



The author(s) shown below used Federal funding provided by the U.S. Department of Justice to prepare the following resource:

Document Title: Understanding Ethnic Disparities in Juvenile Probation: What Affects Decisions?

Author(s): Rudy Haapanen, Ph.D.

Document Number: 250802

Date Received: June 2017

Award Number: 2014-JF-FX-0105

This resource has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. This resource is being made publically available through the Office of Justice Programs' National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

possible, similar categories were used in both counties. Due to differences in how dispositions are noted, these categories included somewhat different specific actions in the two counties, however. The specifics of how these categories were operationalized in the two counties are discussed in the two results sections. The following general categories were used in both counties:

- No Action—cases left pending, merged with other referrals, referred to supervising officers, or simply closed with no action.
- Informal Probation-level Action—letter of warning, informal probation, referral to a local diversion program.
- District Attorney Reject/No Action by Juvenile Court—cases rejected by the district attorney or forwarded to the juvenile court, but without any action taken.
- Informal Court Action (654.2, DEJ)—Juvenile Court-level informal six-month or twelve-month probation or, for felony cases, “deferred entry of judgement,” with the petition dropped if successfully completed.
- Probation (Home/Placement)—formal adjudication/true finding/wardship.
- Secure Facility/DJJ/Adult Court—formal adjudication with secure confinement in a county facility or state-level institution (DJJ). This category also included the few cases filed in adult court.

The last two categories involved important differences between the two counties. In Sacramento county, secure confinement was not shown in the electronic record (these were included in the “probation” category). In contrast, San Joaquin county probation sentences may have been shown as “secure confinement” if the youth was booked prior to adjudication (similar to “credit for time served” at the adult level).

