-	1.3	Chippewa
-	7.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Clark
1.3	-	1.3	-	-	-	1.3	-	3.8	-	Columbia
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Crawford
2.1	0.1	2.6	0.1	0.9	1.4	0.4	1.2	0.4	0.1	Dane
5.4	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Dodge
4.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Door
3.4	1.1	5.7	4.5	2.3	-	1.1	-	2.3	-	Douglas
-	6.0	1.5	-	3.0	1.5	-	-	-	-	Dunn
2.1	6.4	0.3	0.6	1.2	0.9	0.6	-	0.3	0.3	Eau Claire
-	-	-	-	-	14.3	-	-	-	-	Florence
-	-	1.6	0.4	-	0.8	1.2	0.8	-	-	Fond du Lac
3.6	-	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Forest
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Grant
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.1	-	Green
-	-	-	12.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	Green Lake
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Iowa
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Iron
-	5.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Jackson
0.7	-	-	-	0.7	-	-	-	-	0.7	Jefferson
-	-	3.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Juneau
2.2	-	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.7	-	0.3	0.5	Kenosha
-	-	-	3.1	3.1	-	-	-	-	-	Kewaunee
0.9	0.3	3.5	0.3	1.6	0.3	0.2	0.4	-	0.4	La Crosse
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Lafayette
-	-	-	1.1	-	1.1	0.6	-	-	-	Langlade
-	2.1	-	2.1	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	Lincoln
0.2	-	2.3	2.1	-	0.1	0.6	0.1	-	-	Manitowoc
1.4	1.1	0.6	-	0.3	0.3	0.6	-	-	-	Marathon
-	-	0.8	0.8	-	0.8	-	-	-	-	Marinette
-	-	6.7	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	-	Marquette
2.2	1.9	1.5	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.1	Statewide

<u>County</u>	<u>Total Placements</u>	<u>Theft</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Disorderly Conduct</u>	<u>Battery</u>	<u>Drugs</u>	<u>Property Damage</u>	<u>Weapon</u>	<u>Sexual Assault</u>	<u>Warrant</u>
Menominee	92	25.0%	17.4%	16.3%	31.5%	-	2.1%	2.2%	2.2%	-
Milwaukee	3,644	11.2	35.9	2.9	4.3	7.7%	0.8	4.0	3.4	13.4%
Monroe	89	42.7	11.2	9.0	9.0	7.9	3.4	5.6	1.1	-
Oconto	195	32.3	50.8	7.7	5.1	-	1.6	1.0	-	-
Oneida	52	13.5	50.0	3.8	7.7	-	1.9	-	3.9	-
Outagamie	514	28.6	8.6	19.4	15.0	5.1	4.7	5.8	5.8	-
Ozaukee	109	15.6	22.9	16.5	22.0	8.3	2.8	5.5	3.7	-
Pepin	19	57.9	-	5.3	-	26.3	-	-	10.5	-
Pierce	53	41.5	15.1	24.5	5.7	5.6	5.7	-	-	-
Polk	84	45.2	7.1	11.9	7.1	5.9	6.0	2.4	6.0	-
Portage	146	52.1	6.2	8.2	13.0	4.8	7.5	2.0	2.7	-
Price	6	50.0	-	-	-	-	16.7	-	-	-
Racine	1,599	32.5	17.4	14.3	16.5	6.9	2.9	4.8	2.3	-
Richland	18	66.7	5.5	-	16.7	5.5	5.6	-	-	-
Rock	1,261	12.8	42.3	17.0	7.4	7.0	3.5	2.4	2.5	-
Rusk	14	-	35.7	7.1	14.3	14.3	-	-	-	-
Sauk	160	30.6	23.1	18.1	7.5	5.0	5.0	1.9	1.3	-
Sawyer	32	43.8	9.4	6.2	9.4	18.8	-	-	-	-
Shawano	137	24.1	29.9	21.9	8.7	4.4	4.4	-	5.1	-
Sheboygan	818	23.3	15.8	31.7	9.8	6.0	4.5	2.7	1.1	-
St. Croix	172	23.8	30.2	15.1	5.2	7.0	2.9	-	1.2	-
Taylor	39	33.3	7.7	5.1	10.3	-	5.1	2.6	23.1	-
Trempealeau	32	50.0	12.5	6.2	9.4	6.2	9.4	-	-	-
Vernon	46	32.6	4.3	13.0	17.4	4.3	2.2	8.7	4.4	-
Vilas	38	42.1	5.3	15.8	10.5	5.3	5.3	2.6	10.5	-
Walworth	162	31.5	16.0	13.0	10.5	7.4	4.3	5.6	5.6	-
Washburn	22	27.3	36.4	9.1	9.1	-	13.6	-	-	-
Washington	185	35.7	15.7	17.3	7.6	9.7	1.1	0.5	1.1	-
Waukesha	627	28.8	18.2	4.3	21.2	2.9	3.7	1.9	8.3	-
Waupaca	102	49.0	16.7	19.6	4.9	5.9	1.0	2.9	-	-
Waushara	46	28.2	2.2	23.9	8.7	2.2	19.6	2.2	4.3	-
Winnebago	605	26.0	10.9	27.8	11.7	2.6	6.6	1.8	4.8	-
Wood	92	45.6	8.7	15.2	14.1	1.1	4.3	2.2	-	-
Statewide	16,937	25.4	22.7	13.0	11.0	5.9	3.6	3.4	3.3	2.9

<u>Robbery</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Recklessness</u>	<u>Trespass</u>	<u>Fraud</u>	<u>Traffic</u>	<u>Arson</u>	<u>Assaultive</u>	<u>Homicide</u>	<u>Non-Assaultive Sex Crime</u>	<u>County</u>
-	-	1.1%	1.1%	-	-	-	1.1%	-	-	Menominee
5.6%	7.0%	1.9	*	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2	0.5%	0.2%	Milwaukee
6.8	-	1.1	1.1	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	Monroe
-	-	-	0.5	-	0.5	-	-	0.5	-	Oconto
-	-	-	-	1.9	-	-	-	17.3	-	Oneida
2.3	-	0.4	1.5	0.8	0.2	0.6	1.2	-	-	Outagamie
-	-	0.9	-	-	0.9	0.9	-	-	-	Ozaukee
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Pepin
-	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	-	-	-	Pierce
-	4.8	-	-	-	3.6	-	-	-	-	Polk
0.7	-	0.7	0.7	-	0.7	-	-	0.7	-	Portage
33.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Price
1.1	-	-	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.3	-	-	Racine
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Richland
0.7	0.1	1.7	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.3	-	0.1	Rock
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28.6	-	Rusk
-	0.6	1.3	0.6	1.3	3.1	-	-	0.6	-	Sauk
-	6.2	3.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.1	Sawyer
-	-	-	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	Shawano
0.8	0.2	0.4	1.2	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.5	-	0.4	Sheboygan
1.8	-	0.6	2.9	3.5	5.2	-	0.6	-	-	St. Croix
-	-	-	-	5.1	5.1	-	2.6	-	-	Taylor
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.3	-	Trempealeau
-	4.3	4.4	-	-	-	4.4	-	-	-	Vernon
-	2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Vilas
-	-	-	-	0.6	0.6	0.6	-	4.3	-	Walworth
-	-	-	-	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	Washburn
1.6	-	1.6	1.6	4.9	0.5	1.1	-	-	-	Washington
2.9	-	4.4	0.3	1.6	0.2	1.1	-	-	0.2	Waukesha
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Waupaca
-	-	-	2.2	4.3	-	-	-	-	2.2	Waushara
0.8	-	2.2	1.8	0.5	0.8	1.0	0.7	-	-	Winnebago
1.1	2.2	-	2.2	-	1.1	1.1	1.1	-	-	Wood
2.2	1.9	1.5	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.1	Statewide

APPENDIX II

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Adjudicatory Placements
Before and After July 1, 1996

<u>County</u>	<u>Pre-Adjudicatory Placements</u>			<u>Post-Adjudicatory Placements</u>			<u>Total Placements</u>		
	<u>Before</u>	<u>After</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Before</u>	<u>After</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Before</u>	<u>After</u>	<u>Change</u>
Adams	35	46	31.4%	30	37	23.3%	65	83	27.7%
Ashland	48	66	37.5	54	79	46.3	102	145	42.2
Barron	34	63	85.3	49	156	218.4	83	219	163.9
Bayfield	19	24	26.3	23	31	34.8	42	55	31.0
Brown	716	560	(21.8)	191	407	113.1	907	967	6.6
Buffalo	16	42	162.5	2	50	2,400.0	18	92	411.1
Burnett	58	29	(50.0)	22	24	9.1	80	53	(33.8)
Calumet	33	55	66.7	12	44	266.7	45	99	120.0
Chippewa	36	87	141.7	161	217	34.8	197	304	54.3
Clark	12	21	75.0	7	29	314.3	19	50	163.2
Columbia	83	153	84.3	58	58	0.0	141	211	49.6
Crawford	22	28	27.3	6	79	1,216.7	28	107	282.1
Dane	1,032	1,075	4.2	691	940	36.0	1,723	2,015	16.9
Dodge	98	80	(18.4)	86	88	2.3	184	168	(8.7)
Door	21	23	9.5	23	33	43.5	44	56	27.3
Douglas	169	90	(46.7)	42	63	50.0	211	153	(27.5)
Dunn	78	85	9.0	50	67	34.0	128	152	18.8
Eau Claire	218	245	12.4	530	476	(10.2)	748	721	(3.6)
Florence	10	13	30.0	0	10	0	10	23	130.0

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Adjudicatory Placements
Before and After July 1, 1996

County	Post-Adjudicatory Placements			Post-Adjudicatory Placements			Total Placements		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
Fond du Lac	798	542	(32.1%)	201	261	29.9%	999	803	(19.6%)
Forest	42	101	140.5	12	12	0.0	54	113	109.3
Grant	26	29	11.5	39	30	(23.1)	65	59	(9.2)
Green	24	41	70.8	7	14	100.0	31	55	77.4
Green Lake	31	40	29.0	18	62	244.4	49	102	108.2
Iowa	66	59	(10.6)	7	32	357.1	73	91	24.7
Iron	2	4	100.0	6	7	16.7	8	11	37.5
Jackson	30	52	73.3	25	33	32.0	55	85	54.5
Jefferson	118	115	(2.5)	89	229	157.3	207	344	66.2
Juneau	78	50	(35.9)	19	12	(36.8)	97	62	(36.1)
Kenosha	681	382	(43.9)	323	506	56.7	1,004	888	(11.6)
Kewaunee	17	18	5.9	18	27	50.0	35	45	28.6
La Crosse	588	670	13.9	352	629	78.7	940	1,299	38.2
Lafayette	1	15	1,400.0	8	18	125.0	9	33	266.7
Langlade	175	208	18.9	22	176	700.0	197	384	94.9
Lincoln	61	90	47.5	27	80	196.3	88	170	93.2
Manitowoc	233	234	0.4	378	1,139	201.3	611	1,373	124.7
Marathon	357	443	24.1	206	443	115.0	563	886	57.4

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Adjudicatory Placements
Before and After July 1, 1996

County	Pre-Adjudicatory Placements			Post-Adjudicatory Placements			Total Placements		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
Marinette	246	228	(7.3%)	58	132	127.6%	304	360	18.4%
Marquette	41	41	0.0	6	20	233.3	47	61	29.8
Menominee	191	205	7.3	27	111	311.1	218	316	45.0
Milwaukee	10,256	6,430	(37.3)	2,849	3,392	19.1	13,105	9,822	(25.1)
Monroe	88	85	(3.4)	141	144	2.1	229	229	0.0
Oconto	121	152	25.6	19	196	931.6	140	348	148.6
Oneida	70	75	7.1	25	50	100.0	95	125	31.6
Outagamie	531	582	9.6	384	717	86.7	915	1,299	42.0
Ozaukee	192	115	(40.1)	217	232	6.9	409	347	(15.2)
Pepin	2	10	400.0	8	19	137.5	10	29	190.0
Pierce	24	43	79.2	34	55	61.8	58	98	69.0
Polk	61	36	(41.0)	79	124	57.0	140	160	14.3
Portage	131	98	(25.2)	64	162	153.1	195	260	33.3
Price	7	7	0.0	7	8	14.3	14	15	7.1
Racine	1,584	1,245	(21.4)	1,752	2,278	30.0	3,336	3,523	5.6
Richland	58	31	(46.6)	25	6	(76.0)	83	37	(55.4)
Rock	1,121	1,195	6.6	1,468	1,443	(1.7)	2,589	2,638	1.9
Rusk	12	18	50.0	4	22	450.0	16	40	150.0

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Adjudicatory Placements
Before and After July 1, 1996

County	Pre-Adjudicatory Placements			Post-Adjudicatory Placements			Total Placements		
	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change	Before	After	Change
Sauk	185	248	34.1%	65	101	55.4%	250	349	39.6%
Sawyer	56	33	(41.1)	20	38	90.0	76	71	(6.6)
Shawano	142	186	31.0	61	84	37.7	203	270	33.0
Sheboygan	540	608	12.6	717	1,163	62.2	1,257	1,771	40.9
St. Croix	103	162	57.3	23	72	213.0	126	234	85.7
Taylor	18	19	5.6	66	68	3.0	84	87	3.6
Trempealeau	28	21	(25.0)	47	51	8.5	75	72	(4.0)
Vernon	47	62	31.9	29	27	(6.9)	76	89	17.1
Vilas	39	38	(2.6)	33	41	24.2	72	79	9.7
Walworth	97	96	(1.0)	114	274	140.4	211	370	75.4
Washburn	17	18	5.9	7	28	300.0	24	46	91.7
Washington	538	286	(46.8)	174	341	96.0	712	627	(11.9)
Waukesha	909	930	2.3	424	587	38.4	1,333	1,517	13.8
Waupaca	158	83	(47.5)	112	135	20.5	270	218	(19.3)
Waushara	38	45	18.4	21	39	85.7	59	84	42.4
Winnebago	1,038	882	(15.0)	277	520	87.7	1,315	1,402	6.6
Wood	106	105	(0.9)	63	91	44.4	169	196	16.0
Statewide Total	24,861	20,296	(18.4)	13,214	19,369	46.6	38,075	39,665	4.2

APPENDIX III

Secure Detention Facility Profiles 1994-1998

This appendix presents information regarding secure detention placements for each of the 16 county facilities, which also often hold juveniles from other counties. Similar information is also presented for placements at approved juvenile portions of county jails. Data are shown for the past five years.

Each profile presents:

- general trend information, including underlying offenses;
- gender, age, and ethnicity distribution;
- an analysis of the effects of the 1996 statutory changes on placements at the detention facility; and
- a description of the number of placements from other counties.

Brown County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 - 1998

Trend Information

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	539	431	357	412	510	(5.4)%
Common Offenses						
Theft-related	92	93	113	157	188	104.3%
Unknown	269	164	32	54	95	(64.7)
Battery	40	38	63	58	67	67.5
Disorderly Conduct	53	31	24	27	28	(47.2)
Robbery	9	8	26	20	23	155.6
Weapon	18	17	21	13	21	16.7
Property Damage	7	10	15	14	18	157.1
Trespass	4	5	7	7	12	200.0
Drugs	4	13	9	7	12	200.0
Assaultive	1	1	0	0	12	1,100.0
Recklessness	4	5	6	4	10	150.0
Sexual Assault	9	8	8	17	9	0.0
Traffic	19	33	16	13	8	(57.9)
Fraud	2	4	8	3	4	100.0
Homicide	6	1	3	16	2	(66.7)
Sex Crime	0	0	1	2	1	
Other	1	0	0	0	0	(100.0)
Arson	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	(100.0)
TOTAL	539	431	357	412	510	
Gender						
Male	379	320	232	288	342	(9.8)%
Female	160	111	125	124	168	5.0%
Average Age	15.2	15.2	15.1	14.9	14.9	(2.0)%
Ethnicity						
White	314	251	209	271	321	0.3%
Indian	93	66	77	92	84	(9.7)
Asian	37	35	29	15	39	5.4
Black	63	50	19	21	28	(55.6)
Hispanic	28	25	9	11	25	(10.7)
Unknown	4	4	14	2	13	225.0

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes
on Placement Types and Length

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Days</u>
Before July 1996	869	76.6%	266	23.4%	9.3	9.2
After July 1996	647	58.1	467	41.9	11.6	8.6

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Brown	383	366	274	338	440	14.9%
Oconto	13	3	12	8	18	38.5
Shawano	36	3	10	4	12	(66.7)
Marinette	9	2	13	17	6	(33.3)
Waupaca	16	5	4	3	3	(81.3)
Winnebago	1	7	7	3	2	100.0
Menominee	11	5	7	3	2	(81.8)
Sheboygan	15	4	4	10	1	(93.3)
All Others	<u>55</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>26</u>	(52.7)
TOTAL	539	431	357	412	510	

Dane County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 - 1998

Trend Information						
	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	582	710	751	723	783	34.5%
Common Offenses						
Unknown	122	19	20	36	168	37.7%
Battery	121	179	228	162	152	25.6
Theft-related	111	148	196	223	131	18.0
Disorderly Conduct	20	62	38	76	87	335.0
Weapon	69	81	72	47	56	(18.8)
Sexual Assault	24	33	33	29	53	120.8
Drugs	49	59	54	34	38	(22.4)
Recklessness	18	31	15	24	22	22.2
Property Damage	3	25	39	50	22	633.3
Robbery	29	32	36	24	17	(41.4)
Traffic	11	14	10	4	12	9.1
Assaultive	0	6	1	1	9	
Fraud	1	3	2	4	7	600.0
Arson	0	6	0	4	3	
Homicide	4	7	1	0	3	(25.0)
Other	0	0	0	0	1	
Sex Crime	0	1	2	2	1	
Trespass	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	
TOTAL	582	710	751	723	783	
Gender						
Male	454	559	608	551	590	30.0%
Female	128	151	143	172	193	50.8%
Average Age	15.2	15.3	15.1	15.0	14.9	2.0%
Ethnicity						
White	234	330	408	390	379	62.0%
Black	307	323	305	260	315	2.6
Hispanic	25	37	19	38	44	76.0
Asian	10	15	5	28	35	250.0
Indian	5	3	6	5	5	0.0
Unknown	1	2	8	2	5	400.0

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes Placement Types and Length

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	Days	Days
Before July 1996	982	59.0%	683	41.0%	9.3	6.1
After July 1996	983	52.2	901	47.8	12.9	4.6

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998
--

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Dane	574	701	743	723	776	35.2%
All Others	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	(12.5)
TOTAL	582	710	751	723	783	

Northwest Regional (Eau Claire County) Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 - 1998

Trend Information

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	816	888	972	1,013	1,385	69.7%
Common Offenses						
Theft-related	205	302	393	417	532	159.5%
Unknown	381	338	153	178	211	(34.1)
Battery	60	81	127	105	150	150.0
Disorderly Conduct	40	52	91	98	130	225.0
Drugs	4	13	43	47	80	1,900.0
Property Damage	19	15	31	41	67	252.6
Other	0	0	2	8	51	
Sexual Assault	11	12	24	28	40	263.6
Weapon	33	25	37	23	27	(18.2)
Fraud	11	5	12	14	19	72.7
Robbery	18	13	22	16	18	0.0
Recklessness	9	6	7	7	15	66.7
Trespass	2	3	8	14	13	550.0
Homicide	2	8	2	7	11	450.0
Traffic	16	7	10	6	9	(43.8)
Arson	2	6	6	4	7	250.0
Sex Crime	2	1	0	0	4	100.0
Assaultive	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	0.0
TOTAL	816	888	972	1,013	1,385	
Gender						
Male	619	679	726	710	1,016	64.1%
Female	197	209	246	303	369	87.3%
Average Age	15.9	15.6	15.4	15.3	15.0	(5.7)%
Ethnicity						
White	665	684	774	780	1,172	76.2%
Indian	62	100	86	93	126	103.2
Asian	60	60	70	109	59	(1.7)
Black	18	21	18	18	14	(22.2)
Hispanic	10	22	20	11	10	0.0
Unknown	1	1	4	2	4	300.0

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes
on Placement Types and Length

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Days</u>
Before July 1996	863	39.8%	1,308	60.2%	9.6	8.2
After July 1996	1,087	37.4	1,816	62.6	8.0	7.2

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Eau Claire	288	303	291	247	331	14.9%
Chippewa	58	75	110	98	150	158.6
Barron	22	34	40	70	118	436.4
Douglas	37	33	36	34	82	121.6
Marathon	94	78	143	120	74	(21.3)
Polk	29	43	55	38	68	134.5
Dunn	22	66	46	57	65	195.5
Ashland	16	35	33	36	61	281.3
Pierce	9	24	19	19	47	422.2
St. Croix	23	18	16	24	38	65.2
Sawyer	16	21	23	22	30	87.5
Lincoln	4	14	15	19	27	575.0
Taylor	34	19	10	29	26	(23.5)
Clark	3	9	5	14	25	733.3
Burnett	19	16	25	22	16	(15.8)
All Others	<u>142</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>227</u>	59.9
TOTAL	816	888	972	1,013	1,385	

Fond du Lac County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 – 1998

Trend Information

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	397	610	560	557	375	(5.5)%
Common Offenses						
Theft-related	172	249	224	216	125	(27.3)%
Disorderly Conduct	58	88	102	101	81	39.7
Battery	60	89	76	96	62	3.3
Property Damage	35	32	47	28	26	(25.7)
Unknown	1	50	21	34	24	2,300.0
Sexual Assault	14	22	21	22	17	21.4
Drugs	3	5	9	10	14	366.7
Weapon	16	20	29	19	11	(31.3)
Recklessness	6	6	3	8	5	(16.7)
Arson	7	7	5	4	3	(57.1)
Assaultive	1	3	1	0	3	200.0
Traffic	10	12	7	4	2	(80.0)
Robbery	6	5	2	4	1	(83.3)
Trespass	3	11	5	7	1	(66.7)
Fraud	2	5	2	1	0	(100.0)
Homicide	2	4	4	0	0	(100.0)
Sex Crime	1	1	1	2	0	(100.0)
Other	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	
TOTAL	397	610	560	557	375	
Gender						
Male	311	459	388	374	256	(17.7)%
Female	86	151	172	183	119	38.4%
Average Age	15.5	15.3	15.0	14.9	14.8	(4.5)%
Ethnicity						
White	383	552	521	526	353	(7.8)%
Black	14	55	29	20	20	42.9
Hispanic	0	1	1	2	2	
Indian	0	1	9	7	0	
Asian	0	1	0	2	0	

<p>Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes on Placement Types and Length</p>
--

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	Days	Days
Before July 1996	995	76.2%	310	23.8%	6.5	6.8
After July 1996	762	63.8	432	36.2	7.2	7.8

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998
--

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	Percentage Change
Fond du Lac	370	387	394	350	248	(33.0)%
Sheboygan	0	21	15	44	33	
Dodge	2	35	45	31	25	1,150.0
Green Lake	1	18	15	26	24	2,300.0
Winnebago	2	51	50	46	19	850.0
Washington	1	29	7	21	11	1,000.0
Menominee	0	1	12	10	4	
Kenosha	5	41	11	0	0	(100.0)
All Others	<u>16</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>11</u>	(31.3)
TOTAL	397	610	560	557	375	

La Crosse County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 – 1998

Trend Information

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	902	894	837	932	1,076	19.3%
Common Offenses						
Theft-related	213	231	268	308	399	87.3%
Disorderly Conduct	65	100	133	203	213	227.7
Battery	100	98	119	127	128	(28.0)
Unknown	370	293	157	95	82	(77.8)
Drugs	7	11	33	70	70	900.0
Property Damage	43	31	49	36	48	11.6
Weapon	34	45	15	23	38	11.8
Sexual Assault	13	19	12	11	25	92.3
Recklessness	16	18	25	14	25	56.3
Robbery	12	13	4	18	12	0.0
Fraud	4	7	3	6	10	150.0
Trespass	7	2	11	7	9	28.6
Other	1	1	1	1	4	300.0
Arson	0	2	1	6	3	
Traffic	5	10	2	0	3	(40.0)
Assaultive	7	6	4	5	3	(57.1)
Homicide	3	7	0	1	2	(33.3)
Sex Crime	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	0.0
TOTAL	902	894	837	932	1,076	
Gender						
Male	706	673	644	668	753	6.7%
Female	196	221	193	264	323	64.8%
Average Age	15.3	15.2	15.0	15.0	14.8	(3.3)%
Ethnicity						
White	759	709	701	770	893	17.7%
Black	64	63	75	76	85	32.8
Asian	52	81	43	60	63	21.2
Indian	27	37	17	24	32	18.5
Hispanic	0	0	1	2	3	
Unknown	0	4	0	0	0	

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes on Placement Types and Length
--

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	Days	Days
Before July 1996	1,281	58.5%	910	41.5%	7.7	6.9
After July 1996	1,298	53.0	1,152	47.0	7.0	5.0

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998
--

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Percentage Change
La Crosse	329	395	468	471	566	72.0%
Sauk	28	52	92	74	104	271.4
Monroe	85	106	69	100	82	(3.5)
Crawford	6	9	18	35	53	783.3
Vernon	31	20	31	30	42	35.5
Jackson	11	26	19	30	28	154.5
Juneau	38	24	25	18	26	(31.6)
Richland	29	22	7	15	18	(37.9)
Wood	33	20	15	10	18	(45.5)
Grant	29	7	4	15	16	(44.8)
Buffalo	5	0	4	12	15	200.0
Iowa	1	4	15	11	13	1,200.0
Marathon	31	13	0	9	13	(58.1)
Trempealeau	23	26	19	26	11	(52.2)
Marquette	4	13	7	6	9	125.0
Adams	14	24	12	19	7	(50.0)
Douglas	15	11	2	0	4	(73.3)
Columbia	27	32	4	5	2	(92.6)
Jefferson	26	5	1	1	1	(96.2)
Dane	21	15	5	4	0	(100.0)
All Others	<u>116</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>48</u>	(58.6)
TOTAL	902	894	837	932	1,076	

Manitowoc County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 – 1998

Trend Information

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	547	597	548	797	920	68.2%
Common Offenses						
Theft-related	189	215	234	318	302	59.8%
Disorderly Conduct	77	118	112	183	235	205.2
Property Damage	18	38	28	49	89	394.4
Battery	77	73	62	77	87	13.0
Drugs	10	23	23	39	60	500.0
Unknown	77	42	26	21	48	(37.7)
Sexual Assault	16	11	12	42	28	75.0
Weapon	26	29	15	35	18	(30.8)
Recklessness	7	7	5	6	17	142.9
Trespass	6	3	2	2	17	183.3
Arson	1	5	0	2	6	500.0
Robbery	14	11	4	6	5	(64.3)
Fraud	7	9	15	8	3	(57.1)
Assaultive	2	0	1	1	2	0.0
Traffic	18	5	7	5	2	(88.9)
Sex Crime	0	3	1	0	1	
Homicide	0	5	1	2	0	
Other	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	100.0
TOTAL	547	597	548	797	920	
Gender						
Male	361	390	355	522	580	60.7%
Female	186	207	193	275	340	82.8%
Average Age	15.2	15.1	15.0	14.9	14.6	(3.9)%
Ethnicity						
White	442	528	461	682	811	83.5%
Asian	44	26	59	72	84	90.9
Black	40	30	16	33	15	(62.5)
Indian	17	9	11	10	8	(52.9)
Hispanic	4	4	1	0	2	(50.0)

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes on Placement Types and Length
--

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	Days	Days
Before July 1996	669	47.2%	749	52.8%	8.5	8.3
After July 1996	454	22.8	1,537	77.2	7.6	6.2

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998
--

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	Percentage Change
Manitowoc	240	216	318	536	661	175.4%
Sheboygan	84	210	145	133	154	83.3
Kewaunee	12	9	9	6	19	58.3
Oconto	8	0	4	7	15	87.5
Winnebago	0	26	12	38	14	
Door	4	6	14	11	12	200.0
Marinette	24	3	2	14	5	(79.2)
Calumet	13	12	0	5	5	(61.5)
Ozaukee	15	25	14	12	4	(73.3)
Marathon	13	19	6	4	1	(92.3)
Waupaca	17	8	0	0	1	(94.1)
Kenosha	51	40	6	0	0	(100.0)
All Others	<u>66</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>29</u>	(56.1)
TOTAL	547	597	548	797	920	

Milwaukee County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 – 1998

	Trend Information					Percentage Change
	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	
Total Placements	5,871	4,691	4,843	3,829	3,634	(38.1)%
Common Offenses						
Unknown	1,806	937	1,447	1,403	1,302	(27.9)%
Capias (Warrant)	894	556	1,092	536	488	(45.4)
Theft-related	747	770	568	419	402	(46.2)
Drugs	365	440	286	256	281	(23.0)
Other	101	96	243	244	256	153.5
Robbery	446	486	268	258	205	(54.0)
Battery	298	321	266	173	158	(47.0)
Weapon	477	338	177	162	146	(69.4)
Sexual Assault	67	116	98	115	124	85.1
Disorderly Conduct	276	219	152	87	107	(61.2)
Recklessness	154	185	89	82	70	(54.5)
Property Damage	69	49	53	24	29	(58.0)
Arson	39	15	16	11	16	(59.0)
Homicide	80	72	46	24	17	(78.8)
Traffic	23	35	15	14	12	(47.8)
Assaultive	16	18	9	12	8	(50.0)
Fraud	4	6	4	3	7	75.0
Sex Crime	4	7	5	1	5	25.0
Trespass	<u>5</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	(80.0)
TOTAL	5,871	4,691	4,843	3,829	3,634	
Gender						
Male	5,005	3,987	3,937	3,252	3,138	(37.3)%
Female	866	704	906	577	496	(42.7)%
Average Age	15.4	15.4	15.1	15.0	15.2	(1.3)%
Ethnicity						
Black	4,053	3,239	3,390	2,742	2,608	(35.7)%
White	1,173	899	957	717	650	(44.6)
Hispanic	562	473	385	295	305	(45.7)
Asian	49	54	82	58	59	20.4
Indian	34	26	24	12	11	(67.6)
Unknown	0	0	5	5	1	

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes on Placement Types and Length
--

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	Days	Days
Before July 1996	10,233	78.2%	2,850	65.5%	10.6	7.5
After July 1996	6,407	65.5	3,378	34.5	12.3	6.2

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998
--

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	Percentage <u>Change</u>
Milwaukee	5,871	4,691	4,826	3,829	3,634	(38.1)%
All Others	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
TOTAL	5,871	4,691	4,843	3,829	3,634	

Oconto County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 – 1998

Trend Information

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	60	297	394	352	383	538.3%
Common Offenses						
Unknown	23	72	128	138	194	743.5%
Theft-related	18	102	118	75	77	327.8
Disorderly Conduct	6	27	69	58	48	700.0
Battery	6	36	37	41	29	383.3
Property Damage	2	18	9	14	12	500.0
Sexual Assault	0	1	5	4	7	
Drugs	1	8	7	7	5	400.0
Weapon	1	12	11	7	5	400.0
Recklessness	0	1	1	3	2	
Homicide	0	0	0	0	2	
Traffic	0	13	2	3	1	
Trespass	1	1	3	1	1	0.0
Other	0	2	1	1	0	
Robbery	1	3	0	0	0	(100.0)
Arson	0	0	2	0	0	
Assaultive	1	0	0	0	0	(100.0)
Fraud	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
TOTAL	60	297	394	352	383	
Gender						
Male	56	249	310	322	340	507.1%
Female	4	48	84	30	43	975.0%
Average Age	15.2	15.2	14.9	15.7	14.8	(2.6)%
Ethnicity						
White	46	184	221	239	293	537.0%
Indian	12	97	159	104	80	566.7
Hispanic	0	2	4	4	4	
Asian	2	6	1	3	4	100.0
Black	0	8	9	2	1	
Unknown	0	0	0	0	1	

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes
on Placement Types and Length

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length (in days)	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Days</u>
Before July 1996	462	83.1%	94	16.9%	5.8	6.5
After July 1996	585	62.9	345	37.1	5.9	6.4

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Oconto	9	51	65	83	135	1,400.0%
Shawano	9	61	77	69	80	788.9
Marinette	14	52	87	79	75	435.7
Menominee	10	69	118	68	43	330.0
Brown	0	0	0	1	13	
Langlade	0	11	13	15	6	
Forest	4	16	19	7	5	25.0
All Others	<u>14</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>26</u>	85.7
TOTAL	60	297	394	352	383	

Outagamie County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 – 1998

Trend Information

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	432	1,026	1,031	1,301	1,330	207.9%
Common Offenses						
Theft-related	93	330	387	447	389	318.3%
Disorderly Conduct	70	164	163	247	284	305.7
Battery	42	109	156	197	172	309.5
Unknown	143	166	98	96	149	4.2
Property Damage	12	55	58	105	72	500.0
Sexual Assault	7	29	44	47	67	857.1
Drugs	3	25	14	29	55	1,733.3
Weapon	11	45	46	45	50	354.5
Robbery	6	9	8	16	20	233.3
Trespass	1	18	4	20	19	1,800.0
Recklessness	2	15	11	21	13	550.0
Assaultive	9	4	5	5	11	22.2
Traffic	20	29	19	8	9	(55.0)
Arson	1	3	5	2	9	800.0
Fraud	11	14	6	9	9	(18.2)
Homicide	1	8	4	2	1	0.0
Other	0	3	2	3	1	
Sex Crime	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	
TOTAL	432	1,026	1,031	1,301	1,330	
Gender						
Male	321	755	738	992	944	194.1%
Female	111	271	293	309	386	247.7%
Average Age	15.5	15.2	14.9	14.9	14.8	(4.5)%
Ethnicity						
White	330	815	783	1,038	1,018	208.5%
Asian	12	71	70	86	108	800.0
Black	27	64	49	52	86	218.5
Indian	45	43	89	48	80	77.8
Hispanic	16	33	40	36	34	112.5
Unknown	2	0	0	41	4	100.0

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes
on Placement Types and Length

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length (in days)	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	Days	Days
Before July 1996	1,308	65.8%	681	34.2%	6.8	7.3
After July 1996	1,641	52.4	1,490	47.6	6.2	5.5

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Winnebago	9	433	447	469	541	5,911.1%
Outagamie	295	417	375	572	510	72.9
Waupaca	30	60	80	67	70	133.3
Calumet	1	8	5	23	41	4,000.0
Shawano	16	2	2	11	22	37.5
Oconto	4	0	4	7	20	400.0
Menominee	10	13	47	22	20	100.0
Marathon	3	14	35	14	18	500.0
Marinette	2	2	1	19	16	700.0
Green Lake	1	5	1	15	12	1,100.0
Sheboygan	10	9	6	29	3	(70.0)
Waushara	2	22	1	5	2	0.0
All Others	<u>49</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>55</u>	12.2
TOTAL	432	1,026	1,031	1,301	1,330	

Ozaukee County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 – 1998

Trend Information						
	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	370	401	388	394	337	(8.9)%
Common Offenses						
Theft-related	77	116	104	91	100	29.9%
Disorderly Conduct	32	41	41	75	66	106.3
Unknown	112	71	83	84	56	(50.0)
Battery	41	35	38	42	39	(4.9)
Drugs	18	27	27	37	29	61.1
Weapon	18	20	11	16	12	(33.3)
Property Damage	10	29	21	18	8	(20.0)
Sexual Assault	18	7	3	6	7	(61.1)
Fraud	1	2	4	1	7	600.0
Robbery	18	7	13	5	5	(72.2)
Recklessness	4	15	17	6	3	(25.0)
Trespass	2	2	3	0	2	0.0
Traffic	10	19	15	6	2	(80.0)
Arson	2	4	2	3	1	(50.0)
Assaultive	4	3	4	4	0	(100.0)
Homicide	3	0	2	0	0	(100.0)
Other	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
TOTAL	370	401	388	394	336	
Gender						
Male	370	400	386	390	337	(8.9)%
Female	0	1	2	4	0	
Average Age	15.5	15.5	15.3	15.1	15.4	(0.6)%
Ethnicity						
White	274	333	356	372	298	8.8%
Asian	5	2	1	6	22	340.0
Hispanic	20	23	5	6	11	(45.0)
Black	65	41	24	8	5	(92.3)
Indian	6	2	2	2	0	(100.0)
Unknown	0	0	0	0	1	

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes on Placement Types and Length
--

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Days</u>
Before July 1996	544	55.3%	439	44.7%	8.0	6.2
After July 1996	299	33.0	608	67.0	8.5	7.2

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998
--

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Washington	64	103	151	169	124	93.8%
Sheboygan	1	4	9	65	98	9,700.0
Ozaukee	79	163	159	135	87	10.1
Dodge	17	9	5	5	15	(11.8)
Kenosha	138	105	61	1	0	(100.0)
Jefferson	20	3	0	1	0	(100.0)
Marinette	18	0	1	0	0	(100.0)
Walworth	17	4	0	0	0	(100.0)
All Others	<u>16</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>13</u>	(25.0)
TOTAL	370	401	388	394	337	

Portage County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 - 1998

Trend Information

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	34	265	455	490	527	1,450.0%
Common Offenses						
Theft-related	8	70	214	218	233	2,812.5%
Battery	4	18	47	47	76	1,800.0
Disorderly Conduct	7	11	41	49	73	942.9
Unknown	11	128	69	73	32	190.9
Property Damage	0	4	18	20	27	
Drugs	0	6	13	26	21	
Weapon	1	5	18	19	17	1,600.0
Sexual Assault	0	2	12	14	13	
Trespass	0	4	1	3	7	
Fraud	1	0	1	2	5	400.0
Robbery	0	6	9	5	4	
Homicide	0	2	0	0	4	
Recklessness	1	4	3	6	3	200.0
Arson	0	3	1	4	3	
Other	0	0	0	1	3	
Assaultive	0	1	5	0	3	
Traffic	1	1	1	2	2	100.0
Sex Crime	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	
TOTAL	34	265	455	490	527	
Gender						
Male	22	198	316	339	370	1,581.8%
Female	12	67	139	151	157	1,208.3%
Average Age	15.1	15.4	15.3	15.5	15.0	(0.7)%
Ethnicity						
White	31	205	353	380	420	1,254.8%
Asian	2	49	85	82	66	3,200.0
Indian	0	7	7	14	18	
Black	1	3	10	14	16	1,500.0
Hispanic	0	1	0	0	7	

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes on Placement Types and Length
--

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	Days	Days
Before July 1996	327	59.3%	224	40.7%	8.6	6.7
After July 1996	590	48.4	630	51.6	7.9	6.6

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998
--

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	Percentage <u>Change</u>
Portage	34	72	83	79	124	264.7%
Marathon	0	110	181	180	105	
Wood	0	34	60	51	69	
Columbia	0	2	16	40	48	
Waushara	0	0	14	19	43	
Adams	0	6	20	15	23	
Lincoln	0	11	18	27	16	
Marquette	0	1	18	11	15	
Langlade	0	9	16	15	12	
Oneida	0	12	14	20	6	
All Others	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>66</u>	
TOTAL	34	265	455	490	527	

Racine County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 - 1998

Trend Information						
	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	1,447	1,541	1,460	1,940	2,364	63.4%
Common Offenses						
Theft-related	440	459	429	635	731	66.1%
Unknown	159	199	258	363	435	173.6
Battery	250	253	235	319	382	52.8
Disorderly Conduct	156	159	131	183	362	132.1
Drugs	92	84	97	143	154	67.4
Weapon	119	136	85	103	100	(16.0)
Property Damage	62	65	53	72	72	16.1
Sexual Assault	43	37	69	34	53	23.3
Robbery	53	55	53	47	25	(52.8)
Traffic	21	8	7	13	12	(42.9)
Fraud	11	10	4	10	9	(18.2)
Homicide	8	8	5	7	8	0.0
Arson	8	9	7	4	6	(25.0)
Assaultive	0	0	0	2	6	
Trespass	3	4	3	1	3	0.0
Recklessness	22	55	23	2	3	(86.4)
Sex Crime	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	
TOTAL	1,447	1,541	1,460	1,940	2,364	
Gender						
Male	1,055	1,103	981	1,388	1,619	53.5%
Female	392	438	479	552	745	90.1%
Average Age	15.3	15.1	14.9	14.9	14.8	(3.3)%
Ethnicity						
White	618	675	658	903	1,102	78.3%
Black	667	668	611	798	980	46.9
Hispanic	157	197	186	222	261	66.2
Asian	4	0	4	15	16	300.0
Indian	1	1	1	0	4	300.0
Unknown	0	0	0	2	1	

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes on Placement Types and Length
--

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Days</u>
Before July 1996	1,806	48.6%	1,908	51.4%	11.8	6.9
After July 1996	1,794	35.6	3,244	64.4	12.6	6.3

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Racine	1,276	1,381	1,243	1,350	1,597	25.2%
Kenosha	140	148	187	333	398	184.3
Walworth	14	8	21	105	139	892.9
Sheboygan	0	0	0	68	102	
Dane	0	0	0	40	33	
Jefferson	11	1	0	13	23	109.1
Washington	1	0	0	19	19	1,800.0
Winnebago	0	0	5	4	18	
All Others	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>35</u>	600.0
TOTAL	1,447	1,541	1,460	1,940	2,364	

Rock County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 - 1998

Trend Information						
	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	1,059	1,313	1,063	1,171	1,481	39.8%
Common Offenses						
Unknown	163	307	375	483	612	275.5%
Disorderly Conduct	197	230	158	188	230	16.8
Theft-related	310	260	206	189	219	(29.4)
Battery	129	180	97	85	129	0.0
Drugs	65	81	55	66	100	53.8
Property Damage	33	38	36	42	50	51.5
Weapon	31	44	33	26	37	19.4
Sexual Assault	28	60	24	27	33	17.9
Recklessness	27	27	10	16	23	(14.8)
Robbery	7	14	14	9	11	57.1
Arson	6	3	4	3	10	66.7
Trespass	8	4	7	9	9	12.5
Fraud	16	17	12	7	6	(62.5)
Traffic	23	22	23	14	5	(78.3)
Assaultive	4	12	4	0	4	0.0
Homicide	5	7	0	3	1	(80.0)
Sex Crime	0	2	0	1	1	(85.7)
Other	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	(85.7)
TOTAL	1,059	1,313	1,063	1,171	1,481	
Gender						
Male	827	1,041	821	895	1,076	30.1%
Female	232	272	242	276	405	74.6%
Average Age	15.3	15.2	15.0	15.0	14.6	(4.6)%
Ethnicity						
White	650	864	716	795	1,070	64.6%
Black	383	378	285	331	358	(6.5)
Hispanic	18	43	43	26	32	77.8
Asian	2	17	15	13	20	900.0
Indian	6	11	4	0	0	(100.0)
Unknown	0	0	0	6	1	

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes
on Placement Types and Length

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Days</u>
Before July 1996	1,275	44.0%	1,623	56.0%	6.8	7.2
After July 1996	1,456	45.7	1,733	54.3	5.2	4.7

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Rock	1,041	1,087	854	975	1,248	19.9%
Jefferson	0	72	70	120	116	
Dane	1	14	13	3	32	3,100.0
Green	0	14	14	13	28	
Walworth	2	87	70	31	19	850.0
Columbia	1	14	21	15	10	900.0
All Others	<u>14</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>28</u>	100.0
TOTAL	1,059	1,313	1,063	1,171	1,481	

Sheboygan County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 - 1998

Trend Information

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	304	372	361	350	429	41.1%
Common Offenses						
Disorderly Conduct	78	89	119	103	139	78.2%
Theft-related	87	116	104	99	93	6.9
Unknown	32	44	14	19	61	90.6
Battery	21	39	40	32	35	66.7
Drugs	3	22	12	20	27	800.0
Property Damage	22	25	31	19	25	13.6
Weapon	20	15	18	22	14	(30.0)
Trespass	4	4	6	2	9	125.0
Sexual Assault	11	2	6	5	7	(36.4)
Arson	4	3	1	4	4	0.0
Recklessness	9	5	3	2	3	(66.7)
Assaultive	0	0	0	3	3	
Robbery	5	2	2	8	2	(60.0)
Sex Crime	1	0	0	0	2	100.0
Other	0	0	1	2	2	
Fraud	3	3	1	6	2	(33.3)
Traffic	3	3	3	3	1	(66.7)
Homicide	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	(100.0)
TOTAL	304	372	361	350	429	
Gender						
Male	242	295	266	237	304	25.6%
Female	62	77	95	113	125	101.6%
Average Age	15.2	15.3	15.1	14.8	14.8	(2.6)%
Ethnicity						
White	280	356	324	344	410	46.4%
Black	9	4	7	6	13	44.4
Asian	15	12	30	0	6	(60.0)

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes on Placement Types and Length
--

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	Days	Days
Before July 1996	401	45.9%	472	54.1%	10.4	10.9
After July 1996	337	35.7	606	64.3	12.8	13.6

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998
--

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	Percentage Change
Sheboygan	227	364	350	347	423	86.3%
All Others	<u>77</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	(92.2)%
TOTAL	304	372	361	350	429	

Waukesha County Juvenile Detention Facility
1994 - 1998

Trend Information

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	670	699	626	705	683	1.9%
Common Offenses						
Theft-related	159	222	249	234	188	18.2%
Unknown	264	155	105	153	152	(42.4)
Battery	54	39	70	95	136	151.9
Sexual Assault	15	13	42	49	51	240.0
Disorderly Conduct	46	59	23	33	31	(32.6)
Recklessness	9	10	12	20	29	222.2
Property Damage	13	75	23	18	23	76.9
Drugs	36	67	24	24	18	(50.0)
Robbery	6	13	25	21	18	200.0
Weapon	26	24	31	16	14	(46.2)
Fraud	17	10	0	4	10	(41.2)
Arson	2	1	3	15	9	350.0
Trespass	6	7	2	7	2	(66.7)
Traffic	12	4	16	3	1	(91.7)
Sex Crime	0	0	0	3	1	
Assaultive	2	0	0	6	0	(100.0)
Homicide	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	(100.0)
TOTAL	670	699	626	705	683	
Gender						
Male	433	459	405	419	473	9.2%
Female	237	240	221	286	210	(11.4)%
Average Age	15.6	15.8	15.6	16.5	15.2	(2.6)%
Ethnicity						
White	573	599	562	623	612	6.8%
Hispanic	59	59	50	66	54	(8.5)
Black	35	37	12	8	12	(65.7)
Asian	1	3	2	2	3	200.0
Indian	2	0	0	4	1	(50.0)
Unknown	0	1	0	2	1	

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes on Placement Types and Length
--

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	Days	Days
Before July 1996	1,174	69.4%	518	30.6%	7.3	5.1
After July 1996	1,038	61.4	653	38.6	4.2	5.4

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998
--

	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	Percentage <u>Change</u>
Waukesha	485	555	564	613	624	28.7%
Washington	20	39	23	47	27	35.0
Dodge	27	16	8	9	13	(51.9)
Jefferson	14	7	1	11	4	(71.4)
Walworth	27	6	2	2	0	(100.0)
Kenosha	71	64	20	0	0	(100.0)
All Others	<u>26</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>15</u>	(42.3)
TOTAL	670	699	626	705	683	

Placements in Juvenile Portions of County Jails, Statewide
1994 - 1998

Trend Information						
	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
Total Placements	1,169	526	476	313	617	(47.2)%
Common Offenses						
Unknown	242	48	61	87	207	(14.5)%
Theft-related	385	226	157	89	169	(56.1)
Disorderly Conduct	132	60	98	53	84	(36.4)
Battery	130	51	40	27	50	(61.5)
Drugs	14	15	17	20	33	135.7
Property Damage	39	30	22	9	16	(59.0)
Traffic	21	7	7	0	16	(4.8)
Weapon	57	14	18	6	13	(77.2)
Sexual Assault	20	13	7	4	10	(50.0)
Trespass	15	8	7	3	7	(53.3)
Fraud	26	7	3	3	5	(80.8)
Recklessness	37	14	21	4	2	(94.6)
Robbery	19	10	12	2	2	(89.5)
Arson	14	2	1	0	1	(92.9)
Assaultive	9	6	2	0	1	(88.9)
Other	6	8	2	5	1	(83.3)
Homicide	2	7	1	1	0	(100.0)
Sex Crime	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	(100.0)
TOTAL	1,169	526	476	313	617	
Gender						
Male	898	437	380	236	466	(48.1)%
Female	271	89	96	77	151	(44.3)
Average Age	15.7	15.6	15.1	15.1	15.4	(1.9)%
Ethnicity						
White	1,060	473	444	277	487	(54.1)%
Asian	10	6	4	1	64	540.0
Indian	39	25	21	28	19	(51.3)
Black	51	17	6	7	19	(62.7)
Hispanic	9	5	1	0	5	(44.4)
Unknown	0	0	0	0	23	

Effects of 1996 Statutory Changes
on Placement Types and Length

	Placement Type				Average Placement Length	
	Pre-Adjudicatory		Post-Adjudicatory		Pre-Adjudicatory	Post-Adjudicatory
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	Days	Days
Before July 1996	1,716	89.9%	193	10.1%	5.4	7.2
After July 1996	868	72.8	324	27.2	4.0	6.6

Authorizing County for all Placements, 1994-1998

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Percentage Change
Langlade	32	86	93	84	137	328.1%
St. Croix	28	32	20	20	129	360.7
Marathon	0	0	1	0	128	
Forest	2	4	3	22	36	1,700.0
Sauk	23	39	57	30	29	26.1
Lincoln	12	12	3	7	27	125.0
Waupaca	57	1	0	0	20	(64.9)
Columbia	17	6	35	32	17	0.0
Polk	22	14	7	6	15	(31.8)
Grant	16	9	3	13	11	(31.3)
Marinette	67	40	19	32	10	(85.1)
Wood	23	10	2	0	2	(91.3)
Washington	101	150	122	25	0	(100.0)
Iowa	11	22	60	19	0	(100.0)
Richland	23	3	0	2	0	(100.0)
Douglas	63	26	8	1	0	(100.0)
Waushara	13	11	4	1	0	(100.0)
Ashland	17	5	2	0	0	(100.0)
Burnett	12	9	0	0	0	(100.0)
Sawyer	13	6	0	0	0	(100.0)
Kenosha	19	2	0	0	0	(100.0)
Winnebago	476	0	0	0	0	(100.0)
All Others	122	39	37	19	56	(54.1)
TOTAL	1,169	526	476	313	617	