

The Restorative Justice Project of the Midcoast

Executive Summary

This report is designed to compare the effects of a court diversion process, Community Resolution Team conferences, to the effects of supervision by the Department of Juvenile Services upon youth who commit crimes in the state of Maine. Recidivism rates of both cohorts of youth have been tracked for up to three years and compared to determine the following information:

- Number and Percentage of youth who recidivated
- Type of recidivating offense
- Class of recidivating offense
- Status at re-adjudication – juvenile or adult

The aggregate six-month recidivism rate for CRT cohort participants was 46.6% lower than the aggregate six-month rate for state supervised youth. This is a statistically significant difference. Further, the 2006 CRT six-month rate was 43% lower than that of the state, and the 2008 CRT six-month rate was 100% lower. Despite the fact that six-month rates increased for both cohorts in 2007, overall state supervised youth recidivated much sooner than youth who participated in a CRT conference.

Although the one-year recidivism rate in 2007 was higher for the CRT cohort than for the state cohort, overall, offenders who participated in a CRT as a diversion program reoffended at a lower one-year rate than did state supervised youth. The annual one-year recidivism rate for the CRT cohort ranged from 12.8% (2008) to 27% (2006) lower than that for the state cohort. The aggregate CRT one-year recidivism rate was 6.5% lower than the state's.

At two years the 2007 CRT cohort rate was 5.1% lower than that of the state cohort. The two-year rate for the 2006 CRT cohort was 26.8% lower than the state's.

At three years, the recidivism rate for the 2006 CRT cohort was 15.2% higher than the recidivism rate for state supervised youth. Without three-year data from 2007 and 2008, it is impossible to know whether this reflects a trend or is an aberration in the data.

No youth who participated in a CRT conference recidivated as adults within the first year, while over 2% of state supervised youth did recidivate as adults in each of the three years tracked.

No youth in the CRT cohort recidivated with felony offenses within the first year, but from 4.1% - 4.7% of state supervised youth recidivated with felony offenses

44.1% more youth in the CRT cohort recidivated with civil, non-criminal offenses than did youth in the state cohort.

Significantly fewer, almost 74%, youth in the CRT cohort recidivated with offenses against persons than did state supervised youth. CRT participants recidivated with property offenses at a rate 24.1% lower than the state cohort. There was no significant difference in drug and alcohol related offenses.

Summary

Initial data indicate that the Community Resolution Team diversion program has a positive impact on the future lives of participants. CRT participants overall tended to recidivate much later than state supervised youth. A lower percentage of participants overall recidivated as compared to youth who were not diverted from court. Those who did recidivate did so with less severe offenses.

Data Limitations

It is important to note that the numbers presented in the CRT cohort are based upon a small sample size varying from 13 to 21 participants. In the state's Annual Juvenile Recidivism Report, it was noted that any sample of ten participants or less was not included because "(1) small numbers may make it possible to identify individuals, and (2) small changes in numbers make percent changes and proportions in subset analysis less meaningful. For example, a change from two incidents to three is a 50% increase, which by itself is misleading."

Further data collection and analysis is needed over more cohorts is needed.

Data Sources

All data on state supervised youth was taken from the Annual Juvenile Recidivism Report 2011. "The

Maine Correctional Information System (CORIS) is the primary data source. CORIS is a comprehensive, multi-purpose, information system that captures information on youth and adults involved in Maine's juvenile justice and correctional systems."

Before proceeding, a brief explanation of the different processes is necessary. Definitions of terms are taken from the Annual Juvenile Recidivism Report 2011 published by the Maine Statistical Analysis Center, <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch>.

What Is Supervision?

"Supervision in the Maine juvenile corrections system means a youth has gone before a judge, been adjudicated, and either a) placed under community supervision (probation) or, b) committed to a Youth Development Center (YDC). Supervised youth receive case management services from DJS, and also may be required to participate in individual, family or group therapy, or other services."

What is Diversion?

"Diversion is the process of gathering information and developing a case plan with youth and family to divert youth from the court process. Diversion occurs during the pre-adjudicatory process (prior to court). Upon referral to the juvenile justice system, a JCCO either authorizes filing of a petition with the court or develops a diversion plan to avoid court action. Diversions take the form of *No Further Actions*, or *Informal Adjustment*." The diversion program, Community Resolution Team conferencing, referred to in this report is provided by the Restorative Justice Project of the Midcoast.

What is Recidivism?

"Recidivism ... is defined as *a re-adjudication (juvenile) or conviction (adult) for an offense committed by a youth in Maine within three years of his or her first adjudication.*" Since youth participating in the CRT diversion program do not have an adjudication date, the date of their conference was used for comparison purposes. Conference dates were used because, similar to an adjudication, this is the time when participants meet with the persons who have been harmed by their offenses, take responsibility for their actions, accept accountability for the harm done, and sign an agreement that delineates the steps they will take to repair the harm they have caused.

Who are the Cohorts?

This report describes two different cohorts of youth. Unlike the one-year cohorts referred to in the Maine Annual Juvenile Recidivism Report, the cohorts in the RJP report consist either of all state supervised youth for the years 2006, 2007, and 2008 or all youth who participated in the Community Resolution Team (CRT) diversion program during the same time. All youth were tracked for three years from the date of either their first adjudication or their initial CRT conference. Those youth who turned 18 during this time were tracked into the adult criminal system.

Youth are tracked in only one year of each cohort. If a youth was either adjudicated or participated in a CRT in 2006, that youth is not included in the 2007 or 2008 reports. While the report covers a three-year period, only the youth from who were either first adjudicated or participated in a CRT in 2006 were tracked for the full three years.

Table I-1: Cohort and Recidivism Time Frames

| Cohort | Adjudicated Between | Recidivism Rates Calculated At |
|--------|-------------------------------|--|
| 2006 | January 1 – December 31, 2006 | Six months, one year, two years, three years |
| | January 1 – December 31, 2007 | Six months, one year, two years |
| 2008 | January 1 – December 31, 2008 | Six months, one year |

What are the Recidivating Offenses?

For the purpose of this report, recidivating offenses were divided into four classes – felony, misdemeanor, civil, or adult. Civil offenses are non-criminal offenses. Status offenses, those that would not be against the law if committed by an adult, were not included in this report.

Offenses were divided into three types from most severe to least. The types of offenses are personal, property, and drug/alcohol related.

Frequency of Recidivating Offenses

This report does not determine how many times a particular youth recidivated, nor does it determine how many offenses a youth committed. Once a youth was determined to have recidivated, any future offenses were not included. The number of offenses committed at the time of recidivation was not included.

Section II. Comparing the 2006 Cohorts

Tables II-1a and II-1b: Six Month Recidivism Rate, 2006 Cohorts

| CRT Cohort | 2006 – 6 months | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Diverted | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 13 | 1 | 7.7% |
| Adult | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 13 | 1 | 7.7% |

By six months, 1 participant in the CRT program had recidivated. **92.3% of youth did not recidivate within six months.**

| State Cohort | 2006 – 6 months | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Supervised | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 825 | 104 | 12.6% |
| Adult | 0 | 7 | 0.9% |
| Total | 825 | 111 | 13.5% |

By six months, 111 supervised youth recidivated. **86.5% of youth did not recidivate within six months.**

At six months, the recidivism rate for the 2006 CRT cohort was 43% lower than the recidivism rate for state supervised youth.

Tables II-2a and II-2b: One Year Recidivism Rate, 2006 Cohorts

| CRT Cohort | 2006 – One Year | | |
|------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Diverted | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 13 | 2 | 15.4% |
| Adult | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 13 | 2 | 15.4% |

By the end of one year, 2 CRT participants had recidivated. **84.6% of youth did not recidivate within one year.**

| State Cohort | 2006 – One Year | | |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Supervised | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 825 | 157 | 19% |
| Adult | 0 | 17 | 2.1% |
| Total | 825 | 174 | 21.1% |

By the end of one year, 174 supervised youth had recidivated. **78.9% of youth did not recidivate within one year.**

At one year, the recidivism rate for the 2006 CRT cohort was 27% lower than the recidivism rate for state supervised youth.

Tables II-3a and II-3b: Two Year Recidivism Rate, 2006 Cohorts

| CRT Cohort | 2006 – Two Years | | |
|-------------|------------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Diverted | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 13 | 2 | 15.4% |
| Adult | 0 | 1 | 7.7% |
| Total Youth | 13 | 3 | 23% |

By the end of two years, 3 CRT participants had recidivated. **77% of youth did not recidivate within two years.**

| State Cohort | 2006 – Two Years | | |
|--------------|------------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Supervised | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 825 | 222 | 26.9% |
| Adult | 0 | 37 | 4.5% |
| Total | 825 | 259 | 31.4% |

By the end of two years, 259 supervised youth had recidivated. **68.6% of youth did not recidivate within two years.**

At two years, the recidivism rate for the 2006 CRT cohort was 26.8% lower than the recidivism rate for state supervised youth.

Tables II-4a and II-4b: Three Year Recidivism Rate, 2006 Cohorts

| CRT Cohort | 2006 – Two Years | | |
|------------|------------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Diverted | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 13 | 5 | 38% |
| Adult | 0 | 1 | 7.7% |
| Total | 13 | 6 | 46% |

By the end of three years, 6 CRT participants had recidivated. **54% of youth did not recidivate within three years.**

| State Cohort | 2006 – Two Years | | |
|--------------|------------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Supervised | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 825 | 248 | 30% |
| Adult | 0 | 74 | 9% |
| Total | 825 | 322 | 39% |

By the end of three years, 322 supervised youth had recidivated. **61% of youth did not recidivate within three years.**

At three years, the recidivism rate for the 2006 CRT cohort was 15.2% higher than the recidivism rate for state supervised youth.

What Are the Offense Characteristics of the 2006 Cohorts?

Offense characteristics analysis is based on the most serious offense at adjudication. Offenses, in order of most to least severe, are: felony, misdemeanor, and civil. Civil offenses are non-criminal offenses. Offense types are characterized as most to least severe as follows: personal, property, and drug/alcohol.

Table II-5: Recidivating Offense Class, One Year Recidivism, 2006 Cohorts. Percentage of all youth who were either diverted through a CRT (pre-adjudication), or were supervised by the State (post-adjudication).

| Class | 2006 | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | CRT Cohort | | State Cohort | |
| | N | % | N | % |
| Felony | 0 | 0% | 35 | 4.2% |
| Misdemeanor | 1 | 7.7% | 116 | 14.1% |
| Civil / Non-Criminal | 1 | 7.7% | 23 | 2.8% |
| Total Recidivism | 2 | 15.4% | 174 | 21.1% |

A total of 2 youth from the CRT cohort reoffended within one year. Only 1 youth committed a new crime and that was a misdemeanor. No youth from this cohort committed felonies.

A total of 174 youth from the state cohort reoffended within one year. 35 of those youth committed felonies. 23 youth committed civil, non-criminal offenses and 116 youth committed misdemeanors.

Note: The phrase “committed a crime” is used here. It is not meant to be misleading. The data actually reflect the crimes for which the youth were re-adjudicated.

Table II-6: Recidivating Offense Type, One Year Recidivism, 2006 Cohorts. Percentage of all youth who were either diverted through a CRT (pre-adjudication), or were supervised by the State (post-adjudication).

| Type | 2006 | | | |
|---------------------|------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | CRT Cohort | | State Cohort | |
| | N | % | N | % |
| Personal | 1 | 7.7% | 66 | 8% |
| Property | 0 | 0% | 71 | 8.6% |
| Drug/Alcohol | 1 | 7.7% | 35 | 4.2% |
| Total Recidivism | 2 | 15.4% | 174 | 21.1% |

This table shows that one youth from the CRT cohort was re-adjudicated for a crime against a person. Because of the low sample number, we know that crime was a misdemeanor. We also know that the one non-criminal, civil offense committed by a youth in this cohort was indeed an offense involving drugs or alcohol.

By way of comparison, a slightly larger percentage, 3.8%, of state-supervised youth were re-adjudicated for crimes against persons. However, while no youth from the CRT cohort were re-adjudicated for property crimes, 71 state-supervised youth were. 35 youth from the state cohort committed crimes related to drugs or alcohol.

Section III. Comparing the 2007 Cohorts

Tables III-1a and III-1b: Six Month Recidivism Rate, 2007 Cohorts

| CRT Cohort | 2007 – 6 months | | |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Diverted | # Recidivated | Percent |
| | Juvenile | 17 | 3 |
| Adult | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Total Youth | 17 | 3 | 17.6% |

By six months, 3 participants in the CRT program had recidivated. **82.4% of youth did not recidivate within six months.**

| State Cohort | 2007 – 6 months | | |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Supervised | # Recidivated | Percent |
| | Juvenile | 736 | * |
| Adult | 0 | * | * |
| Total Youth | 736 | 121 | 16.4% |

By six months, 121 supervised youth recidivated. **83.6% of youth did not recidivate within six months.**

At six months, the recidivism rate for the 2007 CRT cohort was 6.8% higher than the recidivism rate for state supervised youth.

*Data not available from the state at the time of this report; therefore it is unknown how many youth recidivated as juveniles and how many recidivated as adults.

Tables III21a and III-2b: One Year Recidivism Rate, 2007 Cohorts

| CRT Cohort | 2007 – One Year | | |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Diverted | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 17 | 5 | 29.4% |
| Adult | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Total Youth | 17 | 5 | 29.4% |

By the end of one year, 5 CRT participants had recidivated. **70.6% of youth did not recidivate within one year.**

| State Cohort | 2007 – One Year | | |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Supervised | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 736 | 177 | 24% |
| Adult | 0 | 18 | 2.5% |
| Total Youth | 736 | 195 | 26.5% |

By the end of one year, 195 supervised youth had recidivated. **73.5% of youth did not recidivate within one year.**

At one year, the recidivism rate for the 2007 CRT cohort was 9.9% higher than the recidivism rate for state supervised youth.

Tables III-3a and III-3b: Two Year Recidivism Rate, 2007 Cohorts

| CRT Cohort | 2007 – Two Years | | |
|-------------|------------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Diverted | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 17 | 6 | 35.3% |
| Adult | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Total Youth | 17 | 6 | 35.3% |

By the end of two years, 6 CRT participants had recidivated. **64.7% of youth did not recidivate within two years.**

| State Cohort | 2007 – Two Years | | |
|--------------|------------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Supervised | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 825 | * | * |
| Adult | 0 | * | * |
| Total Youth | 825 | 274 | 37.2% |

By the end of two years, 274 supervised youth had recidivated. **62.8% of youth did not recidivate within two years.**

At two years, the recidivism rate for the 2007 CRT cohort was 5.1% lower than the recidivism rate for state supervised youth.

*Data not available from the state at the time of this report; therefore it is unknown how many youth recidivated as juveniles and how many recidivated as adults.

What Are the Offense Characteristics of the 2007 Cohorts?

Offense characteristics analysis is based on the most serious offense at adjudication. Offenses, in order of most to least severe, are: felony, misdemeanor, and civil. Civil offenses are non-criminal offenses. Offense types are characterized as most to least severe as follows: personal, property, and drug/alcohol.

Table III-4: Recidivating Offense Class, One Year Recidivism, 2007 Cohorts. Percentage of all youth who were either diverted through a CRT (pre-adjudication), or were supervised by the State (post-adjudication).

| Class | 2007 | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | CRT Cohort | | State Cohort | |
| | N | % | N | % |
| Felony | 0 | 0% | 30 | 4.1% |
| Misdemeanor | 4 | 23.5% | 139 | 18.9% |
| Civil / Non-criminal | 1 | 5.9% | 26 | 3.5% |
| Total Recidivism | 5 | 29.4% | 195 | 26.9% |

A total of 5 youth from the CRT cohort reoffended within one year. Four out of the five recidivating offenses were misdemeanors. One youth committed a civil, non-criminal offense. No youth from this cohort committed felonies.

A total of 195 youth from the state cohort reoffended within one year. 30 of those youth committed felonies. 26 youth committed civil, non-criminal offenses and 139 youth committed misdemeanors.

Table III-5: Recidivating Offense Type, One Year Recidivism, 2007 Cohort. Percentage of all youth who were either diverted through a CRT (pre-adjudication), or were supervised by the State (post-adjudication).

| Type | 2007 | | | |
|---------------------|------------|--------|--------------|-------|
| | CRT Cohort | | State Cohort | |
| | N | % | N | % |
| Personal | 0 | 0% | 69 | 9.4% |
| Property | 4 | 23.5% | 87 | 11.8% |
| Drug/Alcohol | 1 | 5.9% | 39 | 5.3% |
| Total Recidivism | 5 | 29.4%% | 195 | 26.5% |

This table shows that no youth from the CRT cohort were re-adjudicated for crimes against persons. However, 4 youth were re-adjudicated for crimes against property. Again, because of the low sample number, we know that these crimes were misdemeanors. We also know that the one non-criminal, civil offense committed by a youth in this cohort involved drugs or alcohol.

By way of comparison, 9.4% of state-supervised youth were re-adjudicated for crimes against persons. However, a lower percentage, 11.8%, were re-adjudicated for property crimes. It is not known how many personal or property crimes committed by state supervised youth were felonies and how many were misdemeanors.

Section IV. Comparing the 2008 Cohorts

Tables IV-1a and IV-b: Six Month Recidivism Rate, 2008 Cohorts

| CRT Cohort | 2008 – 6 months | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Diverted | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 21 | 0 | 0% |
| Adult | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Total Youth | 21 | 0 | 0% |

By six months, 0 participants in the CRT program had recidivated. **100% of youth did not recidivate within six months.**

| State Cohort | 2008 – 6 months | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Supervised | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 656 | * | * |
| Adult | 0 | * | * |
| Total Youth | 656 | 92 | 14% |

By six months, 92 supervised youth recidivated. **86% of youth did not recidivate within six months.**

At six months, the recidivism rate for the 2008 CRT cohort was 100% lower than the recidivism rate for state supervised youth.

*Data not available from the state at the time of this report; therefore it is unknown how many youth recidivated as juveniles and how many recidivated as adults.

Tables IV-2a and IV-2b: One Year Recidivism Rate, 2007 Cohorts

| CRT Cohort | 2008 – One Year | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Diverted | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 21 | 4 | 19% |
| Adult | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Total Youth | 21 | 4 | 19% |

By the end of one year, 4 CRT participants had recidivated. **81% of youth did not recidivate within one year.**

| State Cohort | 2008 – One Year | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| | # Supervised | # Recidivated | Percent |
| Juvenile | 656 | 130 | 19.8% |
| Adult | 0 | 13 | 2% |
| Total Youth | 656 | 143 | 21.8% |

By the end of one year, 143 supervised youth had recidivated. **78.2% of youth did not recidivate within one year.**

At one year, the recidivism rate for the 2008 CRT cohort was 12.8% lower than the recidivism rate for state supervised youth.

What Are the Offense Characteristics of the 2008 Cohorts?

Offense characteristics analysis is based on the most serious offense at adjudication. Offenses, in order of most to least severe, are: felony, misdemeanor, and civil. Civil offenses are non-criminal offenses. Offense types are characterized as most to least severe as follows: personal, property, and drug/alcohol.

Table IV-3: Recidivating Offense Class, One Year Recidivism, 2008 Cohorts. Percentage of all youth who were either diverted through a CRT (pre-adjudication), or were supervised by the State (post-adjudication).

| Class | 2008 | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | CRT Cohort | | State Cohort | |
| | N | % | N | % |
| Felony | 0 | 0% | 31 | 4.7% |
| Misdemeanor | 3 | 14.3% | 88 | 13.4% |
| Civil / Non-criminal | 1 | 4.8% | 24 | 3.7% |
| Total Recidivism | 4 | 19% | 143 | 21.8% |

A total of 4 youth from the CRT cohort reoffended within one year. Three out of the four recidivating offenses were misdemeanors. One youth committed a civil, non-criminal offense. No youth from this cohort committed felonies.

A total of 143 youth from the state cohort reoffended within one year. 31 of those youth committed felonies. 24 youth committed civil, non-criminal offenses and 88 youth committed misdemeanors.

Table IV-4: Recidivating Offense Type, One Year Recidivism, 2008 Cohort. Percentage of all youth who were either diverted through a CRT (pre-adjudication), or were supervised by the State (post-adjudication).

| Type | 2008 | | | |
|-------------------------|------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | CRT Cohort | | State Cohort | |
| | N | % | N | % |
| Personal | 0 | 0% | 33 | 5% |
| Property | 3 | 14.3% | 72 | 11% |
| Drug/Alcohol | 1 | 4.8% | 38 | 5.8% |
| Total Recidivism | 4 | 19% | 143 | 21.8% |

This table shows that no youth from the CRT cohort were re-adjudicated for crimes against persons. However, 3 youth were re-adjudicated for crimes against property. Again, because of the low sample number, we know that these crimes were misdemeanors. We also know that the one non-criminal, civil offense committed by a youth in this cohort involved drugs or alcohol.

By way of comparison, 5% of all state-supervised youth in the 2008 cohort were re-adjudicated for crimes against persons. 11%, were re-adjudicated for property crimes. It is not known how many personal or property crimes committed by state supervised youth were felonies and how many were misdemeanors

Table V-1: Total Cohort One-Year Recidivism Rate by Percentage, 2006-2008

| Percentage | 2006 | | 2007 | | 2008 | | Total | |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | CRT | State | CRT | State | CRT | State | CRT | State |
| | 15.4% | 21.1% | 29.4% | 26.4% | 19% | 21.8% | 21.6% | 23.1 |
| Did Not Recidivate | 84.6% | 78.9% | 70.6% | 73.5% | 81% | 78.2% | 78.4% | 76.9% |

Despite the fact that the one-year recidivism rate in 2007 was higher for the CRT cohort than for the State cohort, overall, offenders who participated in a CRT as a diversion program reoffended at a lower one-year rate than did state supervised youth. The annual recidivism rate for the CRT cohort ranged from 12.8% to 27% lower than that for the State cohort. The aggregate CRT one-year recidivism rate was 6.5% lower than the State's.

Table V-1: Total Cohort One-Year Recidivism Rate by Number, 2006-2008

| Number | 2006 | | 2007 | | 2008 | | Total | |
|---------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| | CRT | State | CRT | State | CRT | State | CRT | State |
| | 2 | 174 | 5 | 195 | 4 | 143 | 11 | 512 |
| Did Not Recidivate | 11 | 651 | 12 | 541 | 17 | 513 | 40 | 1705 |
| | 13 | 825 | 17 | 736 | 21 | 656 | 51 | 2217 |

Table V-3: Recidivism Percentages across Time, 2006 – 2008

| Percentage | Six Months | | One Year | | Two Years | | Three Years | |
|------------|------------|-------|----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------|-------|
| | CRT | State | CRT | State | CRT | State | CRT | State |
| | 7.7% | 13.5% | 15.4% | 21.1% | 23% | 31.4% | 46% | 39% |
| 2007 | 17.6% | 16.4% | 29.4% | 26.5% | 35.3% | 37.2% | -- | -- |
| | 0% | 14% | 19% | 21.8% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Aggregate | 7.8% | 14.6% | 21.6% | 22.3% | 30% | 34.8% | 46% | 39% |

The aggregate six-month recidivism rate for CRT cohort participants was 46.6% lower than the aggregate six-month rate for state supervised youth. This is a statistically significant difference. Further, the 2006 CRT six-month rate was 43% lower than that of the state, and the 2008 CRT six-month rate was 100% lower. Despite the fact that six-month rates increased for both cohorts in 2007, overall state supervised youth recidivated much sooner than CRT participants.

Table V-2: Recidivism Numbers across Time, 2006 – 2008

| Number | Six Months | | One Year | | Two Years | | Three Years | |
|-----------|------------|-------|----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------|-------|
| | CRT | State | CRT | State | CRT | State | CRT | State |
| | 1 | 111 | 2 | 157 | 3 | 259 | 6 | 322 |
| 2007 | 3 | 121 | 5 | 195 | 6 | 274 | -- | -- |
| | 0 | 92 | 4 | 143 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Aggregate | 4 | 324 | 11 | 495 | 9 | 533 | 6 | 322 |

Table V-5: Recidivating Offense Class, One Year. Percentage of all Youth who were either diverted through a CRT (pre-adjudication), or were supervised by the State (post-adjudication).

| Class | Felony | | Misdemeanor | | Civil / Non-Criminal | | As Adult | |
|-----------|--------|-------|-------------|-------|----------------------|-------|----------|-------|
| | CRT | State | CRT | State | CRT | State | CRT | State |
| | | 0% | 4.2% | 7.7% | 14% | 7.7% | 2.8% | 0% |
| 2007 | 0% | 4.1% | 23.5% | 18.9% | 5.9% | 3.5% | 0% | 2.45% |
| | 0% | 4.7% | 14.3% | 13.4% | 4.7% | 3.7% | 0% | 2% |
| Aggregate | 0% | 4.3% | 15.7% | 15.5% | 5.9% | 3.3% | 0% | 2.2% |

No youth who participated in a CRT conference recidivated as adults within the first year, while over 2% of state supervised youth did recidivate as adults in each of the three years tracked.

No youth in the CRT cohort recidivated with felony offenses within the first year, but from 4.1% - 4.7% of state supervised youth recidivated with felony offenses

44.1% more youth in the CRT cohort recidivated with civil, non-criminal offenses than did youth in the state cohort.

Table V-5: Recidivating Offense Type, One Year. Percentage of all Youth who were either diverted through a CRT (pre-adjudication), or were supervised by the State (post-adjudication).

| Type | Personal | | Property | | Drug/Alcohol | |
|-----------|----------|-------|----------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | CRT | State | CRT | State | CRT | State |
| | | 7.7% | 8% | 0% | 8.6% | 7.7% |
| 2007 | 0% | 9.4% | 23.5% | 11.8% | 5.9% | 5.3% |
| | 0% | 5% | 14.3% | 11% | 4.8% | 5.8% |
| Aggregate | 2% | 7.6% | 13.7% | 10.4% | 5.9% | 5.1% |

Significantly fewer, almost 74%, youth in the CRT cohort recidivated with offenses against persons. CRT participants recidivated with property offenses at a rate 24.1% lower than the state cohort. There was no significant difference in drug and alcohol related offenses.