

CENTER

FOR

COURT

INNOVATION

RESEARCH

A Project of the Fund for the City of New York

# Do Community Courts Transform the Justice Response to Misdemeanor Crime?

## Testing the Impact of the Midtown Community Court

Justin Hakuta, Vishtasp Soroushian, and Dana Kralstein

October 2008

520 Eighth Avenue, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10018  
212.397.3050 fax 212.397.0985  
[www.courtinnovation.org](http://www.courtinnovation.org)

## I. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Community courts are neighborhood-focused courts that attempt to harness the authority of the justice system to address local problems. The first such project was the Midtown Community Court, launched in midtown Manhattan in 1993. As of the end of 2007, more than 50 community courts had opened across the globe, including 32 in the United States (Karafin 2008). Yet, only a handful of studies have tested the effects of the community court model in accomplishing its goals (see Kralstein 2005). Many of these goals involve having a real impact on the local community – by implementing restorative community service projects or initiating greater collaboration between the court and community representatives. In addition, community courts seek to diversify the range of disposition and sentencing options that are at the court’s disposal and to apply a form of individualized justice that tailors each response to the litigant’s specific situation and needs (Sviridoff, Rottman, and Weidner 2001). The expected outcome is a far greater use of “alternative sanctions” than in a traditional, downtown court (Kralstein 2005; Sviridoff et al. 2000, Weidner and Davis 2000). Indeed, a recent survey found that 92% of today’s community courts routinely use community service mandates, and 84% routinely use mandates to social services, including substance abuse treatment, treatment readiness sessions, individual counseling, employment readiness, or life skills classes (Karafin 2008).

This study examines the impact of the original Midtown Community Court (“Midtown”), testing whether and to what extent the Court in fact responds differently to its misdemeanor caseload than the nearby downtown criminal court (“downtown”). A previous evaluation which provided a comprehensive analysis of Midtown’s planning and early operations answered these questions for the court’s first three years, from 1993-1995 (Sviridoff et al. 2000; and Sviridoff et al. 2001). That evaluation found that Midtown used community service sentences more than twice as frequently as downtown during the same timeframe. Conversely, downtown was more likely to impose a short-term jail sentence and, on the other end of the severity spectrum, was more likely to impose a sentence of time served, typically involving little more than a day in pre-arraignment detention (Sviridoff et al. 2001). As intended, Midtown therefore moved sentencing for low-level offenders into the middle range, in contrast with the traditional poles of jail on one hand or a sentence not involving any ongoing obligation on the other hand. Yet, we currently know little about what happened after the Midtown model became institutionalized – whether those patterns that applied in its initial years were sustained more than a decade later. Accordingly, this study provides a needed update, examining the more recent impact of Midtown on case processing, dispositions, and sentences.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Authors’ Note:* The authors would like to express gratitude to the Center for Court Innovation staff for providing ongoing support, comments, and edits on earlier drafts. In particular, thanks to Mike Rempel, Angela Tolosa, and Greg Berman. Thanks also to Steve Greenstein of the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for providing the criminal court processing and outcomes data. The authors are solely responsible for the final methodology and results obtained with the DCJS data. Please direct all correspondence to Dana Kralstein, Associate Director of Research, Center for Court Innovation, 520 Eighth Avenue, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor, New York, New York 10018, e-mail: [dkral@courts.state.ny.us](mailto:dkral@courts.state.ny.us).

## II. The Midtown Community Court

The Midtown Community Court opened in October 1993 as a joint venture of the Center for Court Innovation and the New York State Unified Court System. Midtown's catchment area includes three police precincts, out of twenty-two precincts in all of Manhattan: the 10<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and 18<sup>th</sup>. Together, these precincts cover the area from 14<sup>th</sup> Street to 59<sup>th</sup> Street and from Lexington Avenue to the Hudson River. This area includes the entire midtown business district and several West Side residential neighborhoods. Generally, defendants who are arrested on a misdemeanor in this area from 3 PM Sunday to 9 AM Friday will be arraigned at Midtown. If the case is not resolved at the first arraignment court appearance, it is transferred to Manhattan's centralized downtown criminal court.<sup>2</sup>

Midtown was designed to hold its offenders accountable for their actions by sentencing them to perform immediate and visible community restitution within the Midtown neighborhood. In addition, to address the underlying problems that often precipitate low-level crime, Midtown sentences many of its offenders to complete services such as a brief treatment readiness program (usually two days long), job training, mental health counseling, health education classes, or substance abuse treatment. Most of these alternative sanctions average from one to ten days in length, with the exception of substance abuse treatment, which typically involves a mandate of at least 30 days and possibly as long as six months. (Due to the length of the substance abuse treatment mandates, they are typically used only with those misdemeanor defendants whose current charges and criminal record are sufficiently serious to make such a sentence legally appropriate.)

The judge at Midtown receives information on the defendant's demographic background, educational attainment, employment history, and housing situation prior to sentencing, to promote informed decision-making. Such information is viewable on the judge's computer through an electronic management information system developed specially for Midtown. Through the increased use of alternative sanctions, Midtown seeks to reduce the court's reliance on both short-term jail sentences and, on the other end of the spectrum, penalties that do not involve any meaningful obligations, such as fines or time served sentences.

By comparison, judges in the centralized, downtown criminal court have primarily to rely on information that is contained in the official rap sheet (charges and criminal history). These judges may sentence defendants to perform community service or a limited number of social service options: a two-day treatment readiness program, a three-day job training program, and substance abuse treatment. (The substance abuse treatment option is only available to those defendants with a significant prior criminal history.)

---

<sup>2</sup> After the 2002 timeframe for this study, all prostitution and illegal street vending cases throughout Manhattan began to be heard at the Midtown Community Court, regardless of catchment area. Also, all prostitution cases were kept at Midtown until resolution even if they were not disposed at arraignment.

### III. Statistical Methods

Outcomes were compared between misdemeanor defendants arraigned on similar charges at the Midtown and downtown criminal courts. The sample consisted of cases arraigned in Manhattan in 2002 on one of Midtown's top five misdemeanor charges for that year:

- 1) Drug possession (PL 220.03, PL 221.10, PL 221.05): 59% of all five charges;
- 2) Petit larceny (PL 155.25): 17% of all five charges;
- 3) Turnstile jumping (PL 165.15): 15% of all five charges;
- 4) Prostitution (PL 230.00, PL 240.37): 5% of all five charges; and
- 5) Unlicensed general vending (PL 165.71): 4% of all five charges.

Throughout Manhattan, 35% of all misdemeanor arraignments in 2002, or 27,472 total cases, involved one of these charges (38% of all cases arraigned at Midtown and 34% at downtown).

Of the 27,472 cases in the total sample, 4,169 (15%) were arraigned at Midtown and 23,303 (85%) were arraigned downtown. To carry out a valid impact analysis, it was important to ensure that the two groups were as comparable as possible on all relevant background characteristics – i.e., their distribution on the five charges listed above, criminal history, and demographics (sex, age, and race). For this purpose, a propensity score matching strategy was implemented (e.g., see Rubin 1973; Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983, 1984). A propensity score represents the statistical probability that a case falls into the treatment (i.e., Midtown) sample, given its observed background characteristics. We of course factually know which cases were arraigned at Midtown and downtown respectively, but the propensity score assigns to each its relative probability, taking into account the impact of background characteristics in making Midtown or downtown sample membership more or less probable on average. Having established a propensity score for each case, it then becomes possible to match cases with similar scores and to discard comparison (i.e., downtown) cases that do not provide a close match to any case from Midtown.

In this study, separate propensity scores were computed for cases arraigned on each of the five key charges. Then, separately for each charge, each Midtown case was matched to downtown case(s) with the closest available propensity score, according to the following ratios:

- 1) Drug possession: 1,207-to-3,621: One Midtown case to three downtown cases.
- 2) Petit larceny: 1,297-to-2,594: One Midtown case to two downtown cases.
- 3) Turnstile jumping: 687-to-2,061: One Midtown case to three downtown cases.
- 4) Prostitution: 742-to-258: One Midtown case to the nearest neighbor downtown case.<sup>3</sup>
- 5) Unlicensed vending: 170-to-510: One Midtown case to three downtown cases.

---

<sup>3</sup> The original sample size of downtown prostitution cases was less than the original Midtown sample size for prostitution cases. Therefore, we were unable to perform a one-to-many match for prostitution cases as we had done for the other charges. Instead, we matched each Midtown case to the nearest neighbor in the download sample allowing for a single downtown case to be matched to multiple Midtown cases.

After matching, the number of cases in the Midtown sample went from 4,169 to 4,103. (The 66 cases that were lost had missing information on one or more background characteristics that were necessary for the generation of propensity scores.) The number of downtown cases went from 27,472 to 9,044, highlighting the effect of propensity score matching in limiting the comparison sample to a set of cases whose background characteristics provide a truly close match.

Since different matching ratios were implemented for each charge (to take advantage of a particularly high downtown sample size on some charges), the final distribution of charges between the Midtown and downtown groups was disproportional. For example, 29% of the final Midtown sample had been arrested on drug charges, while 40% of the final downtown sample was arrested on that charge. Thus, weighting techniques were employed to equalize the effect of the disparate matching ratios. The use of weighting resulted in the creation of two groups that were proportionally and statistically equivalent, with the sole difference being courthouse of arraignment. This provided the foundation for an unbiased analysis of Midtown's impacts on case processing and outcomes.

#### **IV. Overview of the Analytic Plan**

Analyses were performed to answer three questions. The matched and weighted samples were used to conduct the impact analyses (questions 2 and 3 below), whereas the original, pre-matching sample was used to describe the basic characteristics of the defendant population (question 1 below).

##### ***1. Defendant Profile***

The original distribution of defendant background characteristics was compared between defendants arraigned in 2002 at Midtown and downtown. The purpose was to gain a better understanding of the inherent differences in the populations served by each court.

##### ***2. Impact of the Midtown Community Court on Case Processing***

Analyses were conducted to test the hypothesis that Midtown processes its cases more efficiently than downtown. Specifically, comparisons were conducted on the average number of days between the initial arrest and case resolution (disposition) and on the percent of cases disposed at the initial arraignment court appearance (which generally occurs within 24 hours of the arrest).

### ***3. Impact of the Midtown Community Court on Sentencing Outcomes***

Analyses were conducted to test the hypothesis that Midtown employs a broader range of sentencing options than downtown. Specifically, comparisons were performed on the percent of convicted cases that were sentenced to: (a) alternative sanctions, (b) jail, and (c) penalties that do not involve any ongoing obligations to the court (e.g., fines, time served sentences, or conditional discharges without any real conditions attached). Most comparisons were between cases that were originally arraigned at Midtown versus downtown, although the Appendix at the end of this report provides an additional breakdown between cases that were both arraigned and disposed at Midtown and cases that were arraigned at Midtown but subsequently disposed downtown, comparing both to the cases arraigned and disposed downtown.

## **V. Results**

### ***1. Defendant Profile***

The analysis in this section does not demonstrate an impact of either the Midtown or downtown courts but simply compares the defendant populations that each court sees on a regular basis. Analysis revealed the following significant differences (see Table 1).

*Demographics:* A much higher percentage of male defendants were arraigned downtown than at Midtown (82% vs. 68%,  $p < .001$ ). The remaining demographic differences were small, although the Midtown population was somewhat younger, more likely to be white, and less likely to be black than the downtown population ( $p < .001$ ).

*Criminal History:* Those defendants who were arraigned downtown had a more extensive prior criminal record than those arraigned at Midtown ( $p < .001$  across all specific criminal history measures). However, perhaps due to having previous cases also handled at Midtown, a higher percentage of those defendants who were arraigned at Midtown had been sentenced to community service on a previous case (38% vs. 24%,  $p < .001$ ).

*Charges:* Of the five charges included in the analysis, Midtown was far more likely to see petit larceny (31% vs. 15%), theft of services (18% vs. 14%), and prostitution (18% vs. 3%) cases, whereas downtown was more likely to see drug cases (64% vs. 29%). (All differences were at  $p < .001$ .)

**Table 1: Defendant Characteristics in Midtown and Downtown:  
Top Five Midtown Arrest Charges in 2002 (n = 27,472)**

	Midtown	Downtown
Total (#)	4,169	23,303
Median Age	28	31
21 and under	27%	23%***
Male <sup>1</sup>	68%	82%***
Race		
White	21%	18%***
Black	45%	50%***
Hispanic	28%	28%
Other	5%	4%***
Charge		
Petit Larceny	31%	15%***
Drugs	29%	64%***
Turnstile Jumping	18%	14%***
Prostitution	18%	3%***
Vending	4%	4%
Criminal History		
Any Prior Arrests	50%	61%***
Any Prior Misdemeanor Arrests	45%	56%***
Any Prior Felony Arrests	36%	48%***
Received Community Service Mandate	38%	24%***
Any Prior Warrants	36%	43%***

<sup>1</sup>Defendants identified as "both" genders have been recoded into the majority gender category (male).

Due to the large sample size, only significance of .01 or greater is reported

\*\*p < .01 \*\*\*p < .001 (2-tailed test)

## ***2. Impact of the Midtown Community Court on Case Processing***

Analysis in this and the following sections was performed on the adjusted samples, after the implementation of the propensity score matching and weighting strategies.

As shown in Table 2, downtown was slightly but significantly more likely to resolve its misdemeanor cases immediately at arraignment (76% vs. 71%, p < .001). The total average time to disposition, however, was statistically identical.

**Table 2: Arraigned at Midtown vs. Arraigned at Downtown**

	Total Midtown	Total Downtown
Total N <sup>1</sup>	4,103	9,044
Disposed at Arraignment <sup>2</sup>	71%	76%***
Arrest to Disposition Time		
Mean	163 days	162 days
Median	1 day	1 day

<sup>1</sup> Cases were matched and weighted.

<sup>2</sup> There were 555 cases missing data for Midtown and 573 cases missing data for downtown.

\*\*p < .01 \*\*\*p < .001 (2-tailed test)

### ***3. Impact of the Midtown Community Court on Sentencing Outcomes***

As shown in Table 3, the disposition outcomes are similar in both Midtown and downtown. Overall, cases arraigned at Midtown had a slightly lower conviction rate (64% vs. 68%,  $p < .001$ ) and slightly higher rate of using ACDs – adjournments in contemplation of dismissal, which in New York State connotes a plan to dismiss the case six or twelve months later, conditional on good behavior (29% to 26%,  $p < .001$ ).

Of particular interest is what happened to those cases ending in a conviction: Were alternative sanctions more prevalent at Midtown? Conversely, were jail and other sentences more prevalent downtown? As shown in the bottom portion of Table 3, cases arraigned at Midtown were significantly more likely to be sentenced to community service, either with or without a social service mandate in addition (60% vs. 47%,  $p < .001$ ). Also, cases arraigned at Midtown were more likely to be sentenced to social service-only (16% vs. 8%,  $p < .001$ ). In total, the estimated use of alternative sanctions was 76% at Midtown and 55% at downtown.<sup>4</sup>

Conversely, cases arraigned downtown were significantly more likely to be sentenced to jail (19% vs. 13%,  $p < .001$ ) and were three times as likely to be sentenced to time served (21% vs. 7%,  $p < .001$ ). Interestingly, even though jail sentences were more prevalent downtown than at Midtown, when Midtown did sentence offenders to jail its sentences were longer on average (31 days vs. 18 days,  $p < .001$ ). Midtown apparently reserves jail for only the most serious misdemeanor offenders, resulting in significantly longer jail stays. For this reason, cases arraigned at Midtown and downtown ultimately receive the same number of jail days on average; more of Midtown's cases have zero days (due to receiving non-jail sentences) but more have high numbers of jail days as well.

---

<sup>4</sup> It is not possible to generate an exact figure for downtown regarding the use of social service-only sentences. Although 8% of downtown's cases received a conditional discharge with "other" conditions (not community service), the available data for downtown does not specify what exactly those other conditions involved. They may have included a social service requirement in some cases, but in others may simply have involved a requirement to avoid future criminal activity. During a separate observation of several downtown court parts, 7% of cases called were sentenced to social services, which is similar to the 8% of cases that the data shows as having received a conditional discharge with "other" conditions. However, the size of the population observed was not large enough to draw definitive conclusions.

**Table 3: Impact on Sentencing Outcomes (n=13,147)**

	Midtown	Downtown
Total N <sup>1</sup>	4,103	9,044
Disposition		
Convicted	64%	68%***
ACD	29%	26%***
Dismissed or acquitted	5%	4%***
Other	2%	2%
For those cases that were convicted:	2,645	6,165
Sentence		
Conditional Discharge w/ Community Service	60%	47%***
Conditional Discharge w/ Social Service or other conditions <sup>2</sup>	16%	8%***
Jail	13%	19%***
Time Served	7%	21%***
Other (including fines)	4%	5%
Average jail sentence for all cases	2.5 days	2.4 days
Average jail sentence for all convicted cases	3.9 days	3.5 days
Average jail sentence for cases receiving jail	31 days	18 days***
1 to 10 days	47%	67%***
11 or more days	53%	32%***
22 or more days	28%	19%***

<sup>1</sup> Cases were matched and weighted.

<sup>2</sup> Other for Midtown includes mainly social service sentences and fines.

\*\*p < .01 \*\*\*p < .001 (2-tailed test)

Due to the large sample size, only significance of .01 or greater is reported.

Note: The reflected statistics on jail sentences do not include sentences of time served.

When considering only cases that were disposed at arraignment, most of the aforementioned differences still held true. As shown in Table 4, a higher percentage of those cases that were disposed at arraignment were convicted downtown (81% vs. 76%, p<.001), whereas a higher percentage received an ACD at Midtown (24% vs. 18%, p<.001).

Table 4 also shows that cases arraigned and disposed at Midtown were more likely to be sentenced to community service, either with or without a social service mandate, as compared to those downtown cases that were disposed at arraignment (66% vs. 50%, p<.001). Similarly, cases arraigned and disposed at Midtown were more likely to be sentenced to social service-only (19% vs. 7%, p<.001). In total, 85% of the cases disposed at arraignment at Midtown as compared with only 57% of the cases disposed at arraignment downtown were sentenced to an alternative sanction. Conversely, a higher percentage of cases disposed downtown received sentences of jail (10% vs. 18%, p<.001) or time served (4% vs. 21%, p<.001). Additionally, Table 4 shows that, of those cases receiving jail time, jail lengths were higher for cases arraigned at Midtown.

**Table 4: Impact on Sentencing Outcomes, by Court of Arraignment and Disposition For Cases Disposed at Arraignment (n=8,462)**

	Midtown	Downtown
Total N <sup>1</sup>	2,532	5,930
Disposition		
Convicted	76%	81%***
ACD	24%	18%***
Dismissed or acquitted	0%	0%
Other	0%	1%
For those cases that were convicted:	1,918	4,830
Sentence		
Conditional Discharge w/ Community Service	66%	50%***
Conditional Discharge w/ Social Service or other conditions <sup>2</sup>	19%	7%***
Jail	10%	18%***
Time Served	4%	21%***
Other (including fines)	2%	3%***
Average jail sentence for all cases	1.4 days	1.8 days
Average jail sentence for all convicted cases	1.8 days	2.2 days
Average jail sentence for cases receiving jail	19 days	12 days***
1 to 10 days	57%	78%***
11 or more days	43%	22%***
22 or more days	18%	12%

<sup>1</sup> Cases were matched and weighted.

<sup>2</sup> Other for Midtown includes mainly social service sentences and fines.

\*\*p < .01 \*\*\*p < .001 (2-tailed test)

Due to the large sample size, only significance of .01 or greater is reported.

Note: The reflected statistics on jail sentences do not include sentences of time served.

#### **4. Predictors of Sentencing Outcomes**

Table 5 presents the results of analyses that attempt to pinpoint the predictors of sentencing outcomes. These analyses include arraignment location (Midtown or downtown), demographic characteristics, criminal history, and charges as potential predictors. Results in the first column of the table show the predictors of receiving a community service sentence amongst convicted cases; results in the second column show the predictors of receiving a jail sentence amongst convicted cases; and results in the third column show predictors of receiving more days of jail as part of the sentence amongst convicted cases sentenced to jail.

Several predictors were found to hold explanatory power for all three types of outcomes. Those who were arraigned at Midtown were more likely to receive a community service sentence, less likely to receive jail time, but if sentenced to jail, averaged a longer jail sentence. These findings are consistent with the conclusions reached in the bivariate comparisons above.

In addition, older defendants were more likely to be sentenced to jail and to receive a longer jail term, whereas the younger defendants were more likely to receive a sentence of community service. Finally, analyses indicate that defendants with a prior arrest

history were more likely to be sentenced to jail than if they had not been arrested in the past; conversely, a prior arrest history made it less likely for a defendant to receive a community service sentence.

Other charges and demographic characteristics also predicted some of the outcomes. Convicted defendants charged with prostitution or petit larceny charges were especially likely to be sentenced to jail. Additionally, if sentenced to jail, petit larceny cases averaged longer jail sentences than cases arrested on other charges. Also, men were less likely than women to receive community service and more likely to be sentenced to jail. Finally, sentencing outcomes did not substantially vary among white, black, and Hispanic defendants, but these three groups were more likely to be sentenced to jail than those in the “other” race/ethnicity category (primarily Asian-Americans). (See additional significant differences in Table 5.)

**Table 5: Predictors of Sentencing Outcomes**

	Com. Service <sup>1</sup>	Jail <sup>1</sup>	Jail Length <sup>2</sup>
	Odds Ratios <sup>3</sup>	Odds Ratios <sup>3</sup>	Beta Coefficients <sup>4</sup>
<b>Summary Statistics</b>			
Total Sample	8252	8252	1518
Mandated	4501	1519	
Not Mandated	4308	7290	
Nagelkerke/Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.297	0.323	0.48
Arrested at Midtown	1.752***	0.585***	11.870***
<b>Demographic Characteristics</b>			
Age	0.974***	1.029***	0.283 <sup>4</sup>
Male	0.77***	1.680***	-1.167
White	0.678**	4.777***	9.271
Black	0.715*	6.104***	9.316
Hispanic	0.810	4.704***	9.770
<b>Criminal History</b>			
Any Prior Arrest?	0.177***	120.338***	16.276
<b>Charges</b>			
Petit Larceny	1.275**	4.966***	25.167***
Prostitution	0.872	4.044***	4.979
Vending	2.313***	0.858	1.455
Drugs	0.710***	1.528***	12.001*
<i>Constant</i>	10.025***	0.000***	-31.961

\*p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> Amongst convicted cases.

<sup>2</sup> Amongst convicted cases sentenced to jail.

<sup>3</sup> Logistic regression.

<sup>4</sup> Linear regression.

## VII. Conclusion

This study uncovered several notable differences between defendants arraigned at the Midtown Community Court and the downtown Manhattan Criminal Court. They are briefly summarized as follows:

- **Case Processing** – Cases that are initially arraigned at Midtown and downtown average the same number of days to disposition, although downtown is somewhat more likely to dispose its cases at the arraignment appearance (76% versus 71%).

- **Case Dispositions** – Dispositions are similar in the two sites, with cases originating downtown slightly more likely to be convicted (68% versus 64%) and cases originating at Midtown more likely to receive an ACD (29% versus 26%).
- **Sentences** – As hypothesized, cases originating at Midtown are significantly more likely to receive an alternative sanction (76% versus 55%) and less likely to receive jail time (13% versus 19%); also, cases originating at Midtown are significantly less likely to receive a simple time served sentence (7% versus 21%).
- **Use of Jail** – Although Midtown is significantly less likely to sentence its defendants to jail, when Midtown does use jail, sentences are significantly longer on average. Therefore, considering all cases originating at each site, the net number of jail days is statistically identical.
- **Cases Disposed at Arraignment** – All of the preceding patterns are even more pronounced when isolating those cases that were disposed at the initial arraignment court appearance – i.e., disposed at arraignment in Midtown versus disposed at arraignment downtown. Whereas virtually all such cases (85%) receive an alternative sanction at Midtown, only slightly more than half (57%) receive an alternative sanction downtown.

Similar to the results of the evaluation of its earlier years (Sviridoff et al, 2000, 2001), the Midtown Community Court continues to meet its goals of increasing the use of alternative sanctions and decreasing the use of other, more traditional responses to quality-of-life crime. Midtown was designed to hold its offenders accountable for their actions by sentencing them to perform immediate and visible community restitution within the Midtown neighborhood while providing social services to meet ongoing needs of the defendants. The results do indeed demonstrate that Midtown follows its philosophy of defendant accountability by mandating more alternative sanctions and fewer time served sentences and fines than downtown. The focus of Midtown sentences on alternative sanctions is in distinct contrast to the downtown court, whose sentences are more likely to fall on either extreme of the spectrum, including jail on one hand and sentences that do not entail any meaningful sanction at all (e.g. fines or time served) on the other.

**Appendix: Impact on Sentencing Outcomes, by Court of Arraignment  
and Disposition (n=13,147)**

	Arraigned & Disposed at Midtown	Arraigned at Midtown; Disposed DOWNTOWN	Arraigned & Disposed DOWNTOWN
Total N <sup>1</sup>	2,532	1,016	9,044
Disposition			
Convicted	76%	71%**	68%***
ACD	24%	4%***	26%
Dismissed or acquitted	0%	18%***	4%***
Other	0%	7%***	2%***
For those cases that were convicted:	1,918	717	6,165
Sentence			
Conditional Discharge w/ Community Service	66%	45%***	47%***
Conditional Discharge w/ Social Service or other conditions <sup>2</sup>	19%	7%***	8%***
Jail	10%	21%***	19%***
Time Served	4%	15%***	21%***
Other (including fines)	2%	12%***	5%***
Average jail sentence for all cases	1.4 days	6.8 days***	2.4 days***
Average jail sentence for all convicted cases	1.8 days	9.7 days***	3.5 days***
Average jail sentence for cases receiving jail	19 days	46 days**	18 days
1 to 10 days	57%	34%***	67%**
11 or more days	43%	66%***	32%**
22 or more days	18%	40%***	19%

<sup>1</sup> Cases were matched and weighted.

<sup>2</sup> Other for Midtown includes mainly social service sentences and fines.

\*\*p < .01 \*\*\*p < .001 (2-tailed test)

All t-tests compare to those cases arraigned and disposed at Midtown. Due to the large sample size, only significance of .01 or greater is reported.

Note: The reflected statistics on jail sentences do not include sentences of time served.

## *References*

- Karafin, Diana L. 2008. "Community Courts Across the Globe: A Survey of Goals, Performance, Measures and Operations." Open Society Foundation for South Africa, South Africa.
- Kralstein, Dana. 2005. "Community Court Research: A Literature Review." The Center for Court Innovation, New York, NY.
- Rosenbaum, Paul and Donald Rubin. 1983. "The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects." *Biometrika*, 70: 41-55.
- Rosenbaum, Paul and Donald Rubin. 1984. "Reducing Bias in Observational Studies using Subclassification on the Propensity Score." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 79: 516-524.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1973. "Matching to Remove Bias in Observational Studies." *Biometrics*, 29: 159-183.
- Sviridoff, Michelle, David Rottman, Brian Ostrom, and Richard Curtis. 2000. *Dispensing Justice Locally: The Implementation and Effects of the Midtown Community Court*. Harwood Academic Publishers, Amsterdam.
- Sviridoff, Michelle, David Rottman, and Robert R. Weidner. 2001. "Dispensing Justice Locally: The Impacts, Cost and Benefits of the Midtown Community Court." Center for Court Innovation, New York, NY.
- Weidner, Robert R. and Chuck Davis. 2000. "Benefits and Costs of the Hennepin County Community Court – A Preliminary Analysis." Institute on Criminal Justice, University of Minnesota Law School, MN.