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“In If there is no struggle, there is no progress” - Frederick Douglass
Executive Summary

This report, the second in a series of three Center for Law and Justice analyses of the impact of federal, state and local criminal justice system practices on minorities in the Capital Region, examines “Disproportionate Minority Contact” within the Capital Region juvenile justice system.

Section I of the report describes the state of the juvenile justice system in New York, and the widely-acknowledged need for change. From 2000 to 2008, the number of juveniles in residential facilities fell by 26% nationally, and by more than 30% in New York State. Racial and ethnic disparities, however, persist. Though African American and Latino youth comprise only 44% of the state’s youth population, they represent more than 80% of placements in New York’s juvenile institutional facilities. This phenomenon, in conjunction with other disturbing characteristics of the juvenile justice system, motivated the State’s two most recent governors to insist on systemic change.

Section II describes the juvenile justice system process, explaining key terms including “juvenile delinquent,” “juvenile arrest,” “detention,” “petition,” “delinquency finding,” and “confinement.”

Section III presents data that clearly indicate the disproportionate representation of minorities, compared to their representation in the general population, at all stages of the juvenile justice process. In Albany County, minority youth represented 30% of the local juvenile population, yet accounted for 55% of juvenile arrests, 85% of secure juvenile detentions, 75% of juvenile cases petitioned, 78% of cases with a finding of juvenile delinquency, and 83% of cases resulting in probation placements. In Rensselaer County, minority youth represented 18% of the local juvenile population, yet accounted for 42% of juvenile arrests, 48% of juvenile secure detentions, 59% of cases petitioned, 67% of cases with a finding of juvenile delinquency, and 40% of cases resulting in probation placement. In Schenectady County, minority youth represented 29% of the local juvenile population, yet accounted for 54% of juvenile arrests, 78% of juvenile secure detentions, 78% of cases petitioned, 78% of cases with a finding of juvenile delinquency, and 84% of cases resulting in probation placement. In all three counties, minorities accounted for a disproportionate number of individuals in juvenile correctional facilities, though the total number was below 10 in each county.

Section IV describes the devastating consequences of involvement with the juvenile justice system, including the possibility of placement in one of the state’s secure confinement facilities, which have been found to foster brutal results. Most troublesome is how much more likely it is for children of color to become enmeshed in the juvenile justice system through such avenues as the “school to prison pipeline.” Children who are incarcerated as minors are likely to be incarcerated as adults.

Section V provides specific recommendations for improvement, encouraging Capital Region juvenile justice officials and the communities they serve to acknowledge Disproportionate Minority Contact, embrace the need for change, and work together to save our children.
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Introduction

In an effort to stimulate dialogue and promote meaningful change in the Capital Region criminal justice system, the Center for Law and Justice (CFLJ) is publishing three reports documenting current areas of concern. The Center’s first report (February 2012) focused on the disproportionate impact of the adult criminal justice system on people of color in the Capital Region. This second report examines “Disproportionate Minority Contact” within the Capital Region juvenile justice system, and a third will address the impact of federal drug law enforcement efforts.

The Center for Law and Justice is a community-based organization that envisions a peaceful, just, and compassionate community that provides each resident with equal access to the goods, services and opportunities of that community. The Center also seeks the fair and just treatment of all people throughout the civil and criminal justice systems, and works to reduce reliance upon incarceration.

Founded nearly three decades ago and located in the City of Albany, the Center has been at the forefront of most major criminal justice issues of concern to residents of New York State. Troubled by the historical racial, ethnic, and economic disparities that exist throughout the criminal justice system, it is the Center’s primary mission to promote a fair and equitable criminal justice system devoted to public safety and social justice. Not only has the Center advocated strenuously for the rights of the poor and people of color, but also has worked closely with key players in local and state criminal justice systems. CFLJ has helped to develop policing and training policies, crime prevention programs and strategies, and legal rights advocacy and education programs. In addition, the Center has worked to reduce sentencing disparities and promote sound probation, parole, judicial, and sentencing policies, and has been a leader in efforts to empower families and communities adversely affected by incarceration.

Juvenile justice system policies and practices have a disproportionately adverse impact on children of color in the Capital Region. From arrest to confinement, the numbers of minorities at each stage of the juvenile justice system far exceed their representation in the general population in Albany, Schenectady and Rensselaer counties. Once involved in the juvenile justice system, individuals are more at risk of becoming involved with the criminal justice system when they are adults.
Section I: The State of Juvenile Justice in New York

In December 2009, Governor David Paterson’s Task Force for Transforming Juvenile Justice released its final report, entitled “Charting a New Course: A Blueprint for Transforming Juvenile Justice in New York State.” The appointment of the task force occurred in large part because a United States Department of Justice (Civil Rights Division) investigation of New York State juvenile correctional facilities had found “that staff consistently responded to minor incidents with excessive force, resulting in serious physical injuries to young people.” Other reasons for systemic change cited by the task force were the excessive per-child, annual cost ($210,000 at the time of the task force’s appointment); the fact that the system appeared “unfair” to racial and ethnic minorities; and the apparent ineffectiveness of the system. Recidivism data cited in the task force report indicate that “of all youth released from state custody between 1991 and 1995, 75% were re-arrested, 62% were reconvicted, and 45 percent were re-incarcerated within three years of their release.

The findings of the U.S. Department of Justice’s 2009 investigation depict juvenile correctional facilities in which staff used inappropriate force; children’s mental health needs went unmet; and substance abuse histories were unaddressed. In their complaint filed against the state, the federal government reports the use of a type of physical restraint used by facility staff:

In particular, the use of prone restraint is controversial and has been banned by many facilities nationwide due to the high risk of serious injury or death. In spite of the known risk of prone restraints, staff at the facilities are trained to use prone restraints. The danger of prone restraints is that if the individual’s airway is constricted, he or she is unable to express physical distress. Further, the restrained individual’s struggle for air may be misconstrued by staff as resistance, resulting in increased force on the restrained individual. Indeed, in November 2006, a 15-year-old resident at Tryon Boys died following a prone restraint. The youth allegedly pushed a staff member and then was pinned face-down on the floor and handcuffed by two staff. The youth stopped breathing only minutes later, and then died at a nearby hospital. His death was ruled a homicide by the medical examiner. Despite this tragic death, a dangerous combination of high rates of prone restraints and a low standard for initiating a restraint remains at the facilities.

The investigation also found that despite the fact that many of those housed in juvenile correctional facilities have been diagnosed with mental illnesses, treatment is often not provided and the reactions of staff to the juveniles’ behaviors may make the situation worse. One girl’s experience was described as follows:

Before being placed in the facility, she had been the victim of a serious sexual assault, had been placed in a psychiatric hospital, and had been suspended from school for fighting. The facility psychiatrist recommended that the youth receive psychotherapy in order to address her past trauma. Her single, simplistic treatment goal was: “Youth will identify one way that her behavior has consequences for her and for others” and listed the same treatment modalities as
for any other youth at the facility. Several days after her treatment plan was completed, the youth attempted to hang herself with a shoelace. In a suicide risk evaluation following this incident, the youth asserted that “as long as she is feeling this bad, she will try to kill herself.” Despite these signs of serious mental distress, her treatment plan remained unchanged following the suicide attempt.5

The Department of Justice’s complaint also notes the lack of adequate substance abuse treatment provided at the facilities:

One youth has a self-reported history of daily marijuana use, and indicated that her father also has a substance abuse history. She was diagnosed in the initial facility psychiatric evaluation with Cannabis Abuse (among other diagnoses). She was not, however, referred for any substance abuse treatment.6

The federal and state governments have entered into an agreement to address these dire conditions, and it is encouraging that the numbers of children housed in juvenile correctional facilities are decreasing. From 2000 to 2008, the number of juveniles in residential facilities fell by 26% nationally, and by more than 30% in New York State.7 Racial and ethnic disparities, however, persist. Though African American and Latino youth comprise only 44% of the state’s youth population, they represent more than 80% of placements in New York’s juvenile institutional facilities.8 The dismal state of the juvenile justice system thus has particular consequences for children of color.

Though the focus of Governor Paterson’s Task Force was the particular stage of the juvenile justice system process after a determination by a family court that a youth was a juvenile delinquent, they included among their list of items needing additional analysis “the disproportionate representation of youth of color at all system points.”9 According to their final report, “Racial disparities in the juvenile justice system are part of a much broader phenomenon that begins with the interactions between police and young people. Addressing racial disparities at the back end without a more comprehensive examination of the entire system represents an incomplete and wholly inadequate response to a grave reality.”10

The findings of a very recent Stanford University report reinforce the notion that involvement with the juvenile justice system can have particularly harsh consequences for children of color. The experimental study presented subjects (all of them white) with the description of a juvenile in a 2010 United States Supreme Court case that determined that sentences of life imprisonment without parole may not be imposed for non-homicide offenses committed under the age of 18.11 All subjects received the identical description (with the exception of one word) of a 14-year-old male with 17 prior juvenile convictions who brutally raped an elderly woman; half the subjects were told that the juvenile was white, and half were told that he was black. Asked how juveniles should be sentenced under these circumstances, the subjects who were told the juvenile was black were statistically significantly more likely to support “life without parole” sentences for juveniles, than were those who were told the juvenile was white.12 Additionally, subjects who were told the juvenile was black were statistically significantly more likely to perceive juveniles as more similar to adults in blameworthiness, than were those who were told the juvenile was white.13 The researchers conclude, “These results
highlight the fragility of protections for juveniles when race is in play. Furthermore, we suggest that this fragility may have broad implications for how juveniles are seen and treated in the criminal justice system.\(^\text{14}\) *

Racial and ethnic disparities within New York’s juvenile justice system are documented, monitored and addressed by the Juvenile Justice Advisory Group (JJAG), within the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. These disparities are collectively called “Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)”: the overrepresentation and disparate treatment of youth of color in the juvenile justice system.\(^\text{15}\) New York’s JJAG has noted that minority youth are:

- More likely to have a case referred to juvenile court;
- Less likely to have their cases adjusted or diverted;
- More likely to have their case petitioned to the presentment agency for formal charges;
- And generally, less likely to receive a disposition of probation than white youth.\(^\text{16}\)

It has been contended that factors that may contribute to DMC are differential offending by minority youth (i.e., minority youths commit more criminal acts than white youth), and differential handling of minority youths by juvenile justice system officials. The notion of differential offending by minority youth has largely been discredited by the findings of the 2009 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey, which indicate that:

- Black, Hispanic, and white students were EQUALLY likely to have:
  - Carried a weapon on school property;
  - Carried a weapon; and
  - Used marijuana.

- White students were MORE likely than black and Hispanic students to have:
  - Had five or more drinks of alcohol in a row within a couple of hours

- Black students were LESS likely than Hispanic and white students to have:
  - Ever used any form of cocaine; and
  - Ever used hallucinogenic drugs (such as LSD, acid, PCP, angel dust, mescaline, or mushrooms).\(^\text{17}\)

It is imperative, then, that the differential handling of minority youth at different stages of the juvenile justice system be examined. Section II provides an overview of the juvenile justice system in New York State, and Section III provides Capital Region statistics.

Section II: The Juvenile Justice System Process

Section III provides statistics detailing the differential handling of minority youth at significant stages of the juvenile justice system in the Capital Region. The description of the stages of the juvenile justice system in this section are adapted largely from two documents, “Charting a New Course: A Blueprint for Transforming Juvenile Justice in New York State,” and “Tough on Crime: Promoting Public Safety By Doing What Works.”

Youth who are found by a family court to have committed an act (while between the ages of 7 and 15) that would be a crime if he/she were an adult are deemed “juvenile delinquents.”† The path to an adjudication of juvenile delinquency begins with a juvenile arrest.

A juvenile arrest (abbreviated “arrest” in the charts in Section III) occurs when one between the ages of 7 and 15 is taken into police custody in relation to the investigation of a crime. Juvenile detention (abbreviated “detention” in the charts in Section III) refers to holding a youth in a secure or non-secure facility prior to his/her court hearing; this is similar to pre-trial incarceration for adults.

The third stage of the juvenile justice system documented in Section III is designated “petitions.” A petition constitutes the formal filing of charges against a juvenile, similar to an indictment in the adult criminal system. It should be noted that several activities occur prior to the decision to file (or not file) a petition. “The local probation department conducts an intake assessment to determine whether an alleged juvenile delinquent should be referred to the prosecutor’s office or diverted from prosecution through services in the community. When cases are sent to the prosecutor’s office, prosecution staff decide whether and how to proceed.”

The fourth stage of the juvenile justice system documented in Section III is abbreviated “delinquency.” This refers to an adjudication and disposition by the family court that the youth has, in fact, committed the alleged act(s) and is considered a juvenile delinquent. The full family court processing consists of a “series of court hearings and procedures, including arraignment (initial appearance in court), fact finding (a finding by the judge that a youth committed some or all of the acts outlined in the court petition or criminal complaint), and disposition (when a judge determines whether a youth should be adjudicated—deemed a juvenile delinquent—and orders a sentence).”

The last two entries in the charts in Section III (abbreviated “probation” and “confinement”) represent two of the most severe dispositions that can be applied to one who has been adjudicated a juvenile delinquent; this stage is similar to the sentencing stage in the adult criminal justice system. In the charts, “probation” refers to the placement of the youth under the supervision of the county probation department, and “confinement” refers to the confinement of the youth in a secure juvenile correctional facility. (It should be noted that the youth may also

† In addition to the legal designation “juvenile delinquent,” there are two other classifications that apply to minors in New York. “Juvenile Offenders,” or JOs, are children 13 to 15 who have committed more serious or violent acts and may be treated as adults. The term “Youthful Offender,” or YO, generally refers to a person between the ages of 16 and 19 who has been granted “Youthful Offender” status by the court. A Youthful Offender is not considered to be convicted of a crime by New York State. This report addresses primarily issues related to the “juvenile delinquent” status.
be placed with a suitable caregiver, or with the county Department of Social Services, or in the custody of the New York State Office of Children and Family Services, the agency which administers state juvenile facilities). There are also less severe dispositions than probation that can be meted out, including a conditional discharge (in which the youth is released without court supervision but must comply with certain conditions for a period of time), and an adjournment in contemplation of dismissal (in which the case is dismissed if the youth complies with court conditions for a certain period of time).

To examine the differential handling of minority youth in the juvenile justice system in the Capital Region, Section III presents data regarding six different aspects of the system: arrest, detention, petition, delinquency, probation, and confinement.
Section III: The Juvenile Justice System Process in the Capital Region

The Juvenile Justice Advisory Group computes a ”Relative Rate Index” (RRI) that enumerates the over- or under-representation of people of color compared to the representation of whites.26 In this section of the report, the base numbers used by the JJAG to compute the RRIs for Albany, Rensselaer and Schenectady counties in 2009 (the most recent year for which data are available) are examined to demonstrate the over-representation of minority youth at six points in the juvenile justice system in the Capital Region.

The federal Office of Management and Budget sets five race categories as: American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; and White. These are the race categories used by the Juvenile Justice Advisory Group in the computation of the county RRIs. For the purposes of this section, the term “minority” includes anyone who is not in the “White” category.

The data clearly indicate disproportionate representations of minorities, compared to their representation in the general population, at all six points. (It should be noted that within the “confinement” category, the total numbers are very low: 9 for Albany County, 2 for Rensselaer County, and 1 for Schenectady County).

Figure 1 indicates that within Albany County in 2009, minority youth represented 30% of the local juvenile population, yet accounted for 55% of juvenile arrests, 85% of secure juvenile detentions, 75% of juvenile cases petitioned, 78% of findings of juvenile delinquency, 83% of probation placements, and 100% of youth (of a total of 9) in secure correctional facilities.27

Figure 1: Minority Youth Representation, Albany County (2009)

Sources: NYS Division of Criminal Justice Services; Juvenile Justice Advisory Group; U.S. Census Bureau

Percent who are minorities among:

(*Note: Total n for confinement = 9)
Figure 2 indicates that in Rensselaer County in 2009, minority youth represented 18% of the local juvenile population, yet accounted for 42% of juvenile arrests, 48% of juvenile secure detentions, 59% of cases petitioned, 67% of cases with a finding of juvenile delinquency, 40% of cases resulting in probation placement, and 50% of youth in secure juvenile corrections (of a total of 2).\textsuperscript{28}

**Figure 2: Minority Youth Representation, Rensselaer County (2009)**

Source: NYS Division of Criminal Justice Services, Juvenile Justice Advisory Group; U.S. Census Bureau

Percent who are minorities among:

(*Note: Total n for confinement = 2)*

Figure 3 indicates that in Schenectady County in 2009, minority youth represented 29% of the local juvenile population, yet accounted for 54% of juvenile arrests, 78% of juvenile secure detentions, 78% of cases petitioned, 78% of cases with a finding of juvenile delinquency, 84% of cases resulting in probation placement, and 100% of youth in secure juvenile corrections (of a total of 1).\textsuperscript{29}
Given the severe consequences of involvement with the juvenile justice system, this disproportionate representation of minorities among those in the Capital Region juvenile justice system must be addressed. Section IV examines the direct and indirect (“collateral”) consequences of involvement with the juvenile justice system.
Section IV: The Consequences of Involvement with the Juvenile Justice System

The most alarming consequence of a youth’s involvement with the juvenile justice system is the possibility that he or she may be placed in one of the state’s secure confinement facilities, which have been found to foster brutal results. “Despite the strong research showing that a rehabilitative model of corrections is what works to reduce crime among adolescents, New York’s juvenile placement system is rooted in a traditional correctional approach. For youth who end up placed, it meets misbehavior and offending with incarceration, with only spotty regard for whether the punishment will be effective in reducing future crimes.”

Beyond the inherently punitive, rather than rehabilitative, atmosphere of the state’s juvenile correctional facilities, they are for the most part located hundreds of miles from the juvenile’s home --- thus limiting his or her interaction with positive influences in his or her life. Advocates for community alternatives to incarceration for juveniles make the case for placement closer to the juvenile’s community: “Keeping young people close to home simply makes good sense. Even when the youth is placed out-of-home, it will be easier for parents and other family members to visit, and easier for juvenile justice service providers to interact with families to ensure effective reentry when the youth returns home.”

Most troublesome is how much more likely it is for children of color to become enmeshed in the juvenile justice system. The American Civil Liberties Union is one of several organizations challenging the “school to prison pipeline.:

… a disturbing national trend wherein children are funneled out of public schools and into the juvenile and criminal justice systems. Many of these children have learning disabilities or histories of poverty, abuse or neglect, and would benefit from additional educational and counseling services. Instead, they are isolated, punished and pushed out. "Zero-tolerance" policies criminalize minor infractions of school rules, while high-stakes testing programs encourage educators to push out low-performing students to improve their schools' overall test scores. Students of color are especially vulnerable to push-out trends and the discriminatory application of discipline.

The New York Civil Liberties Union reports that the consequences of the “school to prison pipeline” can be particularly severe for minority youth:

- Black students represented only 17% of national public school enrollment in 2000 but accounted for 34% of suspensions;
- Special education students represent 8.6% of public school students, but 32% of youth in juvenile detention nationwide;
- Black students with learning disabilities are three times more likely to be suspended than white students with learning disabilities and four times more likely to end up in correctional facilities;
- School disciplinary, juvenile, and criminal records work against disadvantaged students when they apply for colleges, scholarships, jobs, and selective high schools.
Perhaps the most devastating consequence of involvement with the juvenile justice system is that youth who are placed in a juvenile correctional facility are likely to return to the system as adult offenders. One 2008 study of New York releasees found that by the time children who had been released from a state facility had reached their 28th birthday, 89% of the boys and 81% of the girls had been rearrested; 71% of the boys and 32% of the girls had spent time in an adult jail or prison.³⁴

Once introduced to the adult criminal justice system, individuals are subject to all of the “collateral consequences” of arrest and/or conviction. In “The Consequences of Criminal Charges: A People’s Guide,” the Bronx Defenders explain the concept of “collateral consequences:”

“Collateral consequences,” is a popular label for the legal, social, and economic barriers to a person’s reentry into his or her community. Although many people released from prison or jail leave with the hope of a fresh start, these barriers to reintegration can feel like the continuation of a prison sentence. In fact, these collateral consequences may take place at both ends of the criminal process system: at the beginning when an individual is arrested, charged, and perhaps considering a plea bargain; and at the end when an individual is released from prison. Even a mere arrest, or minor charges with no jail time, may result in collateral consequences. Collateral consequences have been described as “invisible punishment” because they are not clearly set forth in the New York criminal law. Therefore, they are not usually explained the way prison terms and parole eligibility typically are, as part of the direct consequences of criminal convictions. Instead, the rules that result in collateral consequences are found scattered throughout New York and federal civil laws, making them more difficult to find and understand, and avoid.³⁵

In New York State, conviction and/or incarceration can impose highly restrictive educational, employment, housing, and civic conditions on an individual, including losing the right to vote. Given the ultimately destructive consequences of involvement with the juvenile and criminal justice systems, it is imperative that Capital Region officials and the communities they serve take action immediately to address conditions that promote the disproportionate representation of children of color in the juvenile justice system.
Section V: Recommendations

New York State has already begun an earnest effort to reform the juvenile justice system, Governor Cuomo’s “Close to Home” initiative. Anticipating that implementation of the effort will begin in the fall of 2012, the Office of Children and Family Services states:

Close to Home is a juvenile justice reform initiative designed to help keep youth close to their home communities. When fully implemented, the initiative will require juvenile delinquent youths from New York City, who the Family Court has determined need placement in other than secure settings, to be placed with the New York City Administration for Children Services (ACS).  

Although the “Close to Home” initiative does not immediately affect the Capital Region because it currently applies only to New York City (the source of the vast majority of placements in state juvenile correctional facilities), the stated objectives of the program provide guidance for the design of a more effective and bias-free approach to juvenile justice. The new system is designed to:

- Provide an effective continuum of diversion, supervision, treatment and confinement to ensure that the most appropriate level of care is provided for all youth, consistent with public safety;
- Keep youth close to home to minimize separation from their families and build on positive connections between young people and their communities;
- Provide accountability to ensure that both internal and external oversight is maintained;
- Be data-driven to ensure key decisions are objective and information about changes in policy and practice is transparent;
- Promote family and community involvement to strengthen positive family and community supports;
- Be based on evidence-informed practices to ensure that programs and services have improved outcomes for youth, maintained public safety, reduced recidivism and unwarranted racial/ethnic disparities; and
- Provide effective reintegration services to ensure youth remain connected to appropriate educational services and positive behavioral supports and/or treatments when they transition out of placement.

Though it may be some time before the objectives of the “Close to Home” initiative benefit Albany, Rensselaer and Schenectady counties, there are steps that can be taken now by local juvenile justice officials and the communities they serve to address the disproportionate representation of minority youth in the Capital Region juvenile justice system. As previously noted in this report, Governor Paterson’s Task Force on Transforming Juvenile Justice recognized the need for change at all stages of the juvenile justice system:
Racial disparities in the juvenile justice system are part of a much broader phenomenon that begins with the interactions between police and young people. Addressing racial disparities at the back end without a more comprehensive examination of the entire system represents an incomplete and wholly inadequate response to a grave reality. 38

In its mandate to provide recommendations for reform of the juvenile justice system post-adjudication, the Task Force includes as one of its proposed strategies: “Train all facilities’ staff in cultural competency, positive youth development, and relevant treatment approaches and philosophies.”39 In addressing disproportionate minority representation, the Task Force also recommended that “stakeholders from communities of color have a meaningful role in the process.”40

In light of the exceptionally disproportionate representation of minority youth in the Capital Region juvenile justice system, the Center for Law and Justice makes the following recommendations:

**Recommendation 1:** There should be a series of community-wide discussions regarding the disproportionate representation of children of color in the Capital Region juvenile justice system. Additionally, community organizations should devise and implement methods to educate the general public regarding the impact of disproportionate minority contact on children of color, their families, and their communities in the Capital Region.

**Recommendation 2:** All police departments, district attorney’s offices, public defenders and the judiciary must be trained in cultural competency (the ability to work with people from all cultural identities in a way that promotes respect and dignity), including the examination of personal biases.

**Recommendation 3:** Community organizations should immediately explore the possibility of soliciting the services of the New York State Juvenile Justice Advisory Group (JJAG) for assistance in implementing Recommendations 1 and 2, above. The JJAG provides a workshop entitled **Understanding Disproportionate Minority Contact in the State Juvenile Justice System**, cost-free to local juvenile justice officials.41

2 The Vera Institute of Justice 14.

3 The Vera Institute of Justice 10.


5 United States Department of Justice, Attachment p. 25.

6 United States Department of Justice, Attachment p. 27.


8 The Vera Institute of Justice 14.

9 The Vera Institute of Justice 16.

10 The Vera Institute of Justice 28.


12 Rattan 3.

13 Rattan 3.

14 Rattan 1.


16 Ramirez 16.

17 Ramirez 22.


19 The Vera Institute of Justice 20-21.

20 The Vera Institute of Justice 20-21.

21 The Vera Institute of Justice 20-21.

22 The Vera Institute of Justice 20-21.

23 The Vera Institute of Justice 20-21.
24 The Vera Institute of Justice 20-21.


26 Ramirez 13.


37 New York State Office of Children and Family Services.

38 The Vera Institute of Justice 28.

39 The Vera Institute of Justice 13.

40 The Vera Institute of Justice 27.

The Disproportionate Impact of the Juvenile Justice System on Children of Color in the Capital Region

The Center for Law and Justice
Alice P. Green, Ph. D., Executive Director
518-427-8361
www.cflj.org