Report 6: Technical Violation Rates and Rearrest Rates on Federal Probation after Release from an RRC

What Works in Residential Reentry Centers

Jennifer Lerch MA

Faye S Taxman PhD

Amy Mericle PhD

Advancing Correctional Excellence!
George Mason University
Criminology, Law & Society
10519 Braddock Road, Ste. 1900, Fairfax, VA 22032
Phone: 703-993-9699; Fax: 703-993-8316
http://gemini.gmu.edu/ebct/

December, 2010

This study was funded by a cooperative agreement #07EPI16GJT3 from the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons, and the National Institute of Corrections.

Overview

The "What Works in Community-Based Residential Reentry Centers" study was designed to examine the technical violation rates and release rates of offenders that participated in the RRC, and differences between different RRCs. This is important because it can assist us in better understanding how RRCs help offenders transition from prison to the community. Unfortunately, we do not have data that sheds light on the activities of individuals while housed in the RRC, such as the programming received or the type of discharge. Available data can only tell whether an individual at some point spent time in an RRC. We examine data from the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) and Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to examine the patterns of technical violations and rearrest rates for offenders. The aims of this monograph are to (1) examine if time in an RRC decreases the likelihood of technical violation or new arrest; (2) examine factors that can decrease the likelihood of these events; and (3) recommend important next steps in improving the study outcomes from federal probation supervision as well as better use of the RRCs. The following study illustrates that the rates of rearrest and technical violations for this RRC cohort is similar to the general trends from the Administrative Office of the Courts, about 20 percent for technical violations and 13 percent for new arrests (Administrative Office of the Courts, 2010). It does not appear that participating in an RRC makes a difference in the outcomes of offenders under supervision.

Methods

Data Sources

We compiled two administrative data sets for this study. One is the system maintained by the BOP that contains information on incarceration sentence, length of time in prison, entrance and exit from RRCs, program completion from prison, and nature of instant offense. The other administrative data set is the Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Cases Tracking System (PACTS) maintained by the AOC. This companion system contains data on length of supervision time, nature of supervision conditions, results from risk assessment scores, education status at time of probation sentence, employment status, and nature of discharge.

Sampling

The study consisted of two release cohorts from BOP: 2004 and 2007. We matched the data from the BOP file with PACTS to develop a complete data set. From this data, we constructed two study cohorts for analysis: individuals who participated in an RRC (n=30,108) and those who did not (n=9,019). It should be noted that offenders involved in the nine RRCs in the BOP study do not differ from other RRCs under contract with the BOP in terms of characteristics of offenders, results from RRC, rearrest rates, or technical violation rates. For this reason, the nine study RRCs were included in the RRC category of this analysis.

Dependent Variable Measurement

Our dependent variables consist of new arrests during supervision and technical revocations during probation supervision. Technical revocation measures whether a person violated probation (e.g., for failing to attend programming or a drug test), whereas new arrest is a person charged with a new criminal offense during the period of supervision. Both of these variables are dichotomous, yes (1) or no (0).

Independent Variables Measurement

Sentencing and Prison Variables

BOP data includes the nature of instant offense, in-prison drug treatment completion, and time in an RRC. Instant conviction offenses refer to the nature of the offending behavior. A number of dichotomous variables were constructed to indicate this, such as: 1) drug offense or not; and 2) property offense or not. A dichotomous variable was constructed to indicate whether the person completed an in-prison drug treatment program (RDAP). The amount of time in an RRC was measured as a continuous variable (0 to 6,618 days).

Probation Variables

Four variables from the PACT data set (employment status during probation, Risk Prediction Index (RPI) score, state where individual was released from BOP, and length of time on probation) were used in the models to predict technical revocation and new arrest. Employment status was measured as a dichotomous variable indicating a person's employment status during probation (Y/N). The RPI score is an actuarial measure of the individual's risk of recidivating with a score ranging from 0 to 9. The region of the country where the person was released from BOP custody is a categorical variable: Midwest, Northeast, Southeast, and West. Finally, the length of time on probation is included in the analysis (0 to 71 months).

Demographic Variables

We included demographic variables of race, educational attainment, and age at probation commencement in our models. Race is measured as either white or minority. Education represents whether an individual completed their high school education or GED or not. Age at time of probation commenced is a continuous variable (18 to 65 years old).

Results

Cohort Characteristics

Table 6.1 below presents the characteristics of both cohorts; those who attended an RRC and those who did not. Due to the large sample size, a 10 percent random sample was taken to test for statistical differences between cohorts. Independent sample t-tests were used to test the continuous variables, while chi-square tests were conducted on the categorical variables. Overall, these groups are both approximately 37 years of age at the beginning of probation ($t(1340)=-.92$, p>.05) and 64 percent have completed their high school or GED education ($X^2(1,N=3533) = 1.66$, $p=.20$). A similar percentage of individuals in both cohorts were being returned to the four regions, mid-west (RRC=20.2 and no RRC= 16.4; $X^2(1,N=3596) = 2.24$, $p=.13$), northeast (RRC=14.1 and no RRC=15.1; $x^2(1,N=3596) =.16$, $p=.69$), southeast (RRC=46.9 and no RRC=47.9; $x^2(1,N=3596) =.23$, $p=.63$), and west (RRC=18.8 and no RRC=20.7; $x^2(1,N=3596) =2.92$, $p=.09$). Approximately 13 percent of both cohorts were revoked on new arrest charges ($x^2(1,N=2709) =.39$, $p=.53$). Those who went to an RRC attended for an average of 141 days, although the days varied (see Table 6.3).

Table 6.1 – Cohort Characteristics for the Full Sample

	Attended RRC (N=30,108)	No RRC (N=9,019)	Total (N= 39,127)
Demographic IVs			
% Minority	57.2 (SD=.49)	50.3 (SD=.50)	55.6 (SD=.50)
% Completed High School or GED	64.4 (SD=.48)	63.4 (SD=.48)	64.2 (SD=.48)
Mean Age at probation start	37.21 (SD=9.75)	36.67 (SD=10.96)	37.09 (SD=10.04)
Sentencing and Prison IVs			
% Convicted of Drug Offense	53.7 (SD=.50)	29.9 (SD=.46)	48.2 (SD=.50)
% Convicted of Property Offense	4.7 (SD=.21)	6 (SD=.24)	5 (SD=.22)
% Completed In-Prison Drug Treatment	33.1 (SD=.47)	2.8 (SD=.17)	26.1 (SD=.44)
Mean Time in RRC (Days)	141.22 (SD=134.66)	-	141.22 (SD=134.66)
Probation IVs			
% Employed during probation	34.8 (SD=.47)	14.2 (SD=.35)	30 (SD=.46)
% Mid-West	20.2 (SD=.40)	16.4 (SD=.37)	19.5 (SD=.40)
% Northeast	14.1 (SD=.35)	15.1 (SD=.36)	14.3 (SD=.35)
% Southeast	46.9 (SD=.50)	47.9 (SD=.50)	47.1 (SD=.50)
% West	18.8 (SD=.39)	20.7 (SD=.41)	19.1 (SD=.39)
Mean Risk score	4.00 (SD=2.33)	4.25 (SD=2.55)	4.06 (SD=2.39)
Mean Time on Probation (Months)	28.43 (SD=.50)	24.25 (SD=13.58)	27.36 (SD=14.83)
Dependent Variables			
% New Arrest Revocation	13.2 (SD=.34)	13.5 (SD=.34)	13.3 (SD=.34)
% Technical Revocation	22.5 (SD=.42)	26.3 (SD=.44)	23.5 (SD=.42)

Based on the chi-square and independent t-test of the 10 percent random sample of the dataset, these two cohorts differ on their amount of time incarcerated and on probation, risk scores, racial makeup, employment, drug and property offenses, completion of in-prison drug treatment, and revocations on a technical offense. Of the cohort who attended an RRC, 57.2 percent are minorities ($X^2(1,N=3908) = 12.31$, $p=.000$), and spent an average 46.85 months incarcerated ($t(1644)=-15.57$, $p<.001$) and 28 months on probation ($t(1340)=-7.77$, $p<.001$). In comparison, those who did not attend an RRC are 50.3 percent minority, and served an average of 25.57 months incarcerated and 24.25 months on supervision. Furthermore, 22.5 percent of the RRC

cohort were revoked on technical violations ($X^2(1, N=2709) = 14.00, p=.000$), while 26.3 percent of those who did not attend an RRC received technical violations. The RRC cohort had slightly lower average risk scores (4.00 versus 4.25; $t(1350)=4.08$, p<.001)), were more likely to be employed (34.8% versus 14.2%; $X^2(1,N=3908) = 134.44, p=.000$), complete in-prison drug treatment (33.1% versus 2.8%; $X^2(1,N=3908) = 342.14$ $p=.000$), have an instant drug offense (53.7% versus 29.9%; $X^2(1,N=3908) = 154.67, p=.000$) as compared to the cohort who did not attend an RRC. The RRC cohort was less likely to have an instant property offense (4.7% versus 6%; $X^2(1,N=3908) =6.20, p=.01$) than those who did not go to an RRC. The sample is similar to the larger BOP population[1].

As shown in Table 6.2, those who went to an RRC tended to be lower risk than those who did not attend an RRC ($X^2(3, N=3885) = 35.93, p=.000$). Approximately 72 percent of those who attended an RRC scored a 5 or below on the risk assessment. Examining the nine study RRCs, this group still demonstrates a lower risk level as compared to those who did not go to an RRC ($X^2(3, N=11,071) = 20.26, p=.000$). Of those who attend an RRC, 42.3 percent spent between 171 and 250 days in the RRC (Table 6.3). Nearly one-third of the offenders spent 10 to 90 days in an RRC (32.4%). Few offenders spent fewer than 10 days (.1%) or over 250 days in an RRC (3.6%).

Table 6.2 – Risk Score Distributions among those who attended and did not attend an RRC

Risk Score	Attended RRC (N=29,909)	No RRC (N=8,918)
<4	46.4% (13,865)	41.9% (3,736)
4-5	26.1% (7,801)	24.6% (2,197)
6-7	18.6% (5,578)	20.0% (1,785)
8+	8.9% (2,665)	13.5% (1,200)

Table 6.3 – Distributions of days attended

Days in RRC	Attended RRC (N=30,108)
<10	.1% (44)
10-90	32.4% (9,751)
91-170	21.5% (6,483)
171-250	42.3% (12,735)
>250	3.6% (1,090)

[1] Both of our cohorts appear to be fairly representative of individuals under BOP custody overall. According to June 2010 BOP general statistics, the incarcerated population is made up of 57.9% Caucasians, 38.5% African-Americans, and 10.1% other races. Additionally, the BOP population consists of 33% Hispanics (http://www.bop.gov/news/quick.jsp). Statistics from 2003 reflect a similar distribution of races (http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/pdf/t654.pdf). The cohorts in this analysis appear to underrepresent (17%) the Hispanic population as compared to these BOP statistics. Additionally, our cohorts are slightly older than the average BOP population (38 years old). In comparison to the instant offenses of the BOP population, our cohorts are mostly representative (http://www.bop.gov/news/quick.jsp). However, in two offense categories – immigration (study cohorts=2.8% and BOP =11.6%) and extortion, fraud, bribery (study cohorts=11.8% and BOP=5.1%) – there were slight differences. This comparison is based on using 2010 BOP statistics which may be different than the offender characteristics during 2004 or 2007 when the study cohorts were obtained.

Bivariate Predictors of Technical Violations and New Arrests

Analysis of the bivariate relationships for both technical violations and new arrests revealed several significant predictors. Due to the size of the sample, jackknife samples were once again used to test significance levels (Table 6.4). These associations indicate that individuals younger at the initiation of probation (t(1282.04) = 8.59, p<.001), of minority status (X^2(1, N=1,246) =8.55, p=.003), not having completed their high school degree or GED (X^2(1, N=872) =40.33, p=.000), not committing a drug (X^2(1, N=1,472) =11.14, p=.001) or property instant offense (X^2(1, N=2,538) =7.91, p=.005), and who are unemployed during probation (X^2(1, N=1,535) =20.81, p=.000) are more likely to be technically revoked. Additionally, those with higher risk scores (t(2,660) = -15.36, p<.001) and less time spent on probation (t(1,374.40) = 21.57, p<.001) are more likely to be technically revoked.

Similar associations are found when examining the new arrests. Those who are younger at probation commencement ((t(483.26) = 8.55, p<.001)), minority status (X2(1, N=1,246) =39.55, p=.000), without a high school diploma or GED (X2(1, N=872) =13.21, p=.000), unemployed during probation (X2(1, N=1,535) =16.64, p=.000), and less time on probation ((t(486.49) = 9.07, p<.001)) were more likely to get a new arrest. Also, having a higher risk score increased the likelihood of a new arrest ((t(2,660) = -10.58, p<.001)). As expected those in the 2004 cohort had more revocations. This was controlled for in the models by including length of time under supervision.

Table 6.4: Bivariate Predictors of Technical Violations and New Arrests

	Technical Revocation Mean (SD)	**New Arrest Revocation** Mean (SD)
Demographics IVs		
Age	38.63 (9.02)***	37.78 (8.89)***
Race		
White	.20 (.40)**	.10 (.30)***
Minority	.26 (.44)	.16 (.37)
Completion of Highschool or GED		
Yes	.19 (.40)***	.11 (.31)***
No	.30 (.46)	.17 (.37)
Sentencing and Prison Ivs		
Completion of In-Prison Drug Treatment		
Yes	.21 (.41)	.13 (.34)
No	.24 (.43)	.13 (.34)
Drug Offense		
Yes	.22 (.41)**	.12 (.33)
No	.25 (.43)	.14 (.35)
Property Offense		
Yes	.15 (.35)**	.09 (.29)
No	.24 (.43)	.14 (.34)
Length of time in RRC	17.76 (11.56)	21.50 (13.18)
Probation Ivs		
Employment		
Yes	.18 (.39)***	.10 (.30)***
No	.27 (.45)	.16 (.36)
Returning Region		
Mid-West	.21 (.40)	.12 (.32)
Northeast	.16 (.37)	.11 (.31)
Southeast	.20 (.40)	.14 (.34)
Wesr	.26 (.44)	.10 (.30)
Risk Score	5.36 (2.29)***	5.48 (2.22)***
Length of Time on Probation	17.76 (11.56)***	21.5 (13.18)***

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Multivariate Predictors of Technical Violations

Of our sample, 23.5 percent were technically violated from probation, similar to the AOC report of 20.3 technical violations (Administrative Office of the Court, 2010). A logistic regression equation identifying the characteristics of those that were technically violated is shown in Table 6.5. In this model, having a higher risk score (OR=1.24, CI 1.22, 1.26), being a minority (OR=1.20, CI 1.11, 1.30), and not completing high school (OR=.83, CI .77, .90) increase the likelihood of being technically violated. Length of time in the RRC has no impact on technical violation rates. Additionally, being from the West increases the likelihood of a technical violation, while having an instant property offense decreases the likelihood of a technical violation (OR=.63, CI .51, .77). Less time on supervision decreases the likelihood of a technical violation (OR=.93, CI .93, .94). In using the instant offense as a predictor, many attempts were

made at adding and removing different types of offenses. Property offense, even though significant, does appear to be unstable.

Table 6.5 – Logistic Regression with Technical Violations as the Dependent Variables[2]

Independent Variable	B	S.E.	O.R. (CI)
Instant Drug Offense	.04	.04	1.04 (.95, 1.13)
Instant Property Offense	-.47	.10	.63 (.51, .77)
Completed in-prison drug treatment	.04	.05	1.05 (.94, 1.16)
Risk Score	.22	.01	1.24 (1.22, 1.26)
Employed during probation	.02	.04	1.02 (.94, 1.01)
Region Returning			
Mid-West	-.39	.06	.68 (.61, .76)
Northeast	-.39	07	.67 (.59, .77)
Southeast	-.36	.05	.70 (.63, .77)
Time on Probation	-.07	.00	.93 (.93, .94)
Minority Race	.18	.04	1.20 (1.11, 1.30)
Completed High School or GED	-.19	.04	83 (.77, .90)
Age at start of probation	-.02	.00	.98 (.98, .99)
Time in RRC	.00	.00	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)

Multivariate Predictors of New Arrest

Our sample had 13.3 percent new arrests while under supervision. This rate is nearly identical to the AOC report of 13.2 percent new arrests for individuals on supervised release (Administrative Office of the Courts, 2010). The results of this model are similar to that of technical violations. Being a minority (OR=1.40, CI 1.27, 1.54) and having a higher risk score (OR=1.24, CI 1.22, 1.27) increases the likelihood of rearrest on probation. Having completed a high school degree or GED decreases the likelihood of rearrest (OR=.88, CI .80, .96). Employment during probation appears to play a more significant role in reducing rearrest than it does for technical violations (OR=.86, CI .78, .94).

[2] This model has a Cox & Snell R^2 of .179 and the Nagelkerke R^2 is .283. The Log likelihood is 17,490.87.

Table 6.6 – Logistic Regression with New Arrest as the Dependent Variable

Independent Variables	B	S.E.	O.R. (CI)
Instant Drug Offense	.00	.05	1.00 (.91, 1.11)
Instant Property Offense	-.13	.12	.88 (.70, 1.10)
Completed in-prison drug treatment	.16	.06	1.17 (1.05, 1.31)
Risk Score	.22	.01	1.24 (1.22, 1.27)
Employed during probation	-.15	.05	86 (.78, .94)
Region Returning			
Mid-West	.20	.07	1.22 (1.05, 1.41)
Northeast	.33	.08	1.39 (1.18, 1.63)
Southeast	.41	.06	1.51 (1.33, 1.71)
Time on Probation	-.03	.00	.97 (.97, .98)
Minority Race	.34	.05	1.40 (1.27, 1.54)
Completed High School or GED	-.13	.05	.88 (.80, .96)
Age at start of probation	-.03	.00	.97 (.97, .98)
Time in RRC	.00	.00	1.00 (1.00,1.00)

Conclusions

The data used in this analysis, BOP and PACTS, provides individual level information both before and after the RRC experience. The lack of data on the experience in RRCs, particularly whether the person met the conditions or not, limits this analysis significantly. Previous research demonstrates that simply having a treatment program does not guarantee positive outcomes (Latessa, Lowenkamp, & Bechtel, 2009); and other studies have found that halfway houses or community correctional centers have limited impact due to the tendency to serve low risk offenders, to have limited or poor quality programs, or to not monitor the offenders (see Latessa, et al., 2009).

Limited program availability is a key issue in RRCs. Although most RRCs claim to offer many programs, they're often referred out or, as mentioned earlier, of very poor quality. For instance, less than 50 percent of the nine sites we studied offer programs on behavioral topics such as criminal friends, and sex offender counseling; reentry service topics such as transitional housing/halfway back, and day reporting; and other topics such as art therapy, recreational therapy, mentoring, and yoga/exercise (See Monograph 5). If we look specifically at those services offered in-house, we can add to the list of services not often offered behavioral topics such as domestic violence, family services/counseling, and parenting skills; reentry service topics such as educational, access to support and entitlement services, vocational, and work release; other topics such as AA/NA, mental health, spirituality, and physical care; and all health topics (e.g., Physical Health Services/Medical Care, Hepatitis C Screening, TB Screening, HIV/AIDS Counseling/Services, HIV/AIDS Testing).

Given the limitations of this analysis, the findings of this paper indicate that participation in an RRC does not have a more positive influence on offender outcomes. Both models presented in this paper failed to find that increasing the length of time in an RRC affects positive outcomes. To a large extent, it was unrelated to rearrest or technical violations. However, we did find other factors that appear to decrease the likelihood of these events occurring. An individual who has a high school degree or GED is less likely to be technically revoked or receive a new arrest. Of the

nine sites we observed, only four used obtaining a GED as a way to measure program completion (See Monograph 1, 3, & 5). Eight sites claimed to offer educational programs however only four offered them on-site (See Monograph 5). When asked who was responsible for educational programs, four of the nine directors claimed that responsibility was theirs, while no more than 50 percent of staff ever made such a claim (See Monograph 1 & 4). Additionally, those who have spent less time on probation and were convicted of a property offense are less likely to be technically revoked, while those employed during probation supervision have a decreased likelihood of receiving a new arrest. Of the nine sites we observed six used the ability to hold a job during their time in an RRC as a way to measure program completion (See Monograph 1, 3, & 5). All nine sites offer employment programs and job placement/vocational counseling. Seven of these sites offer these services in-house (See Monograph 5). Other factors such as an individual being a minority and having a higher risk score increase the likelihood of technical violations or a new arrest. Residing in a Western state increases the likelihood of a technical violation.

Based on these findings, there are improvements that can be made to increase the success of offenders. There should be a closer examination of the fidelity of services provided in these facilities; as shown in the other reports in this series, few of the RRCs provide services directly to the offenders. In Monographs 3 and 5, we display the results of a survey question asking directors how many residents were provided certain services/assistance at the time they are in the RRC. The response was none or less than half of the residents were provided a pre-arranged appointment with community-based services programs, personal contact prior to discharge with community-based service programs, the name and contact information of a 12-step sponsor/community sponsor, or a referral to a vocational or educational program in the community. However, about half, more than half, or all residents are provided personal contact prior to release with an employer, vocational, or educational program. They are also provided a referral to a substance abuse treatment program in the community and personal contact prior to discharge with a parole or probation agent. While the data presented here does not allow us to draw conclusions as to program factors that could be influencing the outcomes, the findings are very similar those of Latessa, Lowenkamp, and Bechtel (2009). These authors actually found that the offenders from the treatment facilities were doing worse than those who had not received services. They concluded that the facilities needed to address their assessment of risk and matching of needs, along with improving their flow of information and services across the system (Latessa, Lowenkamp, & Bechtel, 2009).

We surveyed the directors in nine RRCs and asked how placement into services groups is typically decided. Approximately 78 percent said placement is made based on risk level, and 100 percent said placement is based on needs. When asked who made decisions about administering assessment instruments, seven of the directors said it was their responsibility while no more than 44.4 percent of staff said it was theirs (See Monograph 1 & 4). However when asked what specific standardized assessment tools were used, some directors were unaware and most assessment tools weren't used. Out of fifteen standardized assessment tools we listed, only one was used by more than 50 percent of sites, and that was the Level of Service Inventory (LSI-R, LSI-R:SV, LS/CMI), which was used by six sites. All sites had some form of standardized criminality risk/needs instruments, but only 66.7 percent had substance abuse assessment tools, 44.4 percent had assessment tools pertaining to antisocial attitudes/cognitive distortions, only

one site had mental health assessment tools, and one site had assessment tools for sex offenders (See Monograph 1, 3, & 5).

The models found that in-prison drug treatment programs did not positively affect outcomes. This is surprising given prior research has shown that in-prison treatment with aftercare improves outcomes (Mitchell, et al 2006). Given that this study did not have a similar finding we can only surmise that the RRCs did not include any aftercare for the offenders to continue their involvement in treatment during this period of release.

The study does reveal, similar to other studies of residential reentry centers, that using the RRCs for lower risk groups should be re-examined. Latessa, Lowenkamp, and Bechtel (2009) found that placing lower risk individuals in community correctional centers may account for the poor outcomes; in this study we found nearly 75 percent of the offenders to be low or moderate risk that participated in an RRC. Perhaps better gains could be paid by focusing on higher risk offenders in the RRC, and ensuring that the RRC provides more services (see monograph 5 on services provided). Given that the statistical models found that high risk offenders are more likely to have poor supervision outcomes, regardless of time in RRC or participation in in-prison drug treatment, it seems worthwhile to explore what the research literature has found to improve outcomes such as focusing intensive services on high risk offenders, using cognitive behavioral therapies, ensuring that participants in drug treatment in prison have continued care after release, and using the time in the RRC as a period to ensure that offenders address their criminogenic needs. This is the area that should strengthen outcomes based on the existing research and knowledge about the effectiveness of community correctional centers that serve to transition offenders from prison to supervision.

References

Administrative Office of the Courts (2010). Table E-7A: Federal Probation System—Post-Conviction Supervision Cases Closed With and Without Revocation, by Type, During the 12-Month Period Ending March 31, 2010. Unpublished table.

Andrews, D.A. & Bonta, J. (2010). Rehabilitating Criminal Justice Policy and Practice. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law,* 16(1), 39-55.

Latessa, E.J., Lowenkamp, C.T., & Bechtel, K. (2009). Community Corrections Centers, Parolees, and Recidivism: An Investigation into the Characteristics of Effective Reentry Programs in Pennsylvania. Retrieved from http://www.uc.edu/ccjr/Reports/ProjectReports/PA_ReentryFinal_report.pdf

Lowenkampf, C.T. & Latessa, E.J. (2006). Evaluation Of Ohio's CCA Funded Programs: Executive Summary. Retrieved from http://www.uc.edu/ccjr/Reports/ProjectReports/CCA_Executive_Summary.pdf

Mitchell, O., Wilson, D. B., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2007). Does incarceration-based drug treatment reduce recidivism? A meta-analytic synthesis of the research. Journal of Experimental Criminology, 3, 353–375.

The "What Works in Community-Based Residential Reentry Centers (RRCs)" study was designed to examine technical violation and release rates of offenders that participated in select RRCs. Since data on the activities of individuals while at the RRC, such as the programming received was not consistently available in electronic format, the study relied upon data from the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) and Administrative Office of the Courts (AO) to examine patterns, technical violations and rearrest rates for offenders.

The results of this project are reported in seven different monographs:

1. What is the impact of "performance-contracting" for offender supervision services?
2. Measuring Performance – The Capacity of Residential Reentry Centers (RRCs) to Collect, Manage, and Analyze Client-Level Data
3. What organizational factors are related to improved outcomes?
4. How do staff hiring, retention, management and attitudes affect organizational climate and performance in RRCs?
5. What services are provided by RRCs?
6. Technical Violation Rates and Rearrest Rates on Federal Probation after Release from a RRC Site Visits
7. Overview of Site Observations

The project team gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the nine volunteer sites and their staff, as well as the following members of the Advisory Committee for this project:

Advisory Committee Chair
Terry Marshall
Past President, ICCA and
President ATTIC Correctional Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 7370
Madison, WI 53707-7370
Phone: (608) 223-0017
Fax: (608) 223-0019
E-mail: tmarshall@correctionalservices.org

Nancy Beatty Gregoire
Program Administration Division Chief
Office of Probation and Pretrial Services
Administrative Office of the United States Courts
Washington, D.C.
E-Mail: Nancy_Beatty@ao.uscourts.gov

Jane Browning
Project Director and Executive Director
International Community Corrections Association
8701 Georgia Avenue
Suite 402
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Phone: (301) 585-6090
Fax: (301) 585-6094
E-mail: jbrowning@iccaweb.org

Dan Catley
Former ICCA Board Member and
Manager, Correctional Services
VA Dept. of Criminal Justice Services, Retired
Richmond, VA

Elizabeth Curtin
ICCA Board Member and
Dept. Director, Adult Correctional Services
Community Resources for Justice
107 Park Drive
Boston, MA 02215
Phone: (617) 867-0300
Fax: (617) 867-0301
E-mail: lcurtin@crjustice.org

Larry Fehr, Deceased
Senior Vice President, Community Corrections
Pioneer Human Services
7440 W. Marginal Way S.
Seattle, WA 98108
Phone: (206) 766-7023
Fax: (206) 768-9757
E-mail: LarryF@p-h-s.com

Dee Halley
Project Program Officer
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534
Phone: (202) 514-0374
E-Mail: DHalley@bop.gov

Christopher A. Innes, Ph.D. (Chris)
Chief Research and Evaluation
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street, N.W. 5007
Washington, D.C. 20534
Phone: (202) 514-0098
Fax: (202) 305-2185
Email: cinnes@bop.gov

George Keiser
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534
Email: GKeiser@bop.gov

Philip R. Magaletta, Ph.D. (Phil)
Clinical Training Coordinator
Federal Bureau of Prisons
320 First Street, N.W.
Wahsingotn, D.C. 20534
Phone: (202) 514-4495
Fax: (202) 616-3220
Email: pmagaletta@bop.gov

Jane O'Shaughnessy
Immediate Past President, ICCA and Board Chair
Cornerstone
9110 E. Nichols Avenue Ste. 160
Englewood, CO 80112
Phone: (720) 895-1000 x.121
Fax: (720) 895-8000
E-mail: jos@cornerstoneprograms.com

David Robinson, Ph.D.
ICCA Board Member and Principal
Orbis Partners, Inc.
111 Colonnade Rd. N., Suite 207
Ottawa, ON K2E 7M3 Canada
Phone: (613) 236-0773
Fax: (613) 236-3433
E-mail: drobinson@orbispartners.com

Denise Robinson
ICCA Past President and
President/CEO
Alvis House, Inc.
P.O. Box 6868
Columbus, OH 43205
Phone: (614) 252-8402
Fax: (614) 252-5326
E-mail: drobinson@alvishouse.org

Jerry Vroegh
Former Administrator
Community Corrections and Detention Services
Federal Bureau of Prisons, Retired
Washington, DC

This study was funded by a cooperative agreement #07EPI16GJT3 from the U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons, and the National Institute of Corrections. The researchers gratefully acknowledge the collaborative contributions by federal staff from the Administrative Office of the Courts Federal Pretrial and Probation Services, the International Community Corrections Association and the Administration of Justice Department of George Mason University. Contributing Authors and Researchers include: Jennifer Lerch MA, Faye Taxman PhD, Amy Mericle PhD and Jane Browning.

Information about the Project: Both PB and CB contractors participated in the study. Four sites were performance-based (PB) and five sites were compliance-based (CB). The preliminary study findings point to a few variations between performance-based contract sites and compliance-based sites. The experiences of 9 RRC sites and nearly 40,000 individual case histories were examined with the goal of providing details concerning the following:

- Does performance contracting stimulate contractors to develop evidence-based practices, provide better treatment services or become more efficient?
- What types of offenders are released into communities—to the streets, to residential centers, through home confinement or a mix of all of these?
- What happens to individuals who are transitioned through halfway houses or residential reentry centers?
- Does RRC monitoring, case management or treatment reduce the risk of future criminal conduct?
- How should other nonresidential transitional services and monitoring such as home confinement be used?
- What types of services motivate former inmates to live crime free?
- Are Residential Reentry Centers (RRC) geared to provide services that reduce risk of future crimes?
- How do RRCs know if they are successful in attaining their goals?
- What motivates and inspires some contractors to achieve results that improve outcomes?

For further information about the project contact Faye Taxman (ftaxman@gmu.edu), George Mason University at 703-993-8555 or Jane Browning, International Community Corrections Association at 301-585-6090.