

Summary Evaluation Review on the Second Year of RJY

(Re)imagining Justice for Youth (RJY) is a collaborative effort to transform our legal system to be more restorative, help youth learn and grow through developmentally-appropriate responses, address underlying causes by connecting youth with resources to help them succeed in life, and prevent harm from recurring, advancing safety and wellness in our community. We are committed to sharing power with our most impacted communities in co-designing and (re)imagining justice for youth, in decision-making through a collaborative review process, and in responding to harmful behavior through community-based accountability that better serves victims, youth and their families.

In alignment with our values to be transparent and data-informed, we have posted a slide deck and this document to share data and results from our second year. Many of the figures are similar to figures reported in the dashboard and evaluation report from RJY Year 1. Statistics for RJY Year 1 were recalculated in this update to address any pending cases from the Year 1, so any slight differences in year 1 reported results are due to those updates. This document is intended to provide an interpretation of the results shared in the “RJY Dashboard Year 2 Update.ppt”.

Slide 2-3 depict the flow of cases through initial decisions in the RCAO. We kept the first and second year of RJY separately depicted on two separate slides to demonstrate year-to-year changes.

- In Year 1, of 1,203 cases referred to RCAO, 33% were sent for review by the Collaborative Review Team (CRT), 43% of cases were traditionally reviewed by a prosecutor, and in 34% of cases, a prosecutor declined to prosecute or have the CRT review the case.
- In Year 2, of 1,425 referred to RCAO, 23% were sent for review by the CRT, 53% of cases were traditionally reviewed by a prosecutor, and in 24% of cases, a prosecutor declined to prosecute or have the CRT review the case.
- The year 2 rate of CRT review is 10% lower than in year 1, and, due to the higher number of overall referrals, is 50 fewer cases in total.

Slide 4 shows results of CRT decisions in both years 1 and 2.

- Decisions by the CRT were remarkably steady, with 9 in 10 cases being referred away from formal justice system processing. About 3 in 4 cases both years were referred to Community-Based Accountability (CBA) and nearly 1 in 5 cases were referred back to a parent or family members.

Slide 5 compares rates of community-based accountability during years 1 and 2 of RJY to the baseline years of 2017-18.

- While rates of referral to community accountability in RJY Year 1 represented a large increase over baseline, the lower percent of cases reviewed collaboratively in RJY Year 2 resulted in the rate of youth being referred to CBA falling back to pre-RJY levels.

Slides 6 and 7 show the trajectories of racial or ethnic group disparities across the three time points (baseline, RJY Year 1 and RJY Year 2.)

- The midpoint of these slides represent equity, in that the differences in proportions of cases are equal. In other words, if a specific racial or ethnic group makes up 20% of the cases referred to RCAO and 20% of the cases sent to community accountability, the difference between those rates = 0, meaning that group is neither overrepresented nor underrepresented in the results depicted.

Each data point on Slide 6 shows the differences in racial and ethnic proportions between cases of youth referred to RCAO and cases offered community-based accountability for a given time point.

- Cases of American Indian, Asian and Latine youth all were and remain relatively close to having equitable access to community-based accountability across the three time points.
- The biggest changes in equitable representation have been with cases of youth identified as Black or African American. Cases of Black youth went from being underrepresented by 14% in traditional diversion programs in 2017-18 (i.e., the difference in proportionality between cases referred to RCAO and referred to CBA was 14%) to being 1% away from equitable representation in RJY Year 2.

Data points on Slide 7 show the differences in racial and ethnic proportions between cases of youth referred to and succeeding in community-based accountability.

- All racial and ethnic groups were approaching equity in RJY Year 2, especially as compared to baseline years.
- The blue lines and data points show the proportion of successful cases of American Indian youth in community accountability was 2% lower than the proportion of cases of American Indian youth sent to community accountability in 2017-18. In RJY Year 1, the proportion of successful cases of American Indian youth in community accountability was 2% higher than the proportion of cases of American Indian youth sent to community accountability. In RJY Year 2, the proportions were exactly equal.
- Cases of American Indian and Latine youth were and remain relatively close to having equitable success rates in community-based accountability across the three time points.
- Cases of Asian and White youth went from being overrepresented by 6% and 14% respectively in success rates to being closer to equitably represented.
- The biggest change has been among cases of Black youth, which went from being deeply underrepresented in successful community accountability cases to being much closer to equitable, and even slightly overrepresented by 2% in RJY Year 2.

Slide 8 shows direct within-group success rates in community accountability by race or ethnicity.

- 62% of cases of Black youth closed successfully in Year 2 compared to 53% in Year 1
- Similarly, success rates improved in Year 2 for Latine (from 30% to 63%) and White (from 63% to 68%).
- On the other hand, though a small number of cases, success rates for American Indian and Asian youth declined to 50% in Year 2.

Slide 9 shows disaggregated within-group success rates community accountability by assigned sex, age groups and referral numbers.

- For referral numbers, success rates remained at 65% for youth on their first referral to RCAO, but dropped from 73% to 50% for youth on their second referral.

- Success rates by age group remained relatively steady, with 55% of cases of 10-14 year olds closed successfully in RJY Year 2 compared to 60% in RJY Year 1, while rates of success in cases of 15-17 year olds rose from 57% to 62%.
- Success rates for cases of females dropped from 71% to 65% while success rates for males rose from 50% to 55%.

Slide 10 demonstrates rates of the primary initial decisions on cases referred to RCAO.

- In 2012-13, the RCAO charged 67% of cases, declined 13% and worked with community accountability providers to resolve 11% of cases.
- By 2017-18, the initial charge rates fell to 60% while declines rose to 23% and community resolution rose to 15%.
- During the first year of RJY, only 46% of cases were charged, while 42% were declined or sent back to parents, and the rate of resolution through community partners stayed relatively steady at 12%
- Rates were similar in the second year of RJY in terms of a 51% rate of charging cases. On the other hand, fewer (31%) were declined, while a greater percentage (18%) were successfully resolved in community.

Slide 11 is the first look at effectiveness of accountability types since RJY began, and includes a preliminary analysis of the rate at which a youth was re-referred to the RCAO after a new incident within six months of their previous case referral.

- Data show that over time, community accountability has consistently delivered lower re-referral rates compared to system responses that end in dismissals or a finding of guilt and corrections or probation terms. Specifically, during this first two years of RJY, there was a 14% 6-month re-referral rate for youth whose cases were resolved in community accountability (similar to rates of 10% in 2017-18 and 14% in 2012-13.)
- Even as criteria for community accountability expanded during RJY, rates of re-referral after community accountability did not increase.
- The highest rates of re-referral over the past two years were with cases ending in a finding of guilt or a dismissal (both at 42%), while the rate of re-referral after a case was declined fell to 28%.
- **This adds to evidence that system responses are not leading to less harm in the community, but accountability processes led by a youth's family and community appear to be far more effective in preventing future harmful behavior.**

Finally, slide 12 includes aspects of meaningful youth accountability processes that were facilitated by community accountability providers. These examples share the actions, emotional work and family support that embody restorative accountability processes.