

Connecting Iowa's Disproportionate Minority Confinement Efforts to the Iowa Justice Data Warehouse

**A Report From
Department of Human Rights
Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and
Statistical Analysis Center**

June 2002



This report and other CJJP publications can be found at:
<http://www.state.ia.us/government/dhr/cjpp/recpub/html>

Connecting Iowa's Disproportionate Minority Confinement Efforts to the Iowa Justice Data Warehouse

**Department of Human Rights
Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and
Statistical Research Center**

Prepared By
Scott Musel
Laura Roeder-Grubb
Richard Moore

June 2002

Introduction

Funds for this report and grant were provided to the Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP) and Statistical Analysis Center, by the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) through a cooperative agreement entitled “Juvenile Justice Evaluation Resource Center” with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ).

Iowa’s DMC History

Like many states, Iowa has struggled with the Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC) issue. DMC is a concern with the number of minority youth that are involved with the court systems and confined in secure settings, and that these minority youth are disproportionately greater than the number they represent in the overall juvenile population. A break down of the juvenile population of Iowa can be seen in Table 1. DMC is one of the four core requirements¹ that states, which participate in the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act, must address.

Table 1: Juvenile Population of Iowa by Race/Ethnicity

	Number	Percentage
Caucasian	651,482	89%
African American	21,490	3%
Native American	2,679	0%
Asian & Pacific Islander	10,428	1%
Other	1,263	0%
Multi-Racial	13,569	2%
Hispanic/Latino	32,727	4%
Total	733,638	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census

In Iowa, for example, while minority youth have historically represented less than a tenth of the juvenile population they have historically represented from one-quarter to one-third of the youth in Iowa’s juvenile detention centers and at the State Training School, and up to one-half of the number of youth that receive a prison sentence after being transferred to the adult court system (see Table 2).

¹ The four core requirements include: Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO), Jail Removal, Sight and Sound Separation, and Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC).

Table 2: Juvenile Arrest and Incarceration by Race/Ethnicity²

	Arrest		Detention		Training School		Prison	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Caucasian	19,063	86%	3,801	72%	354	75%	53	52%
Minority	3,092	14%	1,493	28%	116	25%	49	48%
Total	22,155		5,294		470		102	

Source: Arrest Data - Department of Public Safety (DPS), 2000 UCR

Source: Detention Data - Department of Human Rights (DHR)/CJJJ, SFY00 Detention Database

Source: Training School - State Training School for Boys at Eldora, SFY00

Source: Prison - ACIS, SFY00

A previous study³ of DMC in the State of Iowa has shown that many factors both within the system and outside the system influence the disproportionate number of minorities involved in the system; however, the single strongest factors are the legal variables (e.g. type of offense committed, prior record). The study also found that even with legal and other variables being held constant there are sometimes different court outcomes for persons of different races.

Iowa has been addressing the DMC issue for a number of years through various efforts. One of the tools that has been used to assist is the DMC Matrix provided by OJJDP. This DMC matrix is a tool that helps determine the rate of disproportionate minority representation at various areas of the justice system (e.g. arrest, petitions filed, detention) by comparing the percentage the minority is in the overall population to the percentage the minority is in the specific area. While parts of this DMC matrix have been simple to complete (e.g. arrests, incarceration in county jails and city lock-ups, holds in juvenile detention), other parts of the DMC matrix have been extremely difficult to complete (e.g. prosecutions, adjudications, dispositions). This can be seen in Appendix A where all of Phase I of the DMC matrix is completed, but only select parts of Phase II are completed. This has made it difficult to study system flow, and whether there are areas within the system flow that require more attention to DMC issues.

In 1997, it was proposed in Iowa to create a Justice Data Warehouse (JDW). The JDW is a central repository of key criminal and juvenile justice information from the Iowa Court Information System (ICIS). The overall mission of the JDW is to provide the judicial, legislative and executive branches of State Government, and other entities, with improved statistical and decision support information pertaining to justice system activities. The JDW's centralized structure allows access to court data from all 99 local jurisdictions in one location, with one query tool. Data from the source ICIS tables are extracted and uploaded to the JDW each month.

² Numbers provided are those reported from the various agencies (i.e. DPS, juvenile detention centers, State Training School), and do not reflect the flow of a youth through the system. The numbers only reflect the numbers of juveniles reported during the indicated time period.

³ *A Description and Discussion of Minority Overrepresentation in Iowa's Juvenile Justice System.* (1993). Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning, Iowa Department of Human Rights. Moore, Richard & Kuker, Dave.

With the JDW project under way, the opportunity was presented to finally begin collecting information for DMC efforts that were previously extremely difficult to collect. Since the data would be available in a central repository the aggregate data needed to complete the DMC Matrix would now be easier to access.

The grant offered through JRSA for DMC evaluation was an excellent opportunity to connect Iowa's DMC and JDW efforts. The JRSA grant allowed for activities that assisted both state and local planners with statistical support information to better plan for both statewide and local DMC initiatives.

State Goals with JRSA Grant

CJJP had two main objectives for this grant.

- Work with Juvenile Court Services (JCS), Iowa's Disproportionate Minority Confinement committee (a sub-committee of Iowa's State Advisory Group), and the State Court Administrator's Office to develop and maintain race-based, standardized reports for planning, evaluation and monitoring purposes.
- Enhance the capacity of state and local officials to better utilize Iowa Court Information data stored in the Justice Data Warehouse.

State Activities with JRSA Grant

Over the course of the grant period, CJJP staff met a number of times with the state's eight Chief Juvenile Court Officers (JCOs) to plan for the use of the data stored in the JDW at the local level. During this process, CJJP staff and the Chief JCOs identified key decision points in the system flow of the juvenile court as both points to be examined as issues to be addressed by DMC efforts and points that otherwise are of interest to the Chief JCOs for monitoring the case loads and work in their offices. These key decision points include juvenile court complaints, diversions, petitions filed, adjudications, dispositions and adult court waivers.

While meeting with the Chief JCOs, CJJP staff was invited to begin working with an ICIS User's Standardization committee. This committee consisted of staff from the eight judicial JCS offices, and was focused on standardizing the data that was being input by the JCS offices. Prior to CJJP staff's involvement with the standardizing committee it had been determined by the JCS offices and Chief JCOs that there was some variance in the codes that were used by the different JCS offices for input into ICIS. For example, the code that one office was using for a juvenile sent to a diversion program may be different than the code that another JCS office was using. These variations made it difficult to track and compare some decisions across the eight judicial districts. It was these variations that led to the formation of the ICIS User's Standardization committee.

While working with the ICIS User's Standardization committee, it was determined that the information being input into ICIS by the JCS offices was very inconsistent for the demographical components of race and gender. In conjunction with the Chief JCOs and the JCS offices, CJJP staff initiated an effort to clean up the data that already existed in the JDW and to begin entering the demographic data more accurately and consistently by the JCS offices.

Once these demographic issues were addressed and the ICIS User's Standardization committee had completed its tasks, it was determined by the Chief JCOs that the data being input into the ICIS system and uploaded into the JDW could be considered consistent and complete for the state effective January 1st, 2002. Reports generated after the January 1st data have shown that the demographic data is being consistently input into the ICIS system. Offices that have historically struggled with inputting demographic data have requested that CJJP provide them with additional, detailed reports indicating which cases they have entered with missing demographic data. They then use these reports to retroactively fill in the missing data fields.

CJJP staff also met with the state's DMC committee on a number of occasions in their efforts to help reduce the DMC issues faced by the State of Iowa. During these meetings the DMC committee was kept abreast of the efforts that the CJJP staff was making with the JRSA grant. The DMC committee was excited by and supportive of these efforts and about the data that the grant will make available to both the committee and to local officials to help coordinate DMC reduction efforts.

Involvement with the DMC committee has led CJJP staff to discussions with Iowa's DMC Resource Center, housed within the National Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice (NRCFCP). Parts of these discussions have included how NRCFCP may be able to utilize the data in the JWD for DMC efforts. NRCFCP is examining manners in which they can assist local communities use the data to address their DMC issues and ways to use the data to monitor any progress towards reducing DMC numbers.

An Examination of the Data


Prior to examining the data it should be noted that the data that follows, and previously shown in Table 2, come from a number of sources (e.g. US Census Bureau, Department of Public Safety, juvenile detention centers, State Training School, Justice Data Warehouse). These sources are generally exclusive of one another, and do not represent a flow of a specific group of youth through the justice system. These are simply the numbers reported from the source for the indicated time period.

The DMC committee and NRCFCP identified six communities⁴ in the state for assistance from NRCFCP's DMC Resource Center. As can be seen in Graph 1 these

⁴ The six communities were the counties of Black Hawk, Muscatine, Polk, Scott, Woodbury and the tri-county area of Hamilton/Humboldt/Wright (H/H/W). These communities were chosen for their DMC

six communities all have issues with DMC. Each has significantly high rates of detaining youth in juvenile detention centers (Detained) and placing them in the State Training School (Committed). The data shown in Graph 1 are the percentages that minority youth comprise of the total youth population for the indicated factor.

Graph 1: DMC Percentages for Six Target Communities⁵




Historically the numbers in the above graph have been relatively easy to obtain for the assessment of DMC issues for local communities. By connecting the DMC efforts with the JDW through the JRSA grant additional information regarding system flow can now be provided to these communities (see Graph 2). The data shown in Graph 2 are the percentages that minority youth comprise of the total youth population for the indicated factor.

issues and to have a mixture of both urban communities (Black Hawk, Polk, Scott and Woodbury) and rural communities (H/H/W and Muscatine).

⁵ Population data is from the US Census Bureau 2000 Census. Arrest data is from the Department of Public Safety’s (DPS) 2000 Uniform Crime Report (UCR). Detention data is from the detention database maintained by CJPJ for SFY01. Commitment data is from the state training school database maintained by CJPJ for SFY01.

Graph 2: DMC Court Percentages for Six Target Communities⁶



As can be seen from Graph 2 the number of minority youth at these various stages of the court flow system are still over-represented; however, the communities are now able to focus on which parts of the system that they have the most over-representation. Please note that the number of cases adjudicated is not available for Black Hawk County at this time. It should also be noted that for H/H/W and Muscatine that they had values of zero for petitions filed and cases adjudicated, respectively, during the time period. As was noted at the beginning of this section the numbers reflected in this graph does not follow the flow of a youth through the system, but is a snap shot of the system for the indicated time period. Due to these being small, rural communities and the time period presently available for data only covering a four month period (January 1st, 2002 – April 30th, 2002) the value of zero in these two areas is not concerning from a data quality perspective.

Completion of Grant Goals

One of the first indicators towards the success of this grant in connecting the DMC efforts with the JDW can be seen in the DMC matrix. As seen in Appendix B a more complete DMC matrix can now be completed through access to data that is now stored in the JDW. As the data to complete the matrix has become available it will now be possible to more fully complete the DMC matrix on an annual basis. When the Phase II section of the DMC matrices in appendix A and appendix B are compared the number of incomplete rows has been reduced between the matrix prior to the JDW (Appendix A) and the matrix after the JDW (Appendix B).

The objectives of goal one, the development and maintenance of race-based, standardized reports were completed through work with the JCS offices, Chief JCOs, DMC committee and State Court Administrators office.

⁶ Data extracted from the JDW by CJJP for the time period of January 1st, 2002 – April 30th, 2002.

As reported previously, the Chief JCOs have given CJJP a start date, January 1st, 2002, for when the data being input by the eight judicial districts encompassing the 99 local jurisdictions would be standardized. The first couple of months of data that has been uploaded from ICIS to the JDW and then extracted from the JDW have verified that there is consistency across the eight judicial districts and the demographic data that had been inconsistently entered, race/ethnicity and gender, are now being consistently entered. Copies of the race-based reports now being generated for the Chief JCOs can be seen in Appendix C.

To achieve the objective of goal two, CJJP staff worked with the State Court Administrators office to obtain access and training for local officials to access and use the ICIS data contained within the JDW. This access and training was designed to help communities identify and plan for their DMC reduction efforts. CJJP staff has helped to ensure that the eight judicial districts are able to gain access to the data through a web-based application, Info View.

The objective of goal two has further been achieved by CJJP staffs' discussions with NRCFCP. These discussions have centered on the use of the data in the JDW, and how it will be used by NRCFCP to assist communities in their DMC planning.

Continuing Efforts

CJJP will stay committed to the original objectives of the grant of developing race-based, standardized reports for planning, evaluation and monitoring purposes, and increasing the capacity at both the state and local level for officials to utilize the Iowa Court Information stored on the JDW. CJJP will work toward these goals through the following efforts:

- Continue to work with the eight judicial district juvenile court offices to improve the consistency of the data input;
- Work with the eight judicial district juvenile court offices on retrieving data on the key decision points of diversions, dispositions and adult court waivers;
- Expand state and local planners in their ability to access the JDW through the web based utility Info View;
- Stay committed to working with Iowa's DMC committee and their parent committee, the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee, in monitoring and working towards reductions in Iowa's DMC numbers;
- Continue to work with ICIS staff in helping coordinate training and assistance on both the data contained in the JDW and the use of the web access tool, Info View;
- Continue to work with Iowa Technology Department in maintaining the number of end-users of the web access tool, and increasing the number of both state and local officials able to access and use the data stored in the JDW;
- Continue to work with NRCFCP in helping communities use data to plan for efforts to reduce DMC.

Summary

In summary, the grant from JRSA allowed the State of Iowa to mesh together two projects that were taking place in the state. The DMC reduction efforts and the JDW project. The grant allowed for these two projects to come closer together and improved the effectiveness of both. For the DMC efforts, more complete data is now available that helps the state focus its efforts towards the regions of the state that require more assistance and helps target the focus on the parts of the juvenile justice that need attention. For the JDW project, the grant helped improve the amount of data and the consistency of the data that was being uploaded to the warehouse, and increased the number of people able to access the JDW.

– Appendix A –

2000 Iowa DMC Matrix: Phase I

Data Items	-A- Total Number of All Youth	-B- Total Number of Minority Youth	-C- Percent Minority	-D- Index
1. Population at risk (ages 10 through 17)	343,147	25,831	7.5%	N/A
2. Juveniles arrested.	19,750	3,586	18.2%	2.41
3. Juveniles confined in secure juvenile detention facilities.	5,294	1,493	28.2%	3.75
4. Juveniles confined in secure juvenile correctional facilities.	470	116	24.7%	3.28
5. Juveniles confined in adult jails.	338	162	47.9%	6.37
6. Juveniles confined in adult lockups.	29	4	13.8%	1.83
7. Total (Items 3 - 6).	6,131	1,775	29.0%	3.85

Data Sources:

- 1: 1999 Woods & Poole Estimates
- 2: 1999 UCR maintained by DPS (race/ethnicity was only reported on 19,750 of the 23,894 juvenile arrests)
- 3: SFY00 Juvenile Detention Database maintained by CJJP
- 4: SFY00 Juvenile Correctional Database maintained by CJJP
- 5: SFY00 Juvenile Jail Hold Database maintained by CJJP
- 6: SFY00 Juvenile Adult Lockup Database maintained by CJJP

2000 Iowa DMC Matrix: Phase II

Data Items	-A- Total Number of All Youth	-B- Total Number of Minority Youth	-C- Percent Minority	-D- Index
1. Population at risk (ages 10 through 17)	343,147	25,831	7.5%	N/A
2. Arrested	Status	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Delinquent	N/A	N/A	N/A
3. Diverted	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4. Detained	Own Home	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Nonsecure	2,819	328	11.6%
	Secure	5,294	1,493	28.2%
5. Prosecuted	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6. Adjudicated	Status	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Delinquent	N/A	N/A	N/A
7. Disposition	Case Closed	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Probation Own Home	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Probation in nonsecure	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Commitment to Private Agency	2,858	411	14.4%
	Commitment to State Agency	102	21	20.6%
8. Committed	State Secure Facility	470	116	24.7%
	Local Secure Facility	148	36	24.3%
9. Transferred to adult Court	416	132	31.7%	4.22

Data Sources:

- 1: 1999 Woods & Poole Estimates
- 2: Data Not Available
- 3: Data Not Available
- 4: Nonsecure data provided by DHS for SFY99. Secure data from SFY00 Detention Database maintained by CJJP
- 5: Data Not Available
- 6: Data Not Available
- 7: Private Agency data provided by DHS for SFY99. State Agency data provided by IJH for SFY99.
- 8: State Secure data provided by SFY00 Juvenile Correctional Database maintained by CJJP. Local Secure data provided by SFY99 ERT Database maintained by CJJP.
- 9: Data extracted from ICIS and ICBC for SFY99 by CJJP. These are only juveniles committed to prison or placed on adult probation. Does not include cases that were dismissed or found innocent.

– Appendix B –

2002 Iowa DMC Matrix: Phase I

Data Items	-A- Total Number of All Youth	-B- Total Number of Minority Youth	-C- Percent Minority	-D- Index
1. Population at risk (ages 10 through 17)	342,622	31,492	9.2%	N/A
2. Juveniles arrested.	22,155	3,092	14.0%	1.52
3. Juveniles confined in secure juvenile detention facilities.	5,245	1,542	29.4%	3.20
4. Juveniles confined in secure juvenile correctional facilities.	421	109	25.9%	2.82
5. Juveniles confined in adult jails.	279	117	41.9%	4.56
6. Juveniles confined in adult lockups.	34	1	2.9%	0.32
7. Total (Items 3 - 6).	5,979	1,769	29.6%	3.22

Data Sources:

- 1: US Census Bureau – 2000 Census
- 2: 2000 UCR maintained by DPS
- 3: SFY01 Juvenile Detention Database maintained by CJJP
- 4: SFY01 Juvenile Correctional Database maintained by CJJP
- 5: SFY01 Juvenile Jail Hold Database maintained by CJJP
- 6: SFY01 Juvenile Adult Lockup Database maintained by CJJP

2002 Iowa DMC Matrix: Phase II

Data Items		-A- Total Number of All Youth	-B- Total Number of Minority Youth	-C- Percent Minority	-D- Index
1. Population at risk (ages 10 through 17)		342,622	31,492	9.2%	N/A
2. Arrested	Status	1,687	144	8.5%	0.93
	Delinquent	20,468	2,948	14.4%	1.57
3. Diverted		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4. Detained	Own Home	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Nonsecure	2,819	328	11.6%	1.27
	Secure	5,245	1,542	29.4%	3.20
5. Prosecuted		2,016	442	21.9%	2.39
6. Adjudicated	Status	7	0	0.0%	0.00
	Delinquent	4,410	884	20.0%	2.18
7. Disposition	Case Closed	569	91	16.0%	1.74
	Probation Own Home	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Probation in nonsecure	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Commitment to Private Agency	2,858	411	14.4%	1.56
	Commitment to State Agency	167	37	22.2%	2.41
8. Committed	State Secure Facility	421	109	25.9%	2.82
	Local Secure Facility	122	20	16.4%	1.78
9. Transferred to adult Court		253	82	32.4%	3.53

Data Sources:

- 1: 1999 Woods & Poole Estimates
- 2: 2000 UCR maintained by DPS
- 3: Data Not Available
- 4: Nonsecure data provided by DHS for SFY99. Secure data from SFY01 Detention Database maintained by CJJP
- 5: Data extracted from JDW for SFY02 by CJJP. This data is only for the period of January 1, 2002 through April 30, 2002.
- 6: Data extracted from JDW for SFY02 by CJJP. This data is only for the period of January 1, 2002 through April 30, 2002.
- 7: Case Closed data extracted from JDW for SFY02 by CJJP. This data is only for the period of January 1, 2002 through April 30, 2002. Private Agency data provided by DHS for SFY99. State Agency data provided by IJH for SFY01.
- 8: State Secure data provided by SFY01 Juvenile Correctional Database maintained by CJJP. Local Secure data provided by SFY01 ERT Database maintained by CJJP.
- 9: Data extracted from ICIS and ICBC for SFY00 by CJJP. These are only juveniles committed to prison or placed on adult probation. Does not include cases that were dismissed or found innocent.

Note: Updated information has not yet been received from the Department of Human Services (DHS) for the number of juveniles detained in a nonsecure setting (Item 4) nor for the number of juveniles committed to a private agency (Item 7).

– Appendix C –

Juvenile Complaints
January 1st, 2002 – April 30th, 2002

Judicial District 1

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	OTHER	Totals
Allamakee	F			11				11
Allamakee	M	1		18	1			20
Black Hawk	F	1	60	91	2		2	156
Black Hawk	M		100	197	3		1	301
Buchanan	F			10				10
Buchanan	M		2	45				47
Chickasaw	F			12				12
Chickasaw	M			17	2			19
Clayton	F			12				12
Clayton	M			19				19
Delaware	F			10				10
Delaware	M			36				36
Dubuque	F		5	103	1			109
Dubuque	M		25	301	5	1	1	333
Fayette	F			26				26
Fayette	M			43				43
Grundy	F			5				5
Grundy	M			21				21
Howard	F			4				4
Howard	M			22				22
Winneshiek	F			10				10
Winneshiek	M			28				28
Totals:		2	192	1,041	14	1	4	1,254
Percentage of Total		0.2%	15.3%	83.0%	1.1%	0.1%	0.3%	

Judicial District 2

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	OTHER	Totals
Boone	F	1		12				13
Boone	M			28				28
Bremer	F			2				2
Bremer	M			19				19
Butler	F			6				6
Butler	M			40	2			42
Calhoun	F			8				8
Calhoun	M			6				6
Carroll	F			19				19
Carroll	M			61	1			62
Cerro Gordo	F			54				54
Cerro Gordo	M		2	117	1			120
Floyd	F			15				15
Floyd	M			42				42
Franklin	F			7	1			8
Franklin	M			17				17
Greene	F			6				6
Greene	M			17	1			18
Hamilton	F			14	1			15
Hamilton	M			29	2			31
Hancock	F			5				5
Hancock	M			30				30
Hardin	F			11				11
Hardin	M		1	39				40
Humboldt	F			4				4
Humboldt	M			16				16
Marshall	F		3	35	10	1		49
Marshall	M	3	4	119	43	5		174
Mitchell	F			3				3
Mitchell	M			13				13
Pocahontas	F			4				4
Pocahontas	M			15				15
Sac	F			6				6
Sac	M			15				15
Story	F	2	3	38	1		1	45
Story	M		12	77	2			91
Webster	F		10	25			1	36
Webster	M		13	67	3		1	84
Winnebago	F			6				6
Winnebago	M			11				11
Worth	F			4				4
Worth	M			13				13
Wright	F			7				7
Wright	M			39	4			43
Totals:		6	48	1,121	72	6	3	1,256
Percentage of Total		0.5%	3.8%	89.3%	5.7%	0.5%	0.2%	

Judicial District 3

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	Totals
Buena Vista	F	4		15	11		30
Buena Vista	M	7		41	11		59
Cherokee	F			4			4
Cherokee	M			11			11
Clay	F			9			9
Clay	M	2		27	1		30
Crawford	F		2	18			20
Crawford	M			35	5		40
Dickinson	F			18			18
Dickinson	M			19			19
Emmet	F			6	3		9
Emmet	M	2		22	2		26
Ida	F			4			4
Ida	M			13			13
Kossuth	F			9			9
Kossuth	M	1		24			25
Lyon	F			9			9
Lyon	M			39			39
Monona	F			5			5
Monona	M			11			11
O'Brien	F			11			11
O'Brien	M			27	2		29
Osceola	F			3			3
Osceola	M			15	1		16
Palo Alto	F			2			2
Palo Alto	M			1			1
Plymouth	F			13			13
Plymouth	M			16			16
Sac	M			1			1
Souix	F			13	2		15
Souix	M		5	48	3		56
Woodbury	F	3	12	79	12	21	127
Woodbury	M	10	28	174	34	37	283
Totals:		29	47	742	87	58	963
Percentage of Total		3.0%	4.9%	77.1%	9.0%	6.0%	

Judicial District 4

		BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	OTHER	Totals
Audubon	F		4				4
Audubon	M		8				8
Cass	F	1	15				16
Cass	M		34				34
Crawford	M			1			1
Fremont	M		14	1			15
Harrison	F		19				19
Harrison	M		21	1	1		23
Mills	F		10				10
Mills	M		11				11
Montgomery	F		8	1			9
Montgomery	M		23			2	25
Page	F		5				5
Page	M		13				13
Pottawattamie	F	6	110	6		1	123
Pottawattamie	M	6	237	14		2	259
Shelby	F		12				12
Shelby	M		13				13
Totals:		13	557	24	1	5	600
Percentage of Total		2.2%	92.8%	4.0%	0.2%	0.8%	

Judicial District 5

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	OTHER	Totals
Adair	F			2				2
Adair	M	1		10				11
Adams	M			3				3
Clarke	F			2				2
Clarke	M			9				9
Dallas	F			31				31
Dallas	M	1		87	15		1	104
Decatur	F			10				10
Decatur	M			11				11
Guthrie	F			13				13
Guthrie	M			15				15
Jasper	F			36				36
Jasper	M			79	3			82
Lucas	F			7				7
Lucas	M			20				20
Madison	F			9				9
Madison	M			24				24
Mahaska	M			1				1
Marion	F			23			1	24
Marion	M			49				49
Polk	?		1					1
Polk	F	7	113	268	23		9	420
Polk	M	22	218	641	63	1	8	953
Ringgold	F			4				4
Ringgold	M			7				7
Taylor	F			11				11
Taylor	M			14				14
Union	F			5				5
Union	M			13				13
Warren	F			37				37
Warren	M		1	59	2	1	1	64
Wayne	F			2				2
Wayne	M			10				10
Totals:		31	333	1,512	106	2	20	2,004
Percentage of Total		1.5%	16.6%	75.4%	5.3%	0.1%	1.0%	

Judicial District 6

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	OTHER	Totals
Benton	F			21				21
Benton	M		1	46	1			48
Iowa	F			5				5
Iowa	M			13				13
Johnson	F		19	58				77
Johnson	M		23	125	1		4	153
Jones	F			14				14
Jones	M		1	23				24
Linn	F	1	13	126	3		3	146
Linn	M	1	24	232	2	2	4	265
Tama	F		1	7	1	12		21
Tama	M		6	23	3	5		37
Totals:		2	88	693	11	19	11	824
Percentage of Total		0.2%	10.7%	84.1%	1.3%	2.3%	1.3%	

Judicial District 7

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	OTHER	Totals
Cedar	F			4				4
Cedar	M			20				20
Clinton	F		1	49				50
Clinton	M	1	6	94				101
Jackson	F			5				5
Jackson	M		1	36				37
Muscatine	F		1	34	11			46
Muscatine	M	1	3	68	26			98
Scott	F		71	117	1	2		191
Scott	M	3	121	276	9	1	13	423
Totals:		5	204	703	47	3	13	975
Percentage of Total		0.5%	20.9%	72.1%	4.8%	0.3%	1.3%	

Judicial District 8

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	OTHER	Totals
Appanoose	F			15			15
Appanoose	M		1	30			31
Davis	M			4			4
Des Moines	F		2	30	1		33
Des Moines	M		23	89	1		113
Henry	F			5			5
Henry	M	1		24			25
Jefferson	F			4			4
Jefferson	M	1		10			11
Keokuk	F			6			6
Keokuk	M		1	14			15
Lee	F		1	47	1		49
Lee	M	1	6	130		1	138
Louisa	F			5	2		7
Louisa	M			20	10		30
Mahaska	F			16			16
Mahaska	M			44	1		45
Monroe	F			1			1
Monroe	M			14			14
Poweshiek	F			6			6
Poweshiek	M	1		20	2		23
Van Buren	M			1			1
Wapello	F			38	2		40
Wapello	M		7	69	5		81
Washington	F		1	7	1		9
Washington	M	1	2	27	2		32
Totals:		5	44	676	28	1	754
Percentage of Total		0.7%	5.8%	89.7%	3.7%	0.1%	

Petitions Filed
 January 1st, 2002 – April 30th, 2002

Judicial District 1

		BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	Totals
Black Hawk	F	12	11	1	24
Black Hawk	M	30	41		71
Buchanan	F		2		2
Buchanan	M		5		5
Delaware	F		9		9
Delaware	M		6		6
Dubuque	F	1	21		22
Dubuque	M	11	87	2	100
Grundy	M		2		2
Totals:		54	184	3	241
Percentage of Total		22.4%	76.3%	1.2%	

Judicial District 2

		BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	OTHER	Totals
Boone	M		3			3
Bremer	M		4			4
Butler	M		8			8
Calhoun	F		3			3
Calhoun	M		1			1
Carroll	F		1			1
Carroll	M		1			1
Cerro Gordo	F	1	2			3
Cerro Gordo	M	1	13			14
Floyd	M		2			2
Franklin	F		1			1
Franklin	M		7			7
Greene	F		1			1
Greene	M		3			3
Hamilton	F		2			2
Hamilton	M		11			11
Hancock	M		2			2
Hardin	F		3			3
Hardin	M	1	4			5
Humboldt	F		1			1
Humboldt	M		3			3
Marshall	F		4	1		5
Marshall	M		22	10		32
Mitchell	M		1			1
Pocahontas	M		4			4
Sac	F		1			1
Sac	M		6			6
Story	F	1	3			4
Story	M	1	15			16
Webster	F	6	3			9
Webster	M	2	18	1	1	22
Winnebago	M		1			1
Worth	M		2			2
Wright	F		2			2
Wright	M		14			14
Totals:		13	172	12	1	198
Percentage of Total		6.6%	86.9%	6.1%	0.5%	

Judicial District 3

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	Totals
Buena Vista	F			1	3		4
Buena Vista	M	1		3	7		11
Cherokee	M			2			2
Clay	F			1			1
Clay	M			8			8
Crawford	F			1			1
Crawford	M			2	1		3
Dickinson	F			1			1
Dickinson	M			4			4
Emmet	F			3	1		4
Emmet	M			3	1		4
Ida	M			2			2
Kossuth	M			8			8
Lyon	F			4			4
Lyon	M			10			10
Monona	F			1			1
Monona	M			3			3
O'Brien	M			4	1		5
Osceola	M			3	1		4
Plymouth	F			2			2
Plymouth	M			1	1		2
Sioux	F			4			4
Sioux	M		1	16	1		18
Woodbury	F		1	8	1	2	12
Woodbury	M	1	1	29	8	4	43
Totals:		2	3	124	26	6	161
Percentage of Total		1.2%	1.9%	77.0%	16.1%	3.7%	

Judicial District 4

		BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	OTHER	Totals
Audubon	F		3			3
Audubon	M		4			4
Cass	M		5			5
Fremont	F		1			1
Fremont	M		6			6
Harrison	F		2			2
Harrison	M		5	1		6
Mills	F		4			4
Mills	M		3			3
Montgomery	F		2			2
Montgomery	M		13		1	14
Page	F		2			2
Page	M		6			6
Pottawattamie	F	2	28	1		31
Pottawattamie	M	3	95	7	1	106
Shelby	F		3			3
Shelby	M		10			10
Totals:		5	192	9	2	208
Percentage of Total		2.4%	92.3%	4.3%	1.0%	

Judicial District 5

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	OTHER	Totals
Adair	M			3			3
Clarke	M			1			1
Dallas	F			3			3
Dallas	M			21	3		24
Decatur	F			4			4
Decatur	M			6			6
Guthrie	F			1			1
Guthrie	M			2			2
Jasper	F			9			9
Jasper	M			24			24
Lucas	F			5			5
Lucas	M			11			11
Madison	F			2			2
Madison	M			12			12
Marion	F			7			7
Marion	M			15			15
Polk	?		1				1
Polk	F	1	18	56	5	1	81
Polk	M	8	115	186	27	2	338
Ringgold	F			5			5
Ringgold	M			7			7
Taylor	F			9			9
Taylor	M			11			11
Union	M			4			4
Warren	F			8			8
Warren	M		1	13	1	1	16
Wayne	F			1			1
Wayne	M			5			5
Totals:		9	135	431	36	4	615
Percentage of Total		1.5%	22.0%	70.1%	5.9%	0.7%	

Judicial District 6

		BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	OTHER	Totals
Benton	F		1				1
Benton	M	1	7				8
Iowa	F		3				3
Iowa	M		7				7
Johnson	F	5	14				19
Johnson	M	10	36			2	48
Jones	F		2				2
Jones	M		12				12
Linn	F	6	28	2			36
Linn	M	7	76	1		1	85
Tama	F		2		4		6
Tama	M	2	6	2			10
Totals:		31	194	5	4	3	237
Percentage of Total		13.1%	81.9%	2.1%	1.7%	1.3%	

Judicial District 7

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	OTHER	Totals
Clinton	F			7			7
Clinton	M		1	30			31
Jackson	M			10			10
Muscatine	M			5	1		6
Scott	F		11	11	1		23
Scott	M	1	32	66	2	6	107
Totals:		1	44	129	4	6	184
Percentage of Total		0.5%	23.9%	70.1%	2.2%	3.3%	

Judicial District 8

		BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	Totals
Appanoose	F		3		3
Appanoose	M		11		11
Des Moines	F	1	5		6
Des Moines	M	11	30	1	42
Henry	F		2		2
Henry	M		7		7
Jefferson	F		1		1
Jefferson	M		1		1
Keokuk	M		6		6
Lee	F		2		2
Lee	M		8		8
Louisa	F		1		1
Louisa	M		5	2	7
Mahaska	F		4		4
Mahaska	M		13		13
Monroe	M		5		5
Poweshiek	M		4		4
Wapello	F		8	1	9
Wapello	M	1	18	3	22
Washington	F	1	2		3
Washington	M		12	3	15
Totals:		14	148	10	172
Percentage of Total		8.1%	86.0%	5.8%	

Adjudications by Case
January 1st, 2002 – April 30th, 2002

Judicial District 1

Data for Adjudications by Case is not available for Judicial District 1 at this time.

Judicial District 2

		BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	OTHER	Totals
Bremer	F		1			1
Bremer	M		1			1
Butler	M		4			4
Calhoun	M		1			1
Carroll	F		1			1
Carroll	M		1			1
Cerro Gordo	F		2			2
Cerro Gordo	M	1	9			10
Floyd	F		1			1
Floyd	M		5			5
Franklin	F		1			1
Franklin	M		4			4
Greene	F		1			1
Greene	M		2			2
Hamilton	F		1			1
Hamilton	M		6			6
Hancock	M		2			2
Hardin	F		1			1
Humboldt	M		3			3
Marshall	M		2	2		4
Mitchell	M		1			1
Pocahontas	M		4			4
Sac	M		3			3
Story	F		2			2
Story	M		7			7
Webster	F	3	2			5
Webster	M	2	9		1	12
Worth	M		1			1
Wright	M		6			6
Totals:		6	84	2	1	93
Percentage of Total		6.5%	90.3%	2.2%	1.1%	

Judicial District 3

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	Totals
Buena Vista	M			1			1
Clay	M	1		3			4
Dickinson	F			1			1
Emmet	F			2			2
Emmet	M			1			1
Ida	M			1			1
Kossuth	M			3			3
Lyon	M			2			2
Osceola	M			1	1		2
Palo Alto	M			1			1
Plymouth	M			3		2	5
Sioux	M			2			2
Woodbury	M		1	1			2
Totals:		1	1	22	1	2	27
Percentage of Total		3.7%	3.7%	81.5%	3.7%	7.4%	

Judicial District 4

		BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	Totals
Pottawattamie	F		9		9
Pottawattamie	M	1	17	3	21
Shelby	M		1		1
Totals:		1	27	3	31
Percentage of Total		3.2%	87.1%	9.7%	

Judicial District 5

		ASIAN	BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	OTHER	Totals
Clarke	M			1			1
Dallas	M			2			2
Decatur	M			1			1
Jasper	F			3			3
Jasper	M			9			9
Lucas	F			2			2
Lucas	M			1			1
Madison	F			2			2
Madison	M			7			7
Marion	F			3			3
Marion	M			7			7
Polk	F			22	1		23
Polk	M		9	68	8	2	87
Warren	F	5	39	3			47
Warren	M			9		2	11
Wayne	M			1			1
Totals:		5	48	141	9	4	207
Percentage of Total		2.4%	23.2%	68.1%	4.3%	1.9%	

Judicial District 6

		BLACK	CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	NATIVE AMERICAN	OTHER	Totals
Benton	M		3				3
Iowa	F		1				1
Iowa	M		2				2
Johnson	F	1	5				6
Johnson	M	1	17				18
Jones	M		3				3
Linn	F		13			1	14
Linn	M	5	38				43
Tama	F		1		1		2
Tama	M	1	3	1	3		8
Totals:		8	86	1	4	1	100
Percentage of Total		8.0%	86.0%	1.0%	4.0%	1.0%	

Judicial District 7

		BLACK	CAUCASIAN	Totals
Clinton	F		2	2
Clinton	M	1	6	7
Jackson	M		1	1
Muscatine	M		4	4
Scott	F	1	1	2
Scott	M		4	4
Totals:		2	18	20
Percentage of Total		10.0%	90.0%	

Judicial District 8

		CAUCASIAN	HISPANIC	OTHER	Totals
Appanoose	M	2			2
Henry	F	2			2
Henry	M	1			1
Keokuk	M	7		1	8
Lee	F	1			1
Lee	M	9			9
Louisa	M	4	1		5
Mahaska	F	1			1
Mahaska	M	9	1		10
Monroe	M	1			1
Poweshiek	M	3			3
Wapello	F	6			6
Wapello	M	14	2		16
Washington	F	1			1
Washington	M	6	1		7
Totals:		67	5	1	73
Percentage of Total		91.8%	6.8%	1.4%	