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Executive Summary

Approved by Oakland voters in November 2004, the City of Oakland’s Measure Y ordinance provides approximately $5 million annually for the City to spend on violence prevention programs (VPPs), with an emphasis on services for youth and children. The four service areas identified in the legislation and funded via Measure Y include 1) youth outreach counselors, 2) after and in-school programs for youth and children, 3) domestic violence and child abuse counselors, and 4) offender/parolee employment training.

As the City of Oakland’s Human Services Department (HSD) prepares to implement a revised array of VPPs, this report is designed to shed light on the implementation and effectiveness of a set of VPPs that have generally received less attention than the others, specifically, those programs that do not directly target individuals at risk of engaging in violent activity, but rather those that provide a range of ancillary services, including services for victims or survivors of violent crime and more globally oriented prevention programs and community-level interventions. The primary purpose of this evaluation is to inform the City’s understanding of how these programs fit within the broader Oakland Unite effort to reduce violence. The following questions guide this report:

- How do strategies that do not directly target individuals involved in criminal/delinquent activities fit within the larger Oakland Unite framework?
- How do these strategies support the goals and objectives of Measure Y and Measure Z?
- How are or should these strategies be integrated into the larger Oakland Unite and City of Oakland violence prevention infrastructure?

The four strategies included in this report are:

- **The Crisis Response and Support Network**, which delivers both immediate and ongoing support to the family and friends of homicide victims in Oakland, including grief and trauma counseling along with intensive case management aimed at linking participants to a variety of supportive services;
- **The Family Violence Intervention Unit**, which provides domestic violence survivors with crisis counseling, safety planning, assistance with Victims of Crime applications, and legal advocacy;
- **Peace in the Parks**, which hosts family-friendly summer events in parks in high crime Oakland neighborhoods; and
- **Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth**, which works with Oakland Unified School District, among others to implement alternative approaches to punitive discipline in order to break the cycle of

---

1 Because reducing crime and violence are the primary goals of Measure Y, over the past several years, evaluation efforts have focused primarily on those programs that work directly with individuals at risk of involvement in criminal or delinquent activities in order to assess whether and to what extent participation in Oakland Unite programs has reduced their negative contact with the justice system. For more information on these programs and their effectiveness, please see previous evaluation reports: [http://oaklandunite.org/about/research-and-reports/](http://oaklandunite.org/about/research-and-reports/)
punitive school discipline and juvenile justice policy that disparately impacts Oakland’s youth of color and leads to youth violence and incarceration.

Findings and Recommendations

Findings

In unique and related ways, all four programs support the City’s violence prevention goals. By serving youth, families, and community members—all of whom have experienced or witnessed violence and most of whom face multiple barriers to stable housing and employment—these programs provide upstream support and resources to help break the cycles of intergenerational and community violence.

Overall these programs are well integrated into the overall Oakland Unite violence prevention service delivery system. This is especially true for CRSN, PIP, and RJOY, all of which collaborate with other Oakland Unite providers and are at least indirectly connected to programs that work with individuals at risk for involvement in street violence.

FVIU is less integrated into the City’s violence prevention service delivery model. FVIU is unique among Oakland Unite grantees in its focus on victims and survivors of violent crime, as well as its high level of collaboration with law enforcement agencies. Because of these differences, FVIU has been less integrated into the larger Oakland Unite service delivery system.

Recommendations

In order to support increased integration between the four strategies examined in this report and the City’s larger violence prevention and intervention infrastructure, we recommend the following:

1. Engage FVIU to provide training to other Oakland Unite providers about the impact of domestic violence and the availability of services for domestic violence survivors. Despite the limited integration between FVIU and other Oakland Unite programs, the boundary between street and family violence is not necessarily distinct, particularly for youth living in high crime, impoverished neighborhoods. Engaging FVIU to train other Oakland Unite providers would increase awareness of the availability of domestic violence support services in Oakland’s high crime neighborhoods, and increase Oakland Unite providers’ understanding of the interconnectedness between home violence and street violence.

2. Incorporate awareness of partner violence and family violence into existing youth programs. The Family Violence Law Center (FVLC), which runs FVIU, has a dating violence prevention program in schools. Most youth who participate in these programs also experience community violence and some are gang involved. In light of the relationship between family violence and street violence, HSD might consider how existing programs could incorporate a greater focus on family violence.

3. Leverage RJOY’s expertise and restorative justice approaches to build relationships with partners across the City’s violence prevention service delivery system. In addition to building
deeper connections between different Oakland Unite programs and strategies, the City should continue to identify opportunities to build relationships between service-based violence prevention efforts and law enforcement-based violence prevention efforts. Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth has made some progress toward this goal, bringing together law enforcement officers and young people of color in Oakland to have a meaningful conversation and build mutual respect, with an aim of supporting youth and reducing the possibility of violence. Supporting similar circles between OPD and young people served by Oakland Unite programs could have a similar effect.

In addition to these cross-cutting findings and recommendations, this report also provides a more detailed overview of the role of each of the four strategies in the City’s violence prevention efforts, the successes and challenges of implementing each strategy, and strategy-specific recommendations for improvements. Below, we provide a brief overview of the findings and recommendations related to each program.

**Program-Level Evaluation Highlights**

**Crisis Response and Support Network**

**Findings:** CRSN partners successfully collaborate to help clients receive needed services and to alert other VPP partners about potential retaliatory violence. At the same time, the informality of the roles and responsibilities of different CRSN partner agencies appears to limit referrals, since potential referring agencies are not always clear about who does what within the network.

**Opportunities to Enhance Role in Violence Prevention**

- Bring the homicide response and crisis intervention network together to develop protocols that clarify roles and responsibilities in order to enhance coordination among the various partners.

**Family Violence Intervention Unit**

**Findings:** FVIU’s co-location with both law enforcement and social service providers at the Alameda County Family Justice Center enables them to help clients navigate the complex landscape of both services and the justice system. Nonetheless, there are limited services and supports available to help clients escaping family violence, which impedes FVIU ability to fully support their clients.

Family violence intervention services are not well integrated into the larger Oakland Unite services delivery infrastructure, and there is little collaboration between FVIU and other Oakland Unite providers.

**Opportunities to Enhance Role in Violence Prevention**

- Leverage FVLC’s youth programs to enhance the connection between domestic violence prevention and street violence prevention.
- Provide training to other Oakland Unite providers about the impact of domestic violence and the availability of services for domestic violence survivors.
Peace in the Parks

**Findings:** PIP events have been associated with reduced crime incidents during the five-week periods in which PIP events were held, but only in the quarter-mile region surrounding the event locations. Crime incidents may have been displaced to the outer regions during the PIP event period.

In the five-week periods after the PIP events, the total number of crime incidents generally returned to the pre-event levels in the quarter- and half-mile regions surrounding the PIP event sites. However, the results of the 2015 spatial analysis suggest that PIP may have a lasting impact on crime incidents in the areas closest to the PIP event sites, as the clusters of crime incidents in the post-PIP period remained farther away from the PIP sites themselves.

**Opportunities to Enhance Role in Violence Prevention**

- Streamline the permitting process for PIP events to reduce the time spent obtaining permits for PIP events.
- Consider expanding PIP to create safe spaces for community events throughout the year and in additional locations in high need areas.
- Explore opportunities to expand case management services for youth through the PIP Youth Squad.

Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth

**Findings:** RJOY’s flexibility and tailored approach have been critical to their success implementing restorative justice programs and processes in OUSD and in Alameda County Probation Department’s Camp Sweeney. In OUSD schools with a high level of administrative buy in, RJOY’s approach has helped foster a school-wide culture shift that has reduced both disciplinary infractions and punitive disciplinary actions.

At the same time, staff turnover at OUSD makes it difficult to develop and maintain a restorative school culture. In addition, Probation Department and Court staff appear to view restorative justice as a distinct set of programs or trainings, rather than a comprehensive shift in approach and practice. As a result, restorative justice remains only slightly integrated in juvenile justice settings.

**Opportunities to Enhance Role in Violence Prevention**

- As HSD and other Oakland Unite stakeholders prepare to move into the implementation of Measure Z, they should consider which elements of restorative justice are appropriate for different partners based on buy-in and feasibility. This consideration will inform the types of restorative justice programming and trainings that HSD funds.
Introduction and Key Findings

Evaluation Background and Purpose

Approved by Oakland voters in November 2004, the City of Oakland’s Measure Y ordinance provides approximately $5 million annually for the City to spend on violence prevention programs (VPPs), with an emphasis on services for youth and children. The four service areas identified in the legislation and funded via Measure Y include 1) youth outreach counselors, 2) after and in-school programs for youth and children, 3) domestic violence and child abuse counselors, and 4) offender/parolee employment training.

The City’s Human Services Department (HSD) is responsible for implementing the VPP component of the Measure Y legislation and does so through the Oakland Unite Programs. In consultation with the Measure Y Oversight Committee (MYOC) and the City Council’s Public Safety Committee (PSC), HSD develops triennial funding strategies for services that align with the legislation and meet the shifting needs of the City. HSD then administers and monitors grants to community-based organizations that provide these services across the City. (See Appendix A for a list of the programs that were funded under the 2012-2015 funding cycle and the larger strategies under which they were funded.)

Because the Measure Y ordinance was designed to sunset after 10 years, in November 2014 City of Oakland citizens voted on a second citywide ordinance to fund a range of public safety services. This ordinance—Measure Z, which was overwhelmingly approved—builds upon the successes of Measure Y while allowing City agencies to refine the violence prevention service delivery system based on lessons learned through Measure Y implementation. As HSD prepares to implement a revised array of VPPs, this report is designed to shed light on the implementation and effectiveness of a set of VPPs that have generally received less attention than the others; specifically, those programs that do not directly target individuals at risk of engaging in violent activity, but rather those that provide a range of ancillary services, including services for victims or survivors of violent crime and more globally oriented prevention programs and community-level interventions.²

This report is a focused evaluation of four violence prevention strategies that do not directly target individuals involved in criminal/delinquent activities. The primary purpose of this evaluation is to inform the City’s understanding of how these programs fit within the broader Oakland Unite effort to reduce violence.

---

² Because reducing crime and violence are the primary goals of Measure Y, over the past several years, evaluation efforts have focused primarily on those programs that work directly with individuals at risk of involvement in criminal or delinquent activities in order to assess whether and to what extent participation in Oakland Unite programs has reduced their negative contact with the justice system. For more information on these programs and their effectiveness, please see previous evaluation reports: [http://oaklandunite.org/about/research-and-reports/](http://oaklandunite.org/about/research-and-reports/)
The following evaluation questions guided the evaluation:

- How do strategies that do not directly target individuals involved in criminal/delinquent activities fit within the larger Oakland Unite framework?
- How do these strategies support the goals and objectives of Measure Y and Measure Z?
- How are or should these strategies integrated into the larger Oakland Unite and City of Oakland violence prevention infrastructure?

Strategies Included in the Evaluation

Below, we provide a brief overview of the four programs included in this evaluation.

Crisis Response and Support Network

The Crisis Response and Support Network (CRSN), comprised of Catholic Charities of East Bay (CCEB) and their subcontractor, Youth ALIVE! (YA), delivers both immediate and ongoing support to the family and friends of homicide victims in Oakland. CRSN provides clinical case management, which includes grief and trauma counseling along with intensive case management aimed at linking participants to a variety of supportive services. In addition, CRSN helps family members of homicide victims obtain Victims of Crime compensation benefits from Alameda County and provides additional emergency financial assistance to help with death and safety related needs not covered by Victims of Crime funds. Through Oakland Unite funding, the program ensures that families, friends, classmates, and other individuals affected by homicides in Oakland receive intensive support after an incident has occurred.

- **Evaluation Questions**: How does CRSN operate within the larger crisis intervention network? To what extent are their services tied to and integrated with those that do directly target individuals at risk for involvement in violent activities, namely Youth Alive!, Street Outreach, CeaseFire, and Highland Hospital?

Family Violence Intervention Unit

The Family Violence Intervention Unit (FVIU) strategy, provided by the Family Violence Law Center (FVLC), aims to connect domestic violence survivors with a range of supportive services. FVIU personnel reach out to the domestic violence survivors and provide crisis counseling, safety planning, assistance with Victims of Crime applications, referrals to FVLC’s legal department, advocacy with the Oakland Police Department (OPD), connection with the District Attorney’s Victim Witness Department, and other support as needed. FVIU staff also work with OPD to provide line-up trainings to police officers to increase their capacity to respond to survivors of domestic violence.

- **Evaluation Questions**: How does FVIU fit within the larger Oakland Unite service delivery model? What is the relationship between FVIU programs and those that target individuals at risk for involvement in violence?
Peace in the Parks

Started in 2011, the Peace in the Parks (PIP) program has hosted family-friendly events that bring Oakland residents together in an effort to reduce violence in high crime areas. During PIP events, entertainment, food, and information regarding community resources are provided to residents at no cost. PIP also provides at-risk youth in Oakland with summer employment to support the operations of PIP events; this is known as the Youth Squad. In addition to obtaining employment experience, youth in the Youth Squad receive case management from Oakland Unite case managers who support and plan group activities for the youth throughout the summer.

- **Evaluation Questions:** How do Peace in the Park fit within the larger Oakland Unite service delivery model? To what extent do these events 1) reduce crime in the area, 2) foster a sense of community among attendees, and 3) refer community members to other services and City agencies?

Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth

Founded in 2005, Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth (RJOY) seeks to break the cycle of punitive school discipline and juvenile justice policy that disparately impacts Oakland’s youth of color and leads to youth violence and incarceration. To achieve this goal, RJOY works with Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) schools, juvenile justice agencies, and the Oakland community to help integrate restorative justice principles and practices. RJOY conducts trainings with OUSD school administration, staff, and students; and provides direct services in West Oakland Middle School and Ralph J. Bunche High School.

- **Evaluation Questions:** How does RJOY use restorative justice principles, practices, and trainings to further the goals of violence prevention? What is the relationship between these programs and those that target individuals at risk for involvement in violence?

Evaluation Methods

Since 2008, the Oakland’s City Administrator’s Office (CAO) has contracted with Resource Development Associates (RDA) to evaluate the Oakland Unite violence prevention programs. As noted above, the specific parameters of these evaluations have varied, based on the issues and interventions of greatest interest to initiative stakeholders and oversight bodies including the CAO, HSD, MYOC, and PSC. For this evaluation, data collection activities included the following:

- **Key informant interviews:** RDA conducted interviews with program managers and staff to better understand how programs are operated and how they work within the City’s larger violence prevention service delivery system.
- **Focus groups:** Similarly, RDA led focus groups with program managers and case managers from CRSN and FVIU, as well as Peace in the Parks Youth Squad participants, to understand program implementation and operation as well as their role within the City’s violence prevention efforts.
- **Participant observation:** RDA attended a Peace in the Parks event to observe the levels of community engagement and to witness the types of community interactions that occur at these events.
• **Client service delivery data**: RDA analyzed data from Oakland Unite’s CitySpan database to determine the number of FVIU and CRSN clients served between 2012-2015, their race/ethnicity and age, and the average number of hours of service that clients received.

• **Quantitative spatial analysis**: RDA conducted a quantitative spatial analysis with data obtained from the Oakland Police Department containing the location of crime incidents to determine if a relationship exists between PIP and crime incidents in the area of PIP events for the past four years (2012-2015). This analysis involved using geographic information systems to identify crime trends in the areas closest to the event sites and comparing these crime trends to crime trends in areas outside of the event locations for five weeks prior, five weeks during, and five weeks after the events.

**Organization of the Report**

In this report, we first present the key findings that emerged from analysis across all four evaluated programs. We discuss the common findings across the four programs along with cross-program recommendations to enhance the City’s violence prevention infrastructure.

Following the summary of key findings are distinct reports for the four evaluated programs. These reports describe how each program is integrated into the broader violence prevention infrastructure, factors that facilitate or hinder successful implementation, and potential strategies to enhance the program’s contribution to violence prevention. The reports follow the following general format:

1. Program Overview and Role in Violence Prevention
2. Facilitators of Successful Implementation
3. Implementation Challenges
4. Opportunities to Enhance Role in Violence Prevention

The report for Peace in the Parks follows a slightly different format. Because the evaluation included an analysis of crime incidents in the periods before, during, and after the events, the evaluation report focuses on describing program outcomes and the components of the program that stakeholders believe have led to its success in reducing crime during the event period.
**Key Findings**

**Cross-Cutting Findings and Recommendations**

In unique and related ways, all four programs support the City’s violence prevention goals. By serving youth, families, and community members—all of whom have experienced or witnessed violence and most of whom face multiple barriers to stable housing and employment—these programs provide upstream support and resources to help break the cycles of intergenerational and community violence.

- **RJOY promotes non-violent approaches and practices** in schools, the juvenile justice system, and the wider community by supporting staff, youth, and communities to change their philosophy about justice and punishment.
- **FVIU helps interrupt intergenerational cycles of violence** by supporting survivors of family violence to seek safety, and in doing so show their children that violence is not and should not be normal.
- **PIP reduces violence in targeted high crime areas** by promoting a sense of unity among community members who might otherwise engage in conflict, and by providing positive alternative activities for community members and youth during the summer.
- **CRSN prevents retaliatory violence** by providing emotional support to family members and close friends of victims of homicide or attempted homicide.

Although the four programs discussed in this report have different target populations and service delivery models from the majority of Oakland Unite programs, overall they are well integrated into the overall Oakland Unite violence prevention service delivery system. This is especially true for CRSN, PIP, and RJOY, all of which collaborate with other Oakland Unite providers and are at least indirectly connected to programs that work with individuals at risk for involvement in street violence. However, FVIU is unique among Oakland Unite grantees in its focus on victims and survivors of violent crime, as well as its high level of collaboration with law enforcement agencies. Because of these differences, FVIU has been less integrated into the larger Oakland Unite service delivery system. That said, there are a number of ways in which this program could be better integrated with the other programs in order to 1) increase awareness of the availability of domestic violence support services in Oakland’s high crime neighborhoods, and 2) increase Oakland Unite providers’ understanding of the interconnectedness between home violence and street violence.

There are opportunities to strengthen violence prevention efforts in the City of Oakland by enhancing the integration of these four programs with those that do directly target individuals at risk for involvement in violent activities. As HSD moves into Measure Z implementation, we recommend that they leverage the existing grantee meetings to facilitate conversations current and potential opportunities for interaction between different providers and strategies. Some possibilities include:

1. **Engage FVIU to provide training to other Oakland Unite providers about the impact of domestic violence and the availability of services for domestic violence survivors.** Noted in the program report on FVIU, the boundary between street and family violence is not necessarily distinct,
particularly for youth living in high crime, impoverished neighborhoods. FVIU providers and the larger family violence intervention network drew these connections, pointing to the complex relationship between family and street violence. However, while providers from a range other agencies noted that many of their clients have some experience with domestic violence situations, they tended to see this issue as outside the purview of their objectives.

2. **Incorporate partner violence and family violence into existing youth programs.** The Family Violence Law Center (FVLC), which runs FVIU, has a dating violence prevention program in schools. Most youth who participate in these programs also experience community violence and some are gang involved. In light of the relationship between family violence and street violence, HSD might consider how existing programs could incorporate a greater focus on family violence.

3. **Leverage RJOY’s expertise and restorative justice approaches to build relationships with partners across the City’s violence prevention service delivery system.** As RJOY’s community-based work launches, RJOY staff highlighted the potential for restorative justice circles to help repair the troubled relationship between youth and Oakland police officers. Describing a circle with youth and police at Bunche High School that was held after the Mike Brown shooting, the RJOY School Coordinator noted that the circle helped youth and officers have a meaningful conversation and begin to build mutual respect for each other, with an aim of supporting youth and reducing the possibility of violence. Supporting similar circles between OPD and young people served by Oakland Unite programs could have a similar effect.
Crisis Response and Support Network

Program Overview

The Crisis Response and Support Network (CRSN) is comprised of Catholic Charities of East Bay (CCEB) and their subcontractor, Youth ALIVE! (YA), which operates the Khadafy Washington Project. The Khadafy Washington Project provides an immediate response to family and friends who have lost a loved one in a shooting homicide. Case managers offer families assistance in meeting concrete needs, such as help with funeral arrangements, filing a Victims of Crime (VoC) benefits application, and housing relocation support. CCEB clinical case managers are second responders as part of the CRSN team. If a family expresses interest in grief counseling, YA will provide a warm hand-off to CCEB. CCEB maintains a three-member team that provides mental health counseling for the victim’s immediate family for up to one year. In addition to supporting victims of attempted homicide and affected family members of homicide victims, the broader network’s mission is to prevent retaliatory cycles of violence.

In addition to providing coordinated support for the family members of homicide victims, CRSN is also part of a larger homicide response and crisis intervention network that includes the Oakland Unite Violence Prevention Network Coordinator (VPNC), Street Outreach workers, Highland Hospital social workers, and case managers from YA’s Caught in the Crossfire (CiC) program.³

Together, CRSN’s goal is to provide coordinated support—for both tangible needs and mental health needs—while family members work through the painful loss of a loved one. From 2012-2015, CRSN served 979 clients through CCEB and YA’s Khadafy Washington Project. As Table 1 demonstrates, nearly all CRSN clients from 2012-2015 identified as Black or Latino. Three-quarters of CRSN clients identified as African American/Black (75%), and approximately one-fifth (19%) identified as Latino. The majority of CRSN’s clients for whom gender information was available identified as female (69%).

³ In addition to operating the Khadafy Washington Project as part of CRSN’s homicide response work, YA also runs the Caught in the Crossfire (CiC) program, a hospital-based intervention program that works with individuals who were injured as the target of an attempted homicide. In contrast to the Khadafy Washington Project, which provides material and emotional support to family members and loved ones of homicide victims, CiC works with individuals who survived homicide attempts, leveraging the experience of having been shot as an opportunity to convince people to engage in services to turn their lives around. Both CiC and CRSN are part of the City’s larger homicide response and crisis intervention network, which meets on a regular basis to strategize around preventing escalation of street conflicts.
Table 1. Race/Ethnicity of CRSN Clients, 2012-2015 (n=973)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian &amp; Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American &amp; Alaskan Native</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages do not add to 100 as some individuals selected more than one option

Figure 1 shows that from 2012-2015, the majority of CRSN clients were adults between the ages of 26 and 59, who comprised 61% of CRSN clients. Close to 30% of clients were children or young adults under age 25, and 11% were adults above age 60.

Figure 1. Age of CRSN Clients, 2012-2015 (n=976)

Role in Citywide Violence Prevention

CRSN’s work focuses on crisis intervention – support and counseling in the wake of a homicide and loss of a loved one. Beyond this goal, however, CRSN services are also crucial for preventing retaliatory violence from occurring. Through a restorative justice approach and by being present with family and friends for “the long haul,” CRSN provides social and emotional support so that people can sustain themselves after the trauma and loss of a loved one. A CCEB clinical case manager elaborated,

*We want to prevent someone from feeling like no one is listening to them, that no one cares, which then creates a feeling in the individual of, ‘What do I have to lose?’ If we don’t assist families through support and restorative practices, the probability of retaliation is very high.*
Facilitators of Successful Implementation

Strong Communication between CCEB and Youth ALIVE!

Robust communication between CCEB and YA facilitates successful coordination.

Both CCEB and YA case managers see themselves as a team, with each agency providing a critical service for clients’ families. Together, YA and CCEB offer clinical case management, with YA supporting families with day-to-day case management to address concrete needs, such as funeral arrangements, relocation services, and Victims of Crime benefits, and CCEB clinical case managers providing clinical support through mental health counseling. Warm hand-offs between YA and CCEB take place during weekly case conferencing between the two agencies.

Staff noted that even after YA officially transitions clients to CCEB, the two agencies continue to work simultaneously with the families, which strengthens their connection and rapport. For example, the two agencies have co-facilitated family grief circles and CCEB clinical case managers have also conducted home visits with YA, which they reported to be beneficial for service coordination and client engagement.

Coordinated and Immediate Response

Informal communication and flexible roles within the crisis intervention network allow for an immediate and coordinated response to crisis situations.

All agencies within the homicide and crisis response network spoke of the strong collaboration and communication among the different partners. Participants cited the following factors as critical to successfully carrying out their work:

- **Regular meetings.** The homicide and crisis response network partners meet on a weekly basis to review cases and receive updates on the City’s most recent homicides. These meetings allow CRSN to receive critical information from partners about family members of victims, as well as provide updates to the other partners that might inform their outreach and intervention work.

- **Informal and personal relationships.** The informal dynamic among partners allows for a certain level of flexibility that facilitates effective crisis response. While some protocols outlining roles and responsibilities have been developed, partners emphasized that having flexible roles has supported their ability to respond immediately and effectively to crises.

- **Trust and shared vision.** The homicide and crisis response network partners have been working together

“Our strength as a group is that we are really good at trauma-informed care. We are not just a head, but we’re a heart that walks in the door to support the victim’s family.” – CCEB clinical case manager

“We all share a common goal. Nobody’s goal is to be a shining star and in the media...as a result, that trust has been built where people feel more comfortable sharing.” – Oakland Unite case manager
for over six years. The personal relationships forged over these years have created a strong sense of trust and shared vision among the partners, facilitating communication and collaboration.

- **Credibility with and connection to community members.** The high level of credibility of the Street Outreach team and VPNC with the neighborhoods and communities in which they work is critical to their ability to assess likelihood of subsequent retaliatory violence and other issues for families. Because of their personal connections to victims and families, as well as their ability to understand community dynamics after a homicide, the Street Outreach workers and VPNC relay important information to CRSN, such as retaliation factors or barriers preventing the family from engaging in services.

### Implementation Challenges

#### Clarity of Roles and Responsibilities

**For homicide and crisis response network partners not working directly in the community, the informal roles and communication among partners may impede service coordination.**

Among providers that are not part of the immediate crisis response network and have not established personal relationships and informal communication with the network partners, the ability to provide smooth referrals and seamless service coordination is limited. For example, Highland Hospital providers reported instances when they were unsure as to which agency they should refer their client to once the client has been assessed and treated at the hospital. For those agencies not working directly in the community, more clarity of each partner’s roles and responsibilities would facilitate more warm hand-offs and accelerate follow-up with clients.

#### Client Engagement

**It can be difficult to engage and retain families in CRSN due to stigma associated with mental health services as well as complex processes and delays in obtaining financial assistance for victims of crime.**

Service providers across the homicide and crisis response network identified significant barriers to engaging clients in CRSN services. CCEB clinical case managers explained that there is significant shame associated with mental health needs as well as seeking help for those needs, particularly for communities of color, who might view counseling as a sign of weakness. As a result, CCEB often attempts to contact families several times before they accept counseling services. As one mental health counselor described this difficulty, “We are offering services to cope [with feelings of loss and grief] and maybe they don’t want to look at their feelings. The person might not be ready for counseling.” Despite these barriers, CRSN case managers have developed several strategies to strengthen the client relationship and make counseling more accessible to families. These strategies include not using the word “therapy,” offering grief and healing circles, and integrating faith-based and traditional healing practices into counseling.

“It takes a lot to keep the families engaged since there are so many hoops to go through or they get denied or there is an appeal.”

– Oakland Unite case manager
Even if CRSN is able to initially engage clients, it can be difficult to maintain engagement over time. CCEB clinical case managers and other network providers noted that many families feel discouraged after trying to navigate the complex bureaucracy required to obtain financial and social assistance.

Barriers to Comprehensive Service Delivery

**CRSN providers identified external barriers that may impede families’ ability to receive the support they need to begin to heal from the experience of losing a loved one.**

- **Access to material support for families.** There are a number of difficulties in attempting to receive adequate financial support for violent crime victims in Oakland through VoC benefits. In 2012, the State of California reduced its VoC funeral service benefits from $7,500 to $5,000. Providers also observed significant wait times between submission of an application for benefits and approval of benefits. Families are frequently denied benefits and must appeal, increasing the wait period. CRSN providers noted that undocumented families face even greater barriers to accessing financial support. Finally, housing and relocation remains a significant need for families impacted by street violence.

- **Referrals to psychiatric services.** CCEB assists clients with scheduling an appointment to receive a medical evaluation with Alameda County Healthcare Service Agency (HCSA). However, CCEB clinical case managers described long waiting periods for appointments for clients suffering from severe trauma and depression and in need of medication.

**Opportunities to Enhance Role in Violence Prevention**

*Bring the homicide response and crisis intervention network together to develop protocols that clarify roles and responsibilities in order to enhance coordination among the various partners.* As discussed in an earlier section, a flexible communication structure has been particularly effective for partners within the homicide and crisis response network, including CCEB and YA case managers, the team of street outreach workers, and the Violence Prevention Network Coordinator. But for agencies that are peripherally related to the homicide and crisis response network, such as Highland Hospital providers and CeaseFire, this flexible communication impedes service coordination. Given both the successes and challenges of the current communication system, it would be helpful for all partners to come together to develop protocols that clarify roles and responsibilities, as well as agree upon the appropriate level of flexibility necessary for rapid, on the ground coordination.
Family Violence Intervention Unit

Program Overview

The Family Violence Intervention Unit (FVIU) of the Family Violence Law Center (FVLC) works in partnership with the Oakland Police Department (OPD), Alameda County Family Justice Center (ACFJC), and Alameda County District Attorney’s office to provide a range of legal, social, and emotional support services for survivors of domestic violence. The team consists of four Crisis Intervention Specialists, one Crisis Services Coordinator, one FVIU Coordinator, and Mobile Response Team Advocates who provide clients with safety planning and referrals to necessary social supports (e.g. shelter, emergency relocation, CalWORKS applications) while also linking them to FVLC’s legal department and, for a limited number of cases, to additional long-term case management. FVIU also provides training to OPD officers, who refer victims. From 2012-2015, over half (57%) of referrals for which a source was reported were from OPD (including police officers, police reports, and police crisis scene). FVLC also enrolls clients through walk-ins at the ACFJC, referrals from hospitals and other agencies, and a 24-hour crisis phone line. From 2012-2015, about 20% of the referrals for which a source was reported were from other agencies.

FVIU served 3,518 clients from 2012-2015. Approximately half (51%) of clients for whom race/ethnicity information was available were African American/Black, and nearly one-third (30%) were Latino, followed by clients who identified as white (14%) and Asian or Pacific Islander (5%) (see Table 2). Eighty percent of FVIU clients who indicated their home language reported speaking English, followed by 17% of clients who reported speaking Spanish as their home language. From 2012-2015, most of FVIU’s clients for whom gender information was available identified as female (90%).

Table 2. Race/Ethnicity of FVIU Clients Served, 2012-2015 (n=3232)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics of Clients served 2012-2015</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian &amp; Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American &amp; Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages do not add to 100 as some individuals selected more than one option

FVIU serves individuals across the life span, though the majority of clients are adults. From 2012-2015, nearly half (48%) of FVIU clients for whom age information was available were between ages 26 and 39.

---

4 Oakland Unite also funds a small amount of FVLC’s legal services, which include providing legal information, preparing legal documents/paperwork, accompanying and representing clients in court. In addition to Oakland Unite-funded services, FVLC has a youth department that runs two youth teen dating violence programs: 1) *Dating Matters* is a partnership with Oakland Unified School District and is implemented in the schools; and 2) *Relationship Abuse Prevention* (RAP), which operates at FVLC.
followed by nearly one-third (31%) between ages 40 and 59. One in six clients (17%) were young adults between the ages of 16 and 25 (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. Age Ranges FVIU Clients, 2012-2015 (n=3305)

Role in Citywide Violence Prevention

FVIU’s services play both a direct and an indirect role in citywide efforts to reduce and prevent violence. At the most direct level, by intervening in family violence situations and helping the survivors of violence leave their abusers, FVIU helps reduce crime and violence in Oakland. In addition, FVLC staff described that FVIU provides a more indirect, mediating role by helping break the cycle of violence across generations. As research has demonstrated, the presence of family violence within a given geographic neighborhood is one of the strongest predictors of youth violence in that neighborhood;\(^5\) by reducing the occurrence of family violence in high crime Oakland neighborhoods, FVIU hopes to disrupt this relationship and ultimately reduce violence downstream.

Facilitators of Successful Implementation

Co-Location and Strong Communication within FVIU Network

Co-location of FVIU and law enforcement partners at the Alameda County Family Justice Center facilitates streamlined communication and warm hand-offs.

---

FVLC is housed at the ACFJC, which serves as a one-stop center for individuals experiencing domestic violence. In addition to FVLC, the ACFJC also accommodates OPD’s domestic violence unit, a division of the Alameda County District Attorney’s Office (DA), and on-site representatives from 30 agencies that provide services including legal assistance, law enforcement support, crisis intervention, case management, and social service assistance. Having these agencies located in one facility enhances communication and warm hand-offs between the different partners.

FVIU staff and partners in OPD and the DA’s office described the many benefits of having a one-stop location for a range of family violence intervention services, including the ability to address clients’ questions and provide referrals in real time, and ease of communication between various program partners. FVLC staff noted that they have taken advantage of this colocation and streamlined communication between partners to eliminate a time lag in referrals from OPD to FVIU that had been identified as a challenge in the 2013 evaluation.

Strong Relationships with External Partners

FVIU has strong relationships with external agencies and as a result has the capacity to provide referrals to an array of community resources.

FVIU has established strong relationships with over 60 external partners throughout Alameda County, such as emergency shelters and CalWORKs. These strong community ties facilitate client referrals and streamline service linkages for FVIU clients. For example, FVLC staff discussed that they commonly refer clients to shelters within Alameda County, and even outside of the County. FVIU has also established relationships with outside agencies that provide domestic violence counseling, though staff noted that these resources were limited.

Implementation Challenges

Service Gaps Within and Beyond FVIU

Staffing shortages and a highly targeted service focus impact FVIU’s capacity to provide a range of services, particularly mental health counseling.

FVIU’s limited number of staff impedes their ability to provide comprehensive legal and counseling services to clients. Specifically, FVLC’s capacity to provide mental health counseling is significantly limited.

“For us it is really a staffing issue. We just can’t represent everyone so we have to decide who and where we can help...we try to address their needs the best we can, while recognizing we have limited capacity.” – FVLC legal staff

6 In addition to the DA’s office, the DA supports a victim/witness assistance and advocacy program and victim’s compensation program.
Executive Director of the ACFJC noted that mental health counseling is needed for all age groups of individuals impacted by family violence. FVLC offers a therapy program for kids 0-5 years of age and their parents and staff members spoke highly of the program. However, staff noted that FVLC has only one therapist intern who works part-time and has a very full caseload.

FVIU staff also highlighted significant gaps in programs and services targeted to youth and young adults 5-24 years of age. FVIU staff identified teen sexual assault and dating violence as issues that require more intervention and support, and noted that there is a general shortage of therapists in the mental health workforce who specialize in providing counseling for teenage survivors. While FVLC has had the opportunity to expand its legal team over time, their capacity to provide mental health counseling remains limited.

**Limited availability of housing and other support services impedes FVIU’s ability to provide successful safety planning, crisis counseling, and long-term case management for clients.**

In addition to a limited number of staff internally, FVIU partners acknowledged that there are inadequate external resources to meet clients’ needs. In particular, providers across the FVIU network emphasized that housing (both emergency shelter and long-term) is a priority for domestic violence survivors. With only five shelters located throughout Alameda County, staff often struggle to find housing for their clients. FVIU has the ability to provide motel vouchers for individuals, but the supply is very limited and this is only a very short-term solution.

**Client Engagement**

**Potential clients may be hesitant to seek family violence services due to socioeconomic conditions and stigma.**

Staff noted that it can be challenging to engage the individuals and families who may most benefit from FVIU’s services. They explained that communities of color, particularly those living in economically and socially vulnerable neighborhoods, are often less likely to come forward and report abuse or seek FVIU’s services, in part due to distrust in law enforcement. Economic codependence is also a key barrier in low income communities. In addition, providers noted that the strong stigma associated with both domestic violence and mental health counseling can compound individuals’ reluctance to engage in services.

**Information Sharing between FVLC and Law Enforcement**

**Differing objectives and data needs limit information sharing between FVLC and law enforcement agencies, which can impact partners’ ability to achieve common goals for clients.**
Despite strong communication across FVIU partners, stakeholders across the agencies also noted the challenges that come with confidentiality protocols between FVIU and their law enforcement partners due to differences between the agencies’ primary goals. FVIU’s primary goal is to ensure clients’ safety, health, and well-being by providing concrete and emotional support. The DA’s goal is to prosecute individuals that may be guilty in cases of domestic violence. Confidentiality laws limit or prohibit FVLC from sharing client information with the DA and/or OPD without client consent. While law enforcement agencies understand the value and importance of confidentiality within FVIU, they noted that for cases that are particularly complex, not having the full details of a client’s background can be challenging, particularly in legal representation. When dealing with complex cases, the District Attorney suggested holding quarterly meetings between service partners in FVLC and law enforcement partners to ensure everyone is up to date on the status of cases and to discuss ways to continue to achieve common goals, despite differences.

Opportunities to Enhance Role in Violence Prevention

FVIU and its partners noted that the work of FVIU is largely separate from other Oakland Unite violence prevention efforts, despite the fact that family violence and community violence are often linked. The following recommendations provide opportunities for the City to leverage FVIU’s capacity to integrate a focus on domestic violence into the City’s broader violence prevention efforts.

1. Leverage FVLC’s youth programs to enhance the connection between domestic violence prevention and street violence prevention. Interviews with FVIU and other Oakland Unite partners highlighted that youth who experience and perpetrate community violence have often experienced family violence as well. However, youth violence prevention programs that focus on delinquent or criminal behavior rarely address the intersection of family and community violence. FVIU staff also emphasized that youth are a highly underserved population in domestic violence services. FVLC’s youth programming offers an effective entry point to incorporate discussions about family violence in violence prevention programs that tend to focus on street violence. The City of Oakland might engage FVLC to provide direct services to youth participating in Oakland Unite youth programs, invite FVLC staff to train Oakland Unite youth case managers, or both. Oakland Unite’s Peace in the Park events and Youth Squad also present opportunities to leverage the strengths of FVLC to integrate domestic violence into Oakland Unite’s broader violence prevention framework.

2. Provide training to other Oakland Unite providers about the impact of domestic violence and the availability of services for domestic violence survivors. FVIU staff and partners suggested that opportunities to engage with other Oakland Unite partners more frequently might help break down silos among the different partners. HSD might consider inviting FVLC to conduct trainings for Oakland Unite
partners about family violence services, or to use the quarterly grantees meetings as an opportunity to discuss the relationship between family violence and street violence. This would provide an opportunity to increase Oakland Unite providers’ awareness of domestic violence in the community as well as potential signs of domestic violence while working with their clients. They would also offer an opportunity for Oakland Unite providers to learn more about family support resources in Oakland, thereby enhancing service referral and coordination.
Peace in the Parks

Program Overview

Started in 2011, the Oakland Unite Peace in the Parks (PIP) program has hosted family friendly events that bring Oakland residents together in an effort to reduce violence in high crime areas. PIP events offer entertainment, food, and information regarding community resources at no cost. In addition, PIP employs at-risk Oakland youth to support the operations of PIP events. In addition to obtaining employment experience, youth that participate in PIP—the Youth Squad—receive case management from Oakland Unite case managers who support youth individually and through a range of group activities throughout the summer.

PIP events are held on six consecutive Friday nights from 6:00-9:00pm, July through August. Events have been held annually at two locations in Oakland. From 2012-2014, PIP events were held in East Oakland at Willie Wilkins Park and Carter Gilmore Park. In 2015, East Oakland PIP events were held at Willie Wilkins Park and West Oakland PIP events were held at 3233 Market Street in the form of a block party. A host of managers and staff are responsible for coordinating and operating PIP events.

- **Site coordinators** ensure that all event spaces are permitted through the City of Oakland and that the sites are cleaned and safe for the public prior to events. Site coordinators are also responsible for building relationships with community based organizations and coordinating their involvement.
- **Case managers** are responsible for inviting youth to take part in PIP and managing their work during events. Case managers also provide participating youth with case management throughout the summer and plan group youth activities.
- **Youth Squad** participants are formally hired by case managers to work at PIP events. Youth Squad participants also receive mentorship from Oakland Unite case managers to help them set and achieve their goals.
- **Street Outreach** workers funded through Oakland Unite conduct community outreach and develop relationships with at-risk youth and adults in the community during PIP events. Street Outreach workers are trained in conflict mediation techniques and are present at all events to diffuse conflicts should they occur.
Role in Citywide Violence Prevention

Reductions in Crime Incidents

RDA used geographic information systems (GIS) to analyze reported incidents of crime in the vicinity of PIP events five weeks prior, five weeks during, and five weeks after events for four years (2012-2015). The purpose of the quantitative spatial analysis was to assess the spatial relationships between PIP events and crime. Using GIS, PIP regions were identified by encircling one-quarter mile (inner region) and half mile (outer region) rings around the center of the PIP event locations.

RDA analyzed the total number of crime incidents in the inner and outer regions, as well as the location of clusters of crime incidents within these regions. Since a dip in crime incidents during PIP events may not indicate that PIP reduces crime, but rather be representative of broader crime trends, crime incidents were analyzed in the region outside of the immediate event area and in the city of Oakland for purposes of comparison. The resulting analysis revealed trends in the location of clusters of crime incidents before, during, and after PIP events that could not be seen by comparing the number of crime incidents alone. Tables reflecting the number of crime incidents near PIP locations in 2012-2015 are presented in Appendix C.

Overall Outcomes: 2012-2015 PIP Events

Over the past four years, PIP events have been associated with reduced crime incidents in the area closest to PIP events during the PIP events. As compared to five weeks prior to PIP events, the number of crime incidents during the PIP event period decreased in the inner regions. As shown in Table 3, crime incidents decreased by 9% in the inner regions during PIP.

At the same time, it is possible that PIP events displaced crime to areas farther from the PIP sites during the PIP event periods. In the time period during PIP events, crime incidents in the outer regions increased by 7%. From five weeks prior to PIP events to the five weeks during PIP events, crime in Oakland overall remained constant, decreasing by one half of a percent. Since crime remained constant in Oakland while it decreased in the inner regions and increased in the outer regions, it is possible that PIP displaced some crime incidents to the outer regions during the PIP events.

The number of PIP events generally returned to the pre-event levels, although it is possible that there is a lasting reduction in crime incidents in the area closest to the PIP sites. From 2012-2015, the number of crime incidents in the 5-week period after PIP in both the inner and outer regions returned to above the pre-event levels of crime incidents. However, the results of the 2015 spatial analysis, discussed below, suggest that PIP may have a lasting impact on crime incidents in the areas closest to the PIP event sites.

The analysis includes all crime incidents reported to OPD. Including all crime incidents, as opposed to only Part 1 and Public Nuisance (Part 2) incidents, allowed larger samples of incidents to be examined, which facilitated a more meaningful statistical comparison of crime trends across the regions surrounding PIP sites.
as the clusters of crime incidents in the post-PIP period remained farther away from the PIP sites themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>% Change Pre/During</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner region all parks</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer region all parks</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Avg.</td>
<td>5208</td>
<td>5173</td>
<td>5131</td>
<td>-½%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Crime Incident Mapping: Summer 2015 PIP Events

The maps below demonstrate the spatial trends in crime incidents prior to, during, and after the Summer 2015 PIP event periods. The quarter-mile inner region is the circle shown in blue. The half-mile outer region is the ring shown in purple. Areas of yellow represent the highest density of crime (the number of crimes in a single location), areas of red are moderate density, and areas of grey represent the lowest density of crimes.

Maps 1, 2, and 3 below illustrate the change in density of crime incidents in the areas closest to the West Oakland PIP site. Crime incidents decreased during the five-week period that PIP events were held, when compared to five weeks prior to PIP events. Map 3 demonstrates that a cluster of crime incidents reemerged in the post-event period in the inner region, but that the cluster of incidents is concentrated farther away from the PIP event site (see arrow in Map 3). The cluster of crime incidents that existed during the five weeks prior to West Oakland PIP events just west of the PIP site did not reemerge in the post-event period (compare circles in maps 1 and 3). This suggests that the West Oakland PIP events may have had a lasting impact on crime reduction—but only in the area closest to the event location.

Crime incidents near the East Oakland PIP site followed a similar trend during the analysis periods. Maps 4, 5, and 6 below demonstrate the trend of crime incidents near the East Oakland PIP location during the pre, during, and post event periods. The cluster of crime incidents that encompassed the PIP site in the pre-event period (see Map 4), was not present during PIP events, and did not return in the post-event period. This suggests that the East Oakland PIP events may have had a lasting impact on crime reduction in the area closest to the event location.
Crime Incidents Before, During, and After 2015 West Oakland Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from PIP Location</th>
<th>Density of Criminal Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue inner circle: $\frac{1}{4}$ mile radius of PIP event</td>
<td>Yellow: highest density of crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple outer circle: $\frac{1}{2}$ mile radius of PIP event</td>
<td>Red: moderate density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grey: lowest density of crimes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map 1. Incidents Prior to PIP WO 2015

Map 2. Incidents During PIP WO 2015

Map 3. Incidents Post PIP WO 2015
Crime Incidents Before, During, and After 2015 East Oakland Events

Distance from PIP Location
- **Blue inner circle**: ¼ mile radius of PIP event
- **Purple outer circle**: ½ mile radius of PIP event

Density of Criminal Incidents
- **Yellow**: highest density of crimes
- **Red**: moderate density
- **Grey**: lowest density of crimes

Map 4. Incidents Prior to PIP EO 2015

Map 5. Incidents During PIP EO 2015

Map 6. Incidents Post PIP EO 2015
Successful Program Components

Interviews with PIP managers and staff revealed three primary ways PIP events work to prevent violence in surrounding communities: 1) creating safe spaces to facilitate community building, 2) enabling residents to reassert their control of their communities, and 3) providing at-risk youth with opportunities for employment and mentorship.

Creating Safe Spaces for Community Building

PIP events have helped local residents build a sense of community by creating safe spaces for them to interact.

Prior to PIP events, event sites are cleaned by the Oakland Public Works Department and PIP staff to ensure that the sites are safe for public use. Additionally, Street Outreach workers trained in various conflict de-escalation techniques attend events to diffuse conflicts if they arise. These actions are taken prior to events to make community members feel safe. PIP staff noted that, taken together, these actions create clearly identifiable safe spaces within violent neighborhoods, giving residents a place to interact more than they do otherwise.

According to one PIP staff member, “Peace in the Park gives community members a chance to get to know each other instead of being suspicious of one another.” Creating a safe space for residents to interact is an important component of community building especially in high crime areas in West and East Oakland.

PIP staff elaborated that residents often get to know their neighbors for the first time at PIP events, providing multiple examples of occasions when community members who had conflicts with one another were able to resolve disagreements at the events. They further indicated that the program has the capacity to improve the relationship between youth and homeowners, by providing a safe space where they can interact in a positive way and mediate tensions that arise when youth “hang out” in the streets and homeowners call the police under the suspicion that they are causing trouble. Youth Squad participants indicated that residents of all ages – including children, teenagers, adults, and seniors – attend and interact at PIP events.

Enabling Residents to Reassert Control of their Community

PIP events give residents a concrete opportunity to reassert their control of public spaces that are often otherwise associated with street crime.

“I would overhear conversations between people who live in the neighborhood that had never met each other before. They would say how the community needed this to bring the community closer and they would thank us for coming out and working at the events.” – Youth squad participant

“PIP events show the community that the government cares. They show them that the government cares and wants to be part of the community”. – PIP site coordinator
PIP staff noted that prior to PIP events in Willie Wilkins Park in East Oakland, the park was not used by families in the area. According to PIP staff, “Willie Wilkins Park wasn’t used by the community, and people would complain about how they couldn’t use it because of the drug dealing and drug usage in the park.” During RDA’s observation of the East Oakland PIP event, hundreds of residents including adults, children, and seniors utilized the park spaces and interacted peacefully with one another. PIP staff perceived that the process of taking back public spaces for residents empowers residents and allows them to feel more invested in the security of their community.

The goal of hosting PIP in West Oakland at 3233 Market Street in 2015 was to allow community residents to reestablish their presence in this location so they could use the resources in the area. According to PIP staff, the West Oakland PIP location was selected to host PIP events because of the presence of community-based organizations in the area and because it is an area that has been plagued by violence. The West Oakland location is surrounded by the St. Mary’s Center for Seniors and Preschool Children, M. Robison Baker YMCA, and the West Oakland Youth Center.

Opportunities for At-Risk Youth

**PIP provides at-risk youth with employment experience, life skills development, and the opportunity to give back to their community.**

PIP Youth Squad participants are selected from areas where crime and violence are present daily. Youth Squad members are between 13 and 18 years of age and are selected to participate in PIP by Oakland Unite case managers. Participants in the Youth Squad focus group indicated that if they had not participated in PIP during the summer they would have had nothing constructive to do during that time. One Youth Squad respondent stated, “Before PIP I would be just sitting at home playing video games and be doing nothing, but this summer was different because I had something productive to do.” PIP case managers and Youth Squad participants all agreed that participation in PIP kept the youth out of trouble, taught participants responsibility, and gave them an opportunity to give back to their communities.

Youth Squad participants also expressed that they felt a sense of personal gratification from working at the events. They indicated they enjoyed seeing the community come together and knowing that they played a role in bringing everyone together. Youth stated that they liked meeting residents and other youth attending the events. Youth Squad participants
also appreciated the participation of community-based organizations because it helped them recognize opportunities about which they were previously not aware. Youth Squad participants specifically indicated that they appreciated learning about courses offered at community colleges in the area from a representative from Laney College.

During the focus group with Youth Squad members, youth described learning valuable life skills as a result of working over the summer, including how to work with the public, and that through that experience, they gained real-life problem solving skills. After PIP is completed for the summer, Youth Squad participants have the opportunity to present to Oakland Unite staff what they learned from their participation in PIP, an opportunity that Youth Squad members praised for helping them become more confident in their public speaking skills.

Collaboration with Violence Prevention Partners

**PIP staff collaborate with Street Outreach workers to increase community outreach at the events and to diffuse conflicts that could become violent.**

In conjunction with other Oakland Unite violence prevention services, such as those conducted by Street Outreach, PIP plays a vital role in violence prevention efforts. Street Outreach workers maintain a consistent presence in high crime areas in an attempt to mitigate conflicts before they turn violent. Street Outreach workers are also present at PIP events, which gives them the opportunity to establish relationships with community members.

Oakland Unite case managers provided examples of how PIP staff, in collaboration with Street Outreach workers, prevented conflicts between residents that otherwise would have turned violent. One method that Oakland Unite case managers and Street Outreach workers use collaboratively to resolve conflicts is restorative justice circles. Oakland Unite site coordinators and case managers have also collaborated with several community-based organizations to provide residents with information and resources at events. Community-based organizations that have attended PIP events include but are not limited to:

- **The West Oakland Health Center** – Provided information to the public about free or reduced cost services offered at clinics, and provided mental health awareness information to attendees.
- **Dash Camp** – Discussed with attendees the culturally competent diabetes education and fitness programs they offer to promote healthy lifestyles.
- **Laney College** – Explained the college enrollment process and available programs offered at community colleges to encourage continuing education.

“It was two girls who had a long standing conflict, and at the event they were ready to fight each other... It got back to us (Case Managers) so we and the Street Outreach Workers stepped in, got them together and did a restorative justice circle and through that we were able to diffuse the conflict” – Oakland Unite Case Manager
Oakland Parks and Recreation – Discussed ongoing recreational and wellness programs offered to the public.

Oakland Fire Department – Met with community residents and engaged youth through explaining the importance of fire safety.

Black Officers Association – Black police officers cooked for the residents and actively participated in PIP events.

PIP staff explained that because the areas where PIP events are held are areas where there is great need among residents for basic resources such as food and clothing, establishing linkages between community service providers and residents is an important component of violence prevention, as it may reduce competition for scarce resources among residents. According to a PIP staff member, “PIP connects people to vital resources they may not be aware of and that’s important because people are fighting over these resources.”

Opportunities to Enhance Role in Violence Prevention

While this report has demonstrated how PIP contributes to violence prevention, RDA’s evaluation revealed several ways the current program could be strengthened to further prevent violence.

1. **Streamline the permitting process for PIP events.** PIP site coordinators indicated that they spent large portions of their time struggling to obtain the proper permits to hold PIP events at site locations and felt that this process interfered with their ability to organize resources for PIP events. Site coordinators felt strongly that the permitting process for events needs to be streamlined.

2. **Consider expanding PIP to create safe spaces for community events throughout the year in high need areas.** PIP site coordinators, case managers, and Youth Squad members agreed that holding events more consistently throughout the year would further help to prevent community violence. The quantitative data supports this perception, as data collected over the four-year period suggests crime incidents return to their pre-event levels after the events conclude. Holding events more consistently throughout the year may help prevent additional violence, although it is likely that the crime prevention impact would be highly localized.

3. **Consider adding additional PIP event locations in Oakland.** The evidence presented in this report suggests PIP is associated with reduced crime, but that the impact is within a small radius of event locations. To increase the capacity of PIP to strengthen communities and reduce crime, HSD should consider adding additional PIP locations in high crime communities. Using GIS mapping to identify spatial factors such as crime incidents may assist planners in identifying appropriate site locations.

4. **Explore opportunities to expand case management services through the PIP Youth Squad.** A major goal of PIP is to reduce youth violence by creating positive and constructive opportunities for youth. PIP has provided youth with valuable employment experience by allowing them to develop a marketable skill set. Although youth that participated in the program indicated they received many benefits from participating in the program, the number of youth served by PIP is far less than the
number of at-risk youth in Oakland. There is a large number of youth that participate in the program as volunteers each year but are unable to receive case management due to limited staff capacity. As a result, the City might explore opportunities to add additional case managers for PIP, or partner with other Oakland Unite grantees that provide case management, so a greater number of youth can be provided with opportunities.
Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth

Program Overview

Founded in 2005, Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth (RJOY) seeks to interrupt cycles of violence and incarceration by promoting a cultural shift from punitive responses to youthful wrongdoing—which disparately impact Oakland’s youth of color and contribute to the school-to-prison pipeline—to restorative approaches that emphasize healing. To achieve this goal, RJOY provides training and technical assistance; launches demonstration programs in schools, communities, and the juvenile justice system; and engages in advocacy and public education to promote policy shifts in Oakland and beyond. Since its inception, RJOY has trained, presented, and offered technical assistance to more than 9,500 youth and justice, health, community, and school stakeholders in Oakland and beyond. RJOY serves more than 250 youth annually through its schools and the juvenile justice system.

Restorative Justice in Oakland Unified School District

RJOY uses Measure Y funds to support the organization’s work in the Oakland public school system. RJOY provides direct services in West Oakland Middle School and Ralph J. Bunche High School, where RJOY School Coordinators facilitate restorative justice circles with students, teachers, administrators, and others. RJOY also conducts restorative justice trainings with administrators and staff at OUSD schools districtwide. RJOY School Coordinators work with administrators to provide ongoing training and technical assistance in the implementation of restorative justice approaches and practices.

Restorative Justice in the Alameda County Juvenile Justice System

RJOY has led a number of trainings with justice system actors, including but not limited to the previous Presiding Judge of the Alameda County Juvenile Court; Alameda County probation officers; and Unit Supervisors at Camp Sweeney, Alameda County’s minimum security residential program for adolescent males. RJOY also operates a restorative reentry pilot project—the Circle of Support and Accountability (COSA) project, a peer-led restorative justice-based support group—at Camp Sweeney. RJOY also offers internships for justice-involved youth who have been released from Camp Sweeney.

Restorative Justice in the Oakland Community

2015 marks the first time that RJOY has had a full-time Community Coordinator dedicated to integrating restorative justice principles and practices across Oakland’s institutions and in the larger community. The Community Coordinator will work with several community-based organizations to respond to youth

---

8 Although not funded by Measure Y, this evaluation explores RJOY’s work in the Alameda County Juvenile Justice System to provide the City of Oakland Human Services Department (HSD) with information and context about RJOY’s work beyond OUSD, which HSD may leverage in future work.
conflicts in the community. As RJOY has only recently launched this work, the report does not include an evaluation of RJOY’s community-wide activities.

Role in Citywide Violence Prevention

Inspired by indigenous values, restorative justice is a philosophy and a theory of justice that emphasizes bringing together everyone affected by wrongdoing to address needs and responsibilities, and to heal the harm to relationships as much as possible. In contrast to a retributive justice model, restorative justice asks: 1) who was harmed, and 2) what are the needs and responsibilities arising out of the harm? By bringing together both those who committed a given wrong and those who were negatively impacted by it, restorative justice practices are designed to create a context in which perpetrators understand and acknowledge the impact of their actions on others, thus reducing the likelihood that they will carry out a harmful act in the future. At the same time, for the victim(s) of harm to be able to explain the impact of a given incident to the perpetrator and have him/her acknowledge it and commit to a set of reparative actions can help victims recover from the harm that was done.

School System Impacts

On light of research showing that higher suspension rates are closely correlated with higher dropout and delinquency rates, school-based restorative justice offers an alternative way of responding to disciplinary infractions. It is also a proactive strategy to create a culture of connectivity, thereby reducing behaviors that may have originally been met with a punitive response. A study completed by the University of Berkeley found that since 2007, RJOY’s West Oakland Middle School pilot eliminated violence and racial disparities in discipline, while reducing suspension rates by 87%. Another study comparing restorative justice schools with non-restorative justice schools in Oakland found a 40% decrease in suspensions for African-American students for “defiance”; a 128% increase in reading scores for restorative justice schools compared to an 11% increase in non-restorative justice schools; a 60% increase in graduation rates at restorative justice schools compared to 7% at non-restorative justice schools; and a 24% decrease in chronic truancy at restorative justice schools compared to a 62% increase in non-restorative justice schools.

Following these successes, OUSD undertook a number of actions to institutionalize restorative justice districtwide. In 2010, the OUSD Board of Directors passed a resolution adopting restorative justice as a

---


system-wide alternative to zero tolerance discipline. Today there are programs in more than 30 schools. All restorative justice schools in OUSD schools use a three-tiered approach to restorative justice that includes proactive as well as conflict resolution components: 1) building relationships and promoting a restorative and caring culture; 2) responding to conflict and harm using restorative practices; and 3) providing individualized support for youth. In addition, OUSD has hired a restorative justice District Coordinator and several Restorative Justice School-Based Facilitators, who work full-time at schools.

Juvenile Justice System Impacts

As in schools, the use of restorative justice in the juvenile justice system is intended to reduce reliance on punitive discipline which can push youth deeper into the justice system. Following presentations from RJOY in 2007, the then-Presiding Juvenile Judge convened a Restorative Justice Task Force, involving probation, court, school, and law enforcement officials, as well as community-based leaders. In 2009, the group produced a Restorative Justice Strategic Action Plan seeking to integrate restorative justice principles and practices across Alameda County’s Juvenile Justice continuum. As a result, RJOY has been given the opportunity to provide several restorative justice trainings for supervisory probation officers, Juvenile Institutional Officers, and Unit Supervisors at Camp Sweeney. RJOY was involved in several pilot programs resulting from the Strategic Action Plan, and today continues to run COSAs and internships for justice-involved youth. RJOY’s COSA Project Director suggested that when youth get comfortable with peer circles at Camp Sweeney, they are better able to make positive choices that help them stay out of the justice system.

The following sections discuss factors that have facilitated and hindered the implementation of restorative justice principles and practices in the school system and the juvenile justice system.

Oakland Unified School District

Facilitators of Successful Implementation

RJOY staff—including the Executive Director and RJOY School Coordinators, OUSD’s Restorative Justice District Coordinator, and a former principal from West Oakland Middle School—highlighted a number of factors that have facilitated the integration of restorative justice within schools.

Committing Time and Resources for Comprehensive Culture Shift

Administrative support has been critical for ensuring that schools dedicate sufficient time and resources to restorative justice to implement it with fidelity.

Although implementing restorative justice circles does not necessarily require a major time commitment, integrating a comprehensive restorative justice approach and corresponding culture shift requires a

---

significant dedication of school time. Consequently, generating and maintaining administrative support has been essential for building restorative justice into the cultures at West Oakland Middle School and Bunche High School. Administrators at both schools have supported the integration of full-time, onsite RJOY School Coordinators to provide support and continuous training for school staff, administration, and youth. In addition to supporting onsite RJOY School Coordinators, administrators at these schools have been willing to commit school time to integrating restorative justice practices, including restorative justice circles, into everyday school practices. During advisory period, all teachers are expected to begin with relationship-building circles with a common topic across classrooms. RJOY School Coordinators hold conflict circles with students, teachers, and administration as necessary, and use them as an alternative to punitive discipline whenever possible. In cases where punitive discipline is unavoidable due to district policy or state law (e.g. physical altercations), staff and teachers are committed to following punitive discipline with restorative practices, such as conflict resolution or healing circles. RJOY School Coordinators agreed that this intensive time commitment had been critical to garnering widespread teachers buy-in.

The constant presence of RJOY School Coordinators also builds student buy-in and helps prevent incidents from escalating.

At West Oakland Middle School, the RJOY School Coordinator begins each day by checking in with teachers and students to see what they need, and to identify issues they may be having at school or in class. The RJOY School Coordinator explained,

*I try to get the temperature of the school. School starts and I am floating in the hallway, in and out of classrooms, observing. I get in teachers and students ears. I’m visible during lunch, breaks, before and after school. I can get the heads-up on information during those times, whether it is fight after school, or something else.*

RJOY School Coordinators also work directly with youth, facilitating restorative justice circles and providing restorative justice trainings that help build trusting relationships so that youth have a safe space to talk about things that are going on in their life:

*At lunch time, I do youth trainings. In the afternoon there are conflict circles or relationship-building circles in my room or in the classroom... It is not a problem to recruit students. If anything, they want to come, because they don’t have a chance to talk about their stuff [and] they want to.*

RJOY School Coordinators help prevent behavioral issues from occurring by supporting students and staff in building trusting relationships with one another. When behavioral issues do occur, rather than resorting to punitive discipline, RJOY School Coordinators provide alternative methods for working through behavioral issues, and help with implementing alternative disciplinary approaches based in restorative justice.
Capacity Building for OUSD Schools and Teachers

RJOY’s train-the-trainer model builds the district’s capacity to conduct restorative justice trainings and integrate restorative justice into schools.

Key to integrating restorative justice across OUSD schools has been building the training capacity of the district so that more schools can receive trainings over shorter periods of time. While in the early stages there were one or two trainers from RJOY who conducted all trainings, RJOY has committed to a train-the-trainer approach to build the district’s capacity to conduct numerous restorative justice trainings. RJOY trainings are also highly experiential, which allows trainees to learn about restorative justice principles while practicing them simultaneously.

RJOY has also worked with OUSD to develop a three-tiered training approach that aligns with an intervention framework focused on building trustful relationships and repairing harm. RJOY recently collaborated with OUSD to conduct summer restorative justice trainings geared toward building the capacity of the district to implement restorative justice principles and practices across schools. These trainings helped to enhance the capacity of existing and prospective Restorative Justice School Based Facilitators. RJOY works closely with OUSD’s Restorative Justice District Coordinator to make sure their training models align, and RJOY is currently in the process of working with OUSD’s Restorative Justice District Coordinator on a restorative justice implementation guide for Restorative Justice School Based Facilitators.

Implementation Challenges

In addition to highlighting a number of factors that facilitate the successful integration of restorative justice principles and practices, RJOY staff, OUSD’s Restorative Justice District Coordinator, and a former principal from West Oakland Middle School also highlighted a number of factors that are barriers to the successful integration of restorative justice across OUSD schools.
Staff Turnover and Buy-In

Staff and administrative turnover makes it difficult to develop and maintain a restorative school culture.

RJOY and OUSD staff emphasized that changing and maintaining a school culture is challenging in the face of frequent staff and administrative turnover, especially since a culture characterized by restorative justice principles and practices is a departure from punitive cultures that were previously engrained in many OUSD schools. Almost all interview participants explained that it takes at least one or two years to see a cultural shift take place; when there are high levels of staff turnover, this can become an even longer process. Moreover, once a restorative culture has been established, it can be disturbed by the hiring of new staff and teachers who have not been a part of that restorative culture.

Buy-in from school staff and administration can be challenging to gain and maintain.

In the face of an entrenched culture of punitive school discipline, as well as frequent staff turnover, it can be challenging to gain and maintain buy-in from administrators, teachers, and other school staff who may only be familiar with punitive strategies for maintaining a calm environment. As the RJOY School Coordinator from Bunche High School noted, teachers are often hesitant or resistant to restorative justice efforts, “Tell[ing restorative justice staff], ‘You are not a teacher so you cannot understand what [we] are going through.’” RJOY staff emphasized that making a paradigm shift from punitive responses to youthful wrongdoing to restorative responses takes time, training, commitment, and practice.

Balancing Scaling Up and Standardization

A districtwide standardized approach to training may limit the ability to tailor trainings to the unique needs of each school.

While RJOY’s train-the-trainer approach has helped build OUSD’s capacity to deliver trainings and implement restorative justice principles and practices across schools in the district, one of the RJOY School Coordinators warned against the risk of standardizing all trainings into a one-size-fits-all approach. The RJOY School Coordinator explained,

Most folks that do training in district have never been a restorative justice coordinator inside of a school so the training is based on restorative justice theory and some of what they have been told by coordinators. I am coming from a place of theory and actuality. There is not a cookie cutter way I do a training and it depends on the culture of school. I dig into this before doing each training.
This highlights the importance of Restorative Justice School Based Facilitators who can study their school site—as well as the staff, administration, and youth that comprise it—in order to get a feel for the school culture as they begin to integrate restorative justice principles and practices and provide coaching throughout the school year.

**Alameda County’s Juvenile Justice System**

As mentioned above, although not funded by Measure Y, this evaluation explores RJOY’s work in the Alameda County Juvenile Justice System to provide the City of Oakland with information and context about RJOY’s work beyond OUSD, which may inform future work. The Project Director of RJOY’s COSA project, as well as a Unit Supervisor from Camp Sweeney and the Presiding Judge of Alameda County’s Juvenile Court discussed some of the factors that have facilitated the integration of restorative justice into the juvenile justice system and Camp Sweeney.

**Facilitators of Successful Implementation**

**Buy-in from Key Justice System Partners**

Support from key Alameda County juvenile justice system partners has enabled RJOY to conduct trainings with juvenile justice system officials and to implement direct services with youth at Camp Sweeney.

Key individuals in Alameda County’s juvenile justice system embraced RJOY’s work several years ago. The former Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court attended numerous RJOY presentations and trainings, served on the Restorative Justice Taskforce, and was very pleased with early results from RJOY’s work with youth. As a result, RJOY had the opportunity to conduct restorative justice trainings with supervisory probation officers, Juvenile Institutional Officers, and Unit Supervisors at Camp Sweeney. Supervisors at Camp Sweeney also expressed strong support for RJOY trainings, including hiring RJOY trainers for an internal staff retreat. One Camp Sweeney Unit Supervisor described that her experience with this internal training opened her eyes to the potential of restorative justice to build rapport and break down barriers among individuals and communities. This buy-in also facilitated RJOY’s access to Camp Sweeney, where they have implemented the COSA project.

**Program Adaptations to Better Fit Need**

*RJOY’s flexibility to adapt its programs to fit the needs of youth has led to successful peer-led restorative justice programs for justice-involved youth.*

“In the RJOY training] we shared a little about us and it brought down barriers between us. It created somewhat of a level playing field in the room. Everyone contributed, shared, and [was] at peace. A lot of time we try to judge and there are ways we just don’t understand each other. But RJ knocks those barriers down.”

– Camp Sweeney Supervisor
One of RJOY’s strengths appears to be the program’s willingness to revisit and revise its implementation based on real-time feedback. For example, RJOY’s pilot reentry COSA project was difficult to implement because youth did not consistently attend community-based COSAs. Based on feedback RJOY received from youth and their experiences during the initial pilot project RJOY learned that youth were more likely to participate in COSAs that were attended and co-facilitated by youth and their peers. Consequently, RJOY shifted their program model to hold peer COSAs, which are attended by RJOY volunteers, interns, and youth detained at Camp Sweeney.

In addition, RJOY’s COSA Project Director learned during the initial reentry COSA project that many of the youth at Camp Sweeney needed employment upon their release to the community. As a response, RJOY developed a youth internship program. RJOY’s Full Circle Internship provides youth an opportunity to work with RJOY and train to become RJOY youth leaders who help co-facilitate restorative justice circles at Camp Sweeney, among other administrative responsibilities. Youth from Camp Sweeney and from the community (e.g., Ralph J. Bunche High School and other impacted environments) can participate in the Full Circle Internship program. This has provided some youth an unexpected opportunity to establish an alternative path upon reentry to the community and adds value to the peer COSAs by including a peer co-facilitator that youth can relate to.

**Implementation Challenges**

Although a number of partners from Alameda County’s juvenile justice system have showed great interest in restorative programming, over time that support appears to have shifted to supporting a set of restorative justice programs rather than a comprehensive restorative justice approach. This has been demonstrated by a number of factors, including fewer restorative justice trainings as well as less high-level leadership at the trainings that have been held. RJOY staff and juvenile justice partners discussed some of the challenges with integrating restorative justice principles and practices into the juvenile justice system.

**Differing Perspectives on the Role of Restorative Justice in the Juvenile Justice System**

**Probation Department and Court staff appear to view restorative justice as a distinct set of programs or trainings, rather than a comprehensive shift in approach and practice. As a result, restorative justice remains only slightly integrated in juvenile justice settings.**

Although juvenile justice system partners worked with RJOY and others to develop a strategic plan for restorative justice across the County juvenile justice system in 2008, interviews with several juvenile justice partners indicated that currently, most juvenile justice partners view restorative justice as a program provided by RJOY, rather than as a comprehensive approach to juvenile justice practices. For example, the Camp Sweeney supervisor who participated in the evaluation was hesitant to recommend further integrating RJOY programming into Camp Sweeney, observing that youth respond differently to the various programs and disciplinary structures offered in the facility. Moreover, she noted that despite the value of RJ, there are a number of reasons why punitive discipline may be appropriate in some cases, including statutory requirements, the interests of victims, and others.
Moreover, the Camp Sweeney supervisor and the Presiding Judge of Alameda County’s Juvenile Court explained that there are a number of other important programs being implemented across the County’s juvenile justice system and that making more time for restorative justice would necessitate making less time for other interventions.

Similarly, while Camp Sweeney staff reported finding RJOY’s trainings to be beneficial, all agreed that a one-time or occasional training was sufficient. In contrast, RJOY views training and continuous coaching as a key element for ensuring that restorative justice principles and practices are integrated into an organization and/or system. Taken together, these findings suggest that RJOY and juvenile justice system partners may hold differing perspectives on the appropriate role and emphasis of restorative justice within the juvenile justice system.

Opportunities to Enhance Role in Violence Prevention

1. Determine the City’s goals and objectives around the role of restorative justice in citywide violence prevention. Based on this determination, HSD and RJOY should work together to tailor trainings and ongoing support to partners. Examining the implementation of restorative justice in Oakland schools and in the Alameda County juvenile justice system, it is clear that there is a distinction between implementing restorative justice as a program or set of practices and implementing restorative justice as a comprehensive philosophical approach, wherein a restorative philosophy drives how all staff within a system view justice and work with youth. While restorative justice programs are key to advancing a restorative approach, implementing restorative justice programming versus a comprehensive restorative justice approach will require different levels of investment from trainees, both among Oakland Unite grantees and among external partners. As HSD and other Oakland Unite stakeholders prepare to move into the implementation of Measure Z, they should consider which elements of restorative justice are appropriate for different partners based on buy-in and feasibility. This consideration will inform the types of restorative justice programming and trainings that HSD funds RJOY to provide.

2. Leverage RJOY’s expertise in restorative justice approaches to build relationships with partners across the City’s violence prevention service delivery system. Given the historical context and current climate between communities of color and police in America, restorative justice practices, such as healing circles, offer a potentially effective approach to build better relationships between OPD and other different violence prevention stakeholders, particularly Oakland Unite providers, African American youth, and Oakland’s African American community more generally. As RJOY’s community-based work launches, RJOY staff highlighted the potential for restorative justice circles to help repair the troubled relationship between youth and Oakland police officers. Describing a circle with youth and police at Bunche High School that was held after the Mike Brown shooting, the RJOY School Coordinator noted that the circle
helped youth and officers have a meaningful conversation and begin to build mutual respect for each other, with an aim of supporting youth and reducing the possibility of violence. Supporting similar circles between OPD and young people served by Oakland Unite programs could have a similar effect.
## Appendix A: Oakland Unite Strategies and Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Juvenile Justice Center and OUSD Wraparound Services | East Bay Asian Youth Center  
Motivating, Inspiring, Supporting and Serving Sexually Exploited Youth (MISSSEY)  
The Mentoring Center  
OUSD Alternative Education  
Youth ALIVE!  
Youth UpRising |
| Oakland Street Outreach                        | California Youth Outreach  
Health Oakland  
CalPEP |
| Crisis Response and Support Network            | Catholic Charities of the East Bay:  
Youth ALIVE! Khadafy Washington Project (Homicide response) |
| Highland Hospital Intervention                 | Youth ALIVE! Caught in the Crossfire (Shooting response) |
| Restorative Justice                            | Restorative Justice for Oakland Youth |
| Gang Prevention                                | OUSD Alternative Education |
| Our Kids/Our Families Middle School            | Alameda County Health Care Services Agency |
| Family Violence Intervention Unit              | Family Violence Law Center |
| Outreach to Sexually Exploited Minors          | Motivating, Inspiring, Supporting and Serving Sexually Exploited Youth (MISSSEY)  
Bay Area Women Against Rape (BAWAR)  
Alameda County Health Care Services Agency |
| Mental Health Services for Ages 0-5            | Safe Passages  
The Link to Children |
| Reentry Employment                             | Civicorps  
Men of Valor Academy  
Volunteers of America Bay Area  
Youth Employment Partnership  
Youth UpRising |
| Youth Employment                               | The Unity Council  
Youth Employment Partnership  
Youth Radio  
Youth UpRising |
| Project Choice                                 | The Mentoring Center  
Volunteers of America Bay Area |
## Appendix B: Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRSN</th>
<th>FVIU</th>
<th>PIP</th>
<th>RJOY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CitySpan Service Delivery Data</td>
<td>• CitySpan Service Delivery Data</td>
<td>• OPD Crime Incident Data</td>
<td>• Interview with RJOY Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interview with CCEB Program Manager</td>
<td>• Interview with FVLC Director</td>
<td>• Interview with PIP Program Coordinator</td>
<td>• Interview with RJOY School Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group Interview with CCEB Clinical Case Managers</td>
<td>• Group Interview with FVLC Managing Advocate, Legal Staff Manager, and Mental Health Team Manager</td>
<td>• Interview with West Oakland Site Coordinator</td>
<td>• Interview with COSTA/Camp Sweeney Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interview with Youth Alive! Program Managers</td>
<td>• Focus Group with FVLC Crisis Intervention Specialists, Legal Staff, and Mental Health Team</td>
<td>• Focus Group with Youth Squad</td>
<td>• Interviews with School Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interviews with Highland Hospital Community Injury Prevention Coordinator</td>
<td>• Interview with OPD</td>
<td>• Interviews with Case Managers</td>
<td>• Interview with RJOY OUSD District Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus Group with CeaseFire Case Managers</td>
<td>• Interview with OPD</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview with Camp Sweeney Unit Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interview with Violence Prevention Network Coordinator</td>
<td>• Interview with Family Justice Center Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview with Juvenile Court Presiding Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observation of Homicide Response Meeting</td>
<td>• Interview with District Attorney’s Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Number of Crime Incidents in All Years by PIP Location

Table 1. Crime Incidents 2012 Carter Gilmore Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>% Change Pre-During</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Region</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Region</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Crime Incidents 2012 Willie Wilkins Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>% Change Pre-During</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Region</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Region</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Crime Incidents 2013 Carter Gilmore Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>% Change Pre-During</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Region</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Region</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>+3.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Crime Incidents 2013 Willie Wilkins Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>% Change Pre-During</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Region</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Region</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>+34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Crime Incidents 2014 Carter Gilmore Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>% Change Pre-During</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Region</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Region</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Crime Incidents 2014 Willie Wilkins Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>% Change Pre-During</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Region</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Region</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>