



# NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

*Data Resources Program*



## Decision-Making in the Juvenile Justice System in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio, 1999–2000

Rosemary Sarri

ICPSR 3581

*User Guide*



Inter university Consortium for Political and Social Research



Decision-Making in the Juvenile Justice System in  
Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio, 1999-2000

(ICPSR 3581)

Principal Investigator

Rosemary Sarri  
University of Michigan  
Institute for Social Research  
Center for Political Studies

First ICPSR Version  
May 2003

Inter-university Consortium for  
Political and Social Research  
P.O. Box 1248  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106



## BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Sarri, Rosemary. DECISION-MAKING IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM IN ILLINOIS, INDIANA, MICHIGAN, AND OHIO, 1999-2000 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research [producer], 2000. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2003.

## REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON USE OF ICPSR RESOURCES

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Please indicate in a cover letter which data were used.

## DATA DISCLAIMER

The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary .....	1
General Study Overview .....	3
Study Identification .....	3
Purpose of the Study .....	3
Methods .....	4
Study Design .....	4
Sources of Information .....	4
Sample .....	4
Response Rates .....	5
Dates of Data Collection .....	5
Summary of Contents .....	6
Description of Variables .....	6
Presence of Common Scales .....	6
Unit of Observation .....	6
Extent of Processing .....	6
Extent of Collection .....	7
Data Collection Notes .....	7
File Specifications .....	7
Restrictions .....	8
Final Reports and Other Publications .....	8
Data Resources Program on the Internet .....	9
Data Completeness Report .....	11
Data Completeness Report for Part 1 .....	11
Data Completeness Report for Part 2 .....	15
Data Completeness Report for Part 3 .....	19
Data Completeness Report for Part 4 .....	23





## SUMMARY

The goals of the juvenile justice system in the United States have always been multiple, beginning with rehabilitation, the primary goal when the juvenile court was established. More recently, policies advocating accountability seem to have predominated over other goals of the court, and concern exists that structured decision-making (SDM) in support of individual accountability has begun to fundamentally change the juvenile justice system. This study examined the use of SDM in state correctional agencies in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio and in juvenile courts in three counties in each of those states. Data were collected in phases from March 1999 to August 2000 during periodic site visits. Probation officers, judges and referees, prosecutors, and defense attorneys were interviewed in each of the 12 courts. Each survey contained a core set of questions eliciting respondents' views of juvenile justice, disposition objectives, and the use and value of SDM. Questions relevant to particular decision-makers were also included. All respondents provided demographic information and information about their job experience in criminal justice and professional training.



## GENERAL STUDY OVERVIEW

## STUDY IDENTIFICATION

Decision-Making in the Juvenile Justice System in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio, 1999-2000

Rosemary Sarri

University of Michigan. Institute for Social Research. Center for Political Studies

Award No. 98-JB-VX-0110

## PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The juvenile justice system in the United States, implemented at the turn of the twentieth century as a legal and social institution for children, has undergone significant changes over the last quarter century. The goals of the juvenile justice system have always been multiple, beginning with rehabilitation, the primary goal when the juvenile court was established. More recently, policies advocating accountability seem to have predominated over other goals of the court, and concern exists that structured decision-making (SDM) in support of individual accountability has begun to fundamentally change the juvenile justice system. SDM is generally defined as a formal and standardized procedure to guide decision-makers by defining the criteria they must use in their deliberations and eventual decisions. Major types of SDM are risk assessment, needs assessment, and security level classification. This study examined the use of SDM in state correctional agencies in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio and in juvenile courts in three counties in each of those states. The project had six specific goals: (1) To assess the effects of recent revisions in juvenile codes on decision-making processes in juvenile courts, (2) to identify correlates of processing and placement decisions, (3) to document and analyze the policies and practices of individual accountability as an organizing principle that defines the relationships among public agencies and citizens, (4) to assess the utility of various types of SDM in sample courts, (5) to assess the context for decision-making to find causes and correlates of case processing decisions and the patterns of accountability and structured decision-making, and (6) to assess practitioners' perspectives about structured decision-making, classification, and risk and needs assessment.

## METHODS

## STUDY DESIGN

Data were collected in phases from March 1999 to August 2000 during periodic site visits. The first site visits were made to units of state government involved with the court. Using data from state site visits, which usually lasted three days, the selection process for courts and counties was refined. Once courts were tentatively selected, chief judges at each of the selected courts were contacted to determine their willingness to participate in the study. The second set of site visits was to each of the selected courts. In several courts, surveys were not distributed on the first visit but were mailed and distributed by the court. However, in-person distribution of the questionnaires was more effective in securing high response rates. Probation officers, judges and referees, prosecutors, and defense attorneys were interviewed in each of the 12 courts. The surveys were based on previous surveys of juvenile court decision-makers and SDM, for example, Champion (1994) and Barton and Creekmore (1994), which were modified to fit the study. Each survey contained a core set of questions regarding juvenile justice administration, but modifications relevant to particular decision-makers were made. The survey was pre-tested in two counties and further changes were made based on those results. The survey was self-administered in each of the courts. The names of potential respondents were obtained through the assistance of court administrators and/or department heads.

## SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Data were collected from self-administered questionnaires.

## SAMPLE

Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio were selected because they are contiguous states in the same geographic region, and it was assumed that they would share common properties, such that the states' general environments would not be a significant factor affecting interpretation of the research findings. Among factors that these four states have in common are the following: concentration of basic industry, extensive farming in rural counties, one or more major urban areas, and significant racial and ethnic diversity. Another criterion for selecting these states was their variation in terms of characteristics related to case processing and juvenile justice. The states varied greatly in the availability and types of state resources at local as compared to state levels. In each state, three counties

were chosen based on selection criteria designed to include a variety of contexts for SDM. First, a populous urban jurisdiction was selected in each state. These jurisdictions had large case volumes and pressure to process cases quickly, as some of the most serious social problems, such as poverty and high arrest rates, occurred in the large urban jurisdictions. Second, a community was selected that provided a range of community resources for dispositional programs. These resources would provide many dispositional alternatives, suggesting more complex decision-making. Third, a community was selected that had several social problems but limited dispositional resources. These communities faced processing pressures without resources, making it likely that decision-making would be simpler and more constrained. Mitigating the choice of counties were such things as a court's willingness to participate and geography. A few counties were unable to participate for a variety of reasons, such as court reorganization or staff turnover. The study sought to avoid geographic concentration in the sample. In one state, most of the large and medium-sized counties were geographically concentrated, so in that state smaller courts were selected. The study attempted to survey all probation officers, judges and referees, prosecutors, and defense attorneys in each of the 12 counties.

#### RESPONSE RATES

In total, 65.2 percent of probation officers, judges and referees, prosecutors, and defense attorneys completed the surveys.

#### DATE(S) OF DATA COLLECTION

1999-2000

## SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

## DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES

All respondents were asked to answer a core set of questions as well as questions that related to their specific role as judge, probation officer, prosecutor, or public defender, in the juvenile justice system. All respondents answered questions on their general views of juvenile justice, which included questions on the importance of rehabilitation, punishment, and due process. There were also core questions on disposition objectives; what factors turn juveniles away from further involvement in delinquency and crime; the use of SDM; the value of SDM; whether decisions recommended by SDM are too lenient, about right, or too restrictive; the meaning of accountability; and inter-organizational and community relations, including questions on community groups' influence over the court, similarity of the respondent's views to the views of others in the community, and the working relationship between the court and community groups. In addition, prosecutors and public defenders answered questions on the factors that influenced their decision to file a petition, recommend a disposition, and make a waiver decision to adult court. Judges and probation officers answered additional questions on the availability of resources for the juvenile court in their county, factors that influenced them when making a disposition, and the usefulness of SDM, including questions on situations in which the respondent had overridden SDM recommendations. Judges also answered questions on judicial discretion. The probation survey data include several derived variables. All respondents provided background information, including age, gender, ethnic/racial background, marital status, number of children in certain age groups, past job experience in criminal justice, percentage of cases handled that were juvenile, duties unrelated to juvenile justice, job satisfaction, attendance of professional training meetings, and which organizations provided the training. Probation officers were also questioned on the highest level of education attained.

## PRESENCE OF COMMON SCALES

Several Likert-type scales were used.

## UNIT OF OBSERVATION

Individuals.

## EXTENT OF PROCESSING

The principal investigator standardized missing value codes. ICPSR produced a codebook, generated SAS and SPSS data definition statements, checked for undocumented codes, standardized missing values, reformatted the data and documentation, and converted hardcopy documentation to machine-readable format.

## EXTENT OF COLLECTION

This data collection consists of four data files, a user guide, codebooks, and data collection instruments in PDF files, and SAS and SPSS data definition statements.

## DATA COLLECTION NOTES

The user guide, codebooks, and data collection instruments are provided by ICPSR as Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat Reader is provided on the ICPSR Web site.

## FILE SPECIFICATIONS

PART NUMBER: 1  
PART NAME: Judge Survey Data  
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular  
CASE COUNT: 87  
VARIABLE COUNT: 244  
RECORD LENGTH: 496  
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 2  
PART NAME: Probation Officer Survey Data  
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular  
CASE COUNT: 489  
VARIABLE COUNT: 253  
RECORD LENGTH: 520  
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 3  
PART NAME: Prosecutor Survey Data  
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular  
CASE COUNT: 31  
VARIABLE COUNT: 220  
RECORD LENGTH: 447  
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 4  
PART NAME: Public Defender Survey Data  
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular  
CASE COUNT: 58  
VARIABLE COUNT: 220  
RECORD LENGTH: 446  
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

#### RESTRICTIONS

The data are restricted from general dissemination. Users interested in obtaining these data must complete a Data Transfer Agreement Form and specify the reasons for the request. A copy of the Data Transfer Agreement Form can be requested by calling 800-999-0960 or 734-647-5000. The Data Transfer Agreement Form is also available as a Portable Document Format (PDF) file from the NACJD Web site at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/Private/private.pdf>. Completed forms should be returned to: Director, National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Institute for Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248, or by fax: 734-647-8200.

#### FINAL REPORTS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) was established in 1972 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), of the U.S. Department of Justice, to provide research findings to criminal justice professionals and researchers. NCJRS operates specialized clearinghouses that are staffed by information specialists who supply a range of reference, referral, and distribution services. Final reports and other publications describing research conducted on a variety of criminal justice topics are available. Publications can be obtained from NCJRS at NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD, 20849-6000, 800-851-3420 or 301-519-5500. TTY Service for the Hearing Impaired is 877-712-9279 (toll-free) or 301-947-8374 (local). The URL for the NCJRS homepage is:

<http://www.ncjrs.org>



## DATA RESOURCES PROGRAM ON THE INTERNET

The National Institute of Justice Data Resources Program (DRP) makes datasets from NIJ-funded research and evaluation projects available to the research community and sponsors research and training activities devoted to secondary data analysis. Datasets are archived by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

The NACJD maintains a World Wide Web site with instructions for transferring files and sending messages. Criminal justice data funded by the Department of Justice are available via the Internet at this site at no charge to the user. NACJD may be contacted at NACJD/ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, 800-999-0960 or 734-647-5000. The URL for the NACJD homepage is:

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD>



DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3581.P1

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values\*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=87)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
-----	
19.3% (47 of 244 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 244 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
18.9% (46 of 244 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
7.0% (17 of 244 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
5.7% (14 of 244 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
III2B SECOND MOST	5.7%
III2C LEAST IMPORTANT	5.7%
VIII13 OFFENDER REHABILITATION	5.7%
VIII14 GENERAL COMMUNITY JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS	5.7%
X2A JUDGES	5.7%
X2C STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS	5.7%
X2D MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS	5.7%
X2E PROBATION OFFICERS	5.7%
X2F DEFENSE ATTORNEYS	5.7%
X2H SOCIAL WORKERS	5.7%
X2J PRIVATE PROGRAM PROVIDERS	5.7%
X2K MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS	5.7%
X2L YOUTH ADVOCACY ORGANIZATIONS	5.7%
VIII12 LAW 'JUST DESERTS'	6.9%
8.6% (21 of 244 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
V8F2 OTHER (OPEN) (F)	10.3%
V8G2 OTHER (OPEN) (G)	10.3%
VIII2 'ACCOUNTABILITY' -- MOST IMPORTANT	10.3%
XII2 GENDER	10.3%
I2 COUNTY HAVE SUFFICIENT PROGRAMS	11.5%
XII12 ATTENDED TRAINING MEETINGS	12.6%
XII8C WORKED IN PRIVATE LAW	13.8%
=====	

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
XIII11	HOW LONG CONTINUE REFEREE IN JUV/FAM CR	13.8%
XIII1	AGE	14.9%
XIII4	MARITAL STATUS	14.9%
XIII6	JOB TITLE (OPEN)	16.1%
XIII9	PERCENTAGE JUVENILE CASES	16.1%
V2	FORMALLY TRAINED	17.2%
XIII5B	UNDER 6	17.2%
XIII5C	6-10	17.2%
XIII5D	11-15	17.2%
XIII5E	16-20	17.2%
XIII8B	WORKED AS PUBLIC DEFENDER	17.2%
XIII5F	21 AND OVER	18.4%
XIII8F	PARTCPATD PROFESSIONL/VOLNTRY ACTIVITIE	18.4%
V4H1	OTHER (OPEN)	19.5%
4.5% (11 of 244 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values		
XIII8A	WORKED AS PROSECUTOR	20.7%
XIII8D	WORKED IN ADULT CORRECTIONS	23.0%
XIII8E	WORKED IN SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY	23.0%
V3	EVER USED STRUCTURED DECISION MAKING	24.1%
XIII3	RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND	24.1%
XIII12B	USEFUL	31.0%
XIII7A	REFEREE (MONTHS)	32.2%
XIII12A	HOW MANY	33.3%
I4	ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS OR SERVICES (OPEN)	39.1%
XIII7C	JUVENILE CASES (OPEN)	39.1%
XIII13A	SUPREME COURT ADMINISTRATORS	39.1%
36.1% (88 of 244 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values		
XIII7B	JUDGE (MONTHS)	43.7%
X2N	PARENT	44.8%
XIII5A	NO CHILDREN	46.0%
V4AB	FEWER YTH IN SECURE PLACEMENT-REASONABL	48.3%
V4CB	ENSURE APPROPRIATE PLACEMENT-REASONABLE	50.6%
V4GB	RESRV COMMIT FOR MOST SERIOUS-REASONABL	50.6%
V4FB	MORE PAPERWORK-REASONABLE	51.7%
V4BB	PLACEMNT DECISIONS CONSISTENT-REASONABL	52.9%
V4DB	DECISION MAKERS ACCOUNTABLE-REASONABLE	52.9%
V4EB	PREVENT OVERREPRESENTATION-REASONABLE	52.9%
V11A	RISK ASSESSMENT	56.3%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
V12C	POST COMMITMENT PLACEMENT	57.5%
V6A	PREDISPOSITION REPORT	58.6%
V12B	POST ADJUDICATION PLACEMENT	58.6%
XIII13D	NAT'L COUNCIL JUV AND FAMILY CRT JUDGES	58.6%
V12A	PRETRIAL DETENTION	59.8%
V12D	RELEASE DECISIONS	59.8%
V4AC	FEWER YOUTHS IN SECURE PLACEMENTS-GOAL	60.9%
V5A	RISK ASSESSMENT	60.9%
V7A	TOO LENIENT	60.9%
V7B	ABOUT RIGHT	60.9%
V7C	TOO RESTRICTIVE	60.9%
V11B	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	60.9%
V11C	SECURITY LEVEL CLASSIFICATION	60.9%
V1	LIST ALL TYPES (OPEN)	62.1%
V6C	DISAGREED	62.1%
V6D	OVERRIDE	62.1%
V4CC	ENSURE APPROPRIATE PLACEMENT-GOAL	63.2%
V8A	COMMUNITY - DISAGREE - OUT OF HOME	63.2%
V8B	COMMUNITY - AGREE - NONE AVAILABLE	63.2%
V8C	OUT - DISAGREE - COMMUNITY	63.2%
V8D	COMMUNITY - AGREE - PARENT REMOVAL	63.2%
V4BC	PLACEMENT DECISIONS CONSISTENT-GOAL	64.4%
V4EC	PREVENT OVERREPRESENTATIONS-GOAL	64.4%
V4GC	RESERVE COMMITMENT FOR MOST SERIOUS-GOA	64.4%
V5B	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	64.4%
V5C	SECURITY LEVEL CLASSIFICATION	64.4%
V4DC	HOLD DECISION MAKERS ACCOUNTABLE-GOAL	65.5%
V6B	STRUCTURED DECISION MAKING	65.5%
V8E	MANDATORY OVERRIDE	65.5%
V4FC	MORE PAPERWORK-GOAL	66.7%
XIII13B	INSTITUTE FOR CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATIO	66.7%
V14	WORST THINGS ABOUT SDM (OPEN)	67.8%
XII8G	SPECIFY (OPEN)	67.8%
XIII13C	BAR ASSOCIATION	69.0%
V3A	YEAR WHEN FIRST USED SDM	72.4%
XIII13E	OTHER	72.4%
XIII13F	SPECIFY (OPEN)	72.4%
V13	BEST THINGS ABOUT SDM (OPEN)	73.6%
V10	OVERRIDE FAVOR COMMUNITY-BASED (OPEN)	75.9%
IX2	ADD'L FACTOR THAT RESTRICTD ABILITY(OPEN)	75.9%
V2A	SATISFIED WITH TRAINING	77.0%
V9	OVERRIDE FAVOR OUT OF COMMUNITY (OPEN)	78.2%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
V16	POLICIES AFFECT DISPOSITNL DECISNS (OPEN)	80.5%
V1A	FAMILIAR WITH SDM	82.8%
V15	CHANGES TO SDM (OPEN)	82.8%
XIII10A	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	82.8%
X3A	JUDGES	86.2%
X3B	POLICE	86.2%
X3D	MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS	86.2%
X3E	PROBATION OFFICERS	86.2%
X3F	DEFENSE ATTORNEYS	86.2%
X3G	PROSECUTORS	86.2%
X3H	PRIVATE PROGRAM PROVIDERS	86.2%
X3I	SOCIAL WORKERS	86.2%
X3J	YOUTH ADVOCACY ORGANIZATIONS	86.2%
X3K	MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS	86.2%
X3L	COMMUNITY RESIDENTS	86.2%
X3M	TEACHERS	86.2%
X3C	STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS	87.4%
XIII10B	ADULT CRIMINAL OR CIVIL CASES	89.7%
XIII10C	OTHER	89.7%
XIII10D	SPECIFY (OPEN)	89.7%
V4AA	FEWER YOUTHS IN SECURE PLACEMENTS-REASO	93.1%
V4BA	PLACEMNT DECISIONS MORE CONSISTNT-REASO	93.1%
V4CA	ENSURE APPROPRIATE PLACEMENT-REASON	93.1%
V4DA	HOLD DECISION MAKERS ACCOUNTABLE-REASON	93.1%
V4EA	PREVENT OVERREPRESENTATION-REASON	93.1%
V4FA	MORE PAPERWORK-REASON	93.1%
V4GA	RESERV COMMITMNT FOR MOST SERIOUS-REASO	93.1%
V4HB	OTHER-REASONABLE	94.3%
V4HC	OTHER-GOAL	95.4%
V7D	DOES NOT FIT	95.4%
V4HA	OTHER-REASON	97.7%
V8F	OTHER (F)	97.7%
V8G	OTHER (G)	98.9%
V5D	OUT OF HOME SCREENING FORM(OAKLAND CNTY)	100.0%
V11D	OUT OF HOME SCREENING FORM	100.0%

\*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.  
Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected  
in the data as coded.

\*\*Values labeled "N/A" are combined with general missing in this table  
because the principal investigator determined the "N/A" distinction  
was inconsequential and so combined the 9 and 99 codes in her  
analyses.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3581.P2

Table 2: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values\*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=489)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
-----	
4.3% (11 of 253 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
22.5% (57 of 253 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
19.0% (48 of 253 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
1.2% (3 of 253 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
9.9% (25 of 253 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
XI6 HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION	5.3%
XI2 GENDER	5.5%
XI7 JOB TITLE (OPEN)	6.3%
XI10 PERCENTAGE JUVENILE CASES	6.7%
III2B SECOND MOST	7.0%
XI4 MARITAL STATUS	7.0%
XI9D WORKED IN SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY	7.2%
XI13 ATTENDED TRAINING MEETINGS	7.2%
XI5B UNDER 6	7.8%
XI5C 6-10	7.8%
XI5D 11-15	7.8%
XI5E 16-20	7.8%
XI5F 21 AND OVER	7.8%
III2A MOST IMPORTANT	8.0%
XI5A NO CHILDREN	8.4%
III2C LEAST IMPORTANT	8.6%
XI8B JUVENILE PROBATION (MONTHS)	8.6%
XI9A WORKED IN EDUCATION	8.6%
XI12 HOW LONG TO CONTINUE JUVENILE PROBATION	8.6%
IV2A MOST IMPORTANT	8.8%
IV2B SECOND MOST	9.0%
XI9E OTHER WORK WITH CHILDREN AND YOUTH	9.0%
XI15A MEMBER OF TECHNICAL OR PROFESSIONAL ORG	9.6%
FILTER XI8B = 99 (FILTER)	9.6%
=====	

Table 2 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
XI1      AGE (YEARS)	9.8%
5.9% (15 of 253 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
V2          FORMALLY TRAINED	10.2%
IV2C       LEAST IMPORTANT	11.2%
XI9B       WORKED IN POLICING	11.2%
XI9C       WORKED IN ADULT CORRECTIONS	11.2%
LEGAL       LEGAL FACTORS	13.3%
BEHAVE2    JUVENILE'S BEHAVIORAL TENDENCIES	13.5%
FAMILY     FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS	13.5%
VIII2      'ACCOUNTABILITY' -- MOST IMPORTANT	13.9%
BEHAVE     (BEHAVIORAL TENDENCIES + LEGAL FACTORS)	14.3%
XI3        ETHNIC/RACIAL BACKGROUND	15.1%
V3          EVER USED STRUCTURED DECISION MAKING	15.3%
PUNISH     PUNITIVE ORIENTATION	15.7%
TREAT      TREATMENT ORIENTATION	15.7%
VICTIM     VICTIMS' RIGHTS	16.6%
I2          COUNTY HAVE SUFFICIENT PROGRAMS	17.2%
13.8% (35 of 253 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
V6A        PREDISPOSITION REPORT	20.0%
V5A        RISK ASSESSMENT	21.9%
XI8A       JUVENILE JUSTICE (MONTHS)	23.5%
V11A       RISK ASSESSMENT	23.7%
V4AB       FEWER YTH IN SECURE PLACEMENT-REASONABL	24.1%
V4DB       DECISION MAKERS ACCOUNTABLE-REASONABLE	24.5%
V4CB       ENSURE APPROPRIATE PLACEMENT-REASONABLE	24.9%
V4BB       PLACEMNT DECISIONS CONSISTENT-REASONABL	25.6%
V4GB       RESRV COMMIT FOR MOST SERIOUS-REASONABL	25.6%
V4EB       PREVENT OVERREPRESENTATION-REASONABLE	26.0%
V4FB       MORE PAPERWORK-REASONABLE	26.6%
I4          ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS OR SERVICES (OPEN)	30.5%
V6B        STRUCTURED DECISION MAKING	30.9%
V6C        DISAGREED	32.1%
V7B        ABOUT RIGHT	32.7%
V7A        TOO LENIENT	32.9%
V6D        OVERRIDE	33.1%
V12B       POST ADJUDICATION PLACEMENT	33.1%
XI15C      ATTENDED MEETING IN LAST 12 MONTHS	33.7%
V4AC       FEWER YOUTHS IN SECURE PLACEMENTS-GOAL	33.9%



Table 2 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
V5B	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	33.9%
V7C	TOO RESTRICTIVE	34.4%
V4CC	ENSURE APPROPRIATE PLACEMENT-GOAL	35.4%
V4BC	PLACEMENT DECISIONS CONSISTENT-GOAL	35.6%
V4GC	RESERVE COMMITMENT FOR MOST SERIOUS-GOA	35.6%
V12A	PRETRIAL DETENTION	35.6%
V4FC	MORE PAPERWORK-GOAL	36.2%
V4DC	HOLD DECISION MAKERS ACCOUNTABLE-GOAL	36.4%
V4EC	PREVENT OVERREPRESENTATIONS-GOAL	36.4%
V11B	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	36.4%
V12D	RELEASE DECISIONS	36.6%
V12C	POST COMMITMENT PLACEMENT	37.0%
XI13B	USEFUL	38.2%
V1	LIST ALL TYPES OF SDM	39.5%
V5C	SECURITY LEVEL CLASSIFICATION	39.7%
23.3% (59 of 253 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values		
V8E	MANDATORY OVERRIDE	40.1%
V8A	COMMUNITY - DISAGREE - OUT OF HOME	40.5%
V8C	OUT - DISAGREE - COMMUNITY	40.5%
V8B	COMMUNITY - AGREE - NONE AVAILABLE	40.7%
V8D	COMMUNITY - AGREE - PARENT REMOVAL	41.1%
V11C	SECURITY LEVEL CLASSIFICATION	43.4%
XI13A	HOW MANY (OPEN)	43.8%
V2A	SATISFIED WITH TRAINING	44.6%
X2N	PARENT OF DELINQUENT YOUTH	52.6%
XI6A	BA OR BS (SPECIFY)	54.4%
V14	WORST THINGS ABOUT SDM (OPEN)	55.2%
V13	BEST THINGS ABOUT SDM (OPEN)	55.6%
XI14D	OTHER	56.4%
V3A	YEAR WHEN FIRST USED SDM	57.5%
V9	OVERRIDE FAVOR OUT OF COMMUNITY (OPEN)	58.5%
XI9E2	YOUTH SERVICE (SPECIFY/OPEN)	58.9%
XI14E	SPECIFY (OPEN)	59.7%
V10	OVERRIDE FAVOR COMMUNITY-BASED (OPEN)	62.6%
V15	CHANGES TO SDM (OPEN)	64.2%
V16	POLICIES AFFECT DISPOSITNL DECISNS (OPEN)	67.3%
XI15B	PLEASE LIST (OPEN)	69.7%
XI14C	STATE DELINQUENCY SERVICES	77.5%
XI14B	DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY JUSTICE	79.3%
XI6B	MASTERS (SPECIFY)	79.8%

Table 2 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
X3A	JUDGES	86.7%
V1A	FAMILIAR WITH SDM	86.9%
X3C	STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS	86.9%
X3B	POLICE	87.1%
X3D	MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS	87.1%
X3E	PROBATION OFFICERS	87.1%
X3F	DEFENSE ATTORNEYS	87.1%
X3G	PROSECUTORS	87.1%
X3H	PRIVATE PROGRAM PROVIDERS	87.1%
X3I	SOCIAL WORKERS	87.1%
X3J	YOUTH ADVOCACY ORGANIZATIONS	87.1%
X3M	TEACHERS	87.1%
X3K	MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS	87.5%
X3L	COMMUNITY RESIDENTS	87.5%
XI14A	SUPREME COURT ADMINISTRATORS	89.6%
V7D	DOES NOT FIT	91.0%
V4AA	FEWER YOUTHS IN SECURE PLACEMENTS-REASO	92.4%
V4HC	OTHER-GOAL	92.4%
V4DA	HOLD DECISION MAKERS ACCOUNTABLE-REASON	92.6%
V4GA	RESERV COMMITMNT FOR MOST SERIOUS-REASO	92.6%
V4BA	PLACEMENT DECISIONS MORE CONSISTNT-REAS	92.8%
V4EA	PREVENT OVERREPRESENTATION-REASON	92.8%
V4FA	MORE PAPERWORK-REASON	92.8%
V4CA	ENSURE APPROPRIATE PLACEMENT-REASON	93.0%
V4HB	OTHER-REASONABLE	93.5%
XI11C	OTHER	94.1%
XI11D	SPECIFY	94.3%
XI6C	OTHER (SPECIFY)	95.3%
V8F	OTHER (F)	95.5%
V8G	OTHER (G)	97.1%
XI11A	DOMESTIC RELATIONS	98.0%
XI11B	ADULT PROBATION OR PAROLE	98.6%
V4HA	OTHER-REASON	98.8%
V5D	OUT OF HOME SCREENING FORM	99.2%
V11D	OUT OF HOME SCREENING FORM	100.0%

\*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.  
Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected  
in the data as coded.

\*\*Values labeled "N/A" are combined with general missing in this table  
because the principal investigator determined the "N/A" distinction  
was inconsequential and so combined the 9 and 99 codes in her  
analyses.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3581.P3

Table 3: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values\*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=31)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
-----	
35.5% (78 of 220 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 220 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 220 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
15.9% (35 of 220 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
13.2% (29 of 220 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
II10 OVERREPRESENTATION OF MINORITY YOUTH	6.5%
III15 EQUITABLE HANDLING	6.5%
VII2A PRESENT OFFENSE	6.5%
VII2B PRIOR OFFENSE	6.5%
VII2D AGE	6.5%
VII2M DESIRES OF VICTIMS	6.5%
VII2N LOSS OR HARM TO THE VICTIM	6.5%
VII7B WAIVER	6.5%
VIII3 PERSONAL BELIEFS ABOUT ACCOUNTABILITY	6.5%
X2G PROSECUTORS	6.5%
XIII7B JUVENILE JUSTICE (MONTHS)	6.5%
XIII7C PRESENT POSITION (MONTHS)	6.5%
XIII8C WORKED IN ADULT CORRECTIONS	6.5%
XIII8D WORKED IN A SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY	6.5%
II4 ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS OR SERVICES (OPEN)	9.7%
VII4A PRESENT OFFENSE	9.7%
VII4B PRIOR OFFENSE RECORD	9.7%
VII4C ATTITUDE AND Demeanor	9.7%
VII4D AGE	9.7%
VII4E EMOTIONAL STABILITY	9.7%
VII4J DRUG INVOLVEMENT	9.7%
VII4K TREATMENT NEEDS	9.7%
VII4M AVAILABILITY COMMUNITY BASED	9.7%
VII4N ABILITY COMMUNITY BASED EFFECTIVE	9.7%
=====	

Table 3 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
VII4O DESIRES OF VICTIMS	9.7%
VII4P LOSS OR HARM TO THE VICTIM	9.7%
VII4Q SCHOOL ATTENDANCE OR BEHAVIOR	9.7%
VII8 PROSECUTORS BE MORE OR LESS INVOLVED	9.7%
XIII3 RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND	9.7%
7.3% (16 of 220 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
VII2C ATTITUDE AND Demeanor	12.9%
VII2J PLACEMENT HISTORY	12.9%
VII2K AVAILABILITY COMMUNITY BASED	12.9%
VII2L ABILITY COMMUNITY BASED EFFECTIVE	12.9%
VII2O GANG ASSOCIATION	12.9%
VII4H PARENTAL COOPERATION	12.9%
VII4L PLACEMENT HISTORY	12.9%
VII4R GANG ASSOCIATION	12.9%
VII7D MONITORING	12.9%
VIII2 'ACCOUNTABILITY' MOST IMPORTANT	12.9%
VII2G PARENTAL COOPERATION	16.1%
VII2I DRUG INVOLVEMENT	16.1%
VII4F STABILITY OF THE FAMILY	16.1%
VII2E STABILITY OF THE FAMILY	19.4%
VII2H SEX	19.4%
VII4G PARENT(S) PRESENCE	19.4%
9.1% (20 of 220 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
XIII12B USEFUL	22.6%
VII2F PARENT(S) PRESENCE IN COURT	25.8%
XIII5F 21 AND OVER	25.8%
XIII5A NO CHILDREN	29.0%
XIII5B UNDER 6	29.0%
XIII5E 16-20	29.0%
XIII13D OTHER	29.0%
VII6A PRESENT OFFENSE	32.3%
VII6B PRIOR OFFENSE	32.3%
VII6D AGE	32.3%
VII6P LOSS OR HARM TO THE VICTIM	32.3%
VII6Q SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND/OR BEHAVIOR	32.3%
XIII5C 6-10	32.3%
XIII5D 11-15	32.3%
VII4I SEX	35.5%

Table 3 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
VII6K TREATMENT NEEDS	35.5%
VII6R GANG ASSOCIATION	35.5%
XIII13E SPECIFY (OPEN)	35.5%
VII6C ATTITUDE AND Demeanor	38.7%
VII6L PLACEMENT HISTORY	38.7%
19.1% (42 of 220 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values	
VII6E EMOTIONAL STABILITY	41.9%
VII6O DESIRES OF VICTIMS	41.9%
XIII12A HOW MANY MEETINGS	41.9%
VII6J DRUG INVOLVEMENT	45.2%
VI2 SDM INFLUENCES HANDLING OF CASES	48.4%
VII6H PARENTAL COOPERATION	48.4%
VII6M AVAILABILITY OF COMMUNITY BASED SERVICE	48.4%
VII6N ABILITY OF COMMUNITY BASED EFFECTIVE	48.4%
VII6F STABILITY OF THE FAMILY	51.6%
VII6G PARENT(S) PRESENCE IN COURT	51.6%
VI1A FAMILIAR WITH SDM	54.8%
VI3A RISK ASSESSMENT	54.8%
VI3B NEEDS ASSESSMENT	54.8%
VI3C SECURITY LEVEL CLASSIFICATION	54.8%
X3A JUDGES	54.8%
X3B POLICE	54.8%
X3C STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS	54.8%
X3D MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS	54.8%
X3E PROBATION OFFICERS	54.8%
X3F DEFENSE ATTORNEYS	54.8%
X3G PROSECUTORS	54.8%
X3H PRIVATE PROGRAM PROVIDERS	54.8%
X3I SOCIAL WORKERS	54.8%
X3L COMMUNITY RESIDENTS	54.8%
X3M TEACHERS	54.8%
VI4A TOO LENIENT	58.1%
VI4B ABOUT RIGHT	58.1%
VI4C TOO RESTRICTIVE	58.1%
VII6I SEX	58.1%
X3J YOUTH ADVOCACY ORGANIZATIONS	58.1%
X3K MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS	58.1%
XIII13B STATE BAR ASSOCIATION	61.3%
VI1 LIST TYPES OF SDM (OPEN)	64.5%
X2N PARENT OF YOUTH	64.5%

Table 3 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
XIIII13C LOCAL BAR ASSOCIATION	67.7%
VIII8E2 SPECIFY (OPEN)	74.2%
XIIII13A STATE COURT ADMINISTRATORS OFFICE	77.4%
VI2A HOW? (OPEN)	90.3%
XIIII10B ADULT CRIMINAL	93.5%
XIIII10A ADULT CIVIL	96.8%
XIIII10C OTHER	96.8%
XIIII10D SPECIFY	96.8%

\*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.  
Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected  
in the data as coded.

\*\*Values labeled "N/A" are combined with general missing in this table  
because the principal investigator determined the "N/A" distinction  
was inconsequential and so combined the 9 and 99 codes in her  
analyses.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3581.P4

Table 4: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values\*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=58)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
-----	
30.9% (68 of 220 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 220 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
10.9% (24 of 220 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
14.1% (31 of 220 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
8.6% (19 of 220 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
III2A MOST IMPORTANT	5.2%
III2C LEAST IMPORTANT	5.2%
IV2C LEAST IMPORTANT	5.2%
VII4N ABILITY COMMUNITY BASED EFFECTIVE	5.2%
VII4R GANG ASSOCIATION	5.2%
X2F DEFENSE ATTORNEYS	5.2%
XIII8A WORKED IN EDUCATION	5.2%
XIII8B WORKED IN POLICING	5.2%
XIII8C WORKED IN ADULT CORRECTIONS	5.2%
XIII8D WORKED IN A SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY	5.2%
IV2A MOST IMPORTANT	6.9%
IV2B SECOND MOST	6.9%
VII7C DISPOSITIONS (OPEN)	6.9%
VII9 PUBLIC DEFENDERS DISCRETIONARY POWER	6.9%
XIII3 RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND	6.9%
XIII7A PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE (MONTHS)	6.9%
XIII8E PARTICPATD PROFESSIONL/VOLNTRY ACTIVTIE	6.9%
III2B SECOND MOST	8.6%
VII4P LOSS OR HARM TO THE VICTIM	8.6%
2.3% (5 of 220 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
VII7A PETITION (OPEN)	10.3%
VII7B WAIVER (OPEN)	10.3%
=====	

Table 4 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
VII7D MONITORING (OPEN)	12.1%
VII40 DESIRES OF VICTIMS	13.8%
II4 ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS OR SERVICES (OPEN)	17.2%
4.5% (10 of 220 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
VII8 PUBLIC DEFENDER BE MORE OR LESS INVOLVE	24.1%
VII1 LIST TYPES OF SDM (OPEN)	27.6%
VII4I SEX	29.3%
VI3B NEEDS ASSESSMENT	31.0%
VI3A RISK ASSESSMENT	32.8%
XIII11 HOW LONG CONTINUE DEFENDING JUV CASES	34.5%
XIII12B USEFUL	34.5%
VI2 SDM INFLUENCES HANDLING OF CASES	37.9%
VI3C SECURITY LEVEL CLASSIFICATION	37.9%
XIII13E SPECIFY (OPEN)	39.7%
28.6% (63 of 220 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values	
XIII12A HOW MANY MEETINGS	41.4%
XIII13D OTHER	44.8%
VII6A PRESENT OFFENSE	46.6%
VII6B PRIOR OFFENSE	46.6%
VII6D AGE	46.6%
VII6N ABILITY OF COMMUNITY BASED EFFECTIVE	46.6%
VI4C TOO RESTRICTIVE	48.3%
VII6C ATTITUDE AND Demeanor	48.3%
VII6E EMOTIONAL STABILITY	48.3%
VII6F STABILITY OF THE FAMILY	48.3%
VII6K TREATMENT NEEDS	48.3%
VII6L PLACEMENT HISTORY	48.3%
VII6M AVAILABILITY OF COMMUNITY BASED SERVICE	48.3%
VII6Q SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND/OR BEHAVIOR	48.3%
VII6R GANG ASSOCIATION	48.3%
VI4A TOO LENIENT	50.0%
VI4B ABOUT RIGHT	50.0%
VII6G PARENT(S) PRESENCE IN COURT	50.0%
VII6H PARENTAL COOPERATION	50.0%
VII6J DRUG INVOLVEMENT	50.0%
VII6P LOSS OR HARM TO THE VICTIM	50.0%
XIII13B STATE BAR ASSOCIATION	53.4%
XIII13C LOCAL BAR ASSOCIATION	53.4%



Table 4 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values	
VII60	DESIRES OF VICTIMS	55.2%
VII6I	SEX	63.8%
XIII10B	ADULT CRIMINAL	63.8%
VI2A	HOW? (OPEN)	69.0%
XIII10A	ADULT CIVIL	72.4%
XIII10C	OTHER	75.9%
XIII10D	SPECIFY	77.6%
X1G	PUBLIC DEFENDERS	84.5%
X2G	PUBLIC DEFENDERS	84.5%
VII2A	PRESENT OFFENSE	89.7%
VII2B	PRIOR OFFENSE	89.7%
VII2C	ATTITUDE AND DEMEANOR	89.7%
VII2D	AGE	89.7%
VII2E	STABILITY OF THE FAMILY	89.7%
VII2F	PARENT(S) PRESENCE IN COURT	89.7%
VII2G	PARENTAL COOPERATION	89.7%
VII2H	SEX	89.7%
VII2I	DRUG INVOLVEMENT	89.7%
VII2J	PLACEMENT HISTORY	89.7%
VII2K	AVAILABILITY COMMUNITY BASED	89.7%
VII2L	ABILITY COMMUNITY BASED EFFECTIVE	89.7%
VII2M	DESIRES OF VICTIMS	89.7%
VII2N	LOSS OR HARM TO THE VICTIM	89.7%
VII2O	GANG ASSOCIATION	89.7%
XIII13A	STATE COURT ADMINISTRATORS OFFICE	91.4%
VI1A	FAMILIAR WITH SDM	100.0%
X3A	JUDGES	100.0%
X3B	POLICE	100.0%
X3C	STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS	100.0%
X3D	MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS	100.0%
X3E	PROBATION OFFICERS	100.0%
X3F	DEFENSE ATTORNEYS	100.0%
X3G	PROSECUTORS	100.0%
X3H	PRIVATE PROGRAM PROVIDERS	100.0%
X3I	SOCIAL WORKERS	100.0%
X3J	YOUTH ADVOCACY ORGANIZATIONS	100.0%
X3K	MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS	100.0%
X3L	COMMUNITY RESIDENTS	100.0%
X3M	TEACHERS	100.0%
XIII8E2	SPECIFY (OPEN)	100.0%

\*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.  
Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected  
in the data as coded.

\*\*Values labeled "N/A" are combined with general missing in this table  
because the principal investigator determined the "N/A" distinction  
was inconsequential and so combined the 9 and 99 codes in her  
analyses.