

**Population Profile and Risk Assessment Study:  
Mississippi Department of Youth Services**

**Jeffrey A. Butts  
and  
Paul Demuro**

**February 1989**

**Center for the Study of Youth Policy  
The University of Michigan**

**Population Profile and Risk Assessment Study:  
Mississippi Department of Youth Services**

**Prepared for  
The State of Mississippi**

**by**

**Jeffrey A. Butts  
and  
Paul Demuro**

**February 1989**

**Center for the Study of Youth Policy  
The University of Michigan  
1015 E. Huron St.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1689**

Population Profile and Risk Assessment Study:  
Mississippi Department of Youth Services

Executive Summary

In response to a request from the Governor's Office and the Office of the Attorney General, the Center for the Study of Youth Policy conducted this risk assessment analysis of juveniles committed to public training schools in Mississippi. The study is designed to help policy makers evaluate the need for institutional/secure beds in the state's juvenile corrections system. It provides a detailed look at the current population being served by two juvenile correctional institutions in Mississippi, includes demographic and delinquency-history profiles of these youths, and assesses their risk for future delinquency and institutionalization.

The analytical procedures used in the study are based on established research findings that suggest the best indicators of future delinquency for any individual juvenile offender are age at onset, and the recency, severity, and chronicity of his or her prior criminal record. These and other factors are combined into a single "risk score" which can be used to screen juvenile offenders according to their potential for future delinquency as well as plan for institutional capacity needs.

The study findings include:

- Seventy-one percent of the youths currently held in Mississippi Institutions scored six points or less on a risk assessment instrument in which 10 is the recommended lower limit for secure care or institutionalization.
- Minor offenders were particularly evident at the Columbia training school. More than 40 percent of Columbia's population scored three points or less on the screening instrument.
- Although the Oakley school held a higher proportion of more serious offenders, nearly two-thirds (62 percent) of the youths committed to Oakley had scores which suggest they could be amenable to non-institutional interventions.
- There are clear opportunities for Mississippi to reduce its level of juvenile institutionalization and shift resources into a mix of locally-based, non-residential and residential programs.
- The state should seriously consider restructuring services at the Columbia training school since it currently serves many minor offenders.
- State officials should also actively pursue strategies to reduce the disproportionate numbers of minority youths committed to juvenile facilities. As of 1987, Mississippi ranked third in the nation for the percentage of minorities in its public training schools.



**Population Profile and Risk Assessment Study:****Mississippi Department of Youth Services****INTRODUCTION**

In late 1988, the Office of the Governor of Mississippi along with the Office of the Attorney General requested the assistance of the University of Michigan's Center for the Study of Youth Policy in assessing the state's needs for institutional/secure care for juvenile offenders. Ira Schwartz, the Director of the Center, has helped a number of other states examine their juvenile correctional systems. Oregon, Colorado, and Delaware, among others, have recently participated in risk assessment studies which aided them in determining the most appropriate number of institutional and secure beds for their states. These studies also provided critical information for the development of more comprehensive service-delivery systems for adjudicated youths.

In addition to Mr. Schwartz, the Mississippi project was conducted by former circuit court judge Frank Orlando who is now the Director of the Center for the Study of Youth Policy at Florida Atlantic University in Ft. Lauderdale, Jeffrey Butts, a researcher from the Center for the Study of Youth Policy in Michigan, and Paul DeMuro, a former correctional administrator and consultant to the Center for the Study of Youth Policy who has advised juvenile justice officials throughout the country.



## THE STUDY

This study offers state policy makers a detailed look at the current population being served by juvenile correctional institutions in Mississippi. It is a cross-sectional, or snap shot picture, of all the youths committed to the Mississippi Department of Youth Services (DYS) on one particular day (October 15, 1988) and placed in either the Columbia or Oakley training schools. It provides a demographic and delinquency-history profile of these youths as well as evaluating their risk for future delinquency and institutionalization. If used properly, the study is a tool that can help officials in Mississippi plan a more efficient and effective juvenile correctional system.

Mississippi is currently evaluating many government programs, including the delivery of all its human services. It is especially appropriate now for the state to examine the current configuration of its juvenile correctional system. A risk assessment study can help establish more consistent guidelines regarding the type of youthful offenders who are appropriate for secure care, and potentially free up resources so that a more diverse set of local options can be developed. The development of a more diversified juvenile correctional system, of course, will require the efforts of more than one state agency, or even the state itself. Other pivotal actors such as the judiciary, law enforcement, and community groups must actively engage in, and support a re-thinking of how Mississippi should handle its youthful offenders. This study is just one of the first steps in such a process.

## Framework for the Study

Before describing the procedures and findings of the risk assessment study, there are a number of premises which must be clarified. These premises informed the orientation and goals of this study:

- Premise 1:** The goals and objectives of a juvenile corrections system should be kept distinct and separate from that of a child welfare system. While child welfare and social services are necessary and appropriate for neglected, dependent, abused and troubled children, juvenile corrections should be used to intervene with juvenile offenders whose behavior presents some risk to their communities. States should carefully avoid using correctional programs and institutions to meet myriad social needs.
- Premise 2:** Within juvenile corrections, secure and institutional bed space should be reserved for serious juvenile offenders. The state's important responsibility to guard the public safety against serious and violent crime must not preclude an objective assessment of the effectiveness, cost, (and physical remoteness) of existing institutional programs. Such programs should be reserved for the most serious cases while less serious offenders are supervised in smaller, locally accessible programs.
- Premise 3:** This risk assessment study does not focus on the service needs of youths committed to the state's care, most of whom do have a number of apparent service needs (health, educational, social, emotional, etc.). Other jurisdictions, however, have found that these needs are often met effectively in closely managed, non-institutional, community settings.
- Premise 4:** The analytical procedures used in this study are based on established research findings that suggest the best indicators of future delinquency for any individual juvenile offender are age at onset, and the recency, severity and chronicity of his or her prior criminal record. These factors can be used to screen juvenile offenders according to their potential for future delinquency.

In the field of juvenile justice there is often a "catch 22" which inhibits the development of effective service delivery systems for adjudicated juveniles. Lacking a diverse set of program options for youths in trouble, many juvenile court judges are compelled to send less serious juvenile offenders (who primarily need services) to the same institutions that hold serious, violent offenders (who require control as well as services). Yet, the very fact that these institutions are used for such a wide range of juvenile offenders often delays or prevents the

development of needed alternatives for those youths who could be handled in other ways. The fixed costs of institutional operation become an impediment to investing resources in more effective, locally-based, non-institutional programs. The findings of this study are offered in the hope that they inform the policy process currently underway to design a more cost-effective juvenile correctional system for Mississippi youths.

### The Cooperation of DYS

Throughout the time it took to conduct this study, all officials from the Department of Youth Services were extremely supportive. Staff from the institutions made every effort to be helpful. Mr. Russell, the former Director of DYS, stated in a long telephone conversation that he hoped the study would support his agency's goals of getting additional resources to improve services at the community level. Philosophically, DYS believes that institutional beds should only be used as a last resort and that more can and should be done to develop and improve community programs.

## **METHODOLOGY**

In September, 1988, Frank Orlando and Paul DeMuro met with a number of Mississippi officials to discuss this risk assessment study and to seek their advice concerning its scope and methodology.<sup>1</sup> In order to insure broad participation in the study, two working groups of officials were formed. The first group was drawn from various high-level officials who have a policy-making interest in juvenile

-----

1. Herbert Terry and Tony Gobar of the Department of Criminal Justice Planning were helpful in coordinating all on-site activity for the project. They compiled background information (see Appendix I for list of materials reviewed), convened meetings and handled logistical support.



justice (see Appendix II for a listing of both groups). A prosecutor, a public defender, a juvenile court judge as well as staff from the institutional and field services division of the Department of Youth Services participated in the second group.

These officials reviewed nationally recognized risk assessment instruments and, using the Mississippi criminal code as well as relying on their understanding of their present system, developed a specialized risk assessment instrument which would be used to gather data about the youths then in the system. Subsequently, Jeff Butts met with and trained a team of students from the University of Southern Mississippi (at Hattiesburg) in data collection techniques and the use of the instrument.<sup>2</sup> The data collection team visited the Oakley and Columbia training schools and reviewed the case files of all youths in the study sample. The assessment instruments were filled out on-site by the data collection team.

### The Assessment Instrument

The risk assessment instrument ranks juvenile offenders according to the seriousness of their criminal histories and other related characteristics. These rankings are then used to recommend which youths would normally be appropriate for secure care. The scores that result from the instrument can range from zero to fifteen or twenty, depending on the seriousness of the youth's delinquency and other factors. The offenses for which a youth has been

-----

2. In addition to participating in the technical work group, Professor Larry LeFlore of the University of Southern Mississippi helped select and supervised the students who carried out the data collection. A graduate student from the University of Michigan, Debbie Cavazos, also assisted with the preparation of the data. See Appendix II for members of the data collection team.

adjudicated contribute the most points to his or her risk score. Other factors than criminal charges, however, may increase the score. (See Appendix III for a copy of the Mississippi risk assessment form, a description of scoring procedures and a listing of possible offenses and associated point totals.)

Each youth's adjudications are scored in two ways. The instant adjudication (or the offense which resulted in the most recent, or current commitment) is scored separately from the most serious *prior* charge. For example, if a youth's instant adjudication was for armed robbery, 10 points would be added to his risk score. When armed robbery is the most serious prior adjudication, however, it receives 7 points. If both the instant adjudication and the most serious prior adjudication were for armed robbery, 17 points (10 + 7) would be added to the score. Lesser offenses, of course, receive fewer points. In this way, the risk scores reflect the overall seriousness of each offender's record, not just the commitment offense.

In addition to official charges, the assessment instrument calls for points to be added for the total number of felony adjudications against a youth during the past two years - five points for three or more. One point is also added if the first adjudication occurred before the age of thirteen. Finally, the working groups requested that a number of other factors be counted against each offender's point total. These additional factors include whether there was a prior history of out-of-home, court-ordered placements for delinquency, and the extent to which the instant offense was directly related to drug and/or gang involvement.

#### Interpretation of Scores

The reader is cautioned not to think of the risk scores in this study as predictions in the purely statistical sense. Assessing risk for future delinquency is

just as problematic as any other exercise in predicting human behavior. Considerable research, however, has shown that these factors can generally distinguish repeat, chronic offenders from other juveniles who will most likely desist from crime earlier and engage in less serious criminal behavior before they do. Furthermore, juveniles who score low on these risk factors are likely to be the very youths most amenable to non-institutional interventions. The risk assessment scores, therefore, are a guide. They bring greater objectivity and consistency to the commitment/placement process by ranking adjudicated juveniles along a continuum of risk.

In general, any youth who receives ten or more points on the risk assessment should be considered eligible for secure care. Thus, a youth whose only offense resulted in an instant adjudication for a violent crime would be automatically liable for secure care. A youth with a history of serious property crime would also be recommended for secure care. On the other hand, youths who score less than seven points should be served through community-based programs *provided those programs are available to local courts at the time a youth appears.* Youths in the middle of the continuum, those scoring from seven to nine points, would undoubtedly need special services and supervision, but they should be considered for alternative placements whenever possible.

The following discussion presents the results of applying this specially designed risk assessment instrument to the case files of the 334 youths committed to Mississippi training schools as of October 15, 1988.<sup>3</sup>

---

3. Although 334 files were scored, the tables to follow will not always add to precisely 334. This is due to missing or unavailable data on certain variables.



TABLE 1  
 Characteristics of Youths by Current Placement

	Current Placement				Total	
	Columbia		Oakley		n	Pct.
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.		
Ethnicity						
Black.....	154	82%	109	74%	263	79%
White.....	33	18%	38	26%	71	21%
Total.....	187	100%	147	100%	334	100%
Male.....	150	80%	147	100%	297	89%
Female.....	37	20%	0	0%	37	11%
Total.....	187	100%	147	100%	334	100%
Age (in years)						
Under 14.....	37	20%	0	0%	37	11%
14.....	40	21%	0	0%	40	12%
15.....	64	34%	3	2%	67	20%
16.....	34	18%	49	34%	83	25%
17.....	7	4%	72	49%	79	24%
Over 17.....	5	3%	22	15%	27	8%
Total.....	187	100%	146	100%	333	100%

Note: One Vietnamese youth was included with Blacks in analyses of ethnicity.

### DESCRIPTION OF COMMITTED YOUTHS

Table 1 presents the age, sex and ethnicity of all 334 youths committed to training schools on October 15<sup>th</sup>. As shown, Blacks make up 79 percent of the total training school population. At the Columbia school, Black youths comprise an even larger 82 percent of the population. Overall, the population is 89 percent male, 11 percent female. At the time of the study, the Columbia school was providing services for 37 girls. Sixteen and seventeen-year-old youths account

for almost half of the population. A significant proportion, however, are below the age of fifteen. Seventy-seven youths (41%) at Columbia were 14 years old or younger.

### Instant (Committing) Offenses

Table 2 lists the types of offenses for which youths were sent to the two training schools. Whenever possible, the data collection team took the instant offense information from actual court documents (i.e., petitions) located in the youths' case files. For some, however, it was necessary to rely on the school files themselves. In Table 3, the various offenses from Table 2 are grouped into five categories of seriousness, ranging from status offenses and misdemeanors to three levels of felony charges. The most serious level, Level 1 Felonies, are for Part 1 violent crimes.

Property crimes are by far the most common commitment offense among youths committed to the training schools. Nearly three-quarters of the youths were committed for Level 2 or Level 3 Felony offenses. Over 12 percent of Columbia's population (23 youths) were committed for shoplifting. Taken together, auto theft (11%), shoplifting (10%), and burglary (10%) account for nearly one third of the instant offenses for the entire training school population. Breaking and entering represents the single highest percentage of instant offenses (19%); 64 youths were committed for this offense.

Also significant are the numbers of youths committed for status offenses and misdemeanors. Nineteen percent of the total population was committed for these reasons. Most (44) of these youths were committed either for Violation of Probation or a status offense. Others, however, were committed for contempt (9 youths) and disorderly conduct (8 youths). Relatively few youths were committed

TABLE 2  
Instant (Commitment) Offenses  
by Current Placement

	Current Placement				Total	
	Columbia		Oakley		n	Pct.
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.		
Status/Minor						
Status	11	6%	3	2%	14	4%
Program Violation	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%
Misdemeanors						
Contempt	6	3%	3	2%	9	3%
VOP	14	7%	16	11%	30	9%
Disorderly	5	3%	3	2%	8	2%
Other Misdemeanors	3	2%	0	0%	3	1%
Level 3 Felony						
Poss Minor Drugs	3	2%	2	1%	5	1%
Shoplift	23	12%	12	8%	35	10%
Simple Assault	2	1%	3	2%	5	1%
Stolen Prop	2	1%	1	1%	3	1%
Fraud	1	1%	2	1%	3	1%
Arson 2/3	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%
Level 2 Felony						
Poss Weapon	1	1%	1	1%	2	1%
Larceny	15	8%	5	3%	20	6%
Burglary	19	10%	14	10%	33	10%
Grand Larc	6	3%	3	2%	9	3%
Car Theft	14	7%	23	16%	37	11%
Burg/Business	1	1%	4	3%	5	1%
B + E	38	20%	26	18%	64	19%
Unarmed Rob	3	2%	1	1%	4	1%
Escape	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%
Assault	9	5%	13	9%	22	7%
Level 1 Felony						
Agg Assault	1	1%	6	4%	7	2%
Armed Robbery	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%
Rape/Sex Offense	7	4%	4	3%	11	3%
Total	187	100%	147	100%	334	100%



TABLE 3  
Instant Offenses (Grouped)  
by Current Placement

Offense Type	Current Placement				Total	
	Columbia		Oakley		n	Pct.
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.		
Status/Minor.....	12	6%	3	2%	15	4%
Misdemeanors.....	28	15%	22	15%	50	15%
Level 3 Felony.....	33	18%	20	14%	53	16%
Level 2 Felony.....	106	57%	91	62%	197	59%
Level 1 Felony.....	8	4%	11	7%	19	6%
Total.....	187	100%	147	100%	334	100%

for the most serious offenses; 11 youths (3 percent) were committed for rape or sexual assault<sup>4</sup>, seven for aggravated assault, and one for armed robbery.<sup>5</sup>

As expected, youths at the Oakley school were committed for more serious offenses than at Columbia. Columbia's population contained a larger percentage of status offenders than Oakley's (6 vs. 2 percent), while Oakley held proportionately more youths whose instant offenses were for the most serious crimes (7 percent compared to 4). More than one-fifth of Columbia's population had instant offenses which fell within the two least serious offense categories

4. The number of youths charged with a sex offense should be seen as a possible error. Due to coding inaccuracies, there were a number of youths whose instant offenses were recorded as only "sexual offense." Without additional data collection, it was not possible to ascertain whether these were misdemeanors or violent, felony assaults. The analysis makes the conservative assumption that all of these charges were for serious assaults.

5. As part of this study, we also looked at data from youths who were transferred (waived) to adult court. Unfortunately, these data were often incomplete or simply unavailable, preventing full analyses. One would naturally suspect that the more serious juvenile cases are being transferred to adult court. This issue bears further study.

TABLE 4  
Instant Offenses (Grouped)  
by Ethnicity of Youth

Offense Type	Ethnicity				Total	
	Black		White		n	Pct.
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.		
Status/Minor.....	9	3%	6	8%	15	4%
Misdemeanors.....	32	12%	18	25%	50	15%
Level 3 Felony.....	44	17%	9	13%	53	16%
Level 2 Felony.....	163	62%	34	48%	197	59%
Level 1 Felony.....	15	6%	4	6%	19	6%
Total.....	263	100%	71	100%	334	100%

(status and misdemeanors). Seventeen percent of Oakley's population fell within these categories.

Tables 4, 5 and 6 present the instant offenses for the two groups according to ethnicity, sex and age. As seen in Table 4, Black youths in the training schools were more often adjudicated for serious offenses than White youths. White youths were twice as likely to be under commitment for a misdemeanor. Fully one quarter of the White youths were committed for misdemeanors.

This difference between Black and White youths in the committed population requires further comment. While it may appear that minority youths are involved in more serious criminal behavior than their White counterparts, the data produced in this study should not be interpreted as proof of this assertion. It is well known among criminological researchers that racial disparities involve a good deal of social and economic influences in addition to the behavior of individual offenders. There also may be system artifacts at work. In other words, minorities are often subject to differential treatment at every stage of the criminal justice

TABLE 5  
Instant Offenses (Grouped)  
by Sex of Youth

	Males		Females		Total	
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.	n	Pct.
Offense Type						
Status/Minor.....	11	4%	4	11%	15	4%
Misdemeanors.....	39	13%	11	30%	50	15%
Level 3 Felony.....	47	16%	6	16%	53	16%
Level 2 Felony.....	182	61%	15	41%	197	59%
Level 1 Felony.....	18	6%	1	3%	19	6%
Total.....	297	100%	37	100%	334	100%

process -- from arrest, to adjudication, to disposition or sentencing. Cross-sectional studies such as this risk assessment are simply not designed to detect system processing dynamics, nor can they account for the effects of social and economic inequities which may be related to ethnicity. They merely reflect the end result of those processes by reporting the characteristics of institutional populations.

Although this study can make no claims regarding the existence of ethnic differentials in justice processing, it is clear that Mississippi training schools currently hold a large, and seemingly disproportionate number of minority youths. Recently released data from the U.S. Census Bureau's "Children in Custody" survey, in fact, indicate that as of 1987, Mississippi ranked third in the nation for the percentage of non-white youths in its public training schools. Still, a careful state-wide analysis of juvenile justice policies and practices would be required to determine the extent to which there is differential handling of minority youths in the Mississippi system.



TABLE 6  
Instant Offenses by Age

	Age of Youth (in Years)					
	Under 14	14	15	16	17	Over 17
Offense Type						
Status/Minor.....	5%	10%	7%	1%	4%	0%
Misdemeanors.....	11%	8%	16%	17%	16%	19%
Level 3 Felony.....	5%	23%	21%	16%	15%	11%
Level 2 Felony.....	78%	55%	51%	55%	61%	63%
Level 1 Felony.....	0%	5%	4%	11%	4%	7%
Total.....	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

As expected, there are also differences in commitment offenses between females and males. In Table 5, it is clear that girls are committed for less serious offenses than boys. Over 40 percent of the girls had instant offenses in the status or misdemeanor categories. Similarly, females were less likely to have been committed for the more serious property offenses in the Level 2 Felony category.

It is surprising at first to note that the seriousness of instant offenses varied only slightly with age. In Table 6, older and younger youths can be seen to have roughly comparable distributions of offenses. About 20 percent of all ages were committed for status offenses and misdemeanors, while approximately 60 to 70 percent were charged with Level 1 or Level 2 Felonies. This seems to contradict the assumption that older youths are adjudicated for more serious offenses. One explanation, however, is that those older youths who are engaged in more serious criminal activity are also more likely to be transferred to the adult system, thus leaving the less serious older youths in the juvenile institutions.

Committed Youths: County of Origin

Table 7 presents the numbers of committed youths by their county of origin. Approximately two-thirds (220 of 334 youths) were sent to the training schools by just 13 Mississippi counties. The thirteen counties are those in Table 7 that show ten or more youths under commitment on the day the risk assessment study was conducted.<sup>6</sup> Sixty-four youths had been committed from two of the three largest counties in the state -- Harrison and Hinds. Ninety-two youths were committed from six mid-size counties (with populations between 50,000 and 100,000) -- Forrest, Lauderdale, Lee, Lowndes, Warren and Washington. Five small counties with populations under 50,000 -- Bolivar, Coahoma, Leflore, Lincoln and Sunflower -- contributed a total of sixty-four commitments.<sup>7</sup>

The fact that such a large proportion of the youths committed to juvenile training schools come from just thirteen counties is suggestive. At the very least, it supports the feasibility of arranging an effective system of smaller, regionally-based programs to handle many of the youths now being sent to just two facilities. Further consideration of such a plan, of course, would require a more complete analysis of the pattern of juvenile commitments from throughout the state.

-----  
6. They are: Harrison, Hinds, Forrest, Lauderdale, Lee, Lowndes, Warren, Washington, Bolivar, Coahoma, Leflore, Lincoln, and Sunflower.

7. See Appendices IV and V for more specific data regarding the types of youths committed by individual counties. In Appendix IV, it would appear that the smaller (usually poor), rural counties are more apt to send younger, less serious (often minority) offenders to training schools than larger counties. One would expect that these less populous counties have relatively fewer local resources as well. In Appendix V, the mean (average) risk scores are presented for each of the top eleven committing counties. While the average score for the entire population was 5.3, several counties can be seen to commit youths with significantly lower scores on average.

TABLE 7  
Number of Commitments by County  
by Current Placement

	Current Placement		Total
	Columbia	Oakley	
Population of Committing County			
Over 100,000			
Harrison.....	13	10	23
Hinds.....	26	15	41
Jackson.....	3	4	7
50 to 100,000			
DeSoto.....	3	1	4
Forrest.....	9	8	17
Jones.....	1	1	2
Lauderdale.....	13	6	19
Lee.....	9	8	17
Lowndes.....	4	7	11
Rankin.....	6	2	8
Warren.....	6	6	12
Washington.....	10	6	16
Under 50,000			
Adams.....	0	1	1
Alcorn.....	0	4	4
Attala.....	0	2	2
Bolivar.....	7	3	10
Coahoma.....	14	7	21
Copiah.....	1	2	3
Franklin.....	1	1	2
Grenada.....	3	3	6
Hancock.....	1	1	2
Holmes.....	1	1	2
Humphreys.....	6	3	9
Jefferson.....	0	1	1
Lafayette.....	2	1	3
Lamar.....	0	1	1

Source for Population Data: U.S. Census Bureau, Current  
Population Reports, Series P-26, No. 84-S-SC, (pp.54-59),  
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1986.

(continued)

TABLE 7  
Number of Commitments by County  
by Current Placement

	Current Placement		Total
	Columbia	Oakley	
Leake.....	1	0	1
Leflore.....	8	4	12
Lincoln.....	5	6	11
Madison.....	0	3	3
Marion.....	1	0	1
Marshall.....	1	2	3
Monroe.....	2	0	2
Neshoba.....	0	1	1
Oktibbeha.....	1	1	2
Panola.....	0	2	2
Pearl River.....	1	0	1
Pike.....	4	2	6
Pontotoc.....	2	0	2
Quitman.....	1	2	3
Scott.....	2	3	5
Smith.....	2	0	2
Stone.....	1	2	3
Sunflower.....	5	5	10
Tippah.....	1	0	1
Tunica.....	1	0	1
Wayne.....	1	1	2
Webster.....	1	0	1
Winston.....	4	1	5
Yalobusha.....	1	2	3
Yazoo.....	0	4	4
Total.....	185	146	331

Source for Population Data: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Series P-26, No. 84-S-SC, (pp.54-59), U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1986.

## RISK ASSESSMENT SCORES

As described above, each offender was given points for the seriousness of his or her instant offense and for the number and seriousness of prior offenses which resulted in adjudications. In addition to each offender's criminal record, other



TABLE 8  
Risk Score by Current Placement

Risk Score	Current Placement				Total	
	Columbia		Oakley		n	Pct.
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.		
0.....	4	2%	1	1%	5	2%
1.....	20	11%	5	4%	25	8%
2.....	15	8%	8	6%	23	7%
3.....	36	19%	22	16%	58	18%
4.....	21	11%	10	7%	31	10%
5.....	26	14%	30	22%	56	17%
6.....	22	12%	10	7%	32	10%
7.....	14	8%	7	5%	21	7%
8.....	9	5%	12	9%	21	7%
9.....	4	2%	6	4%	10	3%
10.....	7	4%	15	11%	22	7%
11.....	4	2%	3	2%	7	2%
12.....	2	1%	5	4%	7	2%
13.....	1	1%	1	1%	2	1%
14.....	0	0%	3	2%	3	1%
Total.....	185	100%	138	100%	323	100%

Note: Scores could not be calculated for all cases due to missing data on critical variables.

factors were taken into account: age at first commitment, prior history of out of home placement, and degree of drug and/or gang involvement.<sup>8</sup>

Table 8 presents the risk assessment scores for all youths in the Mississippi training schools. As shown in Table 8, there were five youths under commitment status who received a score of zero on the risk assessment instrument. These youths were committed for status offenses or other adjudications which receive

8. See Appendix III for a copy of the risk assessment form and other information regarding the scoring of the form.

TABLE 9  
Grouped Scores by Current Placement

Grouped Scores	Current Placement				Total	
	Columbia		Oakley		n	Pct.
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.		
0 - 3	75	41%	36	26%	111	34%
4 - 6	69	37%	50	36%	119	37%
7 - 9	27	15%	25	18%	52	16%
10 +	14	8%	27	20%	41	13%
Total	185	100%	138	100%	323	100%

no points under the scoring system. In addition, they had no compounding factors such as previous placements, felony adjudications, or drug involvement. Forty-eight more youths scored just one or two points. Clearly, training schools are an inappropriate resource for such youths. Twenty-two youths had scores of exactly ten on the instrument, while nineteen scored more than ten points.

In Table 9, the risk scores are grouped into four levels. For each institution, the number and percent of youths whose scores fall within the four levels are presented. In all, forty-one youths, or 13 percent of those for whom scores could be calculated, had scores in the ten-plus range. Thus, according to the logic of the risk assessment study, only 13 percent of the youths in Mississippi training schools would be considered appropriate for such a secure, institutional program. Fifty-two additional youths, or 16 percent of the population, fell into the mid-range (7 to 9 points) category where placement decisions should involve more case-specific discretion -- although probably will also depend on available resources.

TABLE 10  
Grouped Scores  
by Placement by Sex

	Male		Female	
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.
Columbia Only				
Scores				
0 - 3	53	35%	22	63%
4 - 6	60	40%	9	26%
7 - 9	26	17%	1	3%
10 +	11	7%	3	9%
Total	150	100%	35	100%

A total of 230 youths (71 percent) scored six points or less on the risk assessment instrument. Minor offenders were particularly evident at Columbia; more than 40 percent of Columbia's population (75 youths) scored three points or less; 78 percent of Columbia's population scored less than seven points. These youths would appear to be excellent candidates for strong, alternative programs.

Although Oakley had a higher proportion of youths scoring seven or more points than did Columbia, 36 youths (26 percent) of Oakley commitments had scores of three points or less. Nearly two-thirds (62 percent) of the youths committed to the Oakley school had scores which suggest they could be amenable to non-institutional interventions, i.e., from 0 to 6 points. Only 52 youths at Oakley scored seven points or more.

Table 10 indicates also that females seem to be especially over-institutionalized in the Mississippi system; no less than 89 percent (or 31 out of 35) of the girls committed to the Columbia school scored less than seven points

TABLE 11  
Grouped Scores by Ethnicity

Grouped Scores	Ethnicity				Total	
	Black		White		n	Pct.
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.		
0 - 3	86	34%	25	36%	111	34%
4 - 6	89	35%	30	43%	119	37%
7 - 9	44	17%	8	11%	52	16%
10 +	34	13%	7	10%	41	13%
Total	253	100%	70	100%	323	100%

on the instrument. Only four girls had scores in the 7-plus range. Even when compared to just the males at the Columbia school, excluding those at Oakley, female juveniles have substantially lower scores.

Table 11 presents these risk assessment scores by ethnicity. Generally, Black youths received slightly higher risk assessment scores than White youths. While 30 percent of the committed minority youths received scores of seven or more points, just 21 percent of White youths scored as highly. Whether this disparity is due to a true difference in the seriousness of Black delinquency, or a reflection of other factors such as differential justice processing (as discussed above), remains to be determined. It should be recognized, therefore, that if future placement decisions were to be guided by a risk assessment instrument such as this -- with its reliance on official charges and petitions -- the apparent disproportionate institutionalization of minorities in Mississippi could be unchanged. The state would still need to examine the other factors which have led to a large number of minority youths being committed to training schools.



## STUDY FINDINGS

1. Mississippi relies too heavily on training schools. Only 29 percent of the youths in the system scored over 6 points on the risk assessment instrument. Other states are successfully using alternative, locally-based programs to serve the types of youths who score less than 10 points on such an instrument. Clearly, there are opportunities for the state to reduce its operational costs for juvenile institutionalization. Given a reasonable mix of non-residential and residential programs, training school populations could be reduced 65 to 75 percent.
2. From a public safety perspective, female juveniles experience especially high rates of inappropriate placements. Sixty-three percent of the girls in the system scored under four points. Typically, these girls are runaways, often abused and in need of specialized services.
3. The Columbia school currently serves a high proportion of nonviolent youths. Nearly eighty percent of its total population scored six or less points on the risk assessment. Juveniles in this point range are clearly appropriate for non-institutional interventions.
4. Several small and mid-size Mississippi counties commit youths to the training schools at higher rates than larger, more populous counties. Just 13 counties were responsible for committing nearly two-thirds of the training school population. If strong, alternative programs were available (and used) in these areas, the impact on institutional utilization could be significant.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Mississippi officials should seriously consider restructuring the services at the Columbia training school. As this report makes clear, the Columbia facility currently serves many less serious offenders, particularly females. In a re-designed system, perhaps part of the Columbia campus could serve as a small (10-20 beds) regional secure unit to serve the southern part of the State.

Specific strategies and interventions need to be developed for different "high commitment" counties. The counties in the delta region need special attention in order to develop improved services for troubled youths. Focusing restructuring efforts on the relatively small number of counties that contribute the most commitments could have immediate and significant benefits.

Mississippi needs to develop a comprehensive plan to re-configure its institutional juvenile justice resources. Assuming this risk assessment is a fair indicator, the state needs approximately 75 to 85 secure beds for those serious and violent offenders who need to be removed from the community. Remaining juvenile correctional needs could be met in non-secure settings if an array of alternative, non-residential and residential programs were developed.

### Other States

As local officials consider the types of programs that would be appropriate for Mississippi youths, they should examine the experiences of other states where the use of correctional institutions has declined following the implementation of

quality alternatives.<sup>9</sup> It may also be useful to have a group of Mississippi officials visit successful programs in other states.

Pennsylvania, for example, provides a substantial amount of dedicated funding to counties for the development of alternatives. Chief probation officers and judges in Pennsylvania have a wide array of contracted non-residential and residential options available to them. Youths must meet a set of criteria in order to be committed to the state's care. In addition, counties must pay 50 percent of the cost of state secure care.

Maryland has just recently closed one of its large training schools. The Montrose school was a 250-bed facility that had been in operation for nearly 70 years. In about one year's time, the state developed alternative case plans for each youth at Montrose and gradually moved all of them into other settings. Many were sent home with special supervision services or placed in foster homes with contracted intensive services. Others were placed in smaller residential programs. Follow-up research on the Maryland changes is now underway, but preliminary results indicate that the Montrose closure had no detrimental effects on the public safety.<sup>10</sup>

In Michigan's Wayne county (Detroit), state and county officials collaborated in initiating and funding three intensive probation programs for some of the youths typically committed to state institutions. During the first two years (1983-1985) of operating three separate probation programs, state commitments from the Detroit

-----  
9. The Center for the Study of Youth Policy can provide information concerning viable alternative programs currently operating in other jurisdictions. See Appendix VI for selected descriptions of model programs.

10. Materials on the Maryland experience are available from the Center for the Study of Youth Policy.

area fell from over 700 per year to a little more than 500. A carefully designed, four-year evaluation followed the first 300 youths who were diverted from commitment and supervised instead by the probation programs. The researchers found that the probation youths' recidivism was not significantly different from that of a control group. The probation programs were no less effective than commitment in preventing further delinquency, and by reducing commitments the state of Michigan saved an estimated \$8.8 million over four years.<sup>11</sup>

Under a Federal court order, the state of Florida has been reducing the population of its two training schools. Just a few years ago, there were over 1,000 youths held at the two schools. As of December 31, 1988, there were only 317. By implementing tighter controls such as a better intake screening process, assuring that youths are not inappropriately transferred from one program to another, and expanding public and private providers of services, the state has been able to conform to the stipulations of the court order.

### Alternative Programs

Proven alternative program models and interventions already exist. States need not depend on conventional institutions. Mississippi is blessed with coastline and wilderness areas that would seem especially suited for two popular program models -- the Associated Marine Institutes (AMI), and Outward Bound. Both programs have been proven effective in other states in dealing with the type of young offenders who would otherwise be placed in secure institutions.

---

11. The full report of the Wayne County research can be obtained from the Center for the Study of Youth Policy.



In Texas, Louisiana, Florida and Delaware, state officials have contracted with the Associated Marine Institutes to provide intensive non-residential programs for adjudicated offenders. These programs, structured around non-residential alternative schools, feature environmental education. The curricula are marine related and focus on job skills and employment readiness. Youths are picked up every morning at 8:00 a.m. and returned home by 5:00 p.m. While in the program, youths learn scuba diving, sailing, navigation, etc. Each youth leaves the program with a specific educational or vocational plan. AMI programs are particularly effective in advancing the educational achievement and orientation of delinquent youths.

Modified short-term (28-40 days) residential Outward Bound programs are run by the state itself in Massachusetts and under contract in Florida. Groups of delinquent youths go through a series of physically demanding, rugged experiences such as rock climbing, canoeing, and rope climbing. The programs improve youths' self-esteem through challenging experiences that require teamwork. Counselors also help youths identify, address and resolve issues that have been factors in their behavior. Using these programs, Massachusetts and Florida have reduced their reliance on traditional institutional placements.

Other states have also had success with intensive, non-residential programs such as the Youth Advocate Program (YAP). Based in Pennsylvania, YAP contracts with counties to provide intensive, community-based supervision for delinquent youths. The program assigns an individual youth to between 10 and 40 hours of one-on-one community supervision per week. The cost to the county is determined on the basis of the hours of service required. Originally started to remove juveniles from the (adult) Camp Hill prison, the Youth Advocate Program has contracts for services in Philadelphia, Wilmington, Baltimore, Camden,

Newark and Paterson. Its clients include many minority, inner-city youths adjudicated for a wide variety of delinquent acts. YAP staff are usually young adults, recruited from the same neighborhoods as the youths served by the program.

In other states, minority organizations have demonstrated that they can be an effective resource in developing programs for tough, urban youths. A Washington, D.C. inner-city church runs Harambee House, an intensive residential program for hard core delinquent girls. In Philadelphia, the House of Umoja, started by Black parents whose son had joined a gang, has been the city's most effective tool at combating Black gang activity. On the south and west sides of Chicago, the Unified Delinquency Intervention Service (UDIS) Project has proven that local organizations, given the resources and assistance, can develop effective alternatives to traditional institutions. What could predominantly Black churches and neighborhood organizations do in the cities of Mississippi if they were provided with adequate funding to develop supervision programs for youthful offenders? Might they develop, with some professional help, innovative programs to support the youths from their own communities who are now being processed into the state system?

### Other Issues

1. **Organizational structure.** Currently, the state is considering moving the functions of DYS under an umbrella agency. Given such a plan, the least desirable alternative would be to place DYS under adult corrections where, in other states, juveniles often receive inadequate services. If juvenile services are to be improved, resources and support must be provided for the development of a new and improved service system.

2. **The Youth Court Commission.** The work of this Commission should be coordinated with the Executive branch's plan regarding reform in youth services. Also, it would seem that the work of the Commission is hampered by a lack of staff and resources.
3. **The processing of minority youths.** A thorough analysis (from arrest to disposition) should be performed regarding the apparent disproportionate representation of Black youths in the system.
4. **Community supports and interventions.** The number, kind and quality of current community interventions - including aftercare services and supervision - should be identified. Any restructuring of the present system must include consistent case management and aftercare services.
5. **Youths in the adult system.** A profile of youths currently being handled by adult courts should be developed. This profile should analyze the specific sentencing dispositions received by youths waived to adult court.
6. **Pre-trial detention.** The relationship between pre-trial detention (and the use of local jails) and commitment patterns needs to be analyzed.

## **OTHER IMPRESSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS**

Although this report is in no way an evaluation of the training schools' programs, other issues were identified through our on-site work:

1. **Lengths of stay in the disciplinary cottages (Special Intervention Units, or SIU) should be monitored.** Both schools use separate cottages to handle discipline cases. Time in both units is not credited toward an offender's release date and there is limited access to programs.

DYS has a policy setting the maximum length of stay in these units at 30 days. Mississippi officials should consider the disciplinary policies currently in place in the training schools of Florida. In these facilities, similar cases are disciplined in a matter of days (in most instances within two or three days). Every student being disciplined at these Florida facilities attends school in the morning and does special work assignments in the afternoon. Furthermore, the disciplinary programs at the Florida institutions do not rely on room isolation.

2. **The Ironwood Unit.** On the Oakley campus there is a separately administered program for repetitive disciplinary cases. Intake to this unit is approved at central office. There is one tutor assigned to the unit. Youths spend most of their time locked in their rooms (cells); the unit consists of three separate locked units - A, B and C. Some youths do extensive time in Ironwood. At the time of our visit one youth had spent in excess of five months in Ironwood. According to the supervisor of the unit, 19 staff are assigned to this program. Given the program's reliance on lock-up, it is difficult to see how the program can meet its avowed goal of helping youths control their aggression. In a juvenile correctional system there is need for specialized programs for the most serious cases. As it currently operates, however, Ironwood is doing little more than containing these cases. Staff should look closely at the program developed in Alabama (the Intensive Treatment Unit at Mt. Meigs) for a similar population.<sup>12</sup> From a crime control viewpoint, these cases deserve special attention.

-----

12. Recently, the Federal government has helped develop special secure programs for serious and violent juveniles; see Violent Juvenile Offenders: An Anthology. At the ITU at Mt. Meigs, all youths are involved in a full-time educational and counselling program. Although there are two "time out" rooms, they are used sparingly.



3. **The Pilot Cadet Achievement Program (CAP).** Columbia and Oakley run special short-term programs based on a paramilitary, boot camp model. The department is to be congratulated for developing short term (10 weeks) programs for many of their less serious cases. Before expanding this model, however, a number of issues need to be addressed:

- If resources were available locally, could many of the youths in CAP (particularly at Columbia) be diverted from institutional care altogether?
- What objective evidence exists to support the cost-effectiveness of the boot camp approach as opposed to other residential programs?
- How does the boot camp program connect with a youth's educational program? The CAP youths we interviewed at Oakley spent only a small portion of their day (1 to 2 hours) in educational classes.
- What is the specific relationship between the boot camp program and a youth's aftercare plan/experience? This last point is valid for all institutional programming. The payoff for all institutional programs is simply how effectively they assist youths to lawfully re-enter their communities. We sense that there needs to be a stronger relationship between a youth's residential program and his aftercare supervision.

## CONCLUSION

The issues and concerns raised in this report were openly discussed with staff from a variety of levels within DYS. It was clear from these discussions that DYS is genuinely committed to improving services for the youths they serve. The authors of this report hope that this risk assessment study supports the continuing efforts of DYS officials to improve services for adjudicated youths in Mississippi. Other states have demonstrated that improvements in public safety and the reform of institutionally-based juvenile justice systems can happen simultaneously. This report is intended to contribute to the public discussion about the nature, quality and future direction of juvenile correctional services in Mississippi.

## APPENDIX I

### Materials Reviewed

1. 1987 Annual Report, Mississippi Department of Youth Services
2. Authorizing Legislation for the Department of Youth Services
3. 1987 Youth Court Report
4. Legislation establishing the Mississippi Commission on a Uniform Youth Court System
5. Mississippi Department of Youth Services Disciplinary Code
6. Program Description: Pilot Cadet Achievement Program
7. Federal Court Order (5/23/77) re. Oakley Training School

APPENDIX II-A  
WORKING GROUP 1

Ms. Ann Sapp	Special Assistant to the Governor
Ms. Dorothy Triplett	Deputy Director, Federal-State Program
Judge Emily Baker	Jackson County Youth Court
Ms. Pickett Wilson	Education Specialist, Office of the Governor
Mr. Frank Melton	President and Chief Executive Officer of WLBT-TV; Board of Directors of the Mississippi Dept. of Youth Services
Mr. Jesse C. Pennington	Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee
Ms. Pat Flynn	Special Assistant Attorney General
Mr. Roy Thigpen	Director, Department of Criminal Justice Planning
Mr. Walter Wood, Jr.	Administrator, Community Services Division, Mississippi Dept. of Youth Services



APPENDIX II-B  
WORKING GROUP 2

Mr. Jesse C. Pennington	Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee
Mr. Walter Wood, Jr.	Administrator, Community Services Division, Mississippi Dept. of Youth Services
Dr. Myron Horn	Superintendent, Oakley Training School, Mississippi Dept. of Youth Services
Mr. Billy H. McDonald	Superintendent, Columbia Training School, Mississippi Dept. of Youth Services
Mr. Clarence Buford	Assistant Superintendent, Columbia Training School, Mississippi Dept. of Youth Services
Mr. Ed Bergeron	Psychologist, Oakley Training School, Mississippi Dept. of Youth Services
Ms. Linda Whittington	Federal-State Programs
Ms. Kim Crevitt	University of Southern Mississippi
Ms. Karen Wilkerson	University of Southern Mississippi
Dr. Larry LeFlore	University of Southern Mississippi
Judge Emily Baker	Jackson County Youth Court
Ms. Pat Flynn	Special Assistant Attorney General
Mr. Herbert Terry	Director, Justice Programs Division, Dept. of Criminal Justice Planning
Mr. Anthony Gobar, Sr.	Juvenile Justice Specialist, Dept. of Criminal Justice Planning

APPENDIX II-C  
DATA COLLECTION TEAM

University of Southern Mississippi

Ms. Kim Crevitt

Ms. Karen Wilkerson

Ms. Stephanie Boykins

Ms. Betty Boney

Dr. Larry LeFlore, Assistant Professor  
University of Southern Mississippi  
Box 5127, Southern Station  
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-5127  
(601) 266-4509

University of Michigan

Ms. Debora J. Cavazos

APPENDIX III-A  
Scoring Procedures

---

Factors in Risk Score

Points for Offenses

(See APPENDIX III-B)

Prior Felony Adjudications  
in Past Two Years

less than 3 - 0 pts.  
3 or more - 5 pts.

Youth's Age at First Commitment

age 13 or older - 0 pts.  
before age 13 - 1 pt.

Prior Out-of-Home Placements  
(due to delinquency)

No - 0 pts.  
Yes - 1 pt.

Instant Offense Directly  
Related to Drug Use

No or Unknown - 0 pts.  
Yes (Alcohol/Marijuana) - 1 pt.  
Yes (Cocaine/Heroin) - 2 pts.

Instant Offense Directly  
Related to Gang Involvement

No or Unknown - 0 pts.  
Yes - 1 pt.

---

## APPENDIX III-B

Scoring of Offenses  
(Points Awarded)

Offense Type	Points if Instant Offense	Points if Prior Offense
Status		
Status	0	0
Program Violation	0	0
Misdemeanors		
Contempt	1	0
VOP	2	0
Disorderly	0	0
Other Misdemeanors	0	0
Level 3 Felonies		
Poss Minor Drugs	3	1
Shoplift	1	0
Simple Assault	1	0
Stolen Property	3	1
Fraud	2	1
Arson 2/3 Deg.	3	1
Level 2 Felonies		
Poss Weapons	3	2
Larceny	3	1
Burglary	5	3
Grand Larceny	5	3
Car Theft	5	3
Burg/Business	5	3
B + E	3	2
Unarmed Robbery	5	3
Escape	3	1
Assault	3	1
Level 1 Felonies		
Aggravated Assault	10	7
Armed Robbery	10	7
Rape/Sex Offense	10	7



# **APPENDIX III-C** **RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT**

## **PLACEMENT:**

☐ TRAINING SCHOOL \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ RESIDENTIAL \_\_\_\_\_ SCORE: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ WAIVED \_\_\_\_\_

COMMITTING COUNTY: \_\_\_\_\_ DATA COLLECTOR: \_\_\_\_\_

1. FILE #: \_\_\_\_\_ 2. D.O.B.: \_\_\_\_\_

3. SEX: MALE ☐ FEMALE ☐ 4. RACE: \_\_\_\_\_

5. ENROLLED IN SCHOOL: YES ☐ NO ☐ DK ☐ 6. HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED: \_\_\_\_\_

7. DATE OF CURRENT COMMITMENT: \_\_\_\_\_ 7a. DATE OF FIRST <sup>COMMITMENT</sup> ~~ADJUDICATION~~: \_\_\_\_\_

8. CURRENT INSTANT OFFENSE WHICH RESULTED IN ADJUDICATION AND PRESENT COMMITMENT: \_\_\_\_\_

9. MOST SERIOUS PRIOR ADJUDICATED OFFENSE: \_\_\_\_\_

10. NUMBER OF PRIOR <sup>COMMITMENTS</sup> ~~ADJUDICATIONS~~: \_\_\_\_\_

11. GANG INVOLVEMENT: PRE COMMITMENT YES ☐ NO ☐

POST COMMITMENT YES ☐ NO ☐

WAS GANG INVOLVEMENT DIRECTLY RELATED TO INSTANT OFFENSE YES ☐ NO ☐

## **I. Severity of Current Offense**

(Locate offense and its corresponding point value (Column I) on the attached Felony Listing Sheet) \_\_\_\_\_

## **II. Severity of Prior Offense**

(Locate Offense and its corresponding point value (Column II) on the attached Felony Listing Sheet) \_\_\_\_\_

## **III. Number of Prior <sup>COMMITMENTS</sup> ~~ADJUDICATIONS~~ for Felonies: \_\_\_\_\_**

Three or more in the last two years (5 pts.) \_\_\_\_\_

## **STABILITY FACTORS**

## **IV. Prior Out of Home Court-Ordered Placement as a Result of Adjudication for Delinquent Act:**

YES (1 pt.) ☐ NO (0 pt.) ☐ DK ☐ \_\_\_\_\_

## **V. Degree of Drug Involvement:**

(Assess points only if drugs were directly related to the commission of the instant offense)

Crack/Cocaine/Heroin (2 pts.) \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX IV  
 Characteristics of Youths  
 by Population of Committing Counties

	Population of Committing County					
	Over 100k		50 to 100k		Under 50k	
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.	n	Pct.
Black	54	76%	81	76%	125	81%
White	17	24%	25	24%	29	19%
Total	71	100%	106	100%	154	100%
Male	57	80%	95	90%	143	93%
Female	14	20%	11	10%	11	7%
Total	71	100%	106	100%	154	100%
Age (in years)						
Under 14	5	7%	10	9%	22	14%
14	9	13%	14	13%	16	10%
15	16	23%	27	25%	23	15%
16	18	26%	27	25%	38	25%
17	18	26%	23	22%	37	24%
Over 17	4	6%	5	5%	18	12%
Total	70	100%	106	100%	154	100%
Offense Type						
Status/Minor	4	6%	3	3%	8	5%
Misdemeanors	12	17%	24	23%	14	9%
Level 3 Felony	15	21%	11	10%	26	17%
Level 2 Felony	34	48%	63	59%	98	64%
Level 1 Felony	6	8%	5	5%	8	5%
Total	71	100%	106	100%	154	100%
Scores						
0 - 3	21	30%	35	34%	52	35%
4 - 6	28	40%	40	39%	51	34%
7 - 9	8	11%	12	12%	32	22%
10 +	13	19%	15	15%	13	9%
Total	70	100%	102	100%	148	100%

## APPENDIX V

Mean Risk Scores by County  
(for Eleven Highest Committing Counties Only)

<u>County</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Std Dev</u>	<u>No. Cases</u>
Lincoln	3.3	1.25	10
Washington	4.1	2.80	16
Lauderdale	4.1	3.19	17
Leflore	4.7	2.67	12
Harrison	5.1	3.14	23
Lee	5.4	3.24	16
Hinds	5.7	3.39	40
Coahoma	5.8	3.12	18
Warren	6.3	3.36	12
Lowndes	6.3	3.10	11
Forrest	6.5	3.30	17
<i>Entire Population</i>	5.3	3.16	192

---