

# Disproportionate Minority Contact Assessment Report

Richland County, Ohio

Juvenile Court Judge Ron Spon

Jim Kulig, Chair, DMC Steering Committee

Dr. Terri Fisher, Department of Psychology,  
The Ohio State University at Mansfield

Dr. Philip Mazzocco, Department of Psychology,  
The Ohio State University at Mansfield

---

## OVERVIEW

---

Richland County data are available for all nine decision points for the years 2003-2007 (see Attachment I).

1. **Juvenile Arrests-** Overall, the largest RRI across all five years is this decision point, with a five-year average of 4.19. The index reached a high of 5.10 in 2004, but has consistently declined since then, reaching a value of 3.31 for 2007.
2. **Referrals to Juvenile Court-** This decision point also yielded a high average RRI of 3.52, once again peaking in 2004 and declining thereafter to a value of 3.38 in 2007.
3. **Cases Diverted-** For this decision point, the five year average is .77, with RRIs since 2003 all being below 1, reaching a low of .58 in 2006.
4. **Cases Involving Secure Detention-** For this decision point, the five-year RRI average is 1.17, with a low of .91 in 2003 and gradually creeping upward to the high of 1.53 in 2007.
5. **Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)-** For this decision point, the five-year RRI average is 1.09, with yearly scores ranging from a low of .98 in 2003 to a high of 1.17 in 2006.
6. **Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings-** For this decision point, the five-year RRI average is 1.04, with no discernable pattern in the yearly statistics. The low was .89 in 2004 and the high was 1.23 in 2007.
7. **Cases Resulting in Probation Placement-** For this decision point, the five-year RRI average is .87, with scores ranging from .75 to .95.
8. **Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities-** Here, the average RRI over five years was 1.53, but the numbers in this area are small, with much fluctuation in the yearly RRI statistics.
9. **Cases Transferred to Adult Court-** The numbers are much too small for the category of cases transferred to adult court to do any meaningful analyses

The following process was utilized in order to better understand the Relative Rate Index calculations among the nine decision points. These procedures were undertaken at a time when the 2006 data were the most recent available.

1. Reviewed the relationship of data elements for the RRI calculations utilizing the diagram found in DMC technical assistance manual (Attachment II)
2. Reviewed bar graphs comparing the years 2003-2006 for each decision point (Attachment III).
3. Reviewed line graphs comparing years 2003-2006 for each decision point (Attachment IV)
4. Overlaid the line graph transparencies to observe the most significant RRI values.
5. Compared the Richland County RRI values to those of the other reporting Ohio Counties as well as to the United States overall. (Attachment V)

6. Identified from the line graph transparencies four decision points as having the most significant RRI values:
  - a. Juvenile arrests- 2003/2004/2005/2006
  - b. Referrals to juvenile court- 2003/2004/2005/2006
  - c. Cases diverted- 2005/2006
  - d. Cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities- 2005/2006

#### Rationale for Assessing/Not Assessing Each Decision Point

##### Decision Point 1: Juvenile Arrests (not assessed)

RRI 2006 = 4.30

RRI FOUR YEAR (2003-2006) AVE. = 4.40

Although the RRI Juvenile Arrest decision point was the highest both in 2006 and in the four year average, a decision to not further assess this decision point was made. This decision was based upon the belief, after reviewing data from the Mansfield Police Department, that data from eight different police jurisdictions in Richland County would not be consistent and not easily obtained.

##### Decision Point 2: Referred to Juvenile Court (assessed)

RRI 2006 = 3.47

RRI FOUR YEAR AVE. = 3.55

This decision point indicated the highest disparity in favor of white youth both in 2006 and throughout the four year period under review. In addition, the Richland County RRI is higher than that of the average for the other reporting Ohio counties as well as the average for the United States overall. It was essential, therefore, to further assess this decision point. Significant information from the Juvenile Court 2006 data base was easily accessible. Additionally, because the number of referred youth closely approximated the number of arrested youth, it was believed that the profile of referred youth would be a reflection of arrested youth.

##### Decision Point 3: Cases Diverted (assessed)

RRI 2006 = 0.58

RRI FOUR YEAR AVE. =0.80

With an RRI of less than 1.00 both in 2006 and consistently throughout the four year period, this disparity in favor of white youth needed to be assessed. The question that begged to be answered was simply, "What are the reasons more white youth are being diverted from Court filings than black youth?"

Decision Point 4: Cases Involving Secure Detention (not accessed)

RRI 2006 = 1.30                      RRI FOUR YEAR AVE. = 1.075

2006 was the only year in the four year period where the RRI was significantly over 1.00 (2003=1.09; 2004=0.91; 2005=1.00). This is a decision point for which the Richland County RRI is somewhat better than the state and national data. Therefore, a decision was made to not assess, but to continue to review annually to see whether the 2006 data was the beginning of a trend toward disparity in favor of white youth.

Decision Point 5: Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed) (assessed)

RRI 2006 = 1.17                      RRI FOUR YEAR AVE. = 1.08

The RRI difference between Cases Referred and Charges filed needs to be assessed to understand deeper decision point involvement:

Cases Referred 2006 RRI = 3.47	Ave. = 3.55
Charges Filed 2006 RRI = <u>1.17</u>	Ave. = <u>1.08</u>
Difference = 2.30	= 2.47

Decision Point 6: Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings (not assessed)

RRI 2006 =0.93                      RRI FOUR YEAR AVE. = 0.9925

With two years (2004 = 0.89; 2006 = 0.93) indicating disparity in favor of black youth and two years (2003 = 1.08; 2005 = 1.07) indicating disparity in favor of white youth and a four year average of 0.9925. DMC does not appear to be a significant factor at this decision point.

Decision Point 7: Cases Resulting in Probation Placement (not assessed)

RRI 2006 = 0.95                      RRI FOUR YEAR AVE. = 0.8575

The RRI data for all four years is under 1.00 indicating disparity in favor of black youth. (2003=0.75; 2004=0.85; 2005=0.88; 2006=0.95) DMC is not a factor in this decision point.

Decision Point 8: Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities (assessed)

RRI 2006 = 2.43                      RRI FOUR YEAR AVE. = 1.6325

With a relatively small number of youth annually committed to secure juvenile correctional facilities (range 25 to 43) the RRI pattern during the four year period looks rather erratic. (2003=1.06; 2004=0.62; 2005=2.42; 2006=2.43) Assessment was seen as

essential because of the significance of confinement and the RRI increase during years 2005 and 2006.

Decision Point 9: Cases Transferred to Adult Court (not assessed)

The Ohio Department of Youth Services reports that Richland County has not transferred any cases. Court records indicate one (1) transfer in each of the four years.

---

## **ASSESSMENT METHOD**

---

We approached the assessment process in a variety of ways. First we engaged in some general discussion of the problem of disproportionate minority contact in Richland County in order to get some issues aired and give the steering committee an opportunity to begin the analysis. We next heard from officials representing the various decision points in order to gain a better understanding of what was involved at each step. We then began working through the problem in a more systematic way, addressing 19 factors that have been suggested in various government and independent publications as potential reasons or explanations for disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system. A listing of these possible contributing factors and the steering committee's conclusions appear in the Attachment VI. Based on this initial discussion and additional research described below, the factors most likely contributing to DMC for our area included the following:

1. Minority youths may be disproportionately involved in crime (more drug-related and gang offenses).

Self-report data collected from Richland County high school students in 2005 by the Search Institute, an independent, non-profit agency, indicated that while minority youth were more likely to report being involved in property or violent crimes, they were less likely to report using alcohol and any drug other than marijuana. Interestingly, there were no differences in reports on the frequency with which white and minority youth said they have been in trouble with the police.

2. Crimes committed by minority youth may be more likely to be reported to law enforcement.

This seems to be plausible, though difficult to test for. There is definitely a greater police presence in those areas of the city with a greater minority population. Therefore, crimes committed in these areas are more likely to be detected. In addition, Mansfield Senior High School, the county school with the largest minority population by far, has police officers on site. At this school, teachers are empowered to call the police for various infractions, including many that, to the committee, seem rather trivial in nature and that at many other schools would be dealt with by the teachers or the principal.

3. There may be a higher arrest rate for minority youth for similar crimes.

This item also relates to police presence in particular areas. In addition, there could be a greater likelihood that the situation could escalate when minority youth are confronted. The above-mentioned Search Institute data do suggest that police have similar levels of contact with white and minority youth, but the records clearly indicate a much higher arrest rate for African-American youth.

4. Minority youth may become involved in crime at an earlier age and they may be more likely to enter and stay in the juvenile justice system

Based on the Richland County data set, this is correct. The average age at first involvement in the system for white youth is 15.6, whereas for non-white youth, it is 15.0. This age difference could be due to a variety of factors, including the fact that African-American youth tend to experience the changes of puberty at an earlier age. The earlier that youth enter the system, the longer they are likely to be involved in future delinquent behavior.

5. Minority youth may have less eligibility for or accessibility to treatment programs, and may be less positively affected by prevention and treatment programs. In addition, the characteristics of local prevention and treatment programs may discourage minority participation.

The consensus of the local experts is that eligibility for participation in treatment programs is not an issue, but there are likely several barriers to accessibility, including transportation problems, less parental involvement due to more single-parent families, and difficulty navigating the system which consists largely of white staff. It is difficult to estimate the degree to which discomfort experienced by minority youth and their families in dealing with a largely white system with which they may be completely unfamiliar is a barrier in accessing needed services.

6. Indirect influences that are correlated with both crime and minority status (socioeconomic status, family structure, school performance, exposure to drugs, gangs, and violence) may account for some of the disproportionality.

In Richland County, African-American families tend to be clustered in the lower-income, higher-crime census tracts. There are therefore more opportunities for involvement with drugs, gangs, violence, and other forms of crime. African-American youth are more likely to be raised in single-parent households. African-American youth are overrepresented in Child Protective Services as a function of maltreatment, with the resultant emotional and behavior problems which largely go untreated. The majority of maltreated children have at least one contact with juvenile court.

7. Administrative policies and decision-making factors may affect minority youth disproportionately

The committee felt that to the extent that minority youth are more likely to be living in single-parent households, the requirement that a parent (or other adult) be present at a court hearing or present for a diversion activity is likely to affect them disproportionately. However, given that a parent or legal guardian is required by law to be in attendance, hearings can't take place without parental presence. Although we also considered the possibility that youth from single-parent families might also be more likely to be kept in detention, it appears that this is not an issue that affects the detention outcome, because the RRI is close to 1 in this area.

### ***Additional Data for Addressing Possible Factors***

We had or were able to obtain data to enable further study of some of these explanations. In order to address the factor of whether minority youth are more likely to be involved in crime in this area, we were able to obtain data that had been collected by the Search Institute of Minneapolis, MN in 2005 in which students in the Richland County schools reported on their involvement in a variety of behaviors, both positive and negative. In the report provided to Richland County and the Mansfield City Schools, data were not broken down by race. We were able to purchase the data files and do our own analyses.

In the Mansfield City Schools, where African-American students constituted 34% of the student body sample, involvement in illegal activity depended on the nature of the activity. African-American students were significantly more likely to report having committed aggressive acts such as assault, property damage, and theft, whereas the white students were significantly more likely to report the use of drugs and alcohol as well as impaired driving. In the Richland County schools, where African-American students were a much smaller minority (4%), there was a racial difference in the use of drugs, alcohol, and impaired driving in the opposite direction, with the African-American students being more likely to report such behavior than the white students. Overall, African-American and white students seemed to have equivalent numbers of risk factors and protective factors, but these factors certainly varied as a function of race. The most striking aspect of the data is how different the racial differences were in the Richland County schools than in the Mansfield City schools. The committee acknowledged and discussed the very different experience of being in a 4% minority as opposed to a 34% minority. The findings of these analyses are presented in Attachment VII.

The data do support the contention that African-American youth become involved in the juvenile justice system at an average of six months younger than white youth. Regarding the issue of more serious offenses by African-American youth, the data do not support this contention. There are no significant differences in the severity of the offenses committed by Black youth relative to white youth. There are, however, significant differences favoring white youth with regard to census tract level comparisons of household income, poverty level, and percentage of female-headed households with children (see Attachment VIII).

We examined the number of attorneys appointed or retained as a function of race and found equivalent proportions of white and non-white youth had representation. For 2007, of 1578 delinquent cases, 545 had attorneys, of whom 74% had been appointed by the court. Sixty-one percent of those represented were white and 39% were non-white. This coincides almost exactly with the racial breakdown in the delinquent cases. Therefore, lack of representation could not be a contributing factor to DMC in Richland County.

With regard to the actual decision point data, we focused on the year 2006 because that was the most recent year for which there was complete data when we started this assessment. In addition to decision point data, we were able to obtain data on the race, gender, age of the youth involved in the juvenile justice process in some way, the census tract of their residence (in order to assess socioeconomic status including household income and poverty rate), family structure, the severity of the incident, number of repeat offenses, and the number of probation violations.

The data were all analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (v. 15). All simple correlational analyses were conducted by computing Pearson  $r$  correlation coefficients. Correlational analyses that involved controlling for additional variables were conducted using SPSS's partial correlation function. All analyses that examined mean differences utilized general linear model analysis of variance. In all cases, alpha levels, used to determine statistical significance, were set to .05.

Correlational analyses were performed which indicated a statistically significant correlation between race and depth of involvement in the juvenile justice system ( $r = .16$ ), even after controlling for gender, age, repeat offenses, incident severity, census tract poverty rate, census tract household income, and number of female-head households with children in the census tract, all of which are variables which were also significantly correlated with depth of involvement in the system ( $r = .10$ ). A multiple regression analysis which examined depth of involvement in the system while controlling for the effect of each of these variables simultaneously indicated that while most of the variables were statistically significant predictors of the outcome variable, number of female-headed households with children in the census tract was no longer a significant predictor. Age was the strongest outcome predictor with race being the second strongest. All of the aforementioned analyses, as well as others, may be found in Attachment VIII.

The racial disparity in decision point depth found in the main analyses was the product of a consistent pattern throughout Richland County. In the majority of the census tracts in which statistical analyses were possible, non-whites were associated with deeper decision points than whites. In addition, non-whites were associated with deeper decision points regardless of living in the near-city environments where non-whites are overrepresented, or the other areas of Richland county where non-whites are underrepresented—and this is in spite of the fact that non-whites did not commit more serious crimes.

It must be noted, however, that our examination of depth of involvement was limited to referrals, diversion, charges filed, and secure detention. For two of the excluded decision points (cases resulting in delinquent findings and cases resulting in probation placement), the RRIs were very close to one. Had they been included in the analysis, the correlation between depth of decision point and race would likely have been smaller.

In order to gain a better understanding of the juvenile offender population in Richland County, a mapping project was undertaken with the assistance of the Richland County Regional Planning Commission. For census tracts 5, 6, 7, and 8 as well as each Mansfield Police Department sector, we were able to plot the number of youth involved in each of the following four decision points: cases referred to juvenile court, cases diverted, charges filed, and cases resulting in confinement in secure juvenile correctional facilities as well as by race and degree of offense, for a total of 36 maps. These maps may be found in Attachment IX.

A close examination at these maps graphically illustrated what we had previously determined statistically. Census tracts 5, 6, 7, and 8 are the four tracts in which there is at least twice the average amount of juvenile crime for the county.

---

## **ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

---

### Decision Point 2: Referral to Juvenile Court

Sixty-two percent of those referred to Juvenile Court in Richland County were white, with 38% being non-white. This is in a county in which the non-white population is less than 12%. For youth living in census tracts 1-8 (the “center city” of Mansfield), 63.8% of the referrals involve non-white youth. The non-white population in this area is estimated to be 36.8%. For youth living in Richland County, outside of the center portion of Mansfield, 11.7% of the referrals involve non-white youth, and for those youth who reside outside of Richland County, either in a different Ohio county or out-of-state, 23.8% of the referrals involved non-white youth.

We know from the Search Institute Data that the non-white students are more likely to report engaging in property and violent crimes, but fewer offenses related to drugs and alcohol. We also know that the crimes for which the non-whites are arrested are not more severe. This is a decision point for which there is a great deal of subjectivity, with court referrals largely being left to the discretion of the arresting officer. The sorts of considerations that have been mentioned as playing a role in determining whether a case is referred include family support factors, the presence of two parents in the household, and attitude of the juvenile. These are all factors which are likely responsible for the greater referral rate among non-whites in Richland County. Minority youth in Richland County are significantly more likely to be part of a single-parent household. In addition, being a minority youth trying to navigate a juvenile justice system with mostly white employees may lead to a level of unease and defensiveness that could negatively impact the behavior of the youth.

### Decision Point 3: Cases Diverted

This is a difficult decision point to analyze, because there are two different ways of viewing the data. The number of cases diverted can be viewed as a percentage of total referrals. This provides a clear indication of the percentage of cases involving white and non-white youth which have been diverted. However, not all cases are eligible for diversion, and this is a process that involves little subjectivity. Therefore, another way of accessing the data involves simply looking at the racial breakdown for those cases that met the criteria for diversion in Richland County (first-time offenders who commit unruly and low-grade misdemeanor offenses). Both ways of viewing this decision point are presented below, but no interpretation is given to the data because of the challenges posed by the concept of proportionality in diversion.

Seventy-eight percent of those whose cases were diverted in Richland County were white, with 22% being non-white. Using the raw data, this means that while 29.1% of the cases involving white youth were diverted, only 15.9% of those involving non-white youth were diverted. For those living in census tracts 1-8 (the “center city” of Mansfield), 24% of cases involving white youth and 15.6% of cases involving non-white youth were diverted. For those living in Richland County, outside of the center portion of Mansfield, 34.4% of cases involving white youth and 22.3% of cases involving non-white youth were diverted. For those youth who reside outside of Richland County, either in a different Ohio county or out-of-state, 12.2% of cases involving white youth and 2.4% of cases involving non-white youth were diverted.

Of those 509 cases in 2006 that met the criteria for diversion in Richland County, 23% were non-white and 77% were white. In breaking this down between the city of Mansfield and the rest of Richland County, 42% of diverted cases in Mansfield were non-white youth, while only 4% of the cases diverted outside of Mansfield were non-white youth. This is because the vast majority of non-whites in Richland County reside within the city limits. In 2006, 125 white youth (64%) and 69 non-white youth (36%) were diverted post-adjudication.

### Decision Point 5: Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)

Sixty-two percent of the youth against whom charges were filed in Richland County were white and 38% were non-white. For those in census tracts 1-8 (the “inner city” of Mansfield), 76% of cases involving white youth and 84.4% of cases involving non-white youth resulted in charges filed. For those living in Richland County outside of census tracts 1-8, 65.6% of cases involving white youth and 77.7% of cases involving non-white youth resulted in charges filed. For those youth who reside outside of Richland County, either in a different Ohio county or out-of-state, 70.9% of cases involving white youth and 84.1% of cases involving non-white youth resulted in charges filed. This again suggests that disproportionate minority contact in Richland County is an issue regardless of where youth reside.

## Decision Point 8: Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities

In 2006, non-white youth outnumbered white youth, constituting 59% of those referred to DYS from Richland County. The numbers here are quite small, however, limiting conclusions that can be drawn.

---

## **CONCLUSIONS**

---

The steering committee concluded that we should focus on referrals to Juvenile Court for a variety of reasons. First, this is the highest RRI other than arrests. Arrests would be impractical to focus on because we have incomplete and inconsistent data for this contact point. In addition, the committee felt that it would be easier to develop an intervention strategy at the level of referrals than at the arrest level.

We also concluded that we should focus on census tracts 6 and 7. While tracts 5-8 all have at least twice the average amount of juvenile offenders, tracts 6 and 7 have the highest amount of crime and pose some particular challenges. Tract 6 includes the North Lake Park area as well as the high school, the highest source of calls to the police in 2000-2004. There are a number of properties that are vacant or in poor condition. Tract 7 also contains a high number of vacant or substandard dwellings. It contains the Ocie Hill Center which is a neighborhood youth center and the source of a number of police calls.

The North End Community Improvement Collaborative, Inc. is a local agency intending to improve the quality of life for those in these two census tracts by identifying, supporting, and connecting local assets and advancing community and economic development in the area. It is this organization that may hold the key to the rejuvenation and enhancement of this high crime area.

The Richland County Disproportionate Minority Contact Initiative Steering Committee is a very unique, diverse group of stakeholders (see Attachment X). Currently consisting of twenty-two active members and six persons who wish to be informed through the receipt of minutes and reports, the committee has chosen to meet nearly every week since its first meeting in October. A total of 29 meetings have been held from October 2, 2007 to July 1, 2008 with an attendance range of ten to seventeen members. Rather than form sub-committees to accomplish specific tasks, the Steering Committee has chosen to meet as a "committee of the whole" in order to complete the identification and assessment tasks. Additionally, the two professors who were contracted to complete the assessment have been active members of the committee from its inception.

This background is provided to identify that feedback and stakeholder reaction to findings has been an ongoing, weekly process. Each element of the assessment report was reviewed, evaluated, and accepted by committee members as it was developed. Committee members were very engaged with the process, as evidenced by the high rate of attendance and the prolific generation of thoughts and ideas. With the

stakeholders being so involved in the process, they own the results of the assessment and are very committed to being participants in the implementation and/or evaluation of the strategies to reduce DMC at the referral decision point.

Based on the contributing factors generated by the committee after months of studying the DMC issue in Richland County, two logic models were generated (see Attachment XI). The first logic model addresses the use of restorative justice as a strategy to address alienation of youth, lack of effective intervention methods prior to police involvement, the impact of zero tolerance policies, and harm to victims. The second model focuses on the use of mentoring as a strategy to address lack of creative outlets, leadership development opportunities, positive role models, and effective life skills for youth as well as low expectations for youth.

Other strategies were discussed that do not fall within either of the above categories but that committee members believe could be helpful in addressing DMC. Some of these strategies include:

1. Identifying a community liaison who can problem solve between law enforcement, parents, and community
2. Providing cultural competency training
3. Engaging community helping systems to resolve problem behaviors
4. Responding to the needs rather than the wants of youth.
5. Community and parental empowerment
6. Building and supporting parental responsibility
7. Holding a youth/community summit in order to start conversations
8. Community collaboration to build hope and relationships and build on assets
9. Developing youth resource lists to be distributed by police officers
10. Involving community resources and agencies in police training
11. Connecting neighborhood residents with a community policing sergeant
12. Job and economic development

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

Two evidence-based strategies are recommended in response to contributing factors which have been identified in the assessment process and logic model presentations: Restorative Justice and Mentoring Interventions. While specific proposals have not been developed, key activities have been listed in order to guide the development of future proposals. The key activities are presented in Attachment XII. *The Principles to Guide Restorative Justice* as adapted by Catherine Barga from Susan Sharpe's *Restorative Justice: A Vision for Healing and Change (1998)* may be found in Attachment XIII.

It is intended that specific proposals to address the contributing factors identified in the logic model will be developed by community members who live in census tracts 6 and 7 and who are directly associated with the North End Community Improvement

Collaborative (NECIC). The proposals are expected to directly impact the RRI Referral Decision Point by making effective interventions available to law enforcement and Mansfield City School officials.

The completion of the DMC Initiative assessment is perfectly timed with the growing involvement of the North End Collaborative in community improvement activities and the recent formation of the Mansfield City Schools' "Discipline Blue Ribbon Task Force." Members of the DMC Initiative Steering Committee serve as board members, committee members and staff of both NECIC and the Discipline Task Force. By strategically partnering with these organizations, it is believed that the Mansfield community will be additionally engaged. This approach will enhance the capacity of both the neighborhoods and schools to effectively reduce DMC at the Referral decision point and will allow for sustainability of DMC activities.

Restorative justice as an approach to DMC is likely to be effective because it is an evidence-based concept that will involve full participation of various parties (victims, offenders, families, community); will provide for healing; will seek full accountability on the part of the offender; and will strengthen the community, therefore diminishing the chance of future offenses. This approach will directly impact on the sense of disconnect youth feel in their community because it will make them part of the solution. It will impact the lack of effective intervention prior to police involvement because it will provide a means of dealing with misbehavior that does not reach the level that should require police involvement. Restorative justice will deal directly with the harm done to victims and will therefore be a means of educating the offender and providing a means of repairing harm. Finally, it is hoped the restorative justice practices can be used to replace the zero tolerance policies that do not seem to be particularly effective.

Mentoring as a strategy to address DMC is expected to be an effective strategy addressing the need to improve the life skills and situations of those involved in the program because it is an evidence-based approach designed to link concerned, caring adults with youth at risk. For young people lacking effective role models, creative outlets, and high expectations, mentors will provide guidance and direction as well as a means to navigate their way through the complexities of adolescence made more treacherous by growing up in an area lacking in resources.

The basic objective of both of these interventions is to reduce the racial disparity at the Referral decision point. The target will be minority youth living in Richland County Census Tracts 6 and 7. The primary measure of success will be the RRI at the Referral decision point, with success determined by at least a 20% reduction in the RRI during 2009. This program is projected to impact 300 youth, which is the number of youth referred from these two census tracts in the past year (See Attachment XIV).

Richland County has approximately \$40,000 remaining from the original grant. These funds, coupled with the human resources available from law enforcement, the Richland County Juvenile Court, the NECIC, the Mansfield City Schools, and several child and family serving agencies will be adequate to create two demonstration projects:

Mentoring and Restorative Practices. Additional needed resources, based upon the evaluation of these two projects, is unknown at this time. It is expected that the Richland County DMC Steering Committee will participate in the evaluation of the demonstration projects and will make recommendations to the Mansfield Community regarding sustaining the projects. Consideration of Title II funding will also be explored based upon an identified need for additional resources.