

# North Dakota Juvenile Detention Screening Tool Study

Charles Puzzanchera

National Center for Juvenile Justice

May 2015



*NCJJ is the Research Division of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges*

This report was prepared by the National Center for Juvenile Justice, the research division of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. The work was supported by funds from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's State Training and Technical Assistance Center [2011-MU-FX-K009]. North Dakota Supreme Court provided detention screening and other key data to support the work.

Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the position or policies of the North Dakota Supreme Court Services or the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Copyright 2015  
National Center for Juvenile Justice  
3700 South Water Street, Suite 200  
Pittsburgh, PA. 15203-2363  
412-227-6950  
[www.ncjj.org](http://www.ncjj.org)

Suggested citation: Puzzanchera, Charles. 2015. *North Dakota Juvenile Detention Screening Tool Study*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

*For questions or comments about this report contact:*  
Charles Puzzanchera  
[cpuzzanchera@ncjfcj.org](mailto:cpuzzanchera@ncjfcj.org)

## Background

---

A 2007 DMC assessment study in Burleigh County, North Dakota recommended piloting of a detention screening tool. The Juvenile Detention Screening Tool used in North Dakota was adopted from a tool implemented in Iowa. As a participant in the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI), the screening tool used by Iowa has been subject to validation, most recently in May 2014. Over the last few years, the North Dakota Juvenile Detention Screening Tool has only been used in select counties; to date, little has been done to validate the tool and questions remain as to whether the instrument, as currently designed and implemented, is ready for statewide use.

In large measure, the purpose of this report to help the North Dakota Supreme Court determine the utility of the current instrument, and, where appropriate, provide guidance prior to state-wide implementation. To the extent supported by the data, this report seeks to address whether any changes/modifications should be made to the current instrument, to insure the instrument does not pose a risk to public safety (e.g., providing recommendations for release or a non-secure alternative for youth who should be detained), and examine issues related to DMC.

## Study Overview

---

This project emanated from a technical assistance request submitted by the North Dakota Supreme Court to OJJDP's State Relations and Assistance Division. The request specified a validation study of a detention screening tool to measure its success in terms of meeting public safety, limiting detention use, and reducing disproportionate minority contact. A detention screening tool has been piloted for a number of years in the South Central Judicial District in North Dakota. As noted on the technical assistance request form, the tool appears to be having an impact on the use of detention and disproportionate minority contact (DMC). In Burleigh County, the relative rate index for the detention decision involving Native American youth fell from 2.6 in 2009, to 1.6 in 2011, the first full year of implementation of the detention screening tool. Despite these positive strides, the North Dakota Supreme Court would like to have the tool validated to ensure its effectiveness before implementation in other courts. The National Center for Juvenile Justice was assigned as the technical assistance provider, and this report hopes to shed light on the utility of the Juvenile Detention Screening Tool with respect to detention utilization, DMC, and maintaining public safety.

Several data sources were used for this project. The first file contained the risk instrument scoring from 173 screenings from Burleigh and Morton counties involving 143 youth conducted between January 2012 and December 2013. This file included complete scoring details across the six sections of the Juvenile Detention Screening Tool, along with basic youth demographic information, and, where applicable, the reasons for a mandatory hold or detention override. The second file contained detention admission records. As with the screening tool data, this file captured basic youth demographic information, along with detention admission/release dates, and the charge(s) related to the detention admission. The final

major data piece was a charge level juvenile court file; this fourth was used to examine post-release outcomes for youth exiting detention.

## **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the Juvenile Detention Screening Tool Study is to measure the post-implementation impact of the instrument on factors relating to public safety, disproportionality, and detention utilization. Descriptive statistics show the profile of detention requests and addresses fundamental questions to better understand the instrument's impact on detention rates, disproportionate minority contact, and public safety. The study focuses on detention rates and offender profiles among different groups of youth and examines the reoffending patterns for those released from detention.

## **Characteristics of the Screening Sample**

Data for the study documented the characteristics of youth who were screened between January 2012 and December 2013. During this period, 173 screenings were conducted involving 143 youth. The sample was predominantly male (68%); white youth accounted for 44% of all screenings, Native American youth accounted for another 40%, and Hispanic youth accounted for 6% of those screened during the study period. It is important to note that detention screenings were only conducted for those youth that law enforcement believed should not be placed in Attendant Care (i.e. non-secure alternative). As such, the sample excludes an unknown number of youth that may have been eligible for detention.

## **Summary of Key Results**

---

### **Detention Outcomes Overall**

Of the 173 screenings conducted during the study period, 163 were detained, for an overall detention rate of 94%. The combined detention rate for Burleigh and Morton counties is quite high. More than one-fifth (22%, 36 of 163) of those recommended for detention involved youth who presented factors that triggered mandatory holds at the time of the screening. A non-secure detention alternative was recommended for about 1% of the sample, while 5% were recommended for release.

### **Detention Outcomes by Offense**

Table 1 presents detention outcomes by offense category (i.e., section 1 of the detention screening tool) for the screening sample. Detention rates were high (80% or greater) for all five offense categories represented on the instrument. Not surprisingly, youth charged with a felony against a person/felony weapon had the highest detention rate in this sample (98%), while youth charged with Class A misdemeanors against persons experienced the lowest detention rate (80%). Somewhat surprisingly was the fact that youth charged with "other misdemeanors," an offense category that contributes 2 points to the overall risk score, had the second highest detention rate (93%). Upon closer inspection, all of those charged with "other misdemeanors" were detained as the result of a detention override. Detention

alternatives were infrequent for this sample: 2 (1%) of all screenings resulted in a recommendation for attendant care.

**Table 1: Most serious offense category by risk screening outcomes**

Points	Offense Category	Screenings		Detained	
		Count	Percent	Count	Rate
<b>Total</b>		<b>173</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>94%</b>
16	Felony against person/Felony weapon	40	23%	39	98%
13	Felony drug distribution	9	5%	8	89%
10	All other felonies	43	25%	39	91%
5	Class A misdemeanors against persons	10	6%	8	80%
2	Other misdemeanors	29	17%	27	93%
	No entry	6	3%	6	100%
	Out of state hold	3	2%	3	100%
	Court order/house arrest	30	17%	30	100%
	Drug court sanction hold	0	0%	0	0%
	Unspecified*	3	2%	3	100%

\* During preliminary diagnostic work, three screenings surfaced that should have been classified as pick-up and holds. The scoring instruments for each did not include a mandatory hold reason, but these are likely either a court order/house arrest or out of state hold.

### Detention Outcomes by Risk Score

On the Juvenile Detention Screening Tool, a score of 13 points is the threshold for detention, i.e., the default result for youth scoring 13 or more points is detention. Youth who score between 8 and 12 points are eligible for attendant care, while youth accumulating scores between 0 and 7 points are deemed low risk and are eligible for release. Additionally, detention overrides — “up” to a more restrictive sanction or “down” to a less restrictive one — provide flexibility to deviate from the risk score recommendation.

More than one of every ten (13%, N=23) of those screened received scores between 0 and 7 points. Among these low-risk group, 2 were recommended for release. The remaining 21 (91%) were overridden up to detention.

Another 36 (21%) received mid-range scores between 8 and 12 points, rendering them eligible for a non-secure detention alternative. However, thirty of thirty-six (83%) of these screenings were overridden up to detention.

Overall, 59 (excluding two screening instruments without a risk score) screenings produced risk scores less than 13 points, making them eligible for a detention alternative or release. However, the majority (86%, N=53) of these screenings were overridden up to secure detention.

A total of 112 screenings (65%) breached the threshold for detention, producing risk scores of 13 or greater or for mandatory hold reasons. As expected, nearly all of these high-risk youth were recommended for detention: 100% of those exhibiting mandatory hold reasons and 97% of those with risk scores of 13 or greater. Two of these screenings were overridden down and recommended for release.

## Overrides

An override is a decision that deviates from the recommendation associated with one's risk score. For example, the default recommendation for a youth with a risk score between 8 and 12 is attendant care, a non-secure detention alternative. Such overrides allow for deviating in the appropriate direction: "up" if detention overrides are present, "down" if release overrides are present. The Juvenile Detention Screening Tool includes several detention override categories, including:

- Administrative
- Crime involved a weapon
- Allegation of sex offense with access to victim
- No responsible parent/adult relative to assume custody
- Danger to self/others
- Domestic violence/abuse charge

The screening tool in use included a write-in section for "release override" reasons (factors that would override "down" a risk score that recommends detention or attendant care). It is unclear if this section is being used as the screening data received did not include this information for any of the youth in the sample.

### Overrides up to more restrictive outcomes

A total of 59 screenings produced risk scores less than 13 on the screening tool (and were not eligible for a mandatory hold). Based on risk scores alone, these youth were eligible for a non-secure detention alternative or release. However, in this group, the majority of screenings resulted in a recommendation of detention: the total override up rate for this sample was 86% (51 of 59 assessments were recommended for a more restrictive sanction than otherwise indicated by their risk score).

The three primary reasons for an override were: absence of a responsible parent/adult to assume custody (33%), being a danger to self or others (30%), and administrative reasons (25%).

### Overrides down to less restrictive outcomes

There were few instances when a risk score was overridden down to a less restrictive sanction: 2 of those with scores of 13 or higher, and therefore eligible for detention, were recommended for release, as were 4 with risk scores associated with attendant care. The data provided did not capture the reason for these overrides down.

## Race/Ethnicity (DMC) Results

Table 2 presents the reason (risk score, override, or mandatory hold) for detention admission by race/ethnicity.

	White		Native American		Hispanic		African-American	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Total screenings*	76	100%	70	100%	18	100%	7	100%
<b>Detention based on</b>	69	91%	70	100%	18	100%	6	86%
Risk score	33	48%	31	44%	7	39%	3	50%
Override	25	36%	19	27%	7	39%	2	33%
Mandatory hold	11	16%	20	29%	4	22%	1	17%

White youth accounted for 44% of all screening conducted during the study period and Native American youth represented an additional 40%. Hispanic youth accounted for 11%, and 4% involved black youth. Detention rates were relatively high for all race/ethnicity groups. In this sample, all of the Native American and Hispanic youth screened were admitted to detention, and 91% of all white youth screened resulted in detention. As such, there is little evidence of disproportionate minority confinement for this sample. Rather, the disparity worth noting involves the mechanism that triggered admission to detention. Native American youth were almost twice as likely as white youth to be detained as the result of a mandatory hold. Conversely, detention rates were higher for white youth admitted based on risk score or as the result of a detention override. For white youth and Native American youth, less than half were detained as a result of their risk score. In fact, 52% of white youth and 56% of Native American youth entered detention as the result of an override or mandatory hold.

### Summary of Table 2:

- **Screening rates:** The racial composition of those entering detention deviates from the combined Burleigh and Morton counties residential youth population ages 10 through 17. Non-Hispanic white youth accounted for 87% of youth ages 10 through 17 in 2013, but represented 44% of those admitted to detention. Conversely, non-Hispanic Native American youth accounted for about 7% of the youth population ages 10 through 17 in 2013, but accounted for 40% of those admitted to detention. Similarly, Hispanic youth accounted for a greater share of detention admissions (10%) than of the youth population (3%). Non-Hispanic black youth accounted for 2% of the 10 through 17 youth population and 4% of those admitted to detention.
- **Detention rates:** Overall, detention rates were comparable across the four race/ethnicity groups. All screenings involving Native American and Hispanic resulted in admission to detention, and the detention rates for white (91%) and black youth (86%) were similarly high.
- **Detention triggers:** The Juvenile Detention Screening Tool supports three avenues for detention admission: risk score (earning 13 or more points), the presence of a detention override, or a mandatory hold. In this sample, white youth were more likely to be detained based on risk score

than were their Native American peers, (48% versus 44%, respectively), and more likely to be detained subsequent to a detention override (36% versus 27%, respectively). Conversely, Native American youth were almost twice as likely to reach detention as a result of a mandatory hold as their white counterparts (29% versus 16%).

## Post-detention outcomes

In part, this project hopes to better understand the quandary that is the detention admission decision. To be sure, part of the impetus for implementing a screening instrument is to improve the accuracy of the detention decision and to avoid costly decision errors, for example, detaining a youth that poses no threat to public safety, or failing to detain one that does.

The detention decision is about pre-dispositional holding; it attempts to prioritize detention for those that pose a flight risk and to ensure public safety. Ideally, to properly understand the impact of a risk instrument, the screening tool should be completed for all youth for whom detention could be requested. This natural comparison group would support meaningful comparisons, such as failure to appear or re-offending prior to disposition. On the surface, the screening sample for this study appears to include youth for whom detention was likely. As noted, the sample for this study included only a few (N=10) youth who were screened but not detained. Such a small number makes it difficult to examine whether the decision to release was, in fact, a good one.

In an attempt to compensate for an imperfect comparison group, this study focuses on the post release re-offending patterns of detention admissions for a period of one year following release from detention. This longer-term look at outcomes should be considered as a proxy, as after release from detention an unknown number of youth likely were adjudicated delinquent, and some portion of those may have received a placement disposition. Further, it is possible that some of these youth received dispositional interventions that may (or may not) attenuate subsequent offending; the data provided did not support consideration of such interventions. Additionally, the data received did not include disposition dates; so the follow-up period is anchored to the detention release date.

For the purpose of this study, failure is defined as having at least one new charge within one year following release from detention. Overall, 57 (35%) of those detained had at least one new charge during the one year follow-up. Those who entered detention due to a mandatory hold showed the highest failure rate: 44% showed signs of recidivism within one year after release from detention. Failure rates were somewhat lower for those placed in detention due to an override (38%) and for those detained based on risk score (28%). The relatively high failure rate of those detained may highlight the problem mentioned previously, i.e., the detention release date is used as the anchoring point for the follow-up period, rather than the disposition date. Since we don't know the disposition associated with those detained, it is not possible to account for "street time." It may be that those who were detained went on to receive a restrictive disposition, such as placement, which reduces time on the street to reoffend. Absent more information, it is difficult to make sense of the relatively high success rates found for this sample.

**Table 3: Reason for detention by re-offending post detention release**

Reason for detention	Admissions	New charge within one year following detention release			
		No		YES	
		Count	Success rate	Count	Failure rate
Total admissions	163	106	65%	57	35%
Detention based on					
Score	74	53	72%	21	28%
Override	53	33	62%	20	38%
Mandatory hold	36	20	56%	16	44%

Most of those who re-offended within the one year follow-up period committed multiple offenses. In fact, 52% (N=33) had two or more new cases during the one year follow-up.

**Post detention outcomes by race/ethnicity**

Table 4 presents the post detention failure rates by reason for detention and race/ethnicity. Overall, Native American youth (43%) were more likely to recidivate during the one year follow-up than their white peers (30%).

**Table 4: Failure rates by race/ethnicity**

	White	Native American	Hispanic	African-American
Total admissions	69	70	18	6
Failure rate*	30%	43%	28%	17%
Detention based on				
Risk score	12%	16%	11%	17%
Override	14%	11%	11%	0%
Mandatory hold	4%	16%	6%	0%

\* at least one new charge within one year following release from detention

## Discussion and Recommendations

---

This report was intended to shed light on the implementation of the Juvenile Detention Screening Tool used in the North Dakota counties of Burleigh and Morton. While a true validation study was beyond the scope of this effort, we think the current work provides useful information that can shape North Dakota's next steps. The discussion and recommendations that follow draw on things we have learned in doing this work. Hopefully, sharing these observations will inform the decision about broader implementation of the Juvenile Detention Screening Tool.

The composition of the screening sample included youth who were good candidates for detention, as opposed to all youth for whom detention could have been requested. To fully understand the impact and utility of the Juvenile Detention Screening Tool, additional data collection will be required. In practical terms, the pool of those screened should be extended to include all youth eligible for detention. The additional data collection burden will be offset by the fact that a more thorough validation effort would be possible, thereby providing more concrete conclusions. As such, a few precursors to broader implementation of the Juvenile Detention Screening Tool include:

- Expand the pool of those screened to include all youth eligible for detention. This would be a good step toward a more detailed validation study.
- Automate the scoring of the screening tool. Part of our diagnostic tests on the screening data revealed a few scoring inconsistencies. When comparing our computed risk score with the one provided, we found 38 instruments – nearly one-fourth of those screened – with scoring disagreements. Fortunately, the disparate scores would not have changed the screening tool recommendation, but automating the scoring will likely cut down on possible scoring errors.
- Related to the comment above, information system improvements would certainly benefit the specific needs associated with scoring the instrument, and likely would open up more meaningful research opportunities in other areas. From a distance, the data sources used for this project appear to come from disconnected sources. Obviously, a more integrated court management system would simplify (i.e., automate) the instrument's scoring needs, but such enhancements do not come without costs. Funding options do exist: there are federal funds to support court improvement projects that can be used to augment information system needs. In addition, based on our work for the National Juvenile Court Data Archive project, we know of many jurisdictions that built their own case management systems. If the intent is to have empirically rooted decision-making, investing in data capabilities is essential.
- Investigate race/ethnicity reporting. Any effort to understand disproportionate minority contact requires accurate and reliable data. In working with the data used for this project, we identified inconsistencies in the race/ethnicity classification captured on the screening tool versus the information provided in the detention admission data: the race/ethnicity category for 32 of those detained “changed” between the time of screening and admission to detention.
- Investigate the date fields captured by the charge level juvenile court data. In preparing the data to identify reoffending for those exiting detention, we noticed that the date field for the charge level court data always referred to the first of the month, a pattern that seems unlikely. Such

imprecision complicates the calculation of time to reoffending. Similarly, good date information is critical for understanding failure to appear as well as re-offending prior to disposition.

- Given the role mandatory holds and detention overrides play in the number of detention admissions, it seems the criteria for both should be re-evaluated and, perhaps modified. In this sample, 53 youth were detained based on an override – nearly one-third of all detentions – while 36 (22%) of all detention admissions were the result of a mandatory hold. Both groups had relatively high failure rates: 38% of those detained as the result of an override had at least one new charge within one year of release from detention, as did 44% of those detained as the result of a mandatory hold. These data suggest that the current application of overrides and mandatory holds are doing little in terms of future re-offending. To be sure, overrides and mandatory holds detain some low-risk youth who, based on their risk score, would be eligible for release or a non-secure alternative. For example, more than half of those detained as the result of a mandatory hold had risk scores that made them eligible for release, i.e., they are low-risk youth. It would be worth considering more objective criteria for both overrides and mandatory holds and, if possible, explore the possibility of non-secure alternatives in lieu of secure detention.

### **Continued Study—Continued Analysis**

The number of juveniles not admitted to detention was insufficient to support a validation analyses; having data to satisfy skeptics that community safety was not jeopardized by the decision not to detain would be very useful. The fewer of them that failed to appear in court or committed another offense while waiting for their hearing, the better. Not knowing only leaves room for speculation and anecdote.

It would also be useful to gather the additional data necessary to determine the extent to which the court “overrides down” at the detention hearing. If that happens with any frequency, it will be important to understand why the decision to detain is reversed. Such understanding could be used to “recalibrate” the screening instrument.

Continued monitoring of the application of the Juvenile Detention Screening Tool is very important. The implementation thus far has been purposely limited. It is recommended that ongoing output reports be developed that summarize the screening data over a particular time period, including the overall detention decision outcomes, outcomes by offense groups, race, and use of mandatory and detention overrides (both up and down). It is further recommended that screening data be collected on all juvenile offenders considered for admission even if the court is ordering the detention. This output report should be reviewed by detention intake, the director of juvenile court services, and other key decision-makers. Having data on all the youth will also inform future discussion of which juveniles *must* be detained versus those that can be detained.

## **Appendix: Detention Assessment Instruments**

---

**North Dakota Juvenile Detention Screening Tool**

**Allegheny County Juvenile Probation — Detention Assessment Test Instrument**



North Dakota Juvenile Detention Screening Tool  
Quick Guide to Completion

Section I

**Most Serious Referral Offense (Score only one):** Enter the number of points on the line provided for the most serious offense only for the current referral that is resulting in a detention/request for detention.

Section II

**Offense History (score only one):** Enter number of points on the line provided for the *most serious offense* level committed within the past 12 months.

Section III

**Count prior Incidents:** Count each incident (based on the date) that occurred during the past 12 months. If a youth had 5 charges on the same date/referral, this would count as one incident. Points should not be included in this section if counted in Section II. You may only count an incident once in one area.

Section IV

**Failure to Appear/Flight Risk:** This requires that the screener can locate documented history with flight/Failure to Appear (FTA). Score each construct and enter that total number of points on the line provided. Maximum score is 6 points.

Section V

**Aggravating Factors:** Check each construct associated with this youth and add up to a maximum of 3 points.

---

Section VI

**Mitigating Factors:** Check each line and if associated with this youth, one can deduct up to a maximum of 3 points.

**Decision Scale:** Check the appropriate box corresponding to the Risk Score.

**Mandatory Holds:** Check ALL that apply

**Overrides:** If the screener is not acting in accordance with the risk score and decision scale, then it is an override. If youth is released into an alternative, then state the specific program in the space provided.

# Allegheny County Juvenile Probation – Detention Assessment Test Instrument

**Juvenile's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **DOB:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Caselog #:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Gender:**  M  F **Ethnicity:**  Hispanic/Latino  Non Hispanic/Latino  
**Race:**  White  Black/Af. American  Asian  Am. Indian/Alaskan Native  Hawaiian/Pac. Islander  Other (\_\_\_\_\_)  
**Screening Date:** \_\_\_\_\_ **PO Completing Form:** \_\_\_\_\_

If the override is appropriate, you must fill in the type/reason.

**Mandatory Overrides (must be detained):**

- Firearm offense
- Warrant
- Detainer
- CYF Attachment
- Violation of CISP/ EHM
- Removal from Juvenile Court ordered placement for failure to adjust
- New offense committed while on a home pass from a Juvenile Court ordered placement

**Factor (CHOOSE ONLY ONE ITEM PER FACTOR)**

**SCORE**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Most Serious Alleged Offense (see instruction sheet for examples)</b>		
	<b>Category A:</b> Felonies against persons or felony firearm charge.....	15	
	<b>Category B:</b> Felony drug charge...Intent to Deliver (significant amount) .....	12	
	<b>Category C:</b> Other felonies.....	7	
	<b>Category D:</b> Misdemeanors against persons or involving weapon.....	5	
	<b>Category E:</b> Other misdemeanors .....	3	
	<b>No new charge</b> .....	0	
	Specify charge: _____		_____
<b>2.</b>	<b>Additional non-related charges (this referral) or pending charges (see instructions)</b>		
	Two or more additional felonies.....	10	
	One additional felony .....	7	
	One or more additional misdemeanors .....	5	
	No additional current or other pending charges.....	0	
	Specify charge(s) and whether now or pending: _____		_____
<b>3.</b>	<b>Current Alleged Violations</b>		
	Multiple violations of electronic monitoring .....	10	
	Violations of Official Probation .....	5	
	Violations of Consent Decree .....	5	
	No current violations .....	0	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Prior Findings</b>		
	Two or more prior findings for felonies .....	6	
	One prior finding for a felony .....	4	
	Two or more prior findings for misdemeanors .....	3	
	Two or more prior findings for probation violations .....	2	
	One prior finding for a misdemeanor .....	1	
	No prior findings .....	0	_____
<b>5.</b>	<b>Current Supervision Status</b>		
	Aftercare (2 months following JPO placement release) .....	4	
	Official probation/Consent Decree based on (mark one) <input type="checkbox"/> felony or <input type="checkbox"/> misdemeanor.....	3	
	Official probation on other offenses; deferred disposition/supervision (specify whether: <input type="checkbox"/> Probation/Consent Decree <input type="checkbox"/> Deferred Disposition).....	2	
	Extended Service .....	1	
	None of above.....	0	
<b>6.</b>	<b>History or Failure to Appear (within past 12 months)</b>		
	Two or more warrants for failure to appear in past 12 months .....	3	
	One warrant for failure to appear in past 12 months.....	1	
	No warrants for failure to appear in past 12 months.....	0	_____
<b>7.</b>	<b>History of Escape/Runaway (within the past 12 months)</b>		
	One or more instance of run from secure confinement or custody .....	4	
	One or more instances of run from non-secure, court-ordered placement.....	3	
	One or more runaways from home or voluntary placement .....	1	
	No escapes/runaways in past 12 months.....	0	_____
<b>Total Score</b>			_____

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Discretionary Override (with Supervisory Approval only):**

- Override to detain for aggravating factors (override to more restrictive placement than indicated by guidelines)
- Override to release for mitigating factors (override to less restrictive placement than indicated by guidelines)
- Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_

When applying aggravating or mitigating factors, please check the primary factor below that impacted your decision.

***Common Aggravating / Mitigating Factors***

***Aggravating***

- Parent unable/unwilling to provide appropriate supervision
- Juvenile poses a significant risk to community safety
- Juvenile has significant substance abuse problem or tested positive for multiple drugs
- Juvenile has a history of violence in the home or against family members
- Juvenile poses a significant threat to abscond based on out of county residence
- Juvenile poses a significant threat of failure to appear
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

***Mitigating***

- Parent willing/able to provide appropriate supervision
- Juvenile has no prior record
- Juvenile marginally involved in the offense
- Offense less serious than indicated by the charge
- New charge referred is not recent
- Juvenile is 14 years or younger
- Juvenile regularly attends school/work
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

When a score of 15 or more is documented and a detention alternative is selected as the actual outcome, specify the alternative:

**Detention Alternative Selected**

- YES/Rankin Christian Center Detention Diversion
- Expedited court scheduling
- Alternative living arrangement
- Shelter Care

Home Arrest

Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**ACTUAL DECISION:**    **RELEASE**    **DETENTION ALTERNATIVE**    **SECURE DETENTION**

**Screener Comments (if any):** \_\_\_\_\_