

DECEMBER, 2016

# Juvenile Justice Standardized Report

*Education and Workforce Outcomes  
of Juvenile Justice Participants  
in Washington State*

Authored by  
Stephanie Cross



## AUTHORS

### **Stephanie Cross**

*Forecast and Research Analyst  
Washington Statistical Analysis Center*

## ABOUT THE ERDC AND SAC

The research presented here utilizes data from the Education Research and Data Center (ERDC), located within the Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM). ERDC works with partner agencies to conduct powerful analyses of learning that can help inform the decision-making of Washington legislators, parents, and education providers. ERDC's data system is a statewide longitudinal data system that includes de-identified data about people's preschool, educational, and workforce experiences.

This project was completed in partnership with the Washington Statistical Analysis Center (SAC). The Washington Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) conducts and publishes policy-relevant research and analysis on justice issues, provides technical assistance, and maintains a clearinghouse of state justice-related data.

The project was supported by Grant CFD #84.372, awarded by the Institute for Education Science in the US Department of Education to the Office of Financial Management, Education Research and Data Center. Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Institute for Education Science, the Office of Financial Management, or other data contributors.

### **ADDRESS**

Education Research and Data Center  
210 11th Ave. SW, Room 318  
PO Box 43113  
Olympia, WA 98504-3113

### **PHONE**

(360) 902-0599

### **FAX**

(360) 725-5174

### **EMAIL**

[erdc@ofm.wa.gov](mailto:erdc@ofm.wa.gov)

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	4
Introduction.....	5
<i>Data Sources</i> .....	5
<i>Purpose</i> .....	7
I. Cohort Characteristics .....	8
II. Offense Characteristics .....	9
<i>Status offender cohort</i> .....	10
<i>Juvenile offender cohort</i> .....	11
III. High School Characteristics and Outcomes.....	12
<i>Educational services</i> .....	12
<i>High school outcomes</i> .....	13
IV. Postsecondary Enrollment and Outcomes .....	15
<i>Community and technical college enrollment</i> .....	15
<i>Community and technical college degree</i> .....	16
<i>Four-year enrollment</i> .....	19
V. Workforce Outcomes .....	20
VI. Department of Corrections Involvement .....	30
Summary .....	32
Appendix A.....	34

## Executive Summary

Success in early and secondary education sets the groundwork for later success in postsecondary education and in the employment arena. Having contact with the juvenile justice system can potentially disrupt forward progression within this crucial early and secondary education time frame, and therefore can considerably affect a youth's educational and workforce success later in life.

This report looks at the education and workforce outcomes of youth who were enrolled in eighth grade in a Washington state public school at any point during the 2004–05 academic year and who have had one or more contacts with the juvenile justice system between the years 1989 and 2011. The three cohorts (status offender youth, juvenile offender youth and nonjuvenile justice-involved youth) were then matched to unemployment insurance records to examine earnings during the years 2009 through 2014. The cohorts were followed for seven years (through the 2011–12 academic year) to allow for examination of both high school outcomes and postsecondary enrollment.

The report addresses whether the education and workforce outcomes of Washington state youth who are involved in the juvenile justice system are disproportionate to those youth not involved in the juvenile justice system. Specifically, does involvement in the Washington state juvenile justice system affect high school graduation? Are enrollment rates in a Washington state postsecondary institution lower for those who have been involved in the juvenile justice system than those who have not? Does being involved in the Washington state juvenile justice system affect employment?

Based on the findings in this report, nonjuvenile justice-involved youth were more likely to graduate (66.0 percent) than youth in the status offender cohort (21.3 percent) or juvenile offender cohort (28.1 percent). Of those youth who enrolled in postsecondary education, nonjuvenile justice-involved youth were more likely to enroll in a community and technical college (CTC) program (45.0 percent) than status offender youth (38.8 percent) and juvenile offender youth (41.8 percent). Of those youth enrolled in a CTC program, nonjuvenile justice-involved youth were more likely to earn Associate of Arts direct transfer degree, Associate Degree for transfer, workforce or certificate degree (24.3 percent) than youth in the status offender cohort (6.7 percent) and youth in the juvenile offender cohort (17.3 percent). Nonjuvenile justice-involved youth were more likely to enroll in a four-year postsecondary institution (22.5 percent) than youth in the status offender cohort (2.1 percent) and juvenile offender cohort (4.1 percent). Comparing average annual earnings across cohorts, nonjuvenile justice-involved youth ended 2014 making on average \$3,608.19 more than status offender youth and \$4,245.84 more than juvenile offender youth. Lastly, youth in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to have an adult contact with Washington Department of Corrections (5.6 percent) than youth in the status offender cohort (0.8 percent) and youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort (0.2 percent).



## Introduction

It is well documented that early educational success, such as high school graduation, is likely to lead for all youth to further academic success in a postsecondary program and to greater success in the realm of employment. Previous research has shown that youth involved in the juvenile justice system show poor educational outcomes when compared to youth not involved in the juvenile justice system.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, research has shown that juvenile justice-involved youth are less likely to attend college than their nonjuvenile justice-involved peers and less likely to earn a degree from a postsecondary institution if they do enroll.<sup>2</sup> Low levels of academic success, disjointed personal networks and low social capital and minimal work experience, along with the stigmatizing effects of having a criminal record, all have derogatory effects on obtaining successful employment for juvenile justice-involved youth.<sup>3</sup>

A topic of interest among Washington state educators, policymakers and researchers in the juvenile justice field are the implications of involvement in the Washington state juvenile justice system on education and workforce outcomes. This study addresses whether the education and workforce outcomes of Washington state youth who are involved in the juvenile justice system are disproportionate to those youth not involved in the juvenile justice system. Specifically, does involvement in the Washington state juvenile justice system affect high school graduation? Are enrollment rates in a Washington state postsecondary institution lower for those who have been involved in the juvenile justice system than those who have not? Does being involved in the Washington state juvenile justice system affect employment?

## Data Sources

The following sources housed in the Education Research and Data Center (ERDC) data warehouse were used to complete this report:

- The Court Contact and Recidivism Database from the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) provides information on juvenile demographics and juvenile court records such as felony/misdemeanor charges, juvenile status offenses and juvenile dependency-related filings and detention episodes.
- The Middle and High School Enrollment Summary Report (P-210) data from the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) provides information about student demographics, school enrollment and academic progress.
- The Core Student Record System from OSPI is a monthly collection of K-12 student and school records. It is the source data used to identify eight graders' enrollment status in the 2004–05 school year.
- Student educational attainment after high school data are compiled from three sources:
  - General Educational Development (GED) completion data from the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC)

---

1 Sampson, R. J. & Laub, J. (1993). *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points through Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

2 Siennick, S. E. & Staff, J. (2008). Explaining the Educational Deficits of Delinquent Youths. *Criminology*, 46, 609-635.

3 Uggen, C. & Staff, J. (2001). Work as a Turning Point for Criminal Offenders. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5, 1-16.

- Washington state community and technical college (CTC) enrollment and completions data from SBCTC
- Washington state public baccalaureate institution enrollment and completion data from the Public Centralized Higher Education Enrollment System
- Unemployment insurance (UI) data to provide student employment status and earnings outcomes over time.
- Incarceration records from the Department of Corrections (DOC), which are used to flag any adult criminal justice involvement.

The cohort initially consisted of the 93,773 youth who were enrolled in eighth grade in a Washington state public school at any point during the 2004–05 academic year. Of the total 93,773 youth, 20,644 (22.0 percent) were matched to a data set of juvenile justice records provided by the AOC. Of those, 1,850 cases were removed due to missing information, duplicates and possible data errors.<sup>4</sup> This left 73,127 youth who had no contact with the juvenile justice system and 18,796 youth with one or more juvenile justice contacts. Of those 18,796 youth, 1,913 youth were 18 or older during their first contact with the justice system and therefore not considered juvenile. Removing those 1,913 cases left 16,883 youth in the juvenile justice cohort for this study.

The entire cohort of 16,883 juvenile justice participants was then broken into two smaller cohorts, based on type of involvement. These cohorts were then split based on severity of offense, with a felony offense being the most severe, followed by a misdemeanor and then a status offense. There were 4,500 (26.7 percent of the total juvenile justice cohort) youth with neither a misdemeanor nor felony during the time period of the study and were therefore put into the status offender cohort. The status offender cohort consisted of those with dependency offenses; status offenses, such as truancy and at risk youth/child in need of services; and infractions, such as traffic or parking infractions. Of these 4,500 youth in the status offender cohort, 402 were removed due to having a dependency case only, an infraction only, or having a combination of both without a truancy or at risk youth/child in need of services. This left 4,098 youth in the *status* offender cohort.

There were 12,383 (73.3 percent of total juvenile justice cohort) youth with one or more misdemeanor and/or felony offenses during the time span of the study, making up the *juvenile offender* cohort, which consists of youth with misdemeanors only, felonies only and felonies with an accompanying misdemeanor.

It is possible for the youth in the juvenile offender cohort to also have a status offense; however, the most severe offense was used to decide placement in a cohort. The three cohorts (status offender, juvenile offender and nonjuvenile justice-involved) were then matched to UI records to examine earnings during the years 2009 through 2014. Those workers who are working outside of the state or in a job not covered by UI have no earnings that can be matched. The selected cohort was followed for seven years through the 2011–12 academic year to allow for examination of both high school outcomes and postsecondary enrollment.

---

<sup>4</sup> Youth born before 1987 or after 1992 were excluded due to possible data errors as well as blank/missing cases. Offense years before 1989 and after 2011 were excluded due to possible errors, blank/missing cases and based on birth years used in study.

## Purpose

The objectives of this report are as follows:

1. Examine the high school outcomes of youth involved in the juvenile justice system.
2. Examine the postsecondary enrollment and outcomes of youth involved in the juvenile justice system.
3. Examine the workforce outcomes of youth involved in the juvenile justice system.
4. Examine the DOC involvement of youth in the juvenile justice system.

Section I describes the characteristics of youth involved in the juvenile justice system and compares those to other eighth graders who were not involved in the juvenile justice system. Section II looks at the offense characteristics of those youth in the status offender cohort and in the juvenile offender cohort. Section III examines the high school enrollment and outcomes of youth in the status offender cohort and in the juvenile offender cohort, separately, compared to eighth graders who were not involved in the juvenile justice system. Section IV examines postsecondary enrollment and outcomes. Section V focuses on the workforce outcomes of youth in the status offender cohort and in the juvenile offender cohort, compared to eighth graders who were not involved in the juvenile justice system. Section VI examines involvement in the DOC of youth in the status offender cohort and in the juvenile offender cohort, separately, compared to eighth graders who were not involved in the juvenile justice system.

## I. Cohort Characteristics

Table 1 shows the characteristics of youth who are involved in the juvenile justice system and those who are not. Both Asian and white/Caucasians are underrepresented among the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts compared to those youth not involved in the juvenile justice system. American Indian/Native Alaskan, Black and Hispanic/Latinos are overrepresented among the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts compared to those youth not involved in the juvenile justice system. Youth in the status offender cohort are more likely to be female (55.6 percent) while youth in the juvenile offender cohort are more likely to be male (64.0 percent). Gender is spread relatively evenly across the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort. Youth in all three cohorts were of similar average age<sup>5</sup> in the eighth grade. Juvenile offender youth were younger, on average, than status offender youth at their first juvenile justice contact.

**Table 1: Cohort Characteristics**

	Status Offender		Juvenile Offender		Noninvolved	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	2,279	55.6%	4,461	36.0%	36,957	50.5%
Male	1,819	44.4%	7,922	64.0%	36,170	49.5%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>						
American Indian/Native Alaskan	224	5.5%	702	5.7%	1,754	2.4%
Asian	245	6.0%	518	4.2%	6,100	8.3%
Black	229	5.6%	1,139	9.2%	3,754	5.1%
Hispanic/Latino	722	17.6%	1,786	14.4%	8,104	11.1%
Multiracial	16	0.4%	28	0.2%	169	0.2%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	*	0.1%	*	0.0%	39	0.1%
Unknown	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	70	0.1%
White/Caucasian	2,658	64.9%	8,204	66.3%	53,137	72.7%
<b>Average Age</b>						
8th Grade	13.3		13.3		13	
1 <sup>st</sup> Juvenile Justice Contact	15.4		14.4		NA	
Last Juvenile Justice Contact	16.3		16.4		NA	

\* Not reported to protect subgroups with fewer than 10 students. This will be the case throughout this report.

<sup>5</sup> Throughout this report, calculated ages are based on age given at eighth grade and year of juvenile justice contact.



## II. Offense Characteristics


This section discusses the characteristics of the status offender cohort and the juvenile offender cohort. Table 2 displays the number of youth in the status offender cohort and the juvenile offender cohort, along with the number of youth who have one or more of the offense types discussed in this section. It is possible for a single youth to have multiple offense types; the total number of youth in the four offense types will be greater than the total number of youth in the two cohorts.

**Table 2: Count of Cohort and Type of Court Involvement**

	Count
<b>Status Offender</b>	4,098
ARY/CHiNS <sup>6</sup>	419
Truancy	3,866
<b>Juvenile Offender</b>	12,383
ARY/CHiNS	1,190
Truancy	4,536
Misdemeanor	11,367
Felony	4,646

Figure 1 (Table A1 in Appendix A) shows the number of youth in each cohort by age with one or more juvenile justice contacts. After the age of 8, the number of juvenile offenders having contact with the juvenile justice system slowly began to increase and then begins to increase more steeply by age 12. For status offender youth, an increase is not seen until age 13. These results are consistent with research on the age and crime relationship, which consistently shows that the frequency of offending tends to increase from late childhood and peak in the teenage years between age 15 and 19, then begins to decline from the early 20s.<sup>7</sup>

**Figure 1. Number of youth by age with one or more juvenile justice contacts. See also Table A1. in the Appendix.**



6 At Risk Youth and/or Child in Need of Services (ARY/CHiNS)

7 Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. P. (2014). Age-Crime Curve. In Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice (pp. 12-18). New York: Springer


## Status offender cohort

Youth in the status offender cohort have come into contact with the juvenile justice system through a noncriminal act that is considered a law violation due only to the youth's status as being a minor. Status offenses are considered signs of underlying personal, family and community issues that are risk factors for future delinquency or criminal behavior later in life.<sup>8</sup>

Status offender youth can come into contact with the juvenile justice system as either a child in need of services (CHiNS) or at-risk youth (ARY). If a youth is considered a CHiNS, the youth's parent, the youth himself/herself or the Department of Social and Health Services can file a petition to have the youth placed outside of the home. An ARY is a youth who is absent from home 72 or more consecutive hours without permission, who is beyond parental control with behavior that poses a danger to the child himself/herself or someone else, or who has a substance abuse problem. If a youth is considered an ARY, the parental guardian(s) may petition the courts to order the youth to remain at home.<sup>9</sup> Truancy, or the action of staying away from school without proper reason, can also be the cause of a youth's juvenile justice contact. In Washington, a school district is required to file a truancy petition if a youth required to attend public schools has seven unexcused absences in one month or 10 unexcused absences in one academic year.<sup>10</sup>

Figure 2 (Table A2 in Appendix A) looks at the number of youth with one or more ARY/CHiNS or truanies by race/ethnicity and gender of the status offender cohort. American Indian/Native Alaskan youth were more likely to have an ARY/CHiNS (7.1 percent) than any other race. Hispanic/Latino youth were more likely to have a truancy (94.2 percent) than any other race. Multiracial and American Indian/Native Alaskan youth were more likely to have both an ARY/CHiNS and truancy (6.3 percent). More female (6.4 percent) than male (4.6 percent) youth in the status offender cohort were considered ARY and/or CHiNS only. More male (92.2 percent) than female (87.8 percent) youth in the status offender cohort were truant only.

**Figure 2: Percentage of status offenders of each case type by race/ethnicity and gender. See also Table A2. in the Appendix.**



8 Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. [www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Status\\_Offenders.pdf](http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Status_Offenders.pdf)

9 2014 Juvenile Justice Report. Washington State Partnership Council on Juvenile Justice.


10 2014 Juvenile Justice Report. Washington State Partnership Council on Juvenile Justice.

## Juvenile offender cohort

Like adult criminal offenses, juvenile offenses can be classified as either misdemeanors or felonies. Among this cohort, it is possible for one youth to have multiple misdemeanors, multiple felonies or a mix of both during the course of one year and in the course of the 20-year time span included in the data.

Figure 3 (Table A3 in Appendix A) represents the percentage of misdemeanor-only offenses and felony offenses with or without a misdemeanor by race/ethnicity and gender of youth in the juvenile offender cohort. Multiracial youth were more likely to have misdemeanor-only offenses (78.6 percent) than any other race/ethnicity. Black youth were more likely to have felony offenses with one or more misdemeanors (36.8 percent) than any other race/ethnicity. Asian youth were more likely to have a felony-only offense (10.5 percent) than any other race/ethnicity. Female youth in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to have one or more misdemeanor offenses (77.1 percent) than male youth (54.3 percent) in the juvenile offender cohort. Comparatively, male youth (35.7 percent) in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to have one or more felony offenses with one or more misdemeanor offenses than females (17.9 percent). Similarly, male youth (10.0 percent) in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to have one or more felony offenses without a misdemeanor offense than females (5.0 percent).

**Figure 3. Percentage of juvenile justice offenders of each case type by race/ethnicity and gender. See also Table A3. in the Appendix.**



Of those youth who had misdemeanor offenses only, theft/fraud/larceny was the most frequent offense, followed by assault, alcohol offenses, drug possession and property destruction. Of those youth who had one or more felony offenses with one or more misdemeanor offenses, felony burglary was the most frequent offense, followed by felony assault, felony theft/fraud/larceny, felony robbery and felony property destruction. Of those youth who had one or more felony-only offenses, felony theft/fraud/larceny was the most frequent offense, followed by felony burglary, felony child sex offenses, felony property destruction and felony auto theft/vehicle prowl.

There are youth in the juvenile offender cohort that also have truancy and/or ARY/CHiNS cases as well as misdemeanors and felony offenses. Overall, 4,536 youth in the juvenile offender cohort had one or more truancies and 1,190 youth had one or more ARY/CHiNS cases. It is possible for one youth to fall into one or both categories. Youth with a misdemeanor only compose the majority of youth in the juvenile offender cohort with ARY/CHiNS (52.2 percent) and truancy (55.0 percent) cases.

**Table 3: Number of Youth in the Juvenile Offender Cohort with One or More ARY/CHiNS and/or Truancies**


Case Type	Misdemeanor Only		Felony W/ Misd.		Felony Only		TOTAL
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
ARY/CHiNS	621	52.2%	517	43.4%	52	4.4%	<b>1,190</b>
Truancy	2,496	55.0%	1,732	38.2%	308	6.8%	<b>4,536</b>

### III. High School Characteristics and Outcomes<sup>11</sup>

#### Educational services

A wide array of educational services are available to students who qualify under a variety of circumstances. Some of these educational services, such as the free and reduced priced lunch (FRPL) program, are considered indicators of children living in poverty.

Figure 4 (Table A4 in Appendix A) shows the educational services received at eighth grade by race/ethnicity and gender of youth in each cohort. Free and reduced priced lunch was the most frequent service received for all races in each cohort. Hispanic/Latino youth were more likely to receive bilingual services than any other race/ethnicity in all three cohorts, while American Indian/Native Alaskan youth were more likely to be special education participants than any other race/ethnicity in all but the status offender cohort, where multiracial youth were the most likely. Females and males received services at similar rates with the exception of special education in all three cohorts.

**Figure 4. Educational services received at 8<sup>th</sup> grade by race/ethnicity, gender and offender status. See also Table A4. in the Appendix.**

11 Data for this section cover academic years 2004–05 through 2011–12

## High school outcomes

The high school outcomes discussed here should not be interpreted in the same way as those reported by OSPI. First, the percentage of students reported as “graduates” should not be interpreted as a graduation rate as it does not account for transfers in and out of the state. For example, 57.6 percent of the cohort was observed to graduate from public high schools in Washington. By comparison, the “on-time” graduation rate for this cohort was 73.5 percent — a larger percentage because it accounts for the portion of the 23.2 percent of “transfer” students that left the state (or attended private high school). Further, the category “GED” does not exist in the OSPI report; OSPI categorizes GED recipients as dropouts. In this report, “GED” indicates that a student completed a GED certificate by the end of 2012. “Dropouts” in this report are those students who neither completed high school nor received a GED certificate by 2012. The remainder of this report will focus on the students whose last known status was Graduate, GED or Dropout.

**Table 4: High School Outcomes Not Included in Report**

Case Type	Count	%
<b>Status Offender</b>		
Transferred	1,265	30.9%
Enrolled	48	1.2%
Unknown	606	14.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,919</b>	<b>46.8%</b>
<b>Juvenile Offender</b>		
Transferred	3,608	29.1%
Enrolled	123	1.0%
Unknown	1,492	12.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,223</b>	<b>42.2%</b>
<b>Nonjuvenile Justice</b>		
Transferred	14,999	20.5%
Enrolled	499	0.7%
Unknown	4,512	6.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,010</b>	<b>27.4%</b>

Overall, 21.3 percent of youth in the status offender cohort graduated from high school, 21.5 percent received a GED certificate and 14.6 percent dropped out. Of those youth in the juvenile offender cohort, 28.1 percent graduated, 21.3 percent received a GED certificate and 11.7 percent dropped out. Nonjuvenile justice-involved youth graduated at a much higher rate (66.0 percent). A total of 4.3 percent of nonjuvenile justice-involved youth received a GED certificate and 3.0 percent dropped out. Lower rates of graduation for status offender youth could possibly be due to their chronic absence from school and home.


Figure 5 (Table A5 in Appendix A) represents the percentage of youth in each cohort that graduated from high school, received a GED certificate or dropped out of high school, by race/ethnicity and gender. Due to small numbers, multiracial and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander youth were excluded from the figure. Asian youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort (70.4 percent) and juvenile offender cohort (36.7 percent) were more likely to graduate than any other race/ethnicity, while Hispanic/Latino youth



in the status offender cohort were more likely to graduate (24.1 percent) than any other race/ethnicity. American Indian/Native Alaskan youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort (6.5 percent) and status offender cohort (21.9 percent) were more likely to receive a GED certificate (21.9 percent) than any other race/ethnicity, while black youth in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to receive a GED certificate (19.8 percent). American Indian/Native Alaskan youth in all three cohorts were more likely to drop out than any other race/ethnicity in all three cohorts.

Across all three cohorts, female youth were more likely to graduate than male youth; male youth were more likely to receive a GED certificate or drop out of school than female youth.

**Figure 5. High school outcomes by gender, race/ethnicity and offender status. See also Table A5. in the Appendix.**




The majority of both juvenile justice cohorts (99.4 percent and 99.7 percent) and nonjuvenile justice-involved youth (99.9 percent) graduated in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade, with the 11<sup>th</sup> grade being the next most frequent. Youth in the status offender cohort most frequently received their GED certificate in 2009 (26.2 percent), followed by 2008 at 23.0 percent, which would be between 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade. Youth in the juvenile offender cohort most frequently received their GED certificate in 2008 (25.8 percent), followed by 2009 at 21.6 percent, which would be between 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade. Nonjuvenile justice-involved youth most frequently received their GED certificate in 2009 (25.0 percent), followed by 2010 at 22.8 percent, which would have been 12<sup>th</sup> grade. High school drop-outs were most likely to do so during 12<sup>th</sup> grade for both juvenile justice cohorts (46.2 percent for status offenders; 45.4 percent for juvenile offenders) and nonjuvenile justice-involved youth (42.0 percent), followed by the 11<sup>th</sup> grade.

Figure 6 (Table A6 in Appendix A) shows the number of youth in the status and juvenile offender cohorts by case type who either graduated from high school, received a GED certificate or dropped out of

school. In the status offender cohort, youth with an ARY/CHiNS only were more likely to graduate (30.7 percent) than those with a truancy only or both an ARY/CHiNS and truancy. The majority of youth with a misdemeanor only were more likely to graduate (33.7 percent) than receive a GED certificate or drop out, while youth with a felony and a misdemeanor were more likely to receive a GED certificate (25.6 percent) or drop out (13.1 percent).

**Figure 6. High school outcomes by case type. See also Table A6. in the Appendix.**



## IV. Postsecondary Enrollment and Outcomes

This section of the report focuses on enrollment in a Washington state CTC program or a four-year institution. Degree outcomes are available for those students who completed a CTC program. However, they are not available for those students who enrolled in a four-year institution as the data used for this report spans just to the 2011–12 academic year. This means that a student who enrolled in a four-year institution directly after high school would be a junior at that institution.

Table 5 shows the enrollment patterns of youth in each cohort. The majority of each cohort did not enroll in a postsecondary program or institution within the time frame of this study. Of those youth in each cohort who did enroll in postsecondary education, the majority enrolled in a CTC program only.

**Table 5: Enrollment in Postsecondary Education by Cohort**

Enrollment	Status Offender		Juvenile Offender		Not Involved	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
CTC Only	1,535	37.5%	4,887	39.5%	24,616	33.7%
CTC to 4-Year	56	1.4%	283	2.3%	8,321	11.4%
4-Year Only	29	0.7%	218	1.8%	8,136	11.1%
No Postsecondary	2,478	60.5%	6,995	56.5%	32,054	43.8%

### Community and technical college enrollment

Figure 7 (Table A7 in Appendix A) shows the number of youth enrolled in a CTC program by race/ethnicity, gender and high school outcome. Black youth in the status offender cohort (56.8 percent) and the juvenile offender cohort (50.9 percent) were more likely to enroll in a CTC program than any other race/ethnicity. Asian youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort, however, were more likely to enroll in a CTC program than any other race/ethnicity (50.0 percent). Female youth in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to enroll in a CTC (47.3 percent) than female youth in the status offender cohort

(42.6 percent), but slightly less likely than female youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort (47.7 percent). Similarly, male youth in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to enroll in a CTC (38.6 percent) than male youth in the status offender cohort (34.1 percent), but less likely than male youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort (42.3 percent).

Youth who received a GED certificate were more likely to enroll in a CTC program than youth who graduated or youth who dropped out of school across all three cohorts.

**Figure 7. Enrollment in CTC by offender status, high school outcome, gender and race/ethnicity. See also Table A7. in the Appendix.**





Figure 8 (Table A8 in Appendix A) shows the number of youth in the status and juvenile offender cohort by case type who enrolled in a CTC program. Youth with both an ARY/CHiNS and truancy were more likely to enroll in a CTC program (44.5 percent) than youth with an ARY/CHiNS or truancy only. Youth in the juvenile offender cohort enrolled at similar rates across all three offense types.

**Figure 8. Enrollment in CTC by case type. See also Table A8. in the Appendix.**



### Community and technical college degree

Of those youth enrolled in a CTC program, 107 (6.7 percent) youth in the status offender cohort earned a degree. A total of 393 (7.6 percent) youth in the juvenile offender cohort earned a CTC degree. Of those youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort enrolled in a CTC, 7,030 (21.3 percent) earned a degree. CTC degree types included in this report are Associate of Arts direct transfer degrees (AA-

DTA), Associate Degrees for transfer (AS-T), certificates and workforce degrees.

Figure 9 (Table A9 in Appendix A) shows the type of CTC degree earned by youth in all three cohorts. Youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort earned AA-DTA degrees at a higher rate than youth in the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts. Youth in the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts were more likely to earn workforce degrees or certificates than youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort.

**Figure 9. CTC degree type earned by cohort. See also Table A9. in the Appendix.**




Figure 10 (Table A10 in Appendix A) compares CTC degree earned by race/ethnicity across all three cohorts. Asian youth were more likely to receive an AA-DTA degree than any other race/ethnicity, while black youth were more likely to receive a certificate than any other race/ethnicity. AS-T degrees and workforce degrees were earned less frequently by all race/ethnicities.

**Figure 10: CTC degrees earned by race/ethnicity of cohort. See also Table A10. in the Appendix.**




Figure 11 (Table A11 in Appendix A) compares CTC degree earned across gender of each cohort. Female youth in the status offender cohort were more likely to earn a certificate (47.4 percent), while female youth in both the juvenile offender cohort and nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort were more likely to earn an AA-DTA degree (53.8 percent and 72.9 percent, respectively). Male youth were more likely to earn an AA-DTA degree than any other degree across all three cohorts.



**Figure 11: CTC degrees earned by gender. See also Table A11. in the Appendix.**

Figure 12 (Table A12 in Appendix A) looks at CTC degree earned by high school outcome of youth in the status offender cohort, the juvenile offender cohort and the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort. The majority of youth who graduated, regardless of cohort, were more likely to earn AA-DTA degrees. Youth in the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts who received a GED certificate or dropped out of school were more likely to earn certificates. Nonjuvenile justice-involved youth with GED certificates were more likely to earn certificates, while nonjuvenile justice-involved youth who dropped out were more likely to earn AA-DTA degrees.

**Figure 12: CTC degrees earned by high school outcome of juvenile justice participants. See also Table A12. in the Appendix.**

#### Four-year enrollment

Figure 13 (Table A13 in Appendix A) shows the number of youth enrolled in a four-year institution by race/ethnicity, gender and high school outcome of each cohort. Black youth in the status offender cohort were more likely to enroll in a four-year postsecondary institution (2.6 percent) than any other race/ethnicity. Asian youth in both the juvenile offender cohort (9.8 percent) and the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort (35.9 percent) were more likely to enroll in a four-year postsecondary institution than any other race/ethnicity. Female youth in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to enroll in a four-year institution (5.0 percent) than female youth in the status offender cohort (2.3 percent), but less likely than female youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort (24.6 percent). Similarly, male youth in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to enroll in a four-year institution (3.5 percent) than male youth in the status offender cohort (1.8 percent), but less likely than male youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort (20.4 percent). Youth in all three cohorts who graduated from high school were more



likely to enroll in a four-year institution than youth who received a GED certificate or dropped out.

**Figure 13. Percentage of youth enrolled in a 4-year institution by cohort, race/ethnicity, gender and high school outcomes. See also Table A13. in the Appendix.**





Figure 14 (Table A14 in Appendix A) shows the number of youth in the status and juvenile offender cohorts by case type who enrolled in a four-year institution. Youth in the status offender cohort with ARY/CHiNS only were more likely to enroll in a four-year postsecondary institution than youth with a truancy only or youth with both case types. Youth in the juvenile offender cohort with a misdemeanor only or felony only were more likely to enroll in a four-year institution than youth with a felony and a misdemeanor.


**Figure 14. Enrollment in 4-year institution by case type. See also Table A14. in the Appendix.**



## V. Workforce Outcomes

Unemployment insurance wage data were used to analyze the workforce outcomes by juvenile justice participation, race/ethnicity, gender, offense type, high school outcome and postsecondary enrollment. Years 2009 to 2014 were used to examine earnings of youth from the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> grade onward.

Figure 15 (Table A15 in Appendix A) illustrates the association of average annual earnings with juvenile justice participation. Between the years 2009 and 2012, youth in the status offender cohort had higher average annual earnings than youth in the juvenile offender cohort and nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort. In 2013, the status offender cohort earnings were overtaken by youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort. At the end of 2014, nonjuvenile justice-involved youth made, on average, \$3,608.19 more than youth in the status offender cohort and \$4,245.84 more than youth in the juvenile offender cohort.

**Figure 15. Average annual earnings by offender status. See also Table A15. in Appendix.**


The lower earnings for nonjuvenile justice-involved youth can be attributed to this group spending fewer hours working than juvenile justice youth. Table 6 gives a breakdown of the average annual hours spent working and the average hourly wage earned of youth in all three cohorts. Both status offender youth and juvenile offender youth worked, on average, more hours than nonjuvenile justice-involved youth every year except 2014, when, on average, status offender youth worked 73.9 fewer hours and juvenile offender youth worked 129.2 fewer hours. While youth in the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts tended to work more hours on average, they also tended to earn less per hour on average than nonjuvenile justice-involved youth. In 2014, nonjuvenile justice-involved youth earned \$3.37 more per hour than youth in the status offender cohort and \$2.99 more per hour than youth in the juvenile offender cohort, which could lead to the higher increase in earnings in 2014 shown in Figure 15.

**Table 6. Average Hours Worked and Hourly Wage by Cohort**

	Status	Juvenile	Nonjuvenile Justice
<b>2009</b>			
Hours	562.6	523.7	407.6
Wage	\$9.70	\$9.96	\$9.97
<b>2010</b>			
Hours	732.8	692.7	541.0
Wage	\$13.24	\$10.39	\$10.35
<b>2011</b>			
Hours	858.9	818.8	779.9
Wage	\$11.18	\$11.37	\$11.49
<b>2012</b>			
Hours	988.1	928.1	872.3
Wage	\$11.64	\$11.64	\$12.61
<b>2013</b>			
Hours	1,102.7	1,029.0	1,015.2
Wage	\$13.45	\$12.80	\$14.40
<b>2014</b>			
Hours	1,168.7	1,113.4	1,242.6
Wage	\$13.44	\$13.82	\$16.81


Figure 16 (Table A16 in Appendix A) compares the average annual earnings of each race/ethnicity by cohort. Multiracial youth and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander youth were left out of these figures due to very small numbers and therefore potentially becoming identifiable. There is a steady increase in all race/ethnicities in each cohort in average annual earnings beginning in 2009. Black youth and American Indian/Native Alaskan youth in the status offender cohort are the exception, showing a decrease in average annual earnings in 2010 for black youth and 2013 for American Indian/Native Alaskan youth. At the end of 2014, Asian, Hispanic and white/Caucasian nonjuvenile justice-involved youth had the highest average annual earnings.

**Figure 16. Average annual earnings by race/ethnicity. See also Table A16. in the Appendix.**



Overall, youth in all race/ethnicities in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort had higher average annual earnings than youth across all race/ethnicities in both the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts. Youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort made, on average, between \$1,757.78 and \$6,381.48 more than youth in the status offender cohort and the juvenile offender cohort.

Figure 17 (Table A17 in Appendix A) illustrates how average annual earnings are associated with gender. Female status offender youth and female juvenile offender youth had higher average annual earnings than female nonjuvenile justice-involved youth between 2009 and 2012. Beginning in 2012, female nonjuvenile justice-involved youth started to overtake females in the juvenile and status offender cohorts. At the end of 2014, female youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort made, on average, \$3,741.33 more than female status offender youth and \$4,358.79 more than female youth in the juvenile offender cohort. Male status offender youth had higher average annual earnings than male nonjuvenile justice-involved youth and males in the juvenile offender cohort between 2009 and 2013. Beginning in 2013, male nonjuvenile justice-involved youth started to overtake males in the status offender cohort. At the end of 2014, male youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort made, on average, \$2,983.36 more than status offender male youth and \$4,755.41 more than male youth in the juvenile offender cohort.

**Figure 17. Average annual earnings by gender. See also Table A17. in the Appendix.**

Females had lower average annual earnings than males overall. Females in the status offender cohort earned, on average, \$3,806.86 less than males in the status offender cohort. Females in the juvenile offender cohort earned, on average, \$2,652.27 less than males in the juvenile offender cohort. Females in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort earned, on average, \$3,048.89 less than males in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort.

The lower earnings for females can be attributed to this group typically spending fewer hours working and to earning a lower average hourly wage than males. Table 7 gives a breakdown of the average annual hours spent working and the average hourly wage earned by gender of cohort. Male youth in the status offender and nonjuvenile justice-involved cohorts worked, on average, more hours than females, with the exception of females in the juvenile offender cohort who typically worked more hours than males in the juvenile offender cohort between 2009 and 2012. Male youth in the status offender cohort ended 2014 making, on average, \$1.78 more per hour than female status offenders. Male youth in the juvenile offender cohort ended 2014 making, on average, \$1.54 more per hour than female juvenile offenders. Male youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort ended 2014 making, on average, \$2.13 more per hour than female nonjuvenile justice-involved youth.


**Table 7. Average Hours Worked and Hourly Wage by Gender**

	Female			Male		
	Status	Juvenile	Nonjuvenile Justice	Status	Juvenile	Nonjuvenile Justice
<b>2009</b>						
Hours	542.8	547.1	507.3	596.0	505.3	496.1
Wage	\$9.43	\$9.89	\$9.84	\$10.15	\$10.02	\$10.30
<b>2010</b>						
Hours	728.5	719.6	682.2	739.4	672.0	683.4
Wage	\$14.56	\$10.38	\$10.27	\$11.21	\$10.40	\$10.80
<b>2011</b>						
Hours	823.4	841.0	819.2	912.7	802.5	847.1
Wage	\$11.14	\$11.92	\$11.16	\$11.25	\$10.97	\$12.00
<b>2012</b>						
Hours	954.4	931.1	925.4	1039.6	926.0	983.0
Wage	\$11.31	\$11.19	\$11.91	\$12.13	\$11.97	\$13.63
<b>2013</b>						
Hours	1,070.4	999.2	1,033.9	1,148.6	1,050.7	1,101.5
Wage	\$13.57	\$11.98	\$13.53	\$13.26	\$13.40	\$15.56
<b>2014</b>						
Hours	1,122.9	1,078.8	1,241.2	1,233.6	1,138.5	1,290.3
Wage	\$12.71	\$12.93	\$15.85	\$14.49	\$14.47	\$17.98

Figure 18 (Table A18 in Appendix A) illustrates the average annual earnings for youth in the status offender cohort and juvenile offender cohort by case type. The average annual earnings for each category increased from 2009 through 2014. Those with one or more trancies only had higher average earnings than youth with ARY/CHiNS only and youth with both. Those with one or more trancies only ended 2014 earning, on average, \$3,338.93 more than those with one or more ARY/CHiNS only and \$1,548.57 more than youth with both ARY/CHiNS and truancy.

Both misdemeanor and felony categories average annual earnings steadily increase from 2009 through 2014 for youth with either a misdemeanor or felony. Those with a misdemeanor only had higher average earnings between 2009 and 2010, after which the average annual earnings of those with a felony only increased. Those with one or more felonies only ended 2014 earning, on average, \$672.97 more than those with one or more misdemeanors only and \$4,037.11 more than those with one or more felonies and a misdemeanor.



**Figure 18. Average annual income by offense type. See also Table A18. the Appendix.**

The higher earnings for those with one or more truanancies only can be attributed to this group spending more hours working and earning a higher average hourly wage than those with one or more ARY/CHiNS only or youth with both. Table 8 gives a breakdown of the average annual hours spent working and the average hourly wage earned by offense type. While those with one or more truanancies only tended to work more hours on average, they also tended to earn slightly more per hour on average. In 2014, truant youth worked, on average, 126 more hours than ARY/CHiNS only youth and 61.5 more hours than youth with both. In 2014, truant youth made on average \$0.77 more per hour than ARY/CHiNS only youth and \$0.31 more than youth with both. The lower earnings for those with one or more felonies and one or more misdemeanors can be attributed to this group spending fewer hours working and earning a lower average hourly wage than those with a misdemeanor or felony only. Those with a misdemeanor only worked, on average, more hours between 2009 and 2010 and generally made a higher average hourly wage. In 2014, those with a felony only earned less per hour on average than those with a misdemeanor only. However, they worked 47.5 more hours, possibly leading to the higher average annual earnings in 2014.


**Table 8. Average Hours Worked and Hourly Wage by Case Type**

	Truancy	ARY/CHiNS	Both	Misdemeanor	Felony w/ Misd.	Felony
<b>2009</b>						
Hours	575.9	523.6	406.9	542.1	467.3	517.8
Wage	\$9.76	\$9.38	\$9.18	\$10.03	\$9.78	\$9.88
<b>2010</b>						
Hours	739.5	750.0	587.7	726.1	591.8	682.3
Wage	\$10.31	\$9.48	\$9.66	\$10.62	\$9.79	\$10.07
<b>2011</b>						
Hours	869.6	847.4	672.3	842.1	725.2	868.5
Wage	\$11.30	\$10.21	\$10.29	\$11.21	\$12.09	\$10.84
<b>2012</b>						
Hours	999.6	892.3	881.1	958.1	816.5	976.5
Wage	\$11.70	\$10.98	\$11.22	\$11.75	\$11.22	\$11.83
<b>2013</b>						
Hours	1,115.2	903.8	1,116.4	1,062.2	920.8	1,042.1
Wage	\$12.66	\$26.87	\$11.23	\$12.82	\$12.82	\$12.64
<b>2014</b>						
Hours	1,178.5	1,052.5	1,117.0	1,148.9	977.6	1,196.4
Wage	\$13.50	\$12.73	\$13.19	\$14.24	\$12.71	\$13.51

Figure 19 (Table A19 in Appendix A) illustrates the association of average annual earnings with high school outcomes of youth in all three cohorts. Beginning in 2009, status offender and juvenile offender youth who graduated from high school had higher average annual earnings than graduates in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort. Between 2013 and 2014, nonjuvenile justice-involved graduates' average annual earnings increased at a steeper rate, putting them on top in 2014. At the end of 2014, nonjuvenile justice-involved graduates earned on average \$1,000.41 more than graduates in the status offender cohort and \$1,875.32 more than graduates in the juvenile offender cohort.

Beginning in 2009, nonjuvenile justice-involved youth who received a GED certificate had higher average annual earnings than youth in the status offender or juvenile offender cohort who received a GED certificate. Nonjuvenile justice-involved GED recipients ended 2014 making slightly more than status offender GED certificate recipients (\$112.86) and juvenile offender GED certificate recipients (\$2,709.92).

Beginning in 2009, nonjuvenile justice-involved youth who dropped out of school had higher average annual earnings than youth in the status offender or juvenile offender cohort who dropped out of school. Nonjuvenile justice-involved dropouts ended 2014 making, on average, \$2,780.62 more than status offender dropouts and on average, \$4,179.67 more than juvenile offender dropouts.

**Figure 19: Annual earnings by high school outcomes. See also Table A19. in the Appendix.**

At the end of 2014, high school graduates, on average, earned more annually than youth who received a GED certificate or dropped out, across all three cohorts. Youth who received a GED certificate made more, on average, than youth who dropped out in status offender and juvenile justice cohorts. The exception was nonjuvenile justice-involved youth who dropped out who made, on average, \$935.98 more than nonjuvenile justice-involved GED recipients.

Table 9 gives a breakdown of the average annual hours spent working and the average hourly wage earned of the three cohorts by high school outcome. Graduates in the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts worked, on average, more hours than youth who received a GED certificate or who dropped out. Graduates in the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts who graduated also tended to work, on average, more hours than nonjuvenile justice-involved graduates. Youth in the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts who received a GED and who dropped out tended to work fewer hours than their nonjuvenile justice-involved counterparts. Youth in all three cohorts who graduated typically made a higher average hourly wage than youth who received a GED certificate and who dropped out. Youth in the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts, regardless of outcome, typically made a lower average annual hourly wage than nonjuvenile justice-involved youth.

**Table 9. Average Hours Worked and Hourly Wages by High School Outcome**


	Status Offender			Juvenile Offender			Nonjuvenile Justice		
	Graduate	GED	Drop-out	Graduate	GED	Drop-out	Graduate	GED	Drop-out
<b>2009</b>									
Hours	595.9	560.5	552.9	541.8	529.1	534.5	490.5	587.9	573.1
Wage	\$10.15	\$9.37	\$9.25	\$10.13	\$9.68	\$9.60	\$10.04	\$9.64	\$9.98
<b>2010</b>									
Hours	848.6	635.3	685.6	772.4	665.0	651.2	671.6	736.3	720.6
Wage	\$10.35	\$9.58	\$9.32	\$10.72	\$10.05	\$9.76	\$10.49	\$10.22	\$9.99
<b>2011</b>									
Hours	943.0	797.4	840.1	904.7	739.7	748.6	822.7	853.2	901.3
Wage	\$10.91	\$10.50	\$10.61	\$11.54	\$10.85	\$14.38	\$11.47	\$10.48	\$10.78
<b>2012</b>									
Hours	1114.1	949.7	950.3	1020.3	828.0	892.4	941.7	975.5	1,042.7
Wage	\$12.05	\$11.02	\$11.19	\$12.09	\$11.55	\$11.33	\$12.92	\$11.43	\$11.58
<b>2013</b>									
Hours	1,245.1	1,080.9	1,065.9	1,151.7	961.6	993.9	1,054.6	1,102.7	1,133.3
Wage	\$16.58	\$12.35	\$12.65	\$13.45	\$12.19	\$11.77	\$14.45	\$15.47	\$12.35
<b>2014</b>									
Hours	1,324.8	1,200.6	1,057.6	1,245.1	1,016.2	1,022.2	1,274.2	1,208.6	1,236.9
Wage	\$14.20	\$13.28	\$13.15	\$14.64	\$13.71	\$13.98	\$17.38	\$13.36	\$13.68

Figure 20 (Table A20 in Appendix A) illustrates the association of average annual earnings with postsecondary enrollment of youth in the status offender, juvenile offender and nonjuvenile justice-involved cohorts. Beginning in 2009, nonjuvenile justice-involved youth enrolled in a CTC had higher average annual earnings than youth in the status offender or juvenile offender cohort enrolled in a CTC. Nonjuvenile justice-involved CTC students ended 2014 making, on average, \$3,398.34 more than status offender CTC students and \$4,152.86 more, on average, than juvenile offender CTC students.

Beginning in 2009, status offender and juvenile offender youth who enrolled in a four-year institution had higher average annual earnings than four-year enrollees in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort. Between 2013 and 2014, nonjuvenile justice-involved four-year enrollees' average annual earnings increased at a steeper rate, putting them on top in 2014. At the end of 2014, nonjuvenile justice-involved four-year enrollees earned on average \$5,153.94 more than four-year enrollees in the status offender cohort and \$3,514.37 more than four-year enrollees in the juvenile offender cohort.

Average annual earnings for youth who did not enroll in a postsecondary educational program increased steadily from 2009 to 2014. Nonjuvenile justice-involved youth ended 2014 making on average \$3,042 more than nonenrolled youth in the status offender cohort and \$4,064 more than nonenrolled youth in the juvenile offender cohort.

**Figure 20: Average annual earnings by postsecondary enrollment. See also Table A20. in the Appendix.**



Beginning in 2009, youth in all three cohorts who were enrolled in a CTC program had higher average annual earnings than those enrolled in a four-year institution. However, in 2014, the average annual earnings of those enrolled in a four-year institution surpassed those enrolled in a CTC. At the end of 2014, nonjuvenile justice-involved youth enrolled in a four-year institution earned, on average, \$456.72 more than nonjuvenile justice-involved youth enrolled in a CTC. Four-year enrollees in the juvenile offender cohort also earned more, on average, than CTC enrollees (\$340.69). Four-year enrollees in the status offender cohort were the exception, earning on average \$544.36 less than CTC enrollees. Nonjuvenile justice-involved youth who did not enroll ended 2014 earning on average \$121 more than nonjuvenile justice-involved CTC enrollees and \$441 less than four-year enrollees. Nonenrollees in the status offender cohort ended 2014 earning, on average, \$852 more than CTC enrollees and \$1,671 more than four-year enrollees. Juvenile offender youth who did not enroll ended 2014 earning on average \$399 more than CTC enrollees and \$991 less than four-year enrollees.

Table 10 gives a breakdown of the average annual hours spent working and the average hourly wage earned of all three cohorts by postsecondary enrollment. Youth in the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts who enrolled in a CTC program worked, on average, more hours than those enrolled in a four-year institution. While youth in all three cohorts who were enrolled in a CTC tended to work more hours on average, they also tended to earn less per hour on average than those enrolled in a four-year institution. Similarly, over the six-year period, nonjuvenile justice-involved youth enrolled in a CTC program worked, on average, more hours than those enrolled in a four-year institution and made less per hour.



**Table 10. Average Hours Worked and Hourly Wage by Postsecondary Enrollment**

	Status Offender		Juvenile Offender		Nonjuvenile Justice	
	CTC	4 Year	CTC	4 Year	CTC	4 Year
<b>2009</b>						
Hours	556.9	542.9	518.5	455.5	524.6	406.4
Wage	\$9.70	\$9.24	\$9.85	\$9.86	\$9.99	\$10.15
<b>2010</b>						
Hours	724.0	674.0	695.4	586.2	735.5	479.7
Wage	\$10.23	\$9.45	\$10.28	\$11.52	\$10.42	\$10.64
<b>2011</b>						
Hours	856.9	691.5	822.1	664.4	893.9	589.2
Wage	\$11.13	\$11.77	\$11.41	\$13.46	\$11.32	\$12.35
<b>2012</b>						
Hours	970.9	731.2	928.0	760.7	1,020.3	691.5
Wage	\$11.67	\$11.62	\$11.57	\$12.53	\$12.23	\$13.76
<b>2013</b>						
Hours	1,102.9	916.9	1,027.5	889.5	1,132.4	835.0
Wage	\$13.64	\$13.54	\$12.75	\$13.44	\$14.05	\$16.03
<b>2014</b>						
Hours	1,177.1	1,020.4	1,114.3	1,064.2	1,285.2	1,172.3
Wage	\$13.44	\$14.24	\$13.75	\$15.15	\$16.30	\$18.00

## VI. Department of Corrections Involvement


Data from DOC was used to identify whether members of status offender, juvenile offender or nonjuvenile justice-involved cohorts were later incarcerated as an adult in a DOC facility. Overall, there were 58 (0.8 percent) youth in the status offender cohort who had one or more contacts with DOC. Of youth in the juvenile offender cohort, 5.6 percent had one or more contacts with DOC and 170 (0.2 percent) youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort had one or more contacts with DOC.

Figure 21 (Table A21 in Appendix A) provides a breakdown of DOC incarcerations by race/ethnicity, gender and high school outcome of each cohort. Excluding Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and multiracial youth due to a small sample size in all three cohorts, black youth were more likely to have one or more contacts with DOC in the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts.

However, American Indian/Native Alaskan youth were more likely than any other race/ethnicity to have one or more DOC contacts in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort. Asian youth were the least likely to have one or more DOC contacts among all three cohorts. Female youth in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to have one or more DOC contacts (1.9 percent) than female youth in the status offender cohort (0.7 percent) and female youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort (0.1 percent). Similarly, male youth in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to have one or more DOC contacts (7.6 percent) than male youth in the status offender cohort (2.3 percent) and male youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort (0.4 percent).

Youth in the juvenile offender cohort who received a GED certificate or dropped out of school were more likely to become incarcerated than similar youth in the status offender and nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort.


**Figure 21. DOC involvement by race/ethnicity. See also Table A21. in the Appendix.**



Youth in the juvenile offender cohort who enrolled in a CTC program were more likely to become incarcerated (7.9 percent) than youth in the status offender cohort who enrolled in a CTC program (1.8 percent) or nonjuvenile justice-involved youth who enrolled in a CTC program (0.3 percent). Comparatively, youth in the status offender cohort and juvenile offender cohort who enrolled in a four-year institution were equally likely to become incarcerated (1.2 percent, both) but were more likely to become incarcerated than nonjuvenile justice-involved youth who enrolled in a four-year institution (0.0 percent).

Figure 22 (Table A22 in Appendix A) looks at DOC incarcerations by offense type of youth in the status offender and juvenile offender cohorts. Youth with both an ARY/CHiNS and truancy were more likely to become incarcerated in a DOC facility (2.6 percent) than those with one or more truanies only and youth with one or more ARY/CHiNS only. Youth with one or more felony offenses with a misdemeanor were more likely to become incarcerated in a DOC facility (12.1 percent) than those with one or more misdemeanors only (2.7 percent) and those with one or more felonies only (4.2 percent). Overall, youth in the juvenile offender cohort were more likely to be incarcerated (5.6 percent) than youth in the status offender cohort (1.5 percent).

**Figure 22: DOC involvement by offense type. See also Table A22. in the Appendix.**



Over the timespan of this study, of the 54 truant youth who had one or more DOC contacts, 53 (98.1 percent) had more than one juvenile justice contact. Of the nine ARY/CHiNS youth who had one or more DOC contacts, eight (88.9 percent) had more than one juvenile justice contact. Of the 208 youth with misdemeanors only who had one or more DOC contacts, 112 (53.8 percent) had more than one juvenile justice contact. Of the 438 youth with a felony and misdemeanor who had one or more DOC contacts, 409 (93.8 percent) had more than one juvenile justice contact. Of the 43 youth with a felony only who had one or more DOC contacts, 39 (90.7 percent) had more than one juvenile justice contact.

## Summary

This report looked at the education and workforce outcomes of youth who were enrolled in eighth grade in a Washington state public school at any point during the 2004–05 academic year and who have had one or more contacts with the juvenile justice system between the years 1989 and 2011. The cohorts were followed for seven years through the 2011–12 academic year to allow for examination of both high school outcomes and postsecondary enrollment.

Major findings in this report include:

### High school outcomes

- Status offender youth: A total of 21.3 percent graduated from high school; 21.5 percent received a GED certificate; 14.6 percent dropped out of school; Hispanic/Latino youth were more likely to graduate than other race/ethnicities; American Indian/Native Alaskan youth were more likely to receive a GED certificate; and Asian youth were more likely to drop out of school.
- Juvenile offender youth: A total of 28.1 percent graduated from high school; 21.3 percent received a GED certificate; 11.7 percent dropped out of school; Asian youth were more likely to graduate than other race/ethnicities; American Indian/Native Alaskan youth were more likely to receive a GED certificate or drop out of school than other race/ethnicities.
- Nonjuvenile justice youth: A total of 66.0 percent graduated from high school; 4.3 percent received a GED certificate; 3.0 percent dropped out of school; the majority of all race/ethnicity categories in this cohort graduated from high school.

### Postsecondary enrollment and outcomes

- Community and technical colleges
  - 38.8 percent of status offender youth enrolled in a CTC; black youth in this cohort were more likely to enroll in a CTC than other race/ethnicities.
  - 6.7 percent of youth enrolled in a CTC in the status offender cohort earned a degree; of these, 43.0 percent earned a certificate.
  - 41.8 percent of juvenile offender youth enrolled in a CTC; black youth in this cohort were more likely to enroll in a CTC than other race/ethnicities.
  - 17.3 percent of youth enrolled in a CTC in the juvenile offender cohort earned a degree; of these, 48.3 percent earned an AA-DTA degree.
  - 45.0 percent of nonjuvenile justice-involved youth enrolled in a CTC; Asian youth in this cohort were more likely to enroll in a CTC than other race/ethnicities.

- 24.3 percent of youth enrolled in a CTC in the nonjuvenile justice-involved offender cohort earned a degree; of these, 63.1 percent earned an AA-DTA degree.
- Four-year institution
  - 2.1 percent of status offender youth enrolled in a four-year institution; black youth in this cohort were more likely to enroll in a four-year institution than other race/ethnicities.
  - 4.1 percent of juvenile offender youth enrolled in a four-year institution; Asian youth in this cohort were more likely to enroll in a four-year institution than other race/ethnicities.
  - 22.5 percent of nonjuvenile justice-involved youth enrolled in a four-year institution; Asian youth in this cohort were more likely to enroll in a four-year institution than other race/ethnicities.

## Workforce outcomes

- Nonjuvenile justice-involved youth ended 2014 making, on average, \$3,608.19 more than status offender youth and \$4,245.84 more than juvenile offender youth.
- High school graduates made more, on average, than youth who received a GED certificate or dropped out of school across all three cohorts.
- Youth who enrolled in a four-year institution made more, on average, than youth who enrolled in a CTC, with the exception of status offenders.

## Department of Corrections involvement

- A total of 0.8 percent of youth in the status offender cohort had one or more DOC contacts; black youth in this cohort were more likely to have one or more DOC contacts than other race/ethnicities.
- A total of 5.6 percent of youth in the juvenile offender cohort had one or more DOC contacts; black youth in this cohort were more likely to have one or more DOC contacts than other race/ethnicities.
- A total of 0.2 percent of youth in the nonjuvenile justice-involved cohort had one or more DOC contacts; American Indian/Native Alaskan youth in this cohort were more likely to have one or more DOC contacts than other race/ethnicities.

## Appendix A

**Table A1. Number of Youth by Age with One or More Juvenile Justice Contacts. See also Figure 1.**

Age	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Status Offender	30	56	71	73	90	181	481	1,157	1,890	2,376
Juvenile Offender	123	211	285	452	807	1,676	3,145	5,248	6,845	7,434
All Offenders	153	267	356	525	897	1,857	3,626	6,405	8,735	9,810

**Table A2. Percentage of Status Offender of Each Case Type by Race/Ethnicity and Gender. See also Figure 2.**

	ARY/CHiNS		Truant		Both	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	145	6.4%	2,001	87.8%	133	5.8%
Male	83	4.6%	1,678	92.2%	58	3.2%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>						
American Indian/Native Alaskan	16	7.1%	194	86.6%	14	6.3%
Asian	*	3.3%	230	93.9%	*	2.9%
Black/African American	12	5.2%	204	89.1%	13	5.7%
Hispanic/Latino	18	2.5%	680	94.2%	24	3.3%
Multiracial	*	0.0%	15	93.8%	*	6.3%
White	172	6.5%	2,352	88.5%	132	5.0%

**Table A3. Percentage of Juvenile Justice Offenders of Each Case Type by Race/Ethnicity and Gender. See also Figure 3.**

	Misdemeanor Only		Felony W/ Misd.		Felony Only	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	3,439	77.1%	798	17.9%	224	5.0%
Male	4,298	54.3%	2,832	35.7%	792	10.0%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>						
American Indian/Native Alaskan	409	58.3%	250	35.6%	43	6.1%
Asian	362	69.9%	101	19.5%	55	10.5%
Black	618	54.3%	419	36.8%	102	9.0%
Hispanic/Latino	1,038	58.1%	616	34.5%	132	7.4%
Multiracial	22	78.6%	*	21.4%	*	0.0%
White/Caucasian	5,284	64.4%	2,236	27.3%	684	8.3%

**Table A4. Educational Services Received at 8th Grade by Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Offender Status. See also Figure 4.**

		Free and Reduced Priced Lunch		Bilingual Services		Special Education Participant	
	Characteristics	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Status offender	American Indian/Native Alaskan	139	62.1%	*	1.8%	27	12.1%
	Asian	123	50.2%	26	10.6%	10	4.1%
	Black	143	62.4%	*	1.3%	28	12.2%
	Hispanic/Latino	474	65.7%	217	30.1%	62	8.6%
	Multiracial	12	75.0%	*	18.8%	*	18.8%
	White/Caucasian	1,190	44.8%	40	1.5%	323	12.2%
	Female	1,163	51.0%	171	7.5%	174	7.6%
	Male	919	50.5%	123	6.8%	279	15.3%
Juvenile Justice Offender	American Indian/Native Alaskan	436	62.1%	19	2.7%	109	15.5%
	Asian	238	45.9%	32	6.2%	52	10.0%
	Black	674	59.2%	12	1.1%	161	14.1%
	Hispanic/Latino	1,191	66.7%	328	18.4%	212	11.9%
	Multiracial	12	42.9%	*	0.0%	*	10.7%
	White/Caucasian	3,318	40.4%	57	0.7%	1,095	13.3%
	Female	2,111	47.3%	129	2.9%	376	8.4%
	Male	3,761	47.5%	319	4.0%	1256	15.9%
Not Involved	American Indian/Native Alaskan	821	46.8%	19	1.1%	195	11.1%
	Asian	1689	27.7%	476	7.8%	256	4.2%
	Black	1,686	44.9%	120	3.2%	372	9.9%
	Hispanic/Latino	5,000	61.7%	1,705	21.0%	605	7.5%
	Multiracial	50	29.6%	11	6.5%	13	7.7%
	White/Caucasian	10,587	19.9%	425	0.8%	3,833	7.2%
	Female	10,290	27.8%	1,396	3.8%	1886	5.1%
	Male	9,577	26.5%	1,368	3.8%	3388	9.4%



Table A5. High School Outcomes by Gender, Race/Ethnicity and Offender Status. See also Figure 5.

		Graduate		GED		Dropout	
	Characteristics	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Status offender	American Indian/Native Alaskan	32	14.3%	49	21.9%	37	16.5%
	Asian	56	22.6%	24	9.7%	37	14.9%
	Black	36	15.7%	43	18.8%	27	11.8%
	Hispanic/Latino	174	24.1%	67	9.3%	95	13.2%
	Multiracial	*	12.5%	*	18.8%	*	12.5%
	White/Caucasian	516	19.4%	533	20.1%	402	15.1%
	Female	489	21.5%	388	17.0%	308	13.5%
	Male	327	18.0%	331	18.2%	292	16.1%
Juvenile Justice Offender	American Indian/Native Alaskan	112	16.0%	137	19.5%	104	14.8%
	Asian	192	36.7%	68	13.0%	50	9.6%
	Black	229	20.1%	226	19.8%	106	9.3%
	Hispanic/Latino	440	24.6%	271	15.2%	248	13.9%
	Multiracial	*	32.1%	*	10.7%	*	14.3%
	White/Caucasian	2335	28.5%	1546	18.8%	939	11.5%
	Female	1378	30.9%	724	16.2%	482	10.8%
	Male	1939	24.5%	1527	19.3%	969	12.2%
Not Involved	American Indian/Native Alaskan	856	48.8%	114	6.5%	102	5.8%
	Asian	4322	70.4%	114	1.9%	142	2.3%
	Black	1796	47.8%	167	4.5%	132	3.5%
	Hispanic/Latino	4462	55.1%	322	4.0%	384	4.7%
	Multiracial	104	61.5%	*	3.6%	*	0.6%
	White/Caucasian	35880	67.5%	1958	3.7%	1423	2.7%
	Female	24576	66.5%	1104	3.0%	897	2.4%
	Male	22867	63.2%	1581	4.4%	1290	3.6%

Table A6. High School Outcomes by Case Type. See also Figure 6.

		Graduate		GED		Dropout	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Status Offender	ARY - CINS Only	140	30.7%	76	16.7%	48	10.5%
	Truancy	1,458	19.8%	1,270	17.3%	1,094	14.9%
	Both	34	8.9%	92	24.1%	58	15.2%
Juvenile Offender	Misdemeanor Only	5,212	33.7%	2,340	15.1%	1,756	11.4%
	Felony Only	582	28.6%	302	14.9%	198	9.7%
	Misd w/Felony	840	11.6%	1,860	25.6%	948	13.1%
Not Involved	(No Offenses)	47,443	64.9%	2,685	3.7%	2,187	3.0%

Table A7. Enrollment in CTC by Offender Status, High School Outcome, Gender and Race/Ethnicity. See also Figure 7.

		Status Offender		Juvenile Offender		Not Involved	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Gender</b>							
Female		970	42.6%	2,110	47.3%	17,628	47.7%
Male		621	34.1%	3,060	38.6%	15,309	42.3%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>							
American Indian/Native Alaskan		73	32.6%	258	36.8%	659	37.6%
Asian		112	45.7%	252	48.6%	3,050	50.0%
Black		130	56.8%	580	50.9%	1,681	44.8%
Hispanic/Latino		247	34.2%	681	38.1%	3,223	39.8%
Multiracial		*	37.5%	14	50.0%	81	47.9%
White/Caucasian		1,023	38.5%	3,383	41.2%	24,212	45.6%
<b>High School Outcome</b>							
Graduate		376	43.1%	1,602	46.1%	24,681	51.1%
GED		474	53.9%	1,417	53.8%	1,652	52.3%
Dropout		238	39.9%	565	39.1%	856	38.8%

Table A8. Enrollment in CTC by Case Type. See also Figure 8.

Case Type	Count	%
<b>Status Offender</b>		
ARY/CHiNS	89	39.0%
Truancy	1,417	38.5%
Both	85	44.5%
<b>Juvenile Offender</b>		
Misdemeanor Only	3,286	42.5%
Felony w/ Misd.	1,462	40.3%
Felony Only	422	41.5%

Table A9. CTC Degree Type Earned by Cohort. See also Figure 9.

	Status Offender		Juvenile Offender		Not Involved	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
AA-DTA	44	41.1%	190	48.3%	5,047	71.8%
AS-T	*	0.0%	*	0.8%	258	3.7%
Certificate	46	43.0%	138	35.1%	929	13.2%
Workforce	17	15.9%	62	15.8%	796	11.3%

Table A10. CTC Degrees Earned by Race/Ethnicity of Cohort. See also Figure 10.

		AA-DTA		AS-T		Certificate		Workforce	
		%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Not Involved	American Indian/Native Alaskan	71.1%	59	6.0%	*	10.8%	*	12.0%	10
	Asian	74.0%	450	7.4%	45	13.5%	82	5.1%	31
	Black/African American	61.3%	136	2.7%	*	25.7%	57	10.4%	23
	Hispanic/Latino	65.2%	395	1.8%	11	22.3%	135	10.7%	65
	Multiracial	66.7%	10	0	*	6.7%	*	26.7%	*
	White	72.7%	3,996	3.5%	190	11.7%	644	12.1%	663
Status Offender	Asian	57.1%	*	0	*	28.6%	*	14.3%	*
	Black/African American	9.1%	*	0	*	90.9%	10	0	*
	Hispanic/Latino	21.1%	*	0	*	73.7%	14	5.3%	*
	White	50.0%	35	0	*	28.6%	20	21.4%	15
Juvenile Offender	American Indian/Native Alaskan	16.7%	*	0	*	50.0%	*	33.3%	*
	Asian	59.4%	19	3.1%	*	28.1%	*	9.4%	*
	Black/African American	34.8%	*	0	*	60.9%	14	4.3%	*
	Hispanic/Latino	31.0%	13	2.4%	*	50.0%	21	16.7%	*
	Multiracial	100.0%	*	0	*	0	*	0	*
	White	51.9%	147	0.4%	*	31.1%	88	16.6%	4*

Table A11. CTC Degrees Earned by Gender. See also Figure 11.

	Status Offender		Juvenile Offender		Not Involved	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Female</b>						
AA-DTA	30	39.5%	105	53.8%	3,071	76.0%
AS-T	*	0.0%	*	0.0%	79	2.0%
Certificate	36	47.4%	67	34.4%	555	13.7%
Workforce	10	13.2%	23	11.8%	336	8.3%
<b>Male</b>						
AA-DTA	14	45.2%	85	42.9%	1,976	66.1%
AS-T	*	0.0%	*	1.5%	179	6.0%
Certificate	10	32.3%	71	35.9%	374	12.5%
Workforce	*	22.6%	39	19.7%	460	15.4%

Table A12. CTC Degrees Earned by High School Outcome of Juvenile Justice Participants. See also Figure 12.

		AA-DTA		AS-T		Certificate		Workforce	
		%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
<b>Not Involved</b>	Graduate	74.6%	4,403	3.9%	228	10.9%	643	10.6%	628
	GED	22.2%	20	1.1%	*	57.8%	52	18.9%	17
	Dropout	44.3%	27	1.6%	*	34.4%	21	19.7%	12
<b>Status Offender</b>	Graduate	62.2%	28	0	*	24.4%	11	13.3%	*
	GED	20.0%	*	0	*	50.0%	10	30.0%	*
	Dropout	7.7%	*	0	*	84.6%	11	7.7%	*
<b>Juvenile Offender</b>	Graduate	64.1%	150	1.3%	*	18.8%	44	15.8%	37
	GED	13.1%	*	0	*	73.8%	45	13.1%	*
	Dropout	4.5%	*	0	*	86.4%	19	9.1%	*

**Table A13. Percentage of Youth Enrolled in a 4-year Institution by Offender Status, Race/Ethnicity, Gender and High School Outcomes. See also Figure 13.**

	Status Offender		Juvenile Offender		Not Involved	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	53	2.3%	225	5.0%	9,088	75.4%
Male	32	1.8%	276	3.5%	7,369	79.6%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>						
American Indian/Native Alaskan	*	1.8%	11	1.6%	189	10.8%
Asian	*	0.8%	51	9.8%	2,192	35.9%
Black	*	2.6%	40	3.5%	505	13.5%
Hispanic/Latino	*	1.2%	32	1.8%	943	11.6%
Multiracial	*	0.0%	*	3.6%	41	24.3%
White/Caucasian	64	2.4%	366	4.5%	12,574	23.7%
<b>High School Outcome</b>						
Graduate	60	6.9%	413	11.9%	14,862	30.8%
GED	*	0.9%	13	0.5%	46	1.5%
Dropout	*	0.3%	*	0.3%	48	2.2%

**Table A14. Enrollment in 4-year Institution by Case Type. See also Figure 14.**

Case Type	Count	%
<b>Status Offender</b>		
ARY/CHiNS	14	6.1%
Truancy	69	1.9%
Both	*	1.0%
<b>Juvenile Offender</b>		
Misdemeanor Only	396	5.1%
Felony w/ Misd.	59	1.6%
Felony Only	46	4.5%

**Table A15. Average Annual Earnings by Offender Status. See also Figure 15.**

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Juvenile Offender	\$5,014	\$7,194	\$9,089	\$11,334	\$13,809	\$16,279
Status Offender	\$5,361	\$7,427	\$9,496	\$12,167	\$14,751	\$16,948
Not Involved	\$4,753	\$6,955	\$9,160	\$11,729	\$14,945	\$20,507

**Table A16. Average Annual Earnings by Race/Ethnicity. See also Figure 16.**

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
<b>American Indian/Native Alaskan</b>						
Not Involved	\$4,372	\$7,085	\$9,266	\$11,973	\$14,705	\$17,980
Status Offender	\$4,417	\$6,261	\$9,122	\$10,440	\$13,465	\$12,918
Juvenile Offender	\$3,679	\$5,765	\$7,774	\$10,543	\$10,585	\$11,599
<b>Asian</b>						
Not Involved	\$4,214	\$6,146	\$8,111	\$10,889	\$14,628	\$21,197
Status Offender	\$5,120	\$7,216	\$9,479	\$13,934	\$18,068	\$19,443
Juvenile Offender	\$4,988	\$7,043	\$9,126	\$12,295	\$15,733	\$19,456
<b>Black/African American</b>						
Not Involved	\$4,201	\$6,248	\$7,893	\$10,055	\$12,592	\$16,567
Status Offender	\$5,608	\$7,923	\$8,174	\$10,120	\$11,912	\$13,755
Juvenile Offender	\$4,039	\$5,738	\$6,689	\$8,155	\$10,681	\$12,310
<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>						
Not Involved	\$5,480	\$7,957	\$10,366	\$12,908	\$15,457	\$19,351
Status Offender	\$6,167	\$9,094	\$10,512	\$12,961	\$16,360	\$17,721
Juvenile Offender	\$5,609	\$7,297	\$9,333	\$11,286	\$13,510	\$15,842
<b>White</b>						
Not Involved	\$4,782	\$6,990	\$9,230	\$11,808	\$15,084	\$20,769
Status Offender	\$5,216	\$7,131	\$9,400	\$11,971	\$14,244	\$16,832
Juvenile Offender	\$5,052	\$7,374	\$9,378	\$11,675	\$14,214	\$16,823

**Table A17. Average Annual Earnings by Gender. See also Figure 17.**

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
<b>Female</b>						
Not Involved	\$4,699	\$6,752	\$8,672	\$10,894	\$13,801	\$19,009
Status Offender	\$5,043	\$7,234	\$8,699	\$11,195	\$13,595	\$15,267
Juvenile Offender	\$5,070	\$7,255	\$9,023	\$10,731	\$12,485	\$14,650
<b>Male</b>						
Not Involved	\$4,861	\$7,251	\$9,784	\$12,747	\$16,293	\$22,057
Status Offender	\$5,916	\$7,823	\$10,728	\$13,531	\$16,258	\$19,074
Juvenile Offender	\$4,939	\$7,061	\$9,088	\$11,697	\$14,586	\$17,302



**Table A18. Average Annual Income by Offense Type. See also Figure 18.**

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
<b>Juvenile Offender</b>						
Felony Only	\$4,809	\$7,053	\$9,684	\$12,364	\$14,205	\$17,580
Misd w/ Felony	\$4,440	\$5,964	\$7,929	\$9,658	\$11,773	\$13,543
Misdemeanor Only	\$5,193	\$7,533	\$9,340	\$11,688	\$14,260	\$16,907
<b>Status Offender</b>						
ARY - CHINS Only	\$4,892	\$7,277	\$8,881	\$10,041	\$11,424	\$13,757
Both	\$3,857	\$5,759	\$7,152	\$10,389	\$13,660	\$15,548
Truancy	\$5,504	\$7,564	\$9,673	\$12,340	\$14,956	\$17,096

**Table A19. Annual Yearly Earnings by High School Outcomes. See also Figure 19.**

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
<b>Dropout</b>						
Not Involved	\$5,486	\$7,302	\$9,784	\$12,737	\$14,912	\$17,773
Status Offender	\$5,160	\$6,442	\$8,930	\$11,649	\$14,078	\$15,057
Juvenile Offender	\$5,095	\$6,400	\$8,075	\$10,271	\$12,435	\$13,677
<b>GED</b>						
Not Involved	\$5,736	\$7,647	\$9,451	\$11,499	\$14,382	\$17,032
Status Offender	\$5,331	\$6,338	\$8,721	\$11,147	\$13,751	\$17,121
Juvenile Offender	\$5,162	\$6,881	\$8,096	\$10,144	\$12,459	\$14,181
<b>Graduate</b>						
Not Involved	\$4,623	\$6,825	\$9,049	\$11,628	\$14,925	\$21,005
Status Offender	\$5,418	\$8,392	\$10,380	\$14,242	\$17,121	\$20,109
Juvenile Offender	\$5,085	\$8,017	\$10,103	\$12,653	\$16,036	\$19,151

**Table A20. Average Yearly Earnings by Postsecondary Enrollment. See also Figure 20.**

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
<b>2 Year/CTC</b>						
Not Involved	\$5,218	\$8,120	\$10,708	\$13,665	\$16,622	\$20,203
Status Offender	\$5,095	\$7,144	\$9,322	\$12,107	\$14,418	\$16,429
Juvenile Offender	\$5,083	\$7,231	\$9,232	\$11,222	\$13,608	\$15,861
<b>4 Year</b>						
Not Involved	\$3,863	\$4,890	\$6,399	\$8,496	\$12,327	\$20,765
Status Offender	\$4,706	\$6,516	\$7,042	\$9,176	\$13,139	\$15,611
Juvenile Offender	\$4,219	\$5,985	\$7,584	\$9,497	\$12,571	\$17,251
<b>Not Enrolled</b>						
Not Involved	\$5,955	\$8,516	\$11,238	\$13,475	\$16,433	\$20,324
Status Offender	\$5,669	\$7,833	\$9,909	\$12,417	\$15,071	\$17,282
Juvenile Offender	\$5,085	\$7,290	\$9,207	\$11,699	\$14,006	\$16,260

Table A21. DOC Involvement by Race/Ethnicity. See also Figure 21.

	Status Offender		Juvenile Offender		Not Involved	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	16	0.7%	84	1.9%	25	0.1%
Male	48	2.3%	605	7.6%	145	0.4%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>						
American Indian/Native Alaskan	*	1.3%	37	5.3%	10	0.6%
Asian	*	1.2%	18	3.5%	*	0.0%
Black	*	3.1%	113	9.9%	20	0.5%
Hispanic/Latino	11	1.5%	127	7.1%	25	0.3%
White/Caucasian	34	1.3%	392	4.8%	111	0.2%
<b>High School Outcome</b>						
Graduate	*	0.0%	*	0.1%	13	2.2%
GED	37	4.2%	487	18.5%	147	10.2%
Dropout	13	2.2%	123	3.9%	56	2.5%

Table A22. DOC Involvement by Offense Type. See also Figure 22.

Case Type	Count	%
<b>Status Offender</b>		
ARY/CHiNS	*	1.8%
Truancy	49	1.3%
Both	*	2.6%
<b>Juvenile Offender</b>		
Misdemeanor Only	208	2.7%
Felony w/ Misd.	438	12.1%
Felony Only	43	4.2%



**Trusted. Accurate. Objective.**

