

CHI-EI OUTCOME REPORT PRESENTATION:

Recidivism of CHI-EI Youth

December 13, 2017

LPSCC RED Subcommittee

Brian C. Renauer, Ph.D.

Mark Leymon, Ph.D.

Chris Campbell, Ph.D.

Criminal Justice Policy Research Institute

Outcome Report Research Question

Key Questions:

- 1) *Does the CHI-EI Program help reduce recidivism?*
 - *Any racial/ethnic differences in recidivism?*
- 2) *What appears to predict success/failure?*

Table 2. Levels of Youth Engagement in Program

CHI-EI Referrals	Total	%
<i>Non-Completers</i>	206	53.5%
No Contact After 5 Attempts	139	36.1%
Parent Declined Services	35	9.1%
Youth Declined Services	29	7.5%
Administrative Override	3	0.8%
<i>Participants</i>	179	46.5%
Parents Have Support Services In Place	89	23.1%
Service Plan Successfully Completed	55	14.3%
Service Plan Progress	35	9.1%

White = 215 (41% participants)

African American = 65 (49% participants)

Hispanic = 78 (56% participants)

Matching CHI-EI Youth to Historic Youth (Propensity Score Matching)

Method = Propensity Score Matching

- Provides a quasi-experimental design when randomized experiment is not feasible.
- A statistical approach that identifies from a historic sample the youth that closely match the characteristics of the CHI-EI defendants.
 - *The only difference is historic youth received warning letter vs. CHI-EI were referred to program.*
- 6,587 historic youth (only used data from 2009 to 2014)

Matching Criteria:

- ✓ Sex of youth
- ✓ Race/ethnicity (African American, Hispanic, White, and Other).
- ✓ Age at the time of referral
- ✓ Initial offense description
- ✓ Zip code of youth residence
- ✓ Referring agency

Overall Recidivism Results

Table 6. Propensity Score Recidivism Analyses

	Matched Groups		Weighted Groups		
	CHI-EI Participants (n= 179)	Historical Comparison (n= 179)	CHI-EI Participants (n= 159)	Non-Completers (n= 190)	Historical Comparison (n= 3,482)
Recidivism (unrestricted)	9.5%	41.9%	10.1%	13.2%	35.3%
$\chi^2 = 50.4; df 2; p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .374; p < .001$			$\chi^2 = 79.9; df 2; p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .144; p < .001$		
Recidivism (182 days)	3.9%	17.3%	2.5%	4.2%	14.8%
$\chi^2 = 17.0; df 2; p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .218; p < .001$			$\chi^2 = 34.8; df 2; p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .095; p < .001$		

- CHI-EI participants = **85% less likely to recidivate (unrestricted)** and **75% less likely to recidivate within 182 days** compared to *historic youth*
- CHI-EI participants **40% less likely to recidivate** than *non-participants*.
- CHI-EI non-completers also fare better off than historic matched youth.

Recidivism Results by Race/Ethnicity

Table 7. Recidivism by race/ethnicity between matched groups

Recidivism by Race/Ethnicity	African American		Hispanic		White	
	Historic Comp. %	CHI-EI%	Historic Comp. %	CHI-EI%	Historic Comp. %	CHI-EI%
Recidivism (unrestricted)	69.2	28.3***	26.8	6.8**	38.0	5.6***
Recidivism (182 days)	35.9	12.5*	7.3	2.3	16.9	2.3**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

- Each race/ethnicity of CHI-EI participants had much lower recidivism compared to *historic matched youth*.
 - *Change in recidivism should be an important RED benchmark.*
- African American CHI-EI youth more likely to recidivate than Hispanic and White youth.

Factors Related to Recidivism

1. Youth with **risk score above 1** (0-8 scale) were more likely to recidivate (19% vs. 6%).
 - African American youth more likely to have a risk score above 1 (65% vs. 37%).
2. Top risk items = a **suspension/expulsion** in the past 6th months, **chronic truancy**, and **recent runaway**.
 - African American youth more likely to have recent suspension/expulsion and chronic truancy compared to all other youth (43% vs. 21%).
3. Youth/families rated with a **mental health need** as moderate to high (N=33) - 27% recidivated compared to 11% (N= 70).

Key Highlights from Process Evaluation

1. Initial contact and intake very time consuming (particularly for families most in need).
2. Need for enhanced program legitimacy
 - Postcard from the county describing program as opposed to a cold call.
3. Time consuming advocacy work . . . particularly with schools.
4. Need for more culturally responsive mentors.

Overall Conclusions

1. CHI-EI is a worthy substitution for the prior warning letter approach
 - The program lowers recidivism overall and for each major racial/ethnic group.
 - Even for non-participation there seems to be the potential for impact (real diversion).
2. Looking at recidivism reduction over time using matched samples of youth is an important disparity benchmark.
3. Finding ways to tighten school advocacy and monitoring for referred youth appears important to success.