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Prior Research Has Indicated....

....that correctional services and interventions can be effective in reducing recidivism for offenders, however, not all programs are equally effective

- The most effective programs are based on some principles of effective interventions
  - Risk (Who)
  - Need (What)
  - Treatment (How)
  - Program Integrity (How Well)
Risk Principle

• Target those offender with higher probability of recidivism

• Provide more intense services to higher-risk offenders

• Targeting lower risk offenders can lead to increases in recidivism rates
The Risk Principle & Correctional Intervention Results from Meta Analysis

Change in Recidivism Rates

High Risk: 19
Low Risk: -4

Dowden & Andrews, 1999
Recent Study of Intensive Rehabilitation Supervision in Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Non-Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECENT STUDY OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS IN OHIO

- Largest study of community based correctional treatment facilities ever done

- Total of 13,221 offenders – 37 Halfway Houses and 15 Community Based Correctional Facilities (CBCFs) were included in the study.

- Two-year follow-up conducted on all offenders

- Recidivism measures included new arrests & incarceration in a state penal institution

- We also examined program characteristics
Determination of Risk

• Each offender was given a risk score based on 14 items that predicted outcome.

• This allowed us to compare low risk offenders who were placed in a program to low risk offenders that were not, high risk to high risk, and so forth.
Increased Recidivism Reduced Recidivism

Treatment Effects for Low Risk Offenders
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Reduction in recidivism for different programs.
Treatment Effects For High Risk Offenders
Need Principle

• Target crime producing needs and risk factors
## Major Risk and/or Need Factor and Promising Intermediate Targets for Reduced Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Dynamic Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of Antisocial Behavior</td>
<td>Early &amp; continued involvement in a number antisocial acts</td>
<td>Build noncriminal alternative behaviors in risky situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial personality</td>
<td>Adventurous, pleasure seeking, weak self control, restlessly aggressive</td>
<td>Build problem-solving, self-management, anger mgt &amp; coping skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial cognition</td>
<td>Attitudes, values, beliefs &amp; rationalizations supportive of crime, cognitive emotional states of anger, resentment, &amp; defiance</td>
<td>Reduce antisocial cognition, recognize risky thinking &amp; feelings, build up alternative less risky thinking &amp; feelings Adopt a reform and/or anticriminal identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial associates</td>
<td>Close association with criminals &amp; relative isolation from prosocial people</td>
<td>Reduce association w/ criminals, enhance association w/ prosocial people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Major Risk and/or Need Factor and Promising Intermediate Targets for Reduced Recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Dynamic Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and/or marital</td>
<td>Two key elements are nurturance and/or caring</td>
<td>Reduce conflict, build positive relationships, communication, enhance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>better monitoring and/or supervision</td>
<td>monitoring &amp; supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and/or work</td>
<td>Low levels of performance &amp; satisfaction</td>
<td>Enhance performance, rewards, &amp; satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and/or recreation</td>
<td>Low levels of involvement &amp; satisfaction in anti-criminal leisure activities</td>
<td>Enhancement involvement &amp; satisfaction in prosocial activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Abuse of alcohol and/or drugs</td>
<td>Reduce SA, reduce the personal &amp; interpersonal supports for SA behavior, enhance alternatives to SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need Principle

By assessing and targeting criminogenic needs for change, agencies can reduce the probability of recidivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminogenic</th>
<th>Non-Criminogenic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Anti social attitudes</td>
<td>• Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anti social friends</td>
<td>• Low self esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Substance abuse</td>
<td>• Creative abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of empathy</td>
<td>• Medical needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impulsive behavior</td>
<td>• Physical conditioning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Targeting Criminogenic Need: Results from Meta-Analyses

Reentry and the Need Principle

• Conventional wisdom suggests that primary challenges are structural focusing on issues such as jobs, housing, and other resources needed by offenders.

• Empirical Evidence suggests otherwise
Results from some recent studies:

– Virginia study of PV’s found securing a job was not a major problem for parolees, and unemployment was not a major factor in failure (O’Reilly, et al, 2001).

– Urban Institute studies:

– Results from Baltimore found none of the offenders in the sample spent the night on the street following release; most stayed with family (Visher, et al, 2004)

– Results from Cleveland found only 10% reported difficulty finding housing (Visher & Courtney, 2007).

– Study in NY found 6.3% of MI prisoners and 3.6% of non MI prisoners reported being homeless after release (Metraux and Culhane, 2004).
Other Findings

• The Baltimore study found recidivism rates the same for employed and unemployed offenders.

• Hawaii study found willingness to accept responsibility for changing one’s behavior and measures of conventional lifestyle were among strongest predictors of parole outcomes (Kassenbaum, 1999, Kassenbaum and Davidson-Corondo, 2001).
Recent study of parole violators in Pennsylvania found a number of criminogenic factors related to failure*

*Conducted by Pennsylvania Dept. of Corrections
Pennsylvania Parole Study
Social Network and Living Arrangements
Violators Were:

• More likely to hang around with individuals with criminal backgrounds
• Less likely to live with a spouse
• Less likely to be in a stable supportive relationship
• Less likely to identify someone in their life who served in a mentoring capacity
Pennsylvania Parole Study
Employment & Financial Situation
Violators were:

- Slightly more likely to report having difficulty getting a job
- Less likely to have job stability
- Less likely to be satisfied with employment
- Less likely to take low end jobs and work up
- More likely to have negative attitudes toward employment & unrealistic job expectations
- Less likely to have a bank account
- More likely to report that they were “barely making it” (yet success group reported over double median debt)
Pennsylvania Parole Study
Alcohol or Drug Use
Violators were:

• More likely to report use of alcohol or drugs while on parole (but no difference in prior assessment of dependency problem)

• Poor management of stress was a primary contributing factor to relapse
Pennsylvania Parole Study
Life on Parole
Violators were:

- Had unrealistic expectations about what life would be like outside of prison
- Had poor problem solving or coping skills
  - Did not anticipate long term consequences of behavior
- Failed to utilize resources to help them
  - Acted impulsively to immediate situations
  - Felt they were not in control
- More likely to maintain anti-social attitudes
  - Viewed violations as an acceptable option to situation
  - Maintained general lack of empathy
  - Shifted blame or denied responsibility
Pennsylvania Parole Violator Study:

• Successes and failures did not differ in difficulty in finding a place to live after release

• Successes & failures equally likely to report eventually obtaining a job
Some Lessons from PA

• Programs that deliver a one-size-fits-all collection of services (e.g. job preparation) may miss important variations in need

• Corrections agencies should examine the reentry context within their own jurisdictions before planning costly new reentry initiatives that attempt to address problems that may not exist

• Attention to core criminogenic needs are critical to the reentry process
Most researchers who study correctional interventions have concluded:

• Without some form of human intervention or services there is unlikely to be much effect on recidivism from surveillance or supervision alone.

• The evidence also indicates that while treatment is more effective in reducing recidivism than punishment – Not all treatment programs are equally effective.
The Treatment Principle: Provide Behavioral Treatment

- Focus on current risk/need factors
- Action oriented
Behavioral vs. NonBehavioral – Results from Meta Analysis

Some Examples from Research on Community Corrections
Evaluation of Thinking for a Change
Lowenkamp and Latessa (2006)

- Tippecanoe County Indiana
- Probation +T4C vs. Probation
- 136 Treatment cases
- 97 Comparison cases
- Variable follow up (range 6 to 64 months; average 26)
- Outcome—arrest for new criminal behavior
Multivariate Model

- Controlled for
  - Risk (prior arrests, prior prison, prior community supervision violations, history of drug use, history of alcohol problems, highest grade completed, employment status at arrest)
  - Age
  - Sex
  - Race
  - Time at risk or length of follow up time
Adjusted Recidivism Rates Comparing T4C Participants to Comparison Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Membership</th>
<th>Adjusted Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation + T4C Successful Participants Only (90)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation + T4C (121) All Participants</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation (96)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent Study of Non-Residential Community Correctional Programs in Ohio involving over 13,000 Offenders

• Included both misdemeanants and felons under community supervision

• Programs included day reporting centers, work release, ISP, and electronic monitoring programs
FOUR FACTORS WERE SIGNIFICANTLY RELATED TO OUTCOME

• Proportion of higher risk offenders in program (at least 75% of offenders in programs were moderate or high risk)

• Level of supervision for higher risk offenders (high risk offenders averaged longer periods of supervision than low risk)

• More treatment for higher risk offenders (at least 50% more time spent in treatment)

• More referrals for services for higher risk offenders (at least 3 referrals for every 1 received by low risk)
Changes in Recidivism by Program Factors for Probation Programs

Reductions in Recidivism

- High Risk Sample: 0.05
- High Risk Longer Supervision: 0.04
- High Risk More Txt: 0.07
- High Risk More Referrals: 0.11

Increased Recidivism

- High Risk Sample: -0.02
- High Risk Longer Supervision: 0
- High Risk More Txt: 0.01
- High Risk More Referrals: 0.03
Change in Recidivism by 4 Point Factor Score for Probation Programs

![Graph showing change in recidivism by factor score.]

- Reduced Recidivism
- Increased Recidivism

Factors:
- 0 Factors
- 1 or 2 Factors
- 3 Factors

Values:
- 0.15
- 0.03
- -0.13
Recently we looked at Program Characteristics and Program Philosophy
Program Measures

1. Risk principle supervision—longer supervision for higher risk
2. Risk principle treatment—more TX referrals for higher risk
3. Higher-risk sample—75% of offender higher risk
4. Treatment referrals—75% of referrals targeted criminogenic needs
5. At least 5 services available targeting criminogenic needs
6. Separate groups by risk
7. 20 hours or more of treatment per week
8. Program ranged 3 to 9 months
9. Provided quality aftercare
10. Had a manual
11. Adhered to manual
12. Staff hired for skills and values
13. Pre/post testing of offenders
14. Exclusionary criteria in place
15. Exclusionary criteria followed
Program Measures

1. Created Risk-Need adherence scale which was percentage of 15 factors present in program. Scored as 1 or 0.

2. Also asked program staff to identify program philosophy.

3. Assigned philosophy based on dominant response—human service or deterrence
Average Effect Size Overall & By Program Philosophy

- **All (n = 58)**: 0.01
- **Human Service (n=42)**: 0.06
- **Deterrence (n=16)**: -0.11

**Reductions in Recidivism**

**Increased Recidivism**
Average Score on RN Scale

- All (n = 58): 26
- Human Service (n=42): 25
- Deterrence (n=16): 26
Average Effect Size By Program Philosophy and RN Scale
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Reduced Recidivism

Increased Recidivism

All (n = 58)  Human Service (n=42)  Deterrence (n=16)
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Conclusions

1. Philosophy of community supervision program was important: those that self-identified as Human Service oriented were more effective than those with Deterrence orientation.

2. Deterrence oriented programs had increased failure rates.

3. Adhering to the Principles of Risk, Need, Treatment increased effectiveness. Even Deterrence oriented program had better results if principles were met.
Community Based versus Institutional Programs: Results from Meta-Analyses of Programs Based on Principles of Effective Treatment

Adherence to Risk, Need Treatment by Setting: Community Based versus Residential Programs