Appendix 1

Sept. 13, 2017
Dec. 11, 2017
Michael Leiber, Ph.D.
Equal Protection Monitor
&
Maude Beaudry-Cyr, M.A.
Data Manager

In partnership with law enforcement, the Juvenile Court has had a Summons program since 2010. The program was implemented as a means for law enforcement to issue summons rather than arrest youth involved in minor offenses, such as simple assault and trespassing. Until recently, however, the Juvenile Court had conducted no thorough analysis of the effectiveness of the program as relates to DMC. Potentially problematic practices such as the inclusion of too many youth through the program (i.e., net widening) or Black youth not receiving a summons and instead, a direct referral to detention or not enough youth receiving a summons were not monitored. In a new initiative, the Summons Review Team (SRT) was developed where the Juvenile Court now tracks information to assess which youth are receiving summons, for what offenses, whether the summons is appropriately being issued, if youth could be warned and released rather than attend an intake interview, and whether trends exist that need to be addressed with law enforcement. The SRT initiative was fully implemented in the fall of 2016 and revised in February 2017.

In response to recommendations to conduct a formal evaluation of the summons effort and in particular the SRT, the Juvenile Court provided data for a seven-month period (February through August, 2017) to the Equal Protection Monitor. An evaluation was conducted that resulted in a report dated September 13th, 2017, and is presented below.

Summary of Results and Recommendations Pertaining to Evaluation of SRT

Summary Findings:

- 52% of cases result in a SRT admission (see Table 1, next page). That is, 52% of the youth receiving a summons were diverted away (e.g., warned and released) from having to go to Juvenile Court for an intake interview.

- Race does not appear to be related to the SRT decision (see Table 2). That is, being White or Black did not impact the SRT decision once relevant factors were taken into consideration (e.g., crime severity, etc.).

- Race is not related to the non-judicial decision at intake; that is, Black youth were not found to be more likely to go further into the proceedings at intake than comparable White youth (see Table 3, p = .056, not reported).

These findings are very encouraging. The last finding at the non-judicial stage (intake) is inconsistent with results from prior studies of non-judicial decision-making at intake. Thus, the finding could mean that race is not a determinant of intake decision-making. Or, the finding is anomaly since key variables like prior record, family structure, school assessments, etc. were not taken into account. Further research will provide more insights into what relationship, if any, race has at intake.

Qualifiers
- Missing: Prior referrals, Number of charges, Family assessment, School assessment, and information on why not admitted into SRT

- Analyses based on only 7 months of data

Recommendations
- Create a variable or category indicating why declined admission into the SRT program.

- Although a good number of youth are participating in the SRT program, there is a need to increase number of youth participating in the SRT program, especially since 89% of those that did not participate in SRT received a non-judicial outcome at intake - need to assess criteria for declining admission and adjust to include those that are simply being released at intake or receiving modest interventions. In other words, admit more youth into the SRT program.

- Although race was not found to be influential at intake, it is imperative for the Juvenile Court to continue to examine decision-making at this stage and the Graduated Response Grid itself as to why race effects have been present at this stage in the proceedings.

- Instrument used by the SRT needs to be monitored, evaluated, and revised.

Table 1. Distribution of Variables (N = 2,435)

		Full Sample		SRT Status Denied		Approved	
Variable	Value	N	%	N	%	N	%
Independent							
Race							
	0 – White	361	15	160	17	201	16
	1 – Black	2074	85	1009	83	1065	84
SRT Status							
	0 – Denied	1169	48				
	1 – Approved	1266	52				
Gender							
	0 – Male	1715	70	905	77	810	64
	1 – Female	720	30	264	23	456	36
Age							
	Mean =	15.03		15.05		15.01	
	SD =	1.73		1.56		1.87	
	Range =	7-17		7-17		8-17	
Crime severity							
	0 – Misdemeanor	2083	76	920	79	1163	92
	1 – Felony	352	24	249	21	103	8
Property offense[a]							
	0 – No	1721	71	824	71	897	71
	1 – Yes	714	29	345	29	369	29
Person offense[a]							
	0 – No	1693	69	815	70	878	69
	1 – Yes	742	31	354	30	388	31
Drug offense[a]							
	0 – No	2169	89	1078	92	1091	86
	1 – Yes	266	11	91	8	175	14
Dependent							
Intake							
	0 – SRT	1266	52			1266	100
	1 – Non-judicial	1037	43	1037[b]	89		
	2 – Other	132	5	132	11		

a: Reference category is Other offense (e.g. weapon possession, disorderly conduct)
b: For analyses, intake will be defined as 0 non-judicial (includes release cases) versus 1 other/recommended for further court referral at intake (e.g., petition, waiver).

Table 2. Logistic Regression Results Predicting SRT Approval (N = 2,435)

Variable	
Race	$.02^a$
	(1.02)
Gender	.59**
	(1.81)
Age	$-^b$
	-
Crime severity	-1.35**
	(.26)
Property offense^c	.43**
	(1.54)
Person offense^c	.21
	(1.23)
Drug offense^c	1.23**
	(3.43)
-2 Log Likelihood	3180.28

Note: SRT defined as Denied versus Approved
a: Regression coefficient; Exp(B) is in parenthesis ( ).
b: Insufficient cases, variable dropped from analysis
c: Reference category is Other offense (e.g. weapon possession, disorderly conduct)
**$p<.01$

Table 3. Logistic Regression Results Predicting Non-Judicial versus Other (N = 1,169)

Variable	
Race	.62[a]
	(1.85)
Gender	-2.14**
	(.12)
Age	-[b]
	-
Crime severity	.75**
	(2.12)
Property offense[c]	1.99**
	(7.35)
Person offense[c]	2.03**
	(7.59)
Drug offense[c]	1.82**
	(6.16)
-2 Log Likelihood	698.05

Note: Intake defined as 0 non-judicial, includes release, vs. other/further court proceedings
a: Regression coefficient; Exp(B) is in parenthesis ( ).
b: Insufficient cases, variable dropped from analysis
c: Reference category is Other offense (e.g. weapon possession, disorderly conduct)
**$p < .01$