

**RESEARCH FINDINGS ON  
ADULT CORRECTIONS' PROGRAMS:  
*A REVIEW***

Polly Phipps  
Kim Korinek  
Steve Aos  
Roxanne Lieb

January 1999







**RESEARCH FINDINGS ON  
ADULT CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS:  
*A REVIEW***

Polly Phipps  
Kim Korinek  
Steve Aos  
Roxanne Lieb

January 1999

**Washington State Institute for Public Policy**

110 East Fifth Avenue, Suite 214  
PO Box 40999  
Olympia, WA 98504-0999

Phone: (360) 586-2677  
Fax: (360) 586-2793  
URL: <http://www.wa.gov/wsipp>

Document Number: 99-01-1203



# WASHINGTON STATE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

---

## ***Mission***

The Washington Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs the Institute, hires the director, and guides the development of all activities.

The Institute's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State. The Institute conducts research activities using its own policy analysts, academic specialists from universities, and consultants. New activities grow out of requests from the Washington legislature and executive branch agencies, often directed through legislation. Institute staff work closely with legislators, as well as legislative, executive, and state agency staff to define and conduct research on appropriate state public policy topics.

Current assignments include projects in welfare reform, criminal justice, education, youth violence, and social services.

## ***Board of Directors***

Senator Karen Fraser  
Senator Jeanine Long  
Senator Valoria Loveland  
Senator James West  
Representative Ida Ballasiotes  
Representative Jeff Gombosky  
Representative Helen Sommers  
Representative Steve Van Luven

Lyle Quasim, Department of Social and Health Services  
Dick Thompson, Office of Financial Management  
David Dauwalder, Central Washington University  
Jane Jervis, The Evergreen State College  
Marsha Landolt, University of Washington  
Thomas L. "Les" Purce, Washington State University  
Ken Conte, House Office of Program Research  
Stan Pynch, Senate Committee Services

## ***Staff***

Roxanne Lieb, Director  
Steve Aos, Associate Director





# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

	Page
SECTION I: INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY .....	1
SECTION II: FORMAT OF PROGRAM REVIEWS .....	5
SECTION III: WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST .....	7
SECTION IV: SUBSTANCE ABUSE .....	11
In-Prison Therapeutic Community Programs .....	12
Other In-Prison Substance Abuse Treatment Programs .....	32
Community-Based Treatment Programs.....	39
SECTION V: EDUCATION PROGRAMS .....	53
Adult Basic Education.....	53
In-Prison Vocational Education.....	66
SECTION VI: EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS .....	81
Correctional Industries.....	81
Work Release Programs.....	87
Job Counseling and Job Search Programs for Inmates Leaving Prison .....	90
Short-Term Financial Assistance for Inmates Leaving Prison.....	100
Subsidized Jobs for Inmates Leaving Prison .....	104
SECTION VII: SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT .....	107
Prison-Based Programs.....	107
Community-Based Programs.....	120
SECTION VIII: COGNITIVE BEHAVIORAL TREATMENT .....	129
Moral Reconciliation Therapy .....	129
Reasoning and Rehabilitation .....	141
Anger Management .....	150
Cognitive Self-Change.....	157
SECTION IX: LIFE SKILLS .....	161
SECTION X: INTENSIVE SUPERVISION .....	165
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	191







## SECTION I: INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

---

What is known about the effectiveness of adult correctional programs in reducing recidivism?

This report summarizes findings on this question, including programs focused on both the institutional and community settings. Literature published in the United States and Canada is reviewed.

A subsequent report to the Department will address the comparative costs and benefits of major types of interventions, taking into account the state's expenditures on its criminal justice system.

The material is divided into seven topics:<sup>1</sup>

- Substance abuse treatment,
- Education,
- Employment,
- Sex offender treatment,
- Cognitive behavioral treatment,
- Life skills training, and
- Intensive supervision.

---

<sup>1</sup> We have not covered research on the intersection of policing and corrections, courts and corrections, the effect of deterrence and incapacitation in sentencing policies, and boot camps. Although we attempted to find evaluations for other areas of correctional programming such as family attachment (family ties during imprisonment, relationship enhancement, mother/infant programs, parental education) and community transition (furloughs, prerelease programs, day reporting centers), few evaluations have been conducted on these topics. The studies we found relied on very weak designs, thus, they are not summarized.

## ***Three General Findings***

### **1. Does Anything Work? *Yes, but the results are often modest.***

We found some programs have achieved success in lowering the chance that adult offenders will commit new crimes. Other approaches have failed to reduce these odds. Because most programs have not been evaluated rigorously, a substantial amount of uncertainty persists about many interventions.

Even programs with the most favorable outcomes demonstrate success rates that many would consider modest. We found the most successful interventions for adult offenders lower the chance of re-offending by 10 to 15 percent. An example can help put this number in perspective. In Washington State, about 50 percent of all adult offenders leaving prison are subsequently re-convicted for another felony offense after eight years from release.<sup>2</sup> A 10 to 15 percent reduction from a 50 percent starting point would result in a 43 to 45 percent recidivism rate, a significant reduction but not a cure.

Thus the answer to the simple question “Does Anything Work?” is yes—some programs have been shown to lower the odds of criminal offending, but the success rates of even the best programs are relatively modest.

### **2. Are Successful Interventions Also Cost-Effective? *Some are, some are not.***

The follow-up to the “does anything work” question is an economic one: Are the programs that have been shown to lower the rate of criminal behavior also cost-effective? That is, do they save more money than they cost? The Institute will present a separate report to the Department of Corrections describing our conclusions on this subject.

One way to think about this question is this: how successful does a program need to be in order to break even? A simple back-of-the-envelope example can illustrate this point. The present-value cost to taxpayers for the typical adult offender leaving prison who is re-convicted for an average felony is about \$30,000. If a program costs \$1,000 per participant, then that program needs one success out of every 30 offenders in the program. We know from our recidivism research, however, that without the program about half of these 30 offenders will be felony recidivists after leaving prison. This means that the program needs a success rate of just one out of fifteen recidivist offenders. In percentage terms the program needs just a 6.7 percent success rate (1/15) to break-even with taxpayers. If the program achieves a recidivism reduction greater than a 6.7 percent, then the taxpayer gets a positive return. So, because the cost of failure is high in adult corrections, a program can be economically attractive if it can achieve quite small reductions in recidivism. As we found in this review of the literature, a number of programs have been shown to achieve reductions in recidivism above this level, others have not.

---

<sup>2</sup> The 50 percent felony recidivism rate is based on a recidivism analysis the Institute conducted for the Department of Corrections.

Thus the quick answer to the question “Are Successful Interventions Also Cost-Effective?” is that some are and others are not. Like any investment strategy, the goal is to pick winners and avoid losers. Again, a subsequent report to the Department will describe the precise economic analysis we have undertaken on the economics of adult corrections programs.

### **3. *Most Criminal Justice Programs Have Not Been—But Should Be—Evaluated.***

In Washington, as in the rest of the United States, most programs designed to reduce crime have not been rigorously evaluated. Some interventions may be working and we don't know it, while others may not be effective yet absorb scarce tax dollars that could better be directed toward effective programs.

We found that in the broad arena of adult corrections, many questions related to effective programs cannot be answered. Carefully constructed evaluations can help the state assess which programs are valuable investments and which are not. We believe a place to start is to evaluate existing programs, using strong research designs that allow for more definitive findings.<sup>3</sup> We agree with Prendergast and colleagues (1995) that the key policy question is not "what works," but what works most cost-effectively for which types of offenders, under which conditions, and in which settings. We believe the state is in a good position to make headway on this knowledge gap, given the diversity of its programs and offenders.

---

<sup>3</sup> Research designs of a level 4 or 5 (see page 7).





## SECTION II: FORMAT OF PROGRAM REVIEWS

---

**Identification of relevant programs.** We defined adult offender programs to include in-prison programs and community programs linked to criminal justice system supervision. Our identification process started with programs reviewed by the University of Maryland for the Washington State Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) (MacKenzie et al., 1998).<sup>4</sup> We then used the library and Internet to search for additional program evaluations, including websites associated with criminal justice, drug abuse, and other applicable topics. When reading program evaluations, we collected references and used them to identify and locate other programs. We also contacted programs described as promising by the National Institute of Justice or other sources.

To assess program effectiveness, certain ingredients in an evaluation were essential. These included:

- A comparison group that received no (or sometimes minimal) treatment, and
- Measurement of criminal recidivism for both the treatment and comparison groups.

Evaluations that assessed only offenders who received the treatment, or measured program success with outcomes such as drug use, employment, or social-psychological functioning scales, were not included.

**How to use the individual program reviews.** We rely on a standard format to report each program. We first identify the program by name, the major type of treatment, location, and the dates it operated.

Second, we summarize the evaluation results, including the percent of offenders in the treatment and comparison groups who reoffend, if the differences in proportions are statistically significant,<sup>5</sup> and the *effect size statistic* for the program if differences are significant.

Some readers may be unfamiliar with this statistical measurement; it has only recently come into favor as a means to compare program effectiveness. An effect size is a common yardstick to summarize the degree of change in participants. Since they are based on standard calculations, this measurement makes it easier to compare the strengths of one program with others (Cohen, 1988). Most criminal justice programs have been found to have relatively small effect sizes. It should be noted that programs with small effect sizes may still have attractive cost-benefit ratios, a point we will develop in the cost-benefit section.

---

<sup>4</sup> We excluded some programs because they were not specifically for offenders, had been withdrawn from publication due to errors, or did not contain the necessary recidivism statistics. We also excluded programs that did not have a scientifically sound comparison group, e.g., evaluations that compared program completers with drop outs. In the case of programs with multiple evaluations of the same population, we used the latest evaluation.

<sup>5</sup> If an evaluation did not report findings on statistical significance, we calculated a chi-square statistic for the reported recidivism rates and sample sizes.

Third, we provide a **WSIPP evaluation checklist** to assist readers in "evaluating the evaluation." The checklist has several items:

- Evaluation rating,
- Sample size,
- Random assignment to treatment,
- Control/comparison group,
- Means of program entry,
- Statistical controls,
- Recidivism measure,
- Length of follow-up, and
- Program effectiveness.

Each item is discussed in Section III. Readers are advised to take account of the full checklist, rather than a selected set, as the confidence that can be placed in the results is influenced by a combination of factors. Additional program descriptions and bibliographic references complete the reviews.

## SECTION III: WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST

---

### A. Evaluation rating

We use the Maryland Scale of Scientific Methods (Sherman et al., 1997), a five-point scale for rating the overall quality of research designs and their implementation. Within each program area, we use the following ratings:

- **5** indicates an evaluation with well-implemented random assignment to a treatment group and a control group that does not receive the treatment/program. The most confidence can be placed in level "5" studies.
- **4** requires an analysis of comparable treatment and comparison groups, controlling with rigorous statistical methods for factors other than participation that may influence outcomes. A level 4 study may also have a random assignment design that had problems in implementation.
- **3** involves a comparison between two or more groups, one that receives and one that does not receive the treatment/program.
- **2** involves a comparison between two or more groups, one receiving and one not receiving the treatment/program, however, one group lacks comparability to the other.
- **1** involves a study where no comparison group is utilized. Instead, the relationship between a program and an outcome, i.e., recidivism, is analyzed.

We do not include or summarize programs we rated as a "1" on this scale, because they do not include a comparison group and thus there is no context to judge program effectiveness. Evaluations with a rating of 2 are also problematic. We include them in our reviews because they offer additional information, however, caution needs to be exercised in relying on their results.

Our ratings are usually consistent with the McKenzie report for the Washington State JLARC (1998). However, we independently reviewed each study, and occasionally we came to different conclusions and rated a particular evaluation higher or lower.

In addition to program ratings, other items in the checklist provide necessary supporting information as to quality. Even though a program may have a strong rating of 4 or 5, it may have other weaknesses in the design that should be considered in assessing the results, e.g., a small sample size or short follow-up time. This is also true of evaluations with a rating of 3, which are quite variable overall in quality.

The rating pertains only to detection of program effects on recidivism. A study may provide very useful information for other purposes. For example, it may be informative on how to design programs effectively, or it may provide useful policy-level information even if the study has a low rating for recidivism outcomes. Not all of the studies we reviewed have recidivism as the objective of the program evaluation. We are using them for that purpose in this report.

**B. Sample size**

While a large sample size cannot compensate for major research design flaws, it is a basic and critical element of a good evaluation. In general, a larger number of observations increases our confidence that the sample is representative of the population or that the treatment and control groups are equivalent. A larger sample size increases the precision of the outcome statistics, i.e., recidivism, and increases the statistical power of the evaluation results (Cohen, 1988).

**C. Random assignment to treatment**

Random assignment of individuals to a group that receives treatment and a similar group that does not receive treatment offers the strongest potential for scientific evidence. This design assures the comparability of the two groups, thus, one can be more confident that the treatment explains differences in outcome behavior. However, few evaluations of this type are conducted in correctional research, as random assignment is often politically untenable. It also imposes administrative burdens to ensure the random features are maintained. Some people object to random assignment on ethical grounds, arguing that it is wrong to withhold treatment when it is warranted.

**D. Type of control/comparison group**

Most correctional program evaluations use a control or comparison group design. The term "control group," in this report, is reserved for experimental studies utilizing random assignment, while "comparison group" is utilized for all other studies. Comparison groups are not created equal, and one must determine whether a designated comparison group increases or decreases confidence in the evaluation. A number of factors are important. The most desirable condition is for a comparison group that is identical to the treatment group, but does not receive the intervention. In weaker designs, the comparison group may be selected from a different time period, e.g., the comparison group was incarcerated a year earlier than those in the treatment program. This is a potential problem as factors outside the program, such as prosecution and sentencing practices, may differ over time.

The weakest design compares a group of offenders who started and did not complete treatment with those who successfully finished. Here, those who are the least motivated or amenable to treatment success are compared with the most motivated or amenable. The effect size in these designs cannot be relied on to estimate the program's overall benefit.

**E. Means of program entry**

The method of program entry is an important element in assessing a study. For example, judges, parole boards, or correctional staff may be the "gatekeepers," determining who goes into treatment. Thus, the treatment group may include offenders who are judged to be motivated and more likely to succeed, or those most in need of the intervention. In other cases, the entry process may be voluntary (or as voluntary as it can be in an institution), thus the treatment group may be more motivated. If there is some process determining who gets into treatment, the comparison group is influenced as well, since it will consist of residual offenders who did not get into or volunteer for treatment.

In these situations, one worries about potential bias that can make either the treatment or comparison group predisposed to certain outcomes, and thus the results are less reliable.

#### **F. Statistical controls**

In lieu of random assignment, evaluations can be strengthened by statistical techniques to equalize the treatment and comparison groups. Factors that may be addressed with these techniques include: treatment motivation, demographic factors (age, sex, race/ethnicity), criminal history, and duration of problem behavior.

#### **G. Recidivism measure(s)**

Since criminal justice outcomes are the focus of this review, official criminal recidivism is used as the measure of effectiveness. Numerous measures of recidivism are used in the evaluations, including self-reported arrest, official arrests, official convictions, reincarceration (including both convictions and parole revocation), technical violations, and parole revocation. These outcomes are not identical, and readers should pay attention to the measure when comparing programs.

For example, a program showing a reduction in felony convictions is a stronger result than one reporting a reduction in parole revocations or reincarceration. Revocation and reincarceration can be based on a new offense or technical violations of parole conditions, and often the data do not allow one to distinguish these causes. Several studies report no relationship between technical violations and arrests for new crimes, making revocation and reincarceration difficult outcome measures to assess (Clear and Braga, 1995, Petersilia and Turner, 1990).

Whenever possible, we use felony convictions as the measure of recidivism. A conviction represents state action that occurred with due process protections, rather than a decision by a government representative (e.g., an arrest).

Measuring recidivism in binary terms (yes/no) is a relatively straightforward but simplistic means to measure effectiveness. It is useful to also know if a program increases the time until a reoffense occurs, if it lowers the average number of re-offenses that recidivists commit, or if it reduces the severity of the re-offenses. While a few programs provide these types of data, most do not—simple reoffense or lack of it, is the most consistently reported measure available for most programs. The next generation of evaluation research is likely to expand this definition and, in doing so, allow more sensitive measures of effectiveness.

#### **H. Duration of follow-up**

The duration of follow-up is an important factor in assessing a program evaluation. An evaluation that takes account of an offender's behavior during the time in treatment must be given less weight than one that follows an offender for several years after treatment and release. A minimum of 36 months from release is the desired time to capture recidivism events and criminal justice processing time for adult offenders in Washington (Barnoski, 1997). Also, the best evaluations follow offenders for the same length of time, or statistically control for differences in the length of time an offender is at risk in the community. If one offender has been released for six months and another for nine months, clearly the latter had more time to reoffend.

## I. Program effectiveness

Four categories are used for this item: evidence of effect, some evidence of effect, no effect, and cannot be determined. Our definitions for these categories, and their relative frequency, can be summarized as follows:

- A few programs show a clear **evidence of effect**. These few have a research design that is comprehensive enough to make this judgment.
- More programs fall in the category of **some evidence of effect**, as they demonstrate reductions in recidivism, but due to the weakness of the research design, outcomes cannot be attributed solely to treatment.
- There are programs with **no evidence of effect**, that is, when the data are fairly straightforward, the design is sound, and no reductions in recidivism are found.
- Finally, there are programs where the effect **cannot be determined**—these evaluations had significant design weaknesses.

Most of the effects of programs are positive, that is, the treatment group shows lower recidivism than the comparison group. However, a few show a negative program effect: the treatment group demonstrated greater recidivism rates than the comparison group.

## SECTION IV: SUBSTANCE ABUSE

---

Substance abuse treatment can be divided into a number of categories, including short and long-term residential, and outpatient drug-free and methadone programs. Outpatient drug free programs are the most common mode of treatment, while outpatient methadone programs are few in number and serve only a small proportion of clients (SAMSHA, 1998). A one-day census of treatment facilities conducted in October, 1996 indicates that approximately 10 percent of clients were in residential programs compared to 90 percent in outpatient programs (SAMSHA, 1997).

*Residential programs* include two types: short- and long-term. Short-term residential treatment ranges from 14 to 28 days. These programs are highly structured and intensive, involving an in-depth psychiatric and psychosocial assessment, followed by individual counseling and group education. Long-term residential programs include therapeutic communities and other similar programs, with a length of stay of up to fifteen months. These programs emphasize a complete lifestyle change, including abstinence and elimination of anti-social behavior. They emphasize a self-help approach and support from other addicts, involve confrontational group therapy, and rely heavily on peer counselors who are program graduates (Hubbard et al., 1989).

*Outpatient drug-free treatment* is quite diverse and can range from drop-in centers to structured programs. In general, facilities provide a variety of services, with counseling as the backbone, and other secondary services, such as education, vocation, legal, physical and mental health provided. Intensive programs provide clients with two or more hours of treatment a day for three or more days a week.

*Outpatient methadone maintenance* is a treatment option for severe heroin dependency, where a legally prescribed drug that reduces heroin craving is dispensed to stabilize an individual (Gerstein and Harwood, 1990). Because the treatment involves substituting an illegal for a legal narcotic, this treatment is controversial. Clients may remain on methadone indefinitely. National evaluations of community clinics indicate that criminal justice referrals to methadone maintenance programs are rare (Simpson and Friend, 1988; Gerstein and Harwood, 1990; Hubbard et al., 1989; SAMHSA, 1998).

Nationally, substance abuse treatment for offenders involves both residential and outpatient drug-free modes and is located in both prison and community settings. The correctional treatment programs for substance-abusing offenders generally fit into three categories:

- In-prison therapeutic communities,<sup>6</sup>
- Other in-prison programs—similar to outpatient drug-free treatment,
- Community-based programs—both residential and outpatient drug-free.

Unfortunately, the evaluations are not evenly balanced among these three categories. In-prison therapeutic communities have been evaluated across the country, although they represent only a modest proportion of all treatment programs for offenders. Perhaps because these programs are comparatively expensive, they are more likely to be evaluated. Few evaluations have been

---

<sup>6</sup> In Washington State, short-term residential treatment is more commonly available in-prison, compared to therapeutic communities.

conducted on other types of in-prison programs, although they serve the largest proportion of inmates.

Evaluations of community-based programs for offenders are also scarce. Few focus specifically on the effectiveness of drug-treatment, but instead evaluate case management programs that refer offenders to community treatment, such as Treatment Alternatives for Street Crimes (TASC). National evaluations of community-treatment providers should be relevant to this review, however, they rarely provide a separate evaluation of clients who are referred by or involved with the criminal justice system at the time of treatment. Researchers often cite the findings of the national studies for mixed offender and non-offender populations and generalize to offender-only populations. Generalizing in this manner carries risks. Community programs typically include a mixture of clients without any criminal justice system involvement, those with such a history, and those with current involvement. For the purposes of this review, we are interested in clients with criminal justice system involvement during their treatment.

While we think some substance abuse treatment programs have promise in terms of recidivism reduction, we did not locate a model program or method. Overall, the evaluations confirm the difficulty of treating individuals with criminal involvement. In-prison therapeutic communities are successful in reducing recidivism in the short-run, but it is unclear if their effects can be sustained over time. The results from community programs indicate that while participants with criminal history may remain in treatment as long or longer than other participants, they often have poorer outcomes, including lower levels of treatment success and higher rates of official criminal recidivism (Simpson and Friend, 1988; Hser et al., 1998; Hubbard et al. 1989; SAMSHA, 1998).

The next sections will discuss the major types of treatment programs and their evaluation results in more detail.

### ***In-Prison Therapeutic Community Programs***

#### **Overview**

These intensive residential programs for offenders last approximately nine to 12 months, and some include post-treatment aftercare. They involve a strong group orientation, including confrontation, peer counseling, including the use of ex-offenders as program counselors, and a general focus on changing criminal thinking and behavior patterns. According to Anglin (1991), therapeutic communities originated from the experiences of opiate users seeking a community strategy to achieve abstinence. The philosophy is that the whole person must be treated, as drug use and criminal activity are symptoms of a wider behavioral disorder involving dysfunctional thinking and living (Lockwood et al., 1997).

Overall, the results on therapeutic communities are promising, but mixed. Many programs appear to reduce criminal recidivism, particularly among offenders with serious substance abuse problems and extensive criminal histories. A close look at the reviews, however, indicates *great variability* in evaluation quality and suggests that while some of the publicized success is deserved, questions remain regarding the overall effectiveness of this treatment regime.



**What is yet unknown.** At present, we recommend caution in interpreting evaluation findings on therapeutic community programs. First, the conclusions from the evaluations vary, along with the quality of their research designs. Results from evaluations with the strongest designs show effect statistics in the -.2 to -.3 range.

Second, therapeutic community programs are costly—our research indicates that the programs range from \$13 to \$33 per day per offender<sup>7</sup>—and few cost-benefit analyses have been undertaken. (Such an analysis for Washington will be available in a subsequent report.)

Third, the treatment techniques employed in therapeutic communities were derived from encounter groups and confrontational therapy, and these interventions have demonstrated few positive results related to recidivism reduction and some negative findings (increased recidivism with certain populations). According to a review by the Correctional Service of Canada (1996), confrontation in general, and in relation to substance abuse treatment in particular, does not appear to be an effective intervention. Interestingly, the Department of Corrections in the State of Massachusetts currently is evaluating a six-month in-prison treatment program that does not rely on confrontational interactions. Early results from the evaluation by ABT Associates should be available in 1999.

Finally, therapeutic community programs appear to have achieved the greatest success with older offenders with extensive substance abuse and criminal history. Whether this type of intensive treatment will be as successful for offenders with more modest histories is not clear. It is possible that therapeutic communities are appropriate for some types of offenders, but not necessary or desirable for others. Research findings from other correctional programs warn that mixing offenders with extensive criminal history with groups of less criminal offenders, even if the individuals' substance abuse problems are similar, may be detrimental to the less criminal group.

**Programs with evidence of an effect.** The two evaluations demonstrating the most compelling evidence of effectiveness are the Bureau of Prison's (BOP) program in numerous institutions across the United States (Pelissier et al., 1998), and the Key-Crest program in the Delaware correctional system (Inciardi et al., 1997). The BOP program shows an effect size of -.36 for arrests during a six-month follow-up, using carefully controlled evaluation procedures. The evaluation is ongoing, thus we will learn about outcomes at later follow-up periods. The Crest program in Delaware also shows evidence of an effect, -.22 for arrests in an 18-month follow-up. This effect was found in a program that lasted half as long as a typical therapeutic community and occurred in a work-release setting where temptations were more pronounced. The evaluators are now conducting a 42-month follow-up. Final figures are not available, but the preliminary results indicate that the program effect may not be sustained over time (Martin, 1998).

**Programs with some evidence of effect.** A second group of therapeutic community programs shows some evidence of an effect, including Amity in California (Wexler et al., 1995; 1997), the IPTC in Texas, and Stay'n Out in New York (Wexler et al., 1992). Amity, with an effect size of -.42 for arrests and -.49 for reincarceration, and the IPTC, with an effect size of -.11 for arrests, involve evaluation designs that have some weakness and thus factors unrelated to treatment that may be partly responsible for the effect. Stay'n Out shows lesser recidivism when looking at simple arrest percentages and has an effect size of -.30 for arrests. However, more

---

<sup>7</sup> In 1998 dollars.

sophisticated multivariate analyses conducted by the researchers indicate *no* significant program effects.

**Programs where effectiveness cannot be determined.** A third set of programs have such weak evaluation designs that we cannot determine treatment effectiveness. They include: Forever Free in California (Prendergast et al., 1996), Cornerstone in Oregon (Field, 1985; 1989), and the Dallas County Judicial Treatment Center in Texas (Hiller et al., 1996; Knight et al., 1997). These programs show a direction toward reduced recidivism, but the design precludes knowing whether the treatment is responsible for the effect.

**Programs with no effect.** A fourth group of programs shows no evidence of an effect: Turning Point and Powder River in Oregon (Oregon Department of Corrections, 1996), and Dwight Gateway Substance Abuse Program in Illinois (Gransky and Jones, 1995). Turning Point and Powder River programs show some success in the first two years, but at the third year after release, there are no significant differences in recidivism between treatment and comparison groups. Dwight Gateway has a nearly identical rate of return to prison for the treatment and comparison group two years after release.

<b>Program Name:</b>	Federal Bureau of Prisons' (BOP) Drug Abuse Treatment Program, "TRIAD"
<b>Program Type:</b>	Therapeutic community
<b>Program Location/Dates:</b>	Nationwide, 20 sites/late 1980s to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation assessed residential treatment programs at 20 federal correctional institutions. Treated inmates released as of the end of 1995 were compared to offenders with histories of drug use who would have met the criteria for program admission.
- Findings indicated statistically significant differences in arrests six months after discharge for program participants, controlling for self-selection into program with statistical tests. Specifically, 3 percent of offenders who received treatment were arrested during the six-month follow-up, compared to 12 percent of offenders not receiving treatment, a significant difference with an effect size of  $-.36$ .
- Overall, the evaluation demonstrated sound methodological practice and suggested that reduced recidivism among treated offenders was attributable to a treatment effect.
- The follow-up period was limited to six-months. The authors indicated updates are forthcoming, up to three years after release.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	4
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 1,866 (899 treatment, 967 comparison)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No, but statistical correction for self-selection into treatment
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteer
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Yes, selection correction tests
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest, revocation</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Six months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Voluntary program for inmates who entered residential treatment 24 to 36 months before release. There were incentives for treatment, which originally were nominal, but as of 1995 involved earning up to a one-year reduction from the statutory release date.
- There were two types of treatment programs—a nine- and 12-month program (most offenders participated in the nine-month program).
- Each residential unit had approximately 100 inmates. Treatment was conducted daily for two, two-hour sessions. The other half of the day was spent in typical institutional activities, with program participants intermingling with the general prison population.
- Treatment components included assessment, treatment orientation, criminal lifestyle confrontation, cognitive skill building, relapse prevention, interpersonal skill building, wellness and transitional programming. Standardized programs on these topics totaling 450 hours were provided in both didactic and process groups.

- Inmates were required to continue treatment when returned to general population before release, which involved meeting with program staff once a month for relapse prevention and a review of learned techniques.
- All inmates were required to participate in community transitional services when transferred from prison to the halfway house. The treatment was on a contractual basis with community providers who provided group, individual, or family counseling.

***Study Reference***

Pelissier, B., G. Gaes, W. Rhodes, S. Camp, J. O'Neil, S. Wallace, and W. Saylor. 1998. "TRIAD Drug Treatment Evaluation Project Six-month Interim Report." Washington D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research and Evaluation (January 31).

**Program Name:** Key-Crest  
**Program Type:** Therapeutic community  
**Program Location/Dates:** Delaware Correctional System/early 1990s to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Self-reported arrest rates were examined for a comparison and three treatment groups. The groups included: 1) offenders involved in a conventional work release setting (control); 2) offenders completing prison-based therapeutic community treatment only (Key); 3) offenders receiving therapeutic community treatment in a residential work release program, and aftercare therapeutic community treatment (Crest); and 4) offenders completing prison-based therapeutic community treatment in addition to receiving therapeutic community work release treatment, and aftercare treatment (Key-Crest).
- Significant differences were found in recidivism between the control group with an arrest rate of 54 percent, the Key-Crest group with an arrest rate of 23 percent (effect size of  $-.65$ ), and the Crest group with an arrest rate of 43 percent (effect size of  $-.22$ ). The Key group actually was arrested at a higher rate (57 percent) than the comparison group, although the difference was not significant.
- The Key and Key-Crest groups had selection-bias problems, as they included only program graduates. Crest did not have this problem, and thus, provided the strongest evidence of program success.
- The findings suggested that therapeutic community treatment applied to the work release environment was effective in reducing recidivism.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	Crest 5; Key/Key-Crest 2
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 439 (37 Key; 179 Crest; 43 Key-Crest; 180 control)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Crest only
<b>Control group</b>	Work-release parolees not selected into Crest; received AIDS/HIV prevention education
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteers, selection by counselors
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Yes, multivariate controls for offender characteristics
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Self-reported arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	18 months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Key and Key-Crest were components of a multistage therapeutic community program in the Delaware correctional system. This correctional system program involved three stages of therapeutic community intervention: during incarceration, work release, and parole/community supervision.

- The prison therapeutic community (Key) segregated offenders from the negativity of prison culture, stressed recovery from drug abuse and development of pro-social values. This stage lasted 12 months.
- The second stage was a transitional therapeutic community in work release (Crest Outreach Center). This was similar to the prison therapeutic community, with a separate residential setting, but modified for a work release environment. The program was six months in length and offenders did not work outside the facility until the fourth month. This stage was intended to complement the period of work release, which was considered a vulnerable time where street drugs and norms favorable to drug use abound.
- The third stage, aftercare, involved out-patient counseling and group therapy, with strong encouragement to return for reinforcement sessions at the work release facility, to attend weekly groups, to call counselors regularly, and to spend one day a month at the facility.

### ***Study Reference***

Inciardi, J. A., S. S. Martin, C. A. Butzin, R. M. Hooper, and L. D. Harrison. 1997. "An Effective Model of Prison-Based Treatment for Drug-Involved Offenders," *Journal of Drug Issues* 27(2):261-278.

**Program Name:** The Amity Program, California Department of Corrections  
**Program Type:** Therapeutic community  
**Program Location/Dates:** Donovan Correctional Facility for Men, San Diego, California/1990 to present.

### ***Evaluation Results***

#### **1996:**

- This evaluation compared outcomes for 189 offenders—randomly selected volunteers who had completed the Amity therapeutic community program (112) or who dropped out of the program (32), and a comparison group of offenders eligible for, but released prior to treatment (45).
- Arrest rates were examined for a average nine- to 11-month follow-up period. Approximately 41 percent of Amity program participants (weighted average of completers and dropouts) were arrested, compared to 62 percent of the comparison group, a significant difference and an effect size of -.42.
- Approximately one-fifth of those who completed the prison program enrolled in voluntary residential aftercare for up to one year after prison release. This lesser time-at-risk was not controlled for in the evaluation.

#### **1997:**

- Reincarceration rates were compared for randomly selected Amity program participants and a group of eligible, but untreated offenders.
- At 12 months, approximately 34 percent of program participants were reincarcerated compared to 50 percent of the comparison group, a significant difference with an effect size of -.33.
- A 24-month follow-up of a smaller number of offenders showed approximately 43 percent of program participants were reincarcerated compared to 67 percent of the comparison group, a significant difference with an effect size of -.49.
- Approximately one-third of the program participants resided in voluntary community aftercare programs, thus lessening their time-at-risk, which was not controlled for in the evaluation.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	1996 total: 189 (144 treatment, 45 comparison) 1997 total: 715 (425 treatment, 290 control)-12 mo. 1997 total: 263 (178 treatment, 85 comparison)-24 mo.
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment, eligible inmates untreated prior to release
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteer
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>1996: arrest; 1997: reincarceration</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	1996: nine to 11 months; 1997: 12 and 24 months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Some evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Donovan Correctional Center housed a 200-bed therapeutic community program contracted to Amity Foundation of California. Each offender participated in 9 to 12 months of treatment.
- The program included individual and group interaction, cognitive and behavioral restructuring, recovery education, and 12-step activities within a therapeutic community structure. This was in addition to an inmate's eight-hour work/training assignment.
- Relative to therapeutic community programs such as Stay'n Out, Amity maintained a minimum hierarchy necessary for program operations and used a "circle" concept emphasizing equality and inclusion.
- In addition, Amity staff lived in a staff house, which was unique for prison therapeutic communities.
- Upon completion of the therapeutic community program, one-third of the offenders enrolled in community residential substance abuse treatment for up to 120 days, with treatment activities similar to those in prison.

### ***Study References***

Wexler, H. and W. Graham. 1995. "The Amity Program: A Prison-Based Therapeutic Community for Substance Abusers." In R. R. Ross, D. H. Antonowicz, and G. K. Dhaliwal (eds.) *Going Straight*. Ottawa, Ontario: Air Training and Publications, pp. 233-242.

Wexler, H. K., G. Thomas, and J. Peters. 1997. "Prison Substance Abuse Treatment: Recidivism and Relapse," American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting.



**Program Name:** Stay'n Out, NY Department of Corrections  
**Program Type:** Therapeutic community  
**Program Location/Dates:** Arthur Kill Correctional Facility for Men, Staten Island, Bayview Correctional Facility for Women, Manhattan, New York/1976 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Stay'n Out program participants (treatment group) were compared with inmates who volunteered for the program but never participated (comparison group) and inmates who participated in other types of prison-based treatment programs (i.e., milieu therapy and counseling).
- Analyses showed that during the 36-month follow-up period, male Stay'n Out participants had a significantly lower arrest rate (27 percent) than males who did not receive treatment (41 percent), an effect size of  $-.30$ . Those involved in milieu therapy had a slightly lower arrest rate than those not receiving treatment (35 percent), and those receiving counseling had a similar rate to those not receiving treatment (40 percent).
- For female participants, the arrest rate (18 percent) was not significantly different than the arrest rate for those who did not receive treatment (24 percent) or counseling (29 percent).
- Multivariate analyses of arrest rates while controlling for offender characteristics produced no significant findings, casting doubt on program effectiveness. The finding of treatment effectiveness may have been influenced by differences in offender background or in length of follow-up time rather than the treatment program.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Total males: 1,431 (435 treatment, 576 milieu, 261 counseling, 159 no treatment) Total females: 398 (247 treatment, 113 counseling, 38 no treatment)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment, milieu, counseling
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteers
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Multivariate controls used for some analyses
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	36 months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Some evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The highly structured program of six to 12 months included residential segregation with clients responsible for maintaining the program unit. A reward and punishment system was used, e.g., including graduated increases in freedom and short-term removal from the program.
- Group activities included encounters (therapy), emotionality groups, educational seminars, special groups for unit management problems, and individual counseling.

- Program staff were primarily ex-offenders used as role models to demonstrate successful rehabilitation. Creating a treatment environment of psychological safety was a focus of the program.

### **Study References**

Wexler, H. K., G. P. Falkin, and D. S. Lipton. 1990. "Outcome Evaluation of a Prison Therapeutic Community for Substance Abuse Treatment," *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 17(1):79-92.

Wexler, H. K., G. P. Falkin, D. S. Lipton, and A. B. Rosenblum. 1992. "Outcome Evaluation of a Prison Therapeutic Community for Substance Abuse Treatment." In Carl G. Leukefeld and Frank M. Tims (eds.), *Drug Abuse Treatment in Prisons and Jails*, NIDA research Monograph 118, Rockville, MD: NIDA. pp. 156-174.

**Program Name:** Texas In-Prison Therapeutic Community (IPTC)  
**Program Type:** Therapeutic community  
**Program Location/Dates:** Several locations/1992 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

#### **1996:**

- Arrest rates for male and female offenders were compared for program graduates, program dropouts, and offenders who volunteered and met treatment program criteria but were released prior to program selection.
- During the one-year follow-up period, 24 percent of program participants were arrested (weighted average; 13 percent for completers, and 31 percent for dropouts), a rate significantly lower than the 29 percent for comparison group members, an effect size of  $-.11$ .

#### **1997:**

- This evaluation of the unit in Kyle, Texas compared rates of arrest for program graduates and a non-treatment group of offenders.
- Over the six-month follow-up period, significantly different rates of arrest were observed for the treatment group versus the comparison group, with 7 percent of the treatment group being arrested versus 16 percent of the comparison group.
- The use of graduates only in the treatment group resulted in selection bias that makes conclusions difficult.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	1996-3, 1997-2
<b>Sample size</b>	1996 total: 1,067 (672 treatment, 395 comparison) 1997 total: 297 (222 treatment, 75 comparison)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment; lower risk than treatment group; no halfway house assignment, so longer time-at-risk
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Drug/alcohol screening and parole board selection
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	1996: one year 1997: six months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Some evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Texas In-Prison Therapeutic Community is modeled after the New York Stay'n Out program. Texas IPTC had three components: a nine-month prison-based program, followed by a community-residential component of one to three months, and a three- to 12-month period of outpatient treatment.
- The prison-based program included education on the addiction process and emphasized development of life management skills, positive attitudes of personal responsibility, and self-esteem.

- The community-residential phase was similar to a half-way house setting, and emphasized reintegration in the community through employment and accessing support groups.
- The community-based outpatient programs, geared toward helping the parolee transition into unsupervised community living, involved continued counseling and psychoeducational training.

### ***Study References***

Eisenberg, M., and T. Fabelo. 1992. "Evaluation of the Texas Correctional Substance Abuse Treatment Initiative: The Impact of Policy Research," *Crime and Delinquency* 42(2):296-308 (April).

Knight, K., D. Simpson, L. Chatham, and L. Camacho. 1997. "An Assessment of Prison-Based Drug Treatment: Texas' In-Prison Therapeutic Community Program," *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 24:75-100.

**Program Name:** Powder River Alcohol and Drug Treatment Program  
**Program Type:** Therapeutic community  
**Program Location/Dates:** Powder River Correctional Facility, Oregon/1990 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Participants in the treatment program were compared to matched offenders with similar characteristics in the general inmate population. Convictions and incarcerations at one, two, and three years after release were compared.
- At one and two years, the treatment group had a significantly lower rate of convictions than the comparison group (14 percent compared to 23 percent at year one; 23 percent compared to 34 percent at year two), but at three years the differences were not significant (40 percent compared to 42 percent).
- Dropouts in the first 30 days of the program were not included in the analysis, likely causing selection bias.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 286 (144 treatment, 142 comparison)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Referral by correctional counselors at intake
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Matched on demographics, crime type, risk assessment, release date, treatment need
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Three years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The intensive treatment program for men, based on a 24-hour therapeutic community model, was six to 15 months in duration and provided a minimum of 36 hours per week of on-site treatment to each client.
- Program included drug and alcohol education and treatment, changing criminal thought patterns and life style, improving family and intimate relations, developing or improving independent living skills, and establishing and maintaining an aftercare program following release.
- Privileges were linked to fulfillment of treatment and work responsibilities. Inmates moved through treatment levels, adding tasks such as assisting program staff and maintaining facility. Residents in positions of responsibility were used to socialize newcomers.
- Aftercare of six months was required.

### ***Study Reference***

Oregon Department of Corrections, Research Unit. 1996. "Evaluation of the Powder River and Turning Point Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs," Salem, Oregon: Department of Corrections (January).

**Program Name:** Turning Point Alcohol and Drug Treatment Program  
**Program Type:** Therapeutic community  
**Program Location/Dates:** Columbia River Correctional Facility, Portland, Oregon/  
 1990 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Treatment participants were compared to matched offenders with similar characteristics in the general inmate population. Convictions and incarcerations at one-, two-, and three-year periods from release are compared.
- For men, no significant differences in recidivism were found at any time.
- For women, significant differences in recidivism were found at year two only.
- Dropouts in the first 30 days of the program were not included, likely causing selection bias problems.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Total men: 165 (86 treatment, 79 comparison) Total women: 77 (38 treatment, 39 comparison)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Referral by correctional counselors at intake
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Matched on demographics, crime type, risk assessment, release date, treatment need
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Three years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Turning Point had a men's and women's program, both residential.
- The intensive treatment program, based on a 24-hour therapeutic community model, provided a minimum of 30 hours per week of on-site treatment to each client.
- The components of the program included: drug and alcohol education and treatment, family counseling and parenting skills, life skills development, changing criminal thought patterns and developing personal accountability, release planning, relapse prevention.
- Privileges were earned by complying with program rules, completing treatment plan tasks and participating in group activities. Outside work crew responsibilities were required.
- Aftercare of six months was required.

### ***Study Reference***

Oregon Department of Corrections, Research Unit. 1996. "Evaluation of the Powder River and Turning Point Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs," Salem, Oregon: Department of Corrections (January).

**Program Name:** Dwight Gateway Substance Abuse Program  
**Program Type:** Therapeutic community for women  
**Program Location/Dates:** Dwight Correctional Center, Illinois/1988 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Program participants were compared to offenders who volunteered for the program, but were not placed due to space limitations. The groups were matched on substance abuse history, age, race, gender, and remaining sentence time. Return to prison, which appeared to be primarily for new offenses, was compared at two years after release.
- The groups had a nearly identical rate of return, with 41 percent of participants and 42 percent of the comparison group returning to prison.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 415 (168 treatment, 247 comparison)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteer
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Matched on demographics, substance use history, and remaining sentence time
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Return to prison (primarily new offenses)</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- This therapeutic community program for female offenders involved education, daily group therapy, and individual counseling.
- Education topics related to substance abuse included: physical effects, effects on families, AIDS, daily living skills, and stress management.
- Daily group therapy was focused on understanding factors associated with use of substances and development of alternative coping skills.
- Other groups focused on changing negative attitude and behavior patterns.
- Individual counseling included developing a plan to remain drug-free after release.

### ***Study Reference***

Gransky, Laura A., and Robert J. Jones. 1995. "Evaluation of the Post-Release Status of Substance Abuse Program Participants." Report of the Illinois Criminal Justice Authority. Chicago, IL (September).

**Program Name:** Forever Free Substance Abuse Program  
**Program Type:** Therapeutic community for women  
**Program Location/Dates:** California Institute for Women (CIW)/1991 to present

**Evaluation Results**

**1993:**

- Three groups of female prisoners were compared—participants, matched prisoners who did not apply for the program, and matched offenders from other California prisons.
- Differences among groups in parole revocation after six months were not significant, with 37 percent of Forever Free program participants compared to 30 percent of CIW matches and 34 percent of other prison matches having an unsuccessful parole.

**1996:**

- Prison program graduates who participated in community residential treatment for at least 30 days were compared with graduates who did not participate in community treatment, and program applicants who were unable to enter the program due to space limits.
- The evaluation showed significant differences in rate of parole revocation one year after release from prison, with 32 percent of women in community treatment discharged or still on parole with no revocations, compared to 48 percent of women with prison treatment only, and 73 percent of the comparison group.
- The use of graduates for comparison creates selection bias that makes conclusions difficult.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	1993-3, 1996-2
<b>Sample size</b>	1993 total: 413 (196 treatment, 107 CIW comparison, 110 other prison comparison) 1996 total: 64 (19 prison with aftercare, 23 prison treatment only, 22 comparison)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment, matched offenders in 1993 had more serious criminal history and drug use
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteer
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No statistical controls
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Parole revocation</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	1993: six months 1996: one year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>



### ***Program Description***

- The Forever Free program offered a six-month drug treatment program to volunteer women inmates in the last six months of prison, and a voluntary six-month community-based residential program for graduates of the in-prison program who had been released on parole.
- The 120-bed in-prison residential program included individual substance abuse counseling, special workshops, educational seminars, 12-step programs, parole planning, and urine testing. Participants maintained full-time institution work and educational assignments.
- The community residential program included individual and group counseling, and most programs offered family counseling, vocational training/rehabilitation, recreation or social activities, and English and Spanish-speaking staff. The community program was offered in four counties, and had slots for both Forever Free graduates and individuals who did not participate in the Forever Free treatment.

### ***Study References***

Department of Corrections, Office of Substance Abuse Programs. 1993. "An Evaluation of Program Effectiveness for the Forever Free Substance Abuse Program at the California Institution for Women, Frontera, California." Sacramento, CA: Department of Corrections.

Prendergast, M. L., J. Wellisch, and M. M. Wong. 1996. "Residential Treatment for Women Parolees Following Prison-Based Drug Treatment: Treatment Experiences, Needs and Outcomes," *Prison Journal* 76(3):253-274.

**Program Name:** The Cornerstone Program  
**Program Type:** Therapeutic community  
**Program Location/Dates:** Oregon State Hospital, Salem, Oregon/1976 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

#### **1985:**

- This evaluation compared felony and misdemeanor convictions for program graduates, dropouts, and Oregon parolees with a history of alcohol or drug abuse over a three-year follow-up period. The parolees' history of alcohol or drug abuse was less extensive than the graduates' and drop-outs' history.
- Program participants had a conviction rate of 52 percent (weighted average of graduates and dropouts), less than the rate of 64 percent for the comparison group.

#### **1989:**

- This evaluation did not include a no-treatment comparison group. It compared convictions during a three-year follow-up period for 209 program participants only. The participants were sorted into four groups: graduates (43); dropouts with at least six months of treatment (43); dropouts with two to six months of treatment (58); and dropouts with less than two months of treatment (65). An extremely high rate of program dropouts was evident.
- The evaluation found that 49 percent of graduates were convicted within three years compared to 72 percent of dropouts with more than six months of treatment, 76 percent of dropouts with two to six months of treatment, and 89 percent of dropouts with less than two months of treatment.
- Since the study compared participants only, it examined the effectiveness of length of treatment rather than treatment itself. It is hard to isolate the effects of more extensive treatment from the motivation of participants. Was differential motivation responsible for the effect?

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	1985 total: 350 (171 treatment, 179 comparison) 1989 total: 209
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	1985: no treatment 1989: treatment dropouts
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Referral by prison counselors
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Three years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Cornerstone program was a modified therapeutic community drug treatment program at the state hospital where participants spent the last 10 to 12 months of their sentence. They were paroled directly from the program and received six months of aftercare.
- Cornerstone had four phases, half the time split between the two inpatient and two transition phases. Orientation lasted 30 days and involved assertiveness, self-talk, group membership skills, values clarification and wellness, and beginning Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous groups. The intensive phase was four to eight months of inpatient treatment, with counseling and classes in criminal thinking and patterns and cognitive and behavioral interventions.
- Cornerstone residents formed "therapeutic families" in which accountability to other residents was emphasized and peer counseling and confrontation was part of the treatment. Emphasis was placed on individual responsibility with clearly defined rules and consequences; anger management, life skills, basic education, and offenders' self-developed plans for treatment were part of the process.
- In the transition phase, residents completed 40 to 80 of hours community volunteer work, and sought employment while continuing groups and classes at Cornerstone and attending regular AA/NA programs.

### ***Study References***

Field, G. 1985. "The Cornerstone Program: A Client Outcome Study," *Federal Probation* 49:50-55.

Field, G. 1989. "The Effects of Intensive Treatment on Reducing the Criminal Recidivism of Addicted Offenders," *Federal Probation* 53:51-56.

## ***Other In-Prison Substance Abuse Treatment Programs***

### **Overview**

A diverse collection of treatments for substance abusing offenders have operated in prisons, ranging from educational efforts, group and individual therapy, relapse prevention, and various skills training. A National Academy of Science report (Gerstein and Harwood, 1990) suggests that these programs are equivalent to community outpatient drug treatment therapy (non-methadone), primarily involving individual and group therapy, and that they comprise at least two-thirds of prison treatment programs. The programs are usually non-residential, and the length of treatment ranges from several weeks to approximately six months. Self-help treatment such as Alcoholics and Narcotics Anonymous may also be used on an ongoing basis.

As noted earlier, these varied types of programs are numerous in state correctional systems, but unfortunately, few evaluations are available. Six programs are reviewed, and they show mixed evidence of success. However, with such a dearth of evaluations, we consider the programs generally untested in determining effectiveness.

**Programs with some evidence of effect.** In-Focus, an Oregon day treatment program for women prisoners who are about six months from release, shows a 36 percent arrest rate for participants approximately six months after release compared to 65 percent of the comparison group, an effect size of -.59 (Finigan, 1997). Since the evaluation design provides limited controls and cannot rule out non-treatment effects, the program shows only some evidence of an effect.

**Program with no evidence of effect.** A program that involved individual and group counseling was tested in the evaluation of the Stay'n Out therapeutic community conducted by Wexler and colleagues (1992). The counseling was provided once a week for several months with referral services at termination. Those receiving counseling had nearly the same rate of recidivism as the comparison group. This finding of no effect was similar to findings in the non-offender literature where short-term counseling has not been found ineffective. A test of a milieu treatment program in the evaluation of the Stay'n Out therapeutic community also shows no evidence of effect. The program is a residential program and provides residents with individual, group, and vocational counseling, and referral services, using professional drug abuse treatment counselors. Offenders participating in the milieu therapy program have a slightly lower recidivism rate than the no-treatment comparison group, but the difference is not significant.

**Programs where effectiveness cannot be determined.** The Oregon Step day treatment for male prisoners shows a lower rate of arrests for participants, but since the results include only program completers, the overall program effectiveness cannot be determined (Finigan, 1997). We include two evaluations of Washington State correctional drug-treatment programs (Washington State DOC, 1988; Du and Phipps, 1997). The DOC study shows significantly less recidivism for the treatment group, but neither evaluation has a research design that allows for a determination of effectiveness.

**Program Name:** Step and In-Focus Pre-Release Day Treatment  
Substance Abuse Programs

**Program Type:** In-prison, non-residential

**Program Location/Dates:** Eastern Oregon Correctional Institute, Oregon Women's  
Correctional Institute/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared participants in two treatment programs to matched offenders with similar characteristics who were eligible but released before receiving treatment. The follow-up time after release was not clearly specified.
- Approximately 41 percent of those who completed the Step program were arrested after release, compared to 73 percent of the comparison group. The percent for dropouts was not reported, although the author notes the difference between dropouts and the comparison group was non-significant.
- Approximately 36 percent of In-Focus program participants (weighted average of completers/dropouts) were arrested, compared to 65 percent of the comparison group, a significant difference with an effect size of  $-.59$ .

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Step total: 142 (71 treatment, 71 comparison) In-Focus total: 211 (155 treatment, 56 comparison)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Not specified
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Matched on age, prior arrest and race/ethnicity
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	After release, varies for each offender
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	In-Focus— <i>Some evidence of effect</i> Step— <i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Step program at Eastern Oregon Correctional Institute provided prerelease day treatment—pretreatment and treatment classes to identified substance abusers four to seven months from release.
- The offenders were taught to identify needs and be aware of resources that might meet their needs. The program provided guidance in creating a release plan but did not ensure inmates received treatment upon release.
- The In-Focus program at Oregon Women's Correctional Center provided substance abuse treatment services, family, and life skills counseling to identified substance abusers four to six months from release.
- The program provided substance abuse education, including health and diet training, HIV/AIDS prevention, and relapse prevention, in addition to basic life skills training, parenting education, and community reintegration plan.

***Study Reference***

Finigan, Michael. 1997. "Evaluation of Three Oregon Pre-Release Day Treatment Substance Abuse Programs for Inmates." Prepared for Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, West Linn, OR.

**Program Name:** Stay'n Out, NY Department of Corrections  
**Program Type:** Milieu therapy and counseling  
**Program Location/Dates:** Arthur Kill Correctional Facility for Men, Staten Island, Bayview Correctional Facility for Women, Manhattan, New York/1976 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Inmates who participated in other types of prison-based treatment programs, milieu therapy and counseling were compared with inmates who volunteered for the Stay'n Out program but never participated.
- Analyses showed that during the 36 month follow-up period, male milieu therapy participants had a lower arrest rate than those not receiving treatment (35 compared to 40 percent), and those receiving counseling had a similar rate to those not receiving treatment (41 compared to 40 percent). The differences were not significant.
- For female participants, the arrest rate of those receiving counseling (40 percent) was not significantly different than those who did not receive treatment (24 percent).

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Total males: 1,431 (435 treatment, 576 milieu, 261 counseling, 159 no treatment) Total females: 398 (247 treatment, 113 counseling, 38 no treatment)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteers
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Multivariate controls used for some analyses
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	36 months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The highly structured program of six to 12 months included residential segregation with clients responsible for maintaining the program unit. A reward and punishment system was used, e.g., including graduated increases in freedom and short-term removal from the program.
- Group activities included encounters (therapy), emotionality groups, educational seminars, special groups for unit management problems, and individual counseling.
- Program staff were primarily ex-offenders used as role models demonstrating successful rehabilitation. Creating a treatment environment of psychological safety was a focus of the program.

### **Study References**

Wexler, H. K., G. P. Falkin, and D. S. Lipton. 1990. "Outcome Evaluation of a Prison Therapeutic Community for Substance Abuse Treatment," *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 17(1):79-92.

Wexler, H. K., G. P. Falkin, D. S. Lipton, and A. B. Rosenblum. 1992. "Outcome Evaluation of a Prison Therapeutic Community for Substance Abuse Treatment." In Carl G. Leukefeld and Frank M. Tims (eds.), *Drug Abuse Treatment in Prisons and Jails*, NIDA research Monograph 118, Rockville, MD: NIDA. pp. 156-174.



**Program Name:** Washington State Department of Corrections,  
Substance Abuse Program

**Program Type:** In-prison treatment

**Program Location/Dates:** Multiple DOC facilities, Washington State/1986 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- All offenders who received treatment in the first year of program implementation and were released before September 1986, were compared with a group of randomly-selected offenders released prior to program implementation.
- 21 percent of those receiving treatment were returned to prison within two years compared to 29 percent not receiving treatment, a significant difference with an effect size of -.19.
- The authors note a higher proportion of early-release property offenders among those not receiving treatment, making the results difficult to assess, as recidivism rates for property offenders are often higher than among other categories of offenders.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 676 (436 treatment, 240 comparison)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Received no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Not specified
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Return to prison</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Program components included problem assessment, skills training, substance abuse education, individual and family counseling, and a continuum of care plan.
- Programs varied in length and intensity. The range in length of treatment was from approximately five to 13 weeks, with a range of 13 hours in the longest program to 1 1/2 hours in the shortest program.

### ***Study Reference***

Washington State Department of Corrections, Division of Management and Budget, Planning and Research Section. 1988. "Substance Abuse Treatment Program: Evaluation of Outcomes and Management Report," Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Corrections (April).

**Program Name:** Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative  
**Program Type:** Residential and non-residential in-prison treatment  
**Program Location/Dates:** Department of Corrections programs, Washington State/1996 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Included in this evaluation were all first-time felony offenders convicted of heroin or cocaine delivery during the first ten months of fiscal year 1996. The comparison was between those who received any type of treatment in correctional substance abuse programs and those who did not receive treatment.
- The results indicated that 5 percent of those receiving any type of treatment were convicted of a felony after release compared to 8 percent of those not receiving treatment.
- No statistical controls were utilized, the length of the follow-up time varied among offenders, and the type of treatment varied, thus the effectiveness could not be judged.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 398 (192 treatment, 206 comparison)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Received no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Mandatory sentence conditions
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Felony conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Seven to 11 month average
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The drug treatment programs in Washington State Correctional institutions included a six-week intensive inpatient, and a six- and 12-week intensive outpatient program.
- The program consisted of one or more components, including chemical dependency education, moral reconnection therapy, intensive individual and group therapy, dependable strengths therapy, and continuing care in the institution.
- Offender recipients received a variety of treatments, from simple chemical dependency education to intensive inpatient.

### ***Study Reference***

Du, Can, and Polly Phipps. 1997. "Trading Time for Treatment: Second Year Evaluation of the Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative." Olympia, WA: Sentencing Guidelines Commission.

## ***Community-Based Treatment Programs***

### **Overview**

Community-based treatment for offenders usually consists of outpatient drug-free treatment and residential treatment, with few offenders participating in methadone maintenance programs. These programs are available to all community members in need (within resources), and offenders are a large portion of the clientele for community treatment providers. The largest group of offenders treated in the community are probationers, who are often younger and have less extensive criminal and substance abuse histories than offenders in prison.

Offenders are often referred to treatment through the Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC), a program that provides case management for criminal justice referrals to substance abuse treatment programs. These programs operate as a liaison between the criminal justice system and community services, assessing offender needs, and either providing or referring offenders to services. The services can include detoxification, medical care, drug or personal counseling.

Little is known about the effectiveness of community treatment for offenders from the existing evaluation literature. TASC and other case management service have been the focus of most evaluations. We find little evidence from this literature that case management programs lower recidivism, although it is difficult to generalize from the existing evidence, as TASC services vary by program. Unfortunately, the evaluations rarely assess the treatment approaches provided through these programs, or even if the offender received treatment. The type and extent of treatment needs to be considered to determine if substance abuse treatment is effective in combination with case management.

As noted above, many offenders placed into community treatment are younger and have less criminal and substance abuse history than the typical inmate. Since clinical studies indicate a higher likelihood of success for participants with less extensive criminal and substance abuse history, these types of offenders are recommended for treatment (Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, 1994). But not all persons require treatment to discontinue drug use (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1998), and a greater proportion of those with less serious substance abuse and criminal history may desist on their own. For criminal justice populations, it may be that those with the highest risk for recidivism and a medium to high addiction severity should be the highest priority for community treatment. For hard-core opiate addicts, alternatives such as methadone maintenance may be a viable option. Few offenders participate in these programs, although there is some evidence that it may be an effective intervention. In all of these examples and many others, we simply do not have the information we need to make informed decisions on what works.

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** The Opportunity to Succeed (OPTS) case management program involved felony offenders on parole or probation caseload who received substance abuse treatment during incarceration or in a residential facility in lieu of jail. These offenders received intensive case management, urine testing and the provision of services, including mandatory drug treatment. Results from the randomized experiment indicate a 27 percent arrest rate for the treatment group as compared to 20 percent for the control group, a non-significant difference (Buck and Rossman, 1998). Several evaluations of case management programs involved TASC and showed little evidence of an effect. An evaluation of TASC in two regions of Colorado found no evidence of effect when the outcome was return to

prison for a new crime or parole violation (Owens et al., 1997). Additional evidence on TASC is provided by Anglin and colleagues (1996), who evaluated four adult programs across the country. They found no differences in arrests and technical violations between TASC and control groups at two sites, a greater likelihood of arrest at one site for the TASC group, and greater technical violations for the TASC group in another site. Another randomized experiment tested a case management approach versus routine parole supervision and found no significant differences in parole outcomes between the treatment and control groups (Nurco et al., 1995). A randomized experiment tested the effectiveness of acupuncture therapy for probationers who also received group counseling and therapy in a drug-free outpatient clinic (Latessa and Moon, 1992). The researchers found no significant recidivism differences between the groups receiving and not receiving treatment.

**Programs where effectiveness cannot be determined.** An evaluation of several TASC programs in Wisconsin compared offenders who completed the program versus those who dropped out and reported a statistically significant reduction in recidivism; however, the program effectiveness could not be determined due to the use of dropouts as a comparison group (Van Steele et al., 1994). A program involving mandatory outpatient self-help counseling in Kentucky for probationers and parolees who tested positive in a random urinalysis was evaluated. The evaluations of this program were so problematic that effectiveness cannot be determined (Vito, 1989; Vito et al., 1993).

Results from an experimental research design testing case management showed a significantly lower rate of self-reported crime among arrestees who received intensive case management services in Washington D.C., but not in Portland, Oregon. Arrest rates, available for the D.C. site only, show no significant differences between treatment and control groups (Rhodes and Gross, 1997).

### ***Other Applicable Studies on Substance Abuse Treatment***

These studies were not included in the program reviews because they lacked recidivism findings, but we summarize them in order to provide as much information as possible on community programs.

**Outpatient drug-free and residential treatment.** Hubbard and colleagues (1989) have probably conducted the most detailed analyses of criminal justice involved clients using the Treatment Outcome Prospective Study (TOPS), a large-scale study of publicly funded community drug treatment programs in the early 1980s. Criminal justice clients included two groups: those formally referred to TASC and a non-TASC group involved in some stage of criminal processing when entering treatment. Probationers were the majority of both groups, with diversions from the criminal justice system another large proportion. Criminal justice clients were found to be young, criminally active and at early stages of substance abuse compared to other clients. Treatment included both outpatient drug-free locations and residential programs. The findings on self-reported crime indicated criminal justice clients did not significantly differ from other (non-criminal justice) clients. However, being a criminal justice system client did significantly predict arrest for outpatient drug clinic clients after treatment, but not residential program clients. The authors did not comment on this finding, which could have suggested that community residential treatment had a greater effect on recidivism than outpatient drug-free treatment. However, offenders in residential programs had more previous treatment, a trait that is often associated with greater success.

**Methadone Maintenance.** Results from a natural experiment in the 1960s and 1970s involving the California Civil Addict Program (CAP) shed some light on treatment effectiveness for heroin-dependent offenders (Anglin and McGlothlin, 1984; Gerstein and Harwood, 1990). The CAP program results indicated that a large proportion of offenders in the seven-year civil-commitment program responded well to compulsory prison substance-abuse treatment and intensive parole supervision, as measured by reductions in self-reported crime. Of the offenders who did not respond well to the in-prison/parole program, and who remained active users of heroin, a substantial portion entered methadone maintenance programs when they became available. The methadone program participants showed reduced self-reported crime compared to offenders who did not receive methadone. Thus, methadone treatment was successful with a more “hard-core” population who had not responded well to earlier treatment.

**Program Name:** Opportunity to Succeed (OPTS)  
**Program Type:** Case management  
**Program Location/Dates:** Kansas City, St. Louis and Tampa/1995 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This randomized experiment tested the effects of case management for felons on parole or probation who had received substance abuse treatment in prison or residential treatment in lieu of jail.
- The results indicate that 27 percent of the treatment group were rearrested, as compared to 20 percent of the control group, a non-significant difference.
- Other outcomes included a lesser rate of reincarceration for the treatment group as opposed to the control group (35 versus 42 percent, respectively); no difference in technical violations, and slightly more control group offenders with revocations.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 292 (159 treatment, 133 control)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Routine parole/probation
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Not specified
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary as random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Self-reported arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Key program components were intensive case management, supervision (including urine testing), and service provision.
- Participants received employment services, family support services, housing and health/mental health services on an as-needed basis.
- Substance abuse treatment was also provided; some substance abuse treatment was mandatory.

### ***Study Reference***

Buck, Janeen and Shelli Rossman. 1998. "Examining Early Outcomes of the Opportunity to Succeed Program: A Preliminary Analysis of the Follow-up Self-report Data." Paper presented at the Consensus Meeting on Drug Treatment in the Criminal Justice System, Washington, D.C. (March).

**Program Name:** NIJ/NIDA Intensive Case Management  
**Program Type:** Intensive case management  
**Program Location/Dates:** Portland, Oregon and Washington, D.C./1991 to 1993

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation involved a controlled experiment with random assignment to one of three interventions: 1) A videotaped program and printed referral guide intended for offenders with substance-abuse, HIV/STD transmission, and recidivism risks, 2) videotaped program, printed referral guide, and single counseling/referral session, and 3) videotaped program, printed referral guide, and six-month case management program.
- Participants in the case management group had significantly lower rates of self-reported crime during the six-month follow-up period in Washington, D.C. The rate of self-reported crime among this group was 10 percent, compared to 15 and 17 percent among those receiving interventions one and two, respectively. In Portland, 22 percent of the case management group self-reported crime, compared to 27 percent and 26 percent in interventions one and two, respectively, a non-statistically significant effect.
- When arrests were examined, those in the case management group in Washington, D.C. were found to have an arrest rate of 18 percent, compared to the arrest rate of 21 percent and 27 percent among those in interventions one and two, respectively. The difference was not statistically significant. No arrest rate was available for Portland.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Approximately 650 per site evenly distributed across interventions
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Received lesser information/treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteers
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary as random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Self-reported crime; arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Six months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The case management program goals were to increase substance abuse treatment and decrease drug use, recidivism, and HIV risk behaviors during pretrial release.
- The target group included illicit drugs users (other than marijuana use); lockups and booking facilities were the point of contact.
- The program provided difficult-to-access services, including assessment, treatment planning, linkage, referrals, monitoring, and advocacy, without attempting to control illegal behaviors.
- The program was operated by the Bureau of Rehabilitation in Washington, D.C. and TASC in Portland, OR.

- The average caseload was 30 per full-time case manager, with a minimum of two face to face and two telephone contacts per month. Case managers were encouraged to be creative in methods and efforts to maintain client contacts and were allowed to deliver referrals at varying levels of intensity, from providing contact information to accompanying clients to agencies and programs.

***Study Reference***

Rhodes, W., and M. Gross. 1997. "Case Management Reduces Drug Use and Criminality Among Drug-Involved Arrestees: An Experimental Study of an HIV Prevention Intervention." Final Summary Report to the National Institute of Justice and the National Institute on Drug Abuse.



**Program Name:** Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC)  
**Program Type:** Case management  
**Program Location/Dates:** Four sites/see below

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This multiple site evaluation included two experimental sites (Portland, OR and Canton, OH) and two comparison sites (Birmingham, AL and Chicago, IL) to test the effectiveness of TASC programs for adult offenders. TASC programs in Birmingham, Portland, and Chicago had been in operation since the 1970s; Canton for only a year before the evaluation began.
- The TASC/treatment group was significantly more likely to receive at least one type of service than the control/comparison groups and generally averaged more than two services. The services were similar across the sites, with urinalysis testing and drug counseling as the most common. The authors suggested that TASC made its largest impact in getting offenders into treatment rather than influencing the nature and length of services.
- Few significant differences were found between the treatment and control groups in any site in terms of crime outcomes.
- Chicago had slightly higher self-reported property crimes for the TASC group ( $p=.10$ ), while Birmingham had slightly lower self-reported drug crimes for the TASC group ( $p=.10$ ). TASC offenders with three or more prior convictions in Chicago had a significantly lower self-reported drug crime ( $p=.01$ ). All other differences were non-significant.
- For official recidivism, the treatment group in Portland had an increased probability of arrest ( $p=.01$ ), while the treatment group in Birmingham had an increased probability of a technical violation ( $p=.05$ ) and slightly more days incarcerated ( $p=.10$ ). All other differences were non-significant.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	Portland: 5; Canton, Birmingham, Chicago: 3
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 862; control: 681
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	In Portland and Canton only
<b>Control group</b>	Received alternative intervention in experimental sites, regular probation supervision in comparison group sites
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Conditions of probation
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Controlled for in multivariate analyses
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Six months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) programs in this evaluation involved case management service for substance-abusing offenders on probation.
- TASC programs served as a link between the criminal justice system (probation officer) and alcohol and drug treatment services in the community.
- Case management services included assessment, urinalysis monitoring, treatment referral to drug or other counseling programs, and follow-up monitoring.

### ***Study Reference***

Anglin, M. Douglas, Douglas Longshore, Susan Turner, Duane McBride, James Inciardi, and Michael Prendergast. 1996. "Studies of the Functioning and Effectiveness of Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime Programs, Final Report," Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Drug Abuse Research Center.

**Program Name:** Baltimore City Social Support Experiment  
**Program Type:** Case management  
**Program Location/Dates:** Baltimore, MD/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This experimental evaluation tested the effects of treatment services and surveillance for parolees identified as heavy users of narcotic addictive drugs or cocaine.
- Parolees were randomly assigned to a treatment or one of two control groups. Treatment involved social support services (counseling, client advocacy, case management) and intensive urine monitoring as surveillance. The control groups received routine supervision, one with intensive urine monitoring and one with infrequent, random urine testing.
- The recidivism measure was a negative change in parole status, encompassing either a parole violation, issuance of a warrant for arrest, an arrest, parole revocation, or reincarceration.
- The differences in recidivism were in the expected direction, however, none were significant. Approximately 48 percent of the treatment group, 50 percent of those receiving routine supervision with intensive urine monitoring, and 56 percent of those receiving routine supervision with infrequent urine monitoring had a negative parole outcome.
- The authors indicated a longer-term follow-up with a larger sample was underway.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 90; control group 1: 50, control group 2: 48
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	1-Routine parole/intensive urine monitoring 2-Routine parole/infrequent, random urine testing
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Condition of parole
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary with random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Negative parole outcome</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	At least six months; average of ten months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The program focused on social support systems as a determinant of relapse or remission. Social support, including client advocacy and case management services, were provided by the study's counseling personnel.
- More frequent monitoring of urine samples was also hypothesized to reduce readdiction and recidivism, if in tandem with quick and consistent sanctions.

### ***Study Reference***

Nurco, David, Thomas E. Hanlon, Richard W. Bateman, and Timothy W. Kinlock. 1995. "Drug Abuse Treatment in the Context of Correctional Surveillance," *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 12 (1):19-27.

**Program Name:** Acupuncture Outpatient Drug Treatment Program  
**Program Type:** Outpatient treatment facility  
**Program Location/Dates:** A medium-sized Midwestern city/1990 to 1992

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation tested the effectiveness of acupuncture therapy for substance abuse.
- The study population included probationers with serious substance abuse histories (cocaine was the primary drug of choice) and criminal histories that were not extensive (40 percent had prior felony convictions; the current conviction was usually a lower-level felony).
- No significant differences in rates of arrest, conviction, or technical violations of probation were detected across the acupuncture treatment, control (no treatment), or placebo (acupuncture-like simulation) groups.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 270 (182 treatment, 45 control, 43 placebo)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Placebo and no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Referral by probation officer
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary, as random assignment used
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest, conviction, probation violation</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Not specified, probably during treatment only
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The program used a combination of group counseling and therapy accompanied by acupuncture.
- There were three phases, each designed to be completed in 30 days (90 days was minimum to graduate, although 120 to 160 was normal). Phase one involved treatment sessions five days a week, including physician-administered acupuncture each day for 45 minutes; in phase two, sessions dropped to three days per week, acupuncture was used for relapse, or if requested; and phase three was 30 days of aftercare.
- In addition, offenders were required to attend Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, or Cocaine Anonymous four times per week.
- Three weeks of negative urinalyses were required to move through the treatment phases.

### ***Study Reference***

Latessa, E. J., and M. M. Moon. 1992. "The Effectiveness of Acupuncture in an Outpatient Drug Treatment Program," *Journal of Contemporary Justice* 8(4):317-331.

<b>Program Name:</b>	Colorado TASC program
<b>Program Type:</b>	Case management; treatment alternatives to street crime (TASC)
<b>Program Location/Dates:</b>	Four TASC programs in western and southeastern Colorado/1989 to present

### **Evaluation Results**

- This evaluation compared male parolees who were referred and participated in the TASC program to a historical comparison group of randomly selected male parolees released during the two-year period prior to implementation of the TASC program.
- The study did not find any statistically significant effects of the program treatment on reducing the rate of return to prison.
- The use of a historical comparison group made conclusions difficult.
- The authors pointed out the potential difficulty in evaluating TASC, as increased monitoring may have increased recidivism risk.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Southeastern total: 391 (219 treatment, 172 comparison) Western total: 145 (38 treatment, 107 comparison)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment; historical comparison groups
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Referral by parole officer
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Matched on ethnicity, age, recidivism risk, and in west region study, alcohol/drug severity
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Return to prison, new crime, or parole violation</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### **Program Description**

- The Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) program was a case management service for offenders on parole which served as a link between the criminal justice system (parole officer) and alcohol and drug treatment services in the community.
- Case management services included assessment, urinalysis monitoring, treatment referral and follow-up monitoring.

### **Study Reference**

Owens, S., K. Klebe, S. Arens, R. Durham, J. Hughes, C. Moor, M. O'Keefe, J. Phillips, J. Sarno, and, J. Stommel. 1997. "The Effectiveness of Colorado's TASC Programs," *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 26:161-176.

<b>Program Name:</b>	Treatment Alternative Programs (TAP)
<b>Program Type:</b>	Case management; treatment alternatives to street crime (TASC)
<b>Program Location/Dates:</b>	Dane, Eau Claire and Rock Counties, Wisconsin/1989 to 1991

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The rates of arrest and conviction were compared for male offenders who completed the TAP program versus those who dropped out of the program. Offenders had extensive drug use and criminal history (an average of 10 arrests and six convictions).
- During the 18-month follow-up period, 43 percent of program completers were arrested compared to 74 percent of program dropouts. Similarly, 42 percent of program completers were convicted during the follow-up period, compared to 70 percent of program dropouts.
- While differences in recidivism were statistically significant, the selection bias in the use of dropouts as a comparison group, and the lack of statistical controls for offender characteristics, made it difficult to discern program effectiveness.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 259
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Treatment dropouts
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Official referral any time in legal process
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest, conviction, probation violation</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	18-month average
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Wisconsin TAP case management model provided treatment alternatives to imprisonment for substance-abusing offenders. Some treatment services were provided by programs; others were provided under contract with external community providers.
- The model included identification, assessment, client monitoring (including urinalysis), and coordination and provision of treatment services, including individual and group therapy, and in one county, intensive day services. The program length was six months in Dane and Rock Counties and one year in Eau Claire.

### ***Study Reference***

Van Stelle, K. R., E. Mauser, and D. P. Moberg. 1994. "Recidivism to the Criminal Justice System of Substance-Abusing Offenders Diverted into Treatment," *Crime and Delinquency* 40(2):175-196 (April).

**Program Name:** Kentucky Substance Abuse Program  
**Program Type:** Outpatient treatment and drug-testing program  
**Program Location/Dates:** Jefferson County, Kentucky/1991 to 1992

### ***Evaluation Results***

#### **1989:**

- Misdemeanor and felony arrests, convictions, and incarceration rates, and also prison reincarceration rates were analyzed for Kentucky Substance Abuse Program participants with a comparison group eligible for, but not initially enrolled in the program.
- 17 percent of those participating in treatment (weighted average of graduates and failures) were reincarcerated compared to 8 percent of the comparison group. Approximately 5 percent of treatment participants were convicted of a felony offense, compared to .4 percent of the comparison group.
- The comparison group was problematic, as they started with lower rates of substance abuse, treatment history, and criminal history.

#### **1993:**

- 4 percent of those completing treatment were reincarcerated compared to 20 percent of those who dropped out of treatment.
- The comparison of program completers and program dropouts may bias the findings.
- The number of offenders in each group and the length of follow-up were not specified.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	1989 total: 477 (247 treatment, 230 comparison) 1993 total: not specified
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	1989: comparisons had lesser substance abuse, treatment and arrest history 1993: treatment dropouts
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Counselor referral
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>1989: arrest, conviction, reincarceration</b> <b>1993: reincarceration</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	1989: six months 1993: not specified
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The program, for male and female offenders on probation/parole, was designed for identification and mandatory referral of drug abusers to treatment.
- The in-community, non-residential program offered educational, in-patient, and out-patient treatment. The majority of offenders were referred to out-patient treatment.
- The community substance abuse treatment consisted of self-help counseling contracted to private sector programs.

### ***Study References***

Vito, G. F. 1989. "The Kentucky Substance Abuse Program: A Private Program to Treat Probationers and Parolees," *Federal Probation* 53 (1):65-72.

Vito, G. F., D. G. Wilson, and S. T. Holmes. 1993. "Drug Testing in Community Corrections: Results From a Four-year Program," *The Prison Journal* 73(3 & 4):343-354.



## SECTION V: EDUCATION PROGRAMS

---

### *Adult Basic Education*

#### **Overview**

Adult Basic Education (ABE) of felony offenders appears to be a promising, but still unproven, crime reduction strategy. The premise behind ABE is that many inmates lack basic abilities in reading, writing, and mathematics and if these skills are increased, then offenders have a better chance of avoiding criminal behavior when released from prison. The Institute's review of the national research literature found that this question has not been extensively or rigorously evaluated. Only a handful of studies have been published on this topic, and most employ fairly weak research designs.

**Programs with evidence of an effect.** The Federal Bureau of Prisons (Harer, 1994 and 1995) has conducted the most rigorous research in this area. This research tested whether participation in prison education programs contributed to a reduced rate of recidivism. The potential curricula included adult basic education (ABE), general equivalency diploma (GED), adult continuing education (ACE), post secondary education (PSE), vocational training, and social skills courses (e.g., parenting). The research did not attempt to measure the effect of these program types, only whether at least six months of any education participation influenced recidivism. The population studied included 619 federal prisoners with a length of stay greater than one year, randomly drawn, from inmates released in the first half of 1987.

Recidivism was tracked for a three-year period. The analysis used multivariate methods (including a Heckman correction factor) to correct for existing differences across the groups participating in education programs and those with no participation. Evaluation findings suggest that for the entire sample of inmates, recidivism was significantly reduced through participation in the education program. The estimated recidivism rate over the three-year follow-up was 46 percent for nonparticipants and 39 percent for participants.

**Programs with some evidence of an effect.** A study of male inmates released from Wisconsin prisons in the late 1980s tested the effect of basic or vocational education program completion on recidivism (Piehl, 1995). The evaluation methods were non-experimental; however various techniques were employed to control for sample selection bias. Recidivism was measured as recommitment to Wisconsin prisons over a three-year period. The research demonstrated that those completing the programs were one-third less likely to recidivate than those who do not complete the programs.

**Programs where effectiveness cannot be determined.** A study of all inmates released from Ohio State prisons in 1992 compared recidivism rates for those taking part or completing different education programs while in prison and a comparison group without such participation (Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, 1995). Participation in an education program included at least 90 days involvement in either an ABE, GED, vocational, or college program. Comparisons of education program participants and nonparticipants revealed that during the two-year follow-up period, 27 percent of GED achievers were reincarcerated, compared to 32 percent of the nonparticipants. The absence of statistical controls prevents a solid determination of program effects on recidivism.

For a variety of methodological reasons, research studies by Walsh (1985), Porporino (1992), and Stevens (1986) rated only a "2" on the Maryland research quality index. In the Institute's view, results from these studies cannot be used to determine whether a program is effective or not.

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** An evaluation of recidivism rates for a cohort of Texas inmates who were both admitted and released from prison between March 1991 and December 1992 examined whether Texas prison education participants had lower rates of reincarceration than nonparticipants (Adams et al., 1994; Marquant et al., 1994). Participants in academic programs had a reincarceration rate of 23 percent, compared to 24 percent of nonparticipants. While participants in vocational programs had a slightly lower rate of reincarceration (21 percent), the difference across groups was not significant.

<b>Program Name:</b>	Federal Bureau of Prisons
<b>Program Type:</b>	In-prison education
<b>Program Location/Dates:</b>	Nationwide, federal prisons/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

#### **1994 Study:**

- This research tested whether participation in prison education programs contributed to a reduced rate of recidivism. The curricula included adult basic education (ABE), general equivalency diploma (GED), adult continuing education (ACE), post secondary education (PSE), vocational training, and social skills courses (e.g. parenting). The research did not attempt to measure the effect of these program types, only whether at least six months of any type of education program influenced recidivism.
- Multivariate analyses were used to examine recidivism over a three-year period for 865 federal prison releasees whose prison stay was at least one year.
- Recidivism rates were lower for participants in the education program. The estimated recidivism rate over three years was 33 percent for nonparticipants and 29 percent for participants. This difference was significant statistically at the .10 level (not as significant as the 1995 study); the effect size was -.09.

#### **1995 Study:**

- Prison education was measured based upon whether prisoners participated in at least half a course (of any type) for at least six months.
- The population studied included 619 federal prisoners with a length of stay greater than one year, randomly drawn, from inmates released in the first half of 1987.
- Recidivism was tracked for a three-year period. The analysis used multivariate methods (including a Heckman correction factor) to correct for differences which existed across the groups.
- Recidivism rates were lower for program participants. The estimated recidivism rate over three years was 46 percent for nonparticipants and 39 percent for participants. This difference was significant statistically at the .001 level. The effect size was -.15.
- Personal communication with the author of the two studies indicated that the 1995 study was superior to the 1994 study. Among other reasons, Harer commented that the 1995 study limited the sample to those imprisoned for more than a year—a length of time that was necessary for inmates to participate meaningfully in the education programs.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	4 (portions of the evaluation not using statistical controls in the analyses were rated as 2)
<b>Sample size</b>	1994 total: 865; 1995 total: 619
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No participation/treatment, random selection from cohort of releasees
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Yes, correction for sample selection bias and multivariate regression controls for offender traits such as drug use, criminal history, and race
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest (all offenses) and parole revocations</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Three years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Evidence of overall effect of education programs, but not separated by type of educational program</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Federal Bureau of Prisons provided courses in adult basic education (ABE), general equivalency diploma (GED), adult continuing education (ACE), post secondary education (PSE), vocational training, and social skills courses (e.g. parenting). The author provided little detail regarding the education program policies and implementation.
- Although federal inmates without a high school diploma or GED were required to take at least one literacy course, and all other inmates were encouraged to participate in educational programs, and various incentives existed to promote participation, both participation and completion remained largely voluntary.

### ***Study References***

Harer, Miles D. 1994. "Recidivism Among Federal Prisoners Released in 1987." Washington, D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research and Evaluation.

Harer, Miles D. 1995. "Prison Education Program Participation and Recidivism: A Test of the Normalization Hypotheses." Washington, D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research and Evaluation.

**Program Name:** Wisconsin Prison Education Program  
**Program Type:** In-prison adult education  
**Program Location/Dates:** Wisconsin Prison System/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This study used data for male inmates released from Wisconsin prisons in the late 1980s to test the effect of basic or vocational education program completion on recidivism. The evaluation methods were non-experimental; however various techniques were employed to control for sample selection bias.
- Measuring recidivism as recommitment to Wisconsin prisons over a three-year follow-up period, the research estimated that (using a kaplan-meier analysis) 41 percent of prisoners without the education program returned to prison within three years, while 33 percent of those completing prison education programs returned to prison, a significant difference with an effect size of  $-.17$ .

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 1,473 (completers and noncompleters)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Inmates who do not complete prison education program
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Following assessment and evaluation, inmates were offered a job, school, or vocational assignment
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Yes, statistical controls for selection bias were used
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Recommitment to Wisconsin prison</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Three years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Some evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Upon being sentenced to prison, individuals were assessed and evaluated to determine educational achievement, career interests, intelligence levels, and psychiatric wellbeing. Based upon assessment and other information, inmates were assigned to a particular institution, security-level, and offered a job, school, or vocational education assignment.
- Education programs available included the following: adult basic education, high school equivalency, literacy programs for inmates with learning disabilities, high school degree and college course programs, college correspondence, day release to local colleges, and approximately 50 vocational subject programs.
- Participation in education programs is encouraged by correctional staff and consideration of program participation in reviews is an incentive for participation. Furthermore, all inmates must accept either a school or work assignment, and completion of one education course is required for entry into many vocational programs.

***Study Reference***

Piehl, Anne M. 1995. "Learning While Doing Time," Cambridge, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

**Program Name:** Ohio Correctional Education Programs  
**Program Type:** In-prison education  
**Program Location/Dates:** Ohio Prison System/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This study examined rates of reincarceration (state level) for all inmates released from Ohio State prisons in 1992. The evaluation compared recidivism rates for those taking part or completing different education programs while in prison and a comparison group without participation. Participation in an education program included at least 90 days involvement in either an Adult Basic Education (ABE), General Equivalency Diploma (GED), vocational, or college program. Education program achievement was defined as program completion.
- The research presented comparisons of “achievers” (i.e., completers), “participants” (i.e., participated in but were not the achievers) and the nonparticipant comparison group. We combined the results of the achievers and participants and compared these to the nonparticipant comparison group.
- This analysis revealed that during the two-year follow-up period, 29 percent of achievers/participants and 30 percent of the comparison group were reincarcerated. When the groups were disaggregated by type of education program, 27 percent of GED achievers/participants were reincarcerated, compared to 32 percent of the comparison group, a significant difference. Furthermore, 29 percent of vocational program achievers/participants were reincarcerated, compared to 31 percent of the comparison group, a non-significant difference.
- The absence of statistical controls and the uncontrolled differences across the participant and comparison study groups precluded assessment of effectiveness.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Participation: 3,969; nonparticipation: 14,099
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment, members of 1992 release cohort not participating in prison education
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Reincarceration in Ohio prison</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The article did not provide information on the policies and implementation of education programs in Ohio State Corrections, so it is not possible to identify particular program elements that may have been a part of the overall effects. The program did make available Adult Basic Education (ABE), vocational training, General Equivalency Diploma (GED), and college curricula.

***Study References***

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. 1995. Evaluation of the Impact of Correctional Education Programs on Recidivism, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.



**Program Name:** Windham School System  
**Program Type:** In-prison education  
**Program Location/Dates:** Windham School System, Texas Prisons/1969 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared rates of recidivism for a cohort of Texas inmates who were both admitted and released from prison between March 1991 and December 1992. The research examined whether Texas prison education participants had lower rates of reincarceration than a nonparticipant comparison group.
- The simple comparison of participants and comparisons demonstrated that participation in academic and vocational programs had little relationship to reincarceration. Participants in academic programs had a reincarceration rate of 23 percent compared to 24 percent of the comparison group. Participants in vocational programs had a slightly lower rate of reincarceration (21 percent). Both differences were non-significant.
- The absence of statistical controls and the uncontrolled differences across the participant and comparison study groups precluded assessment of effectiveness.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 422; comparison: 8,001
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment/participation in program
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Not specified in article, most likely voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Pre-existing differences across the treatment and comparison groups were found, but not statistically controlled in the research
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Reincarceration</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years on average
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Created in 1969, the program objectives were to raise inmates' literacy levels and provide vocational skills to better equip inmates to join the workforce upon release from prison. Underlying these objectives was the desire to reduce recidivism.
- The Windham School System offers adult basic education (ABE), high school equivalency (GED), bilingual, special education, and numerous vocational education programs. Both classroom and in-cell programs were available.
- The Windham School System is a legally independent school system like any other local Texas community school system. Each prison unit has its own principal, teachers, and student prisoners. The scope of the program is extensive—by 1991, 36 institutions were providing prison education to an average of 10,400 inmates per day.

### ***Study References***

Adams, Kenneth, Katherine Benneth, Timothy J. Flanagan, James W. Marquart, Steven J. Cuvelier, Eric Fritsch, Jurg Gerber, Dennis R. Longmire, and Velmer S. Burton. 1994. "A Large-scale Multidimensional Test of the Effect of Prison Education Programs on Offender Behavior." *The Prison Journal* 74:433-449.

Marquart, James, S. Cuvelier, V. Burton, K. Adams, J. Gerber, D. Longmire, T. J. Flanagan, K. Bennett, and E. Fritsch. 1994. "A Limited Capacity to Treat: Examining the Effects of Prison Population Control Strategies on Prison Education Programs." *Crime and Delinquency*, 40(3):516-531.

**Program Name:** Adult Basic Education  
**Program Type:** Adult basic education  
**Program Location/Dates:** Correctional Services of Canada/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation monitored reincarceration of adult offenders who participated in Adult Basic Education (ABE) in 1988. The groups compared in the evaluation were those who completed the ABE program (i.e., achieving equivalence of 8th grade) and those who were released from prison prior to completing the ABE program.
- The comparison demonstrated that 30 percent of the ABE completers were convicted during the follow-up period compared to 36 percent of those released before program completion, a significant difference.
- The absence of statistical controls, and the inability to include program drop-outs in the analysis make drawing conclusions from this research problematic.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Completers: 899; non-completers: 462
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Program participants who were released prior to completing the ABE Program
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Reincarceration</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	1.1 years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Correctional Services of Canada offers educational programming to inmates which includes ABE, secondary, vocational, college, and university studies. A share of all prison enrollments—approximately 30 percent—are involved in ABE. ABE leads to certification in literacy and numeracy skills at the grade-eight level.
- Upon admission, all offenders take achievement tests and are offered the opportunity to enroll in ABE programs if they test below grade-eight proficiency.
- The program stresses small teacher-to-student ratios (one teacher for six to eight students), peer tutoring, variety in curricula and resource material, and adequate learning space.

### ***Study Reference***

Porporino, F. J., and R. Robinson. 1992. "The Correctional Benefits of Education: A Follow-up of Canadian Federal Offenders Participating in ABE." *Journal of Correctional Education* 43(2):92-98.

**Program Name:** General Equivalency Diploma (GED) program of Lucas County, Ohio  
**Program Type:** Adult in-prison education (GED)  
**Program Location/Dates:** Lucas County, Ohio/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This study evaluated a GED program for male probationers in the Lucas County Adult Probation Department (Toledo, Ohio) during the years 1979 through 1981.
- Tallying arrest rates for program participants and the nonparticipant comparison group over a period of 3 1/2 years, the comparison found that 24 percent of GED participants were arrested during the follow-up, compared to 44 percent of the comparison group.
- The difference in rates of arrest between program participants and nonparticipants was statistically significant. However, the evidence for program effectiveness cannot be determined due to the small sample size and the lack of analytical tests for sample selection bias. The research did select the comparison group based on similar previous criminal record. This gives some control for pre-existing differences between the two groups.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Total 100: (50 participants, 50 nonparticipants)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment/participation in GED program
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Not stated in article, most likely voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not in the analysis of outcomes; control group was selected for similar sex, lack of high school diploma, and previous arrest seriousness
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest for felonies and 1st degree misdemeanors</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	3 ½ years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The article provided little description about the Lucas Country Adult Probation Department's GED program. The accommodation of prisoners at various educational levels, and the potential for individualized instruction were mentioned as advantages of the GED program.

### ***Study Reference***

Walsh, Anthony. 1985. "An Evaluation of the Effects of Adult Basic Education on Arrest Rates Among Probationers." *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation* 9(4):69-76.

**Program Name:** General Education Development  
**Program Type:** In-prison adult education program (GED)  
**Program Location/Dates:** Georgia Correctional System/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This study examined all males released from Georgia prisons between 1972 and 1978 who participated in GED programs. The goal of the evaluation was to determine whether there were significant differences in rates of recidivism among GED diploma recipients, GED participants who failed to get diplomas, and inmates who lacked GED or high school diplomas.
- Measuring recidivism as reincarceration in state prison within two years of release, the evaluation demonstrated that individuals with some GED program participation had lower rates of recidivism (14 percent arrested) than did those in the nonparticipant comparison group (18 percent arrested), a significant difference.
- Some pre-existing differences favoring the GED group were noted, but not controlled for, in the analysis.
- The absence of statistical controls and the uncontrolled differences across the participant and comparison study groups precluded assessment of effectiveness.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	2,047: participants 2,318 nonparticipants
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Inmates without GED participation; inmates who participated in GED but did not graduate
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Not specified in article, most likely voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Reincarceration</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The article provided minimal information on the policies and implementation of education programs in the Georgia Correctional System. These programs possess many similarities, however differences in class size, instructor's philosophy, and teaching style vary across the institutional settings.

### ***Study Reference***

Stevens, Reid D. 1986. "The Effect on Recidivism of Attaining the General Education Development Diploma." *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation* (October):3-9.

## ***In-Prison Vocational Education***

### **Overview**

Adult vocational education may have potential to be a cost-beneficial crime reduction strategy, but it is still unproven. Many adult offenders in the criminal justice system have poor job market skills and records. The purpose of providing vocational education to inmates is to improve the odds of post-prison employment and decrease the chance of subsequent criminal activity. Vocational education can include improving the work-related math skills needed for the automotive or construction trades. Some programs offer in-prison apprenticeships and an accreditation element that can make it easier for an offender to obtain a trade license.

The Institute's review of the evaluation research literature found very few published studies that have measured the effect of vocational education on criminal recidivism. Moreover, the studies reported mixed results and most of the evaluations used fairly weak research designs making it difficult to generalize the findings.

**Programs with evidence of an effect.** Lattimore (1990) examined a vocational training and education program for 18 to 22 year old male property offenders. Using a well-implemented, true experimental design with random assignment to treatment, the authors investigated whether participation influenced rates of offender recidivism. Recidivism was measured as rate of re-arrest two years after release. Offenders receiving services exhibited marginally significantly ( $p=.10$ ) lower rates of rearrest (36 percent) than did offenders receiving fewer/no services (46 percent).

Saylor (1996) performed a quasi-experimental evaluation comparing the recidivism of offenders participating in vocational/apprentice training to a set of statistically-matched offenders who did not participate in correctional industries or work training. The long-term follow-up, which considered offenders' recommitment to a federal facility for up to 12 years, demonstrated that vocational training participants were 33 percent less likely to be recommitted to the federal prison system during the observation period than comparison group members. This difference was statistically significant and suggested that vocational training participation has a long-term impact on post-release recommitment rates.

**Programs where effectiveness cannot be determined.** A study of all inmates released from Ohio State prisons in 1992 examined the recidivism rates of those taking part or completing a vocational education program while in prison and a control group without education program participation (Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, 1995). Comparisons of education program participants and nonparticipants revealed that during the two-year follow-up period, 29 percent of vocational program achievers were reincarcerated, compared to 31 percent of the nonparticipant group. The absence of statistical controls prevents a solid determination of program effects on recidivism.

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** An evaluation of recidivism rates for a cohort of Texas inmates who were both admitted and released from prison between March 1991 and December 1992 examined whether Texas prison education participants had lower rates of reincarceration than nonparticipants (Adams et al., 1994; Marquant et al., 1994). Participants in vocational programs had a slightly lower rate of reincarceration than the comparison group (21 as compared to 24 percent), but the difference was not significant.

Wisconsin's Department of Correction's Specialized Training and Employment Project (STEP) is designed to assist inmates in obtaining and retaining employment upon release to the community. STEP provides training in the institution, support during the transition from prison to the community, and assistance in obtaining and maintaining employment after release. An evaluation was conducted but found no significant difference in recidivism rates after a nine-month follow-up period (Van Stelle, 1995). The study showed the treatment group with a recidivism rate of 24 percent while the (mostly) randomly assigned control had recidivism rates of 19 percent. The results were only for the "graduates" (the dropout results were not reported).

Downes (1989) evaluated a vocational education program in New Mexico comparing those successfully completing the program with a control group matched on a number of characteristics. Recidivism was measured as whether parole was completed successfully or not. No significant differences were found; the treatment group had a recidivism rate of 24 percent while the control group had a lower rate at 20 percent.

**Program Name:** Sandhills Vocational Delivery System (VDS)  
**Program Type:** Vocational training  
**Program Location/Dates:** North Carolina's Cameron Morrison and Sandhills Youth Centers/1982 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This research examined a vocational training and education program for 18- to 22-year-old male property offenders. The study population included offenders sentenced to prison in North Carolina between 1983 and 1986.
- Using an experimental design with random assignment to treatment, the authors investigated whether VDS participation influenced rates of offender recidivism. Recidivism was measured as the rate of arrest two years after release.
- The evaluation demonstrated a marginally significant ( $p=.10$ ) treatment effectiveness. Comparison of the treatment and control groups revealed that offenders receiving VDS services exhibited marginally significant lower rates of arrest (36 percent) than offenders receiving fewer or no services (46 percent arrest). Furthermore, survival analysis demonstrated that upon reaching a recidivism "steady state" after 600 days of release, the rate of arrest for the experiment group (40 percent arrested) remained significantly (though the effect is marginal at  $p=.12$ ) lower than that observed for the control group (50 percent arrested).

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	4
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 138; control: 109
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Control group that received significantly fewer VDS services than treatment group
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Random assignment; selected from group of offenders likely to benefit from employment-oriented program
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary, given random assignment; comparison shows groups were similar on many social, criminal, and employment measures
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The VDS program was offered at North Carolina's Cameron Morrison and Sandhills Youth Centers, both medium- to minimum-security facilities housing 200 to 400 youth inmates.
- The program, which integrated training and employment services provided by numerous service agencies, was based on the theory that an improved ability to earn wages reduces participation in crime.



- The staff worked with inmates to identify vocational interests and aptitudes; developing individual plans of study for improving vocational skills; providing identified training and other skills; and helping inmates secure post-release employment. Inmates worked with case managers in meeting program goals for skill attainment and post-release employment.

***Study Reference***

Lattimore, Pamela K., Ann D. Witte, and, Joanna R. Baker. 1990. "Experimental Assessment of the Effect of Vocational Training on Youthful Property Offenders." *Evaluation Review* 14(2):115-133.

**Program Name:** New Mexico's Vocational Education Program  
**Program Type:** In-prison vocational education  
**Program Location/Dates:** New Mexico/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared offenders who successfully completed New Mexico's vocational education program to a matched group of inmates who did not participate in vocational programs.
- Measuring recidivism as unsuccessful completion of parole, the evaluation found no significant differences across groups. 24 percent of the vocational education group recidivated, compared to 20 percent of the control group
- While this study possessed numerous methodological flaws, such as the potential for sample selection bias, an unspecified follow-up period, and a limited recidivism measure, it suggests that New Mexico's vocational education program was not effective in reducing offender recidivism.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 66; control: 66
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Control group</b>	A matched group of inmates who did not participated in the vocational education programs
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Participation is voluntary and inmates must meet admissions requirements (H.S. diploma or GED)
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Treatment and control groups matched on several characteristics
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Unsuccessful completion of parole</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Not specified
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- New Mexico has implemented a broad educational program for inmates, in which four correctional facilities offer educational programming. To be eligible for the vocational programming, inmates must have a completed high school diploma or GED.
- Two college level career programs are included in the New Mexico in-prison vocational curriculum, as well as a career services program which assists inmates in the transition from prison to the community by providing job placement services, training in job preparation, and other life skills programs.
- Santa Fe Community College offers 18 vocational programs to inmates and academic education is provided by the College of Santa Fe. In each program instruction is individualized and competency-based. Courses taken and credits earned can lead to certificates and/or associate degrees in particular vocational programs.

***Study Reference***

Downes, Elizabeth A., Katherine R. Monaco, and Sheila Ortega Schreiber. 1989. "Evaluating the Effects of Vocational Education on Inmates: A Research Model and Preliminary Results," *The Yearbook of Correctional Education*:249-262.

**Program Name:** Bureau of Prisons' Correctional Industries  
**Program Type:** Correctional industries and vocational education  
**Program Location/Dates:** Nationwide federal prisons/1930 to present

**Evaluation Results**

- This evaluation compared the recidivism of offenders participating in federal prison correctional industries and/or vocational/apprentice training to a set of statistically-matched offenders who did not participate in correctional industries or work training. The treatment group was involved in correctional industries or vocational/ apprentice training for at least six months during their federal prison incarceration.
- In the short-term follow-up, 7 percent of the treatment group and 10 percent of the comparison group had their supervision revoked during the one-year follow-up. This difference was statistically significant.
- The long-term follow-up, which considered offenders' recommitment to a federal facility for up to 12 years, demonstrated that prison industries participants were 24 percent less likely to be recommitted to the federal prison system during the observation period than comparison group members. This difference was statistically significant; the effect size was -.13. Participation in a vocational training program was also tested. The study found that participants in vocational training were 33 percent less likely to be recommitted to the federal prison system during the observation period than were comparison group members. This difference was statistically significant; the effect size was -.34.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Total 7,000 (size of experimental and comparison group not specified)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Releasees who received no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary application and staff selection
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Statistical matching of offenders; long-term evaluation also controlled for offender characteristics including race, age, and education
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Short-term: supervision revocation;</b> <b>Long-term: federal recommitment</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Short-term (one year); long-term (eight to 12 years)
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Short-term: Evidence of effect</i> <i>Long-term: Evidence of effect</i>

**Program Description**

- The evaluation provided little information on the structure and practices of the Bureau of Prisons correctional industries program.
- It is known that Federal prison inmates in the treatment group participated in some form of prison industries, vocational training, and apprenticeship training.

***Study Reference***

Saylor, William G., and Gerald G. Gaes. 1996. PREP: "A Study of 'Rehabilitating' Inmates Through Industrial Work Participation, and Vocational and Apprenticeship Training." Washington, D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons.

**Program Name:** Ohio Correctional Education Programs  
**Program Type:** In-prison education  
**Program Location/Dates:** Ohio Prison System/dates not specified

**Evaluation Results**

- This study examined rates of reincarceration (state level) for all inmates released from Ohio State prisons in 1992. The evaluation compared recidivism rates for those taking part or completing different education programs while in prison and a comparison group without participation. Participation in an education program included at least 90 days involvement in either an Adult Basic Education (ABE), General Equivalency Diploma (GED), vocational, or college program. Education program achievement was defined as program completion.
- The research presented comparisons of “achievers” (i.e., completers), “participants” (i.e., participated in but were not the achievers) and the nonparticipant comparison group. We combined the results of the achievers and participants and compared these to the nonparticipant comparison group.
- This analysis revealed that during the two-year follow-up period, 29 percent of achievers/participants and 30 percent of the controls were reincarcerated. When the groups were disaggregated by type of education program, 27 percent of GED achievers/participants were reincarcerated, compared to 32 percent of the comparison group, a significant difference. Furthermore, 29 percent of vocational program achievers/participants were reincarcerated, compared to 31 percent of the comparison group, a non-significant difference.
- The absence of statistical controls and the uncontrolled differences across the participant and comparison study groups precluded assessment of effectiveness.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Participation: 3,969; nonparticipation: 14,099
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment, members of 1992 release cohort not participating in prison education
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Reincarceration in Ohio prison</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

**Program Description**

- The article did not provide information on the policies and implementation of education programs in Ohio State Corrections, so it is not possible to identify particular program elements that may have been a part of the overall effects. The program did make available Adult Basic Education (ABE), vocational training, General Equivalency Diploma (GED), and college curricula.

***Study References***

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. 1995. Evaluation of the Impact of Correctional Education Programs on Recidivism, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

**Program Name:** Windham School System  
**Program Type:** In-prison education  
**Program Location/Dates:** Windham School System, Texas Prisons/1969 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared rates of recidivism for a cohort of Texas inmates who were both admitted and released from prison between March 1991 and December 1992. The research examined whether Texas prison education participants had lower rates of reincarceration than a nonparticipant comparison group.
- The simple comparison of participants and comparisons demonstrated that participation in academic and vocational programs had little relationship to reincarceration. Participants in academic programs had a reincarceration rate of 23 percent compared to 24 percent of the comparison group. Participants in vocational programs had a slightly lower rate of reincarceration (21 percent). Both differences are non-significant.
- The absence of statistical controls and the uncontrolled differences across the participant and comparison study groups precluded assessment of effectiveness.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 422; comparison: 8,001
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment/participation in program
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Not specified in article, most likely voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Pre-existing differences across the treatment and comparison groups were found, but not statistically controlled in the research
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Reincarceration</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years on average
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Created in 1969, the program objectives were to raise inmates' literacy levels and provide vocational skills to better equip inmates to join the workforce upon release from prison. Underlying these objectives was the desire to reduce recidivism.
- The Windham School System offers adult basic education (ABE), high school equivalency (GED), bilingual, special education, and numerous vocational education programs. Both classroom and in-cell programs were available.
- The Windham School System is a legally independent school system like any other local Texas community school system. Each prison unit has its own principal, teachers, and student prisoners. The scope of the program is extensive—by 1991, 36 institutions were providing prison education to an average of 10,400 inmates per day.



**Study References**

Adams, Kenneth, Katherine Benneth, Timothy J. Flanagan, James W. Marquart, Steven J. Cuvelier, Eric Fritsch, Jurg Gerber, Dennis R. Longmire, and Velmer S. Burton. 1994. "A Large-scale Multidimensional Test of the Effect of Prison Education Programs on Offender Behavior." *The Prison Journal* 74:433-449.

Marquart, James, S. Cuvelier, V. Burton, K. Adams, J. Gerber, D. Longmire, T. J. Flanagan, K. Bennett, and E. Fritsch. 1994. "A Limited Capacity to Treat: Examining the Effects of Prison Population Control Strategies on Prison Education Programs." *Crime and Delinquency*, 40(3):516-531.

**Program Name:** Specialized Training and Employment Project (STEP)  
**Program Type:** In-prison vocational education  
**Program Location/Dates:** Fox Lake Correctional Institution, Wisconsin/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation attempted to utilize a random design to assess the impact of STEP participation upon recidivism. Random assignment was incomplete, due to program recruitment difficulties, and offenders were added to supplement the control group and increase sample size.
- The research findings may be compromised by several methodological shortcomings, such as the short follow-up period and small sample sizes.
- Comparing the arrest rate of STEP graduates (drop-outs were removed from the analyses) to routine parolees, the evaluation found that 24 percent of STEP participants were rearrested, compared to 19 percent of the control group. This difference was not statistically significant, suggesting that the STEP program did not have a recidivism-reducing effect.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 63; control: 36
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Incomplete random assignment
<b>Control group</b>	Random assignment to regular parole
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Offenders who meet eligibility criteria and are subsequently selected by the parole commission
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Nine months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Wisconsin's Department of Corrections' Specialized Training and Employment Project (STEP) was designed to assist inmates in obtaining and retaining employment upon release to the community.
- STEP provided training in the institution, support during the transition from prison to the community, and assistance in obtaining and maintaining employment upon release.
- The STEP six-month institutional component included a comprehensive curriculum, a work assignment in the institution, pre-parole planning, and employment readiness training. Upon release, STEP community staff assisted the parolees and helped them by assessing special needs, facilitating access to community services, and providing assistance for obtaining job/training placement.

***Study Reference***

Van Stelle, Kit R., Julie R. Lidbury, and D. Paul Moberg. 1995. "Final Evaluation Report, Specialized Training and Employment Project (STEP)," Wisconsin Department of Corrections: Center for Health Policy and Program Evaluation.



## SECTION VI: EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

---

Efforts to improve the labor market performance of ex-offenders in the community are based on the same theory underlying in-prison vocational education programs. If offenders become employed when they leave supervision, they will be significantly less likely to become re-involved in criminal activity. Whether this intuitive theory is right or not (see Needels 1996 for conflicting evidence), a number of programs have tried to reduce the recidivism rates of ex-offenders by improving their employment prospects.

### *Correctional Industries*

#### **Overview**

There are very few well-designed studies of the effects that correctional industry programs have on criminal recidivism. Correctional industry programs have several goals, but one of them is to improve the job market skill of offenders so that recidivism rates can be reduced when inmates leave prison. Like vocational education programs, many adult offenders in the criminal justice system have poor job market skills and records. It is very difficult to say whether correctional industry programs accomplish this because very few studies have been undertaken, and those that have produced conflicting evidence

**Programs with evidence of an effect.** Saylor (1996) used a quasi-experimental evaluation to compare the recidivism of offenders participating in federal prison correctional industries programs to a set of statistically-matched offenders who did not participate in correctional industries. The treatment group was involved in correctional industries for at least six months during their federal prison incarceration. In the short-term follow-up, 7 percent of the treatment group and 10 percent of the control group had their supervision revoked during the one-year follow-up. This difference was statistically significant. The long-term follow-up, which considered offenders' recommitment to a federal facility for up to 12 years, demonstrated that prison industries participants were 24 percent less likely to be recommitted to the federal prison system during the observation period than comparison group members. This difference was statistically significant and suggested that prison industry participation has a long-term impact on post-release recommitment rates.

**Programs where effectiveness cannot be determined.** An Ohio (Anderson, 1995) study compared the post-release recidivism of 2 groups: those with "meaningful participation" in an Ohio Penal Industries (OPI) Job, and those who did not have this type of participation. Meaningful participation was defined as an official work assignment lasting 90 days or more. The comparison found that 25 percent of participants in OPI were recommitted to the Ohio prison system during the two-year follow-up, compared to 30 percent of nonparticipants. Statistical significance of this difference was not reported. Given the absence of statistical controls and the potential for selection bias in the treatment group, one cannot determine whether recidivism was effectively reduced through program participation.

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** Maguire (1988), using a quasi-experimental research design, estimated the effect of prison industry employment on post release felony re-arrests among adult male offenders from seven maximum-security facilities in the New York State correctional system. The study used both a proportional hazards models and a logit model to

analyze rates of felony rearrest during a two-year post-release follow-up period. 26 percent of correctional industry participants were rearrested for felonies, compared to 28 percent of the nonparticipant control group. These results were not significantly different. The industry participation variable was shown to have the least important effect in the model, compared to other offender characteristics such as age at admission and prior arrests, suggesting that involvement in the prison industry programs did not significantly reduce recidivism.

**Program Name:** New York State Correctional Industries  
**Program Type:** Correctional industries  
**Program Location/Dates:** New York State/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This research estimated the effect of prison industry employment on post-release felony arrests among adult male offenders from seven maximum-security facilities in the New York State correctional system.
- The authors utilized both a proportional hazards model and a logit model to analyze rates of felony arrest during a two-year post-release follow-up period. Using the logit model, 26 percent of the industries' participants recidivated with felony arrests, compared to 28 percent for the nonparticipant comparison group. The analysis found no statistically significant difference in felony arrest rates across the treatment and comparison groups. The authors reported that the findings from the logit model were similar to the proportional hazards model.
- The industry participation variable was shown to have the least important effect in the model, compared to other offender characteristics, such as age at admission and prior arrests, further suggesting that involvement in prison industry programs did not significantly reduce recidivism.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	4
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 399; comparison: 497
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Inmates without participation in prison industries
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Selection by correctional staff and self-selection
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Yes, multivariate analyses control for age, crime and drug-use history, and other offender traits.
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Felony arrests</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- No program description available.

### ***Study Reference***

Maguire, Kathleen E., Timothy J. Flanagan, and Terence P. Thornberry. 1988. "Prison Labor and Recidivism," *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 4(1):3-18.

**Program Name:** Bureau of Prisons' Correctional Industries  
**Program Type:** Correctional industries and vocational education  
**Program Location/Dates:** Nationwide federal prisons/1930 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared the recidivism of offenders participating in federal prison correctional industries and/or vocational/apprentice training to a set of statistically-matched offenders who did not participate in correctional industries or work training. The treatment group was involved in correctional industries or vocational/ apprentice training for at least six months during their federal prison incarceration.
- In the short-term follow-up, 7 percent of the treatment group and 10 percent of the comparison group had their supervision revoked during the one-year follow-up. This difference was statistically significant.
- The long-term follow-up, which considered offenders' recommitment to a federal facility for up to 12 years, demonstrated that prison industries participants were 24 percent less likely to be recommitted to the federal prison system during the observation period than comparison group members. This difference was statistically significant; the effect size was -.13. Participation in a vocational training program was also tested. The study found that participants in vocational training were 33 percent less likely to be recommitted to the federal prison system during the observation period than were comparison group members. This difference was statistically significant; the effect size was -.34.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Total 7,000 (size of experimental and comparison group not specified)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Releasees who received no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary application and staff selection
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Statistical matching of offenders; long-term evaluation also controlled for offender characteristics including race, age, and education
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Short-term: supervision revocation;</b> <b>Long-term: federal recommitment</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Short-term (one year); long-term (eight to 12 years)
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Short-term: Evidence of effect</i> <i>Long-term: Evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The evaluation provided little information on the structure and practices of the Bureau of Prisons correctional industries program.
- It is known that Federal prison inmates in the treatment group participated in some form of prison industries, vocational training, and apprenticeship training.



***Study Reference***

Saylor, William G., and Gerald G. Gaes. 1996. PREP: "A Study of 'Rehabilitating' Inmates Through Industrial Work Participation, and Vocational and Apprenticeship Training." Washington, D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons.

**Program Name:** Ohio Penal Industries  
**Program Type:** Correctional industries  
**Program Location/Dates:** Ohio Prison System/dates unknown, most likely ongoing

### **Evaluation Results**

- This evaluation compared the post-release recidivism of two groups, those with "meaningful participation" in an Ohio Penal Industries (OPI) job, and those who did not have this type of participation (note: meaningful participation is defined as an official work assignment lasting 90 days or more).
- The comparison of groups demonstrated that 25 percent of releasees who participated in OPI were recommitted to the Ohio prison system during the two-year follow-up, compared to 30 percent of the nonparticipant comparison group. Statistical tests of significance for the difference, if they were calculated, were not reported.
- Given the absence of statistical controls and the potential for selection bias in the treatment group, it is not possible to determine whether recidivism was effectively reduced through program participation.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 744 (4 percent of all releasees); comparison 7,839
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Remainder of release cohort
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary program application and staff selection
<b>Statistical controls</b>	None, except for matching on reading score (i.e., minimum criteria for program eligibility)
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Reincarceration within Ohio prison system</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### **Program Description**

- Little information was provided on the structure and implementation of the Ohio Penal Industries program.
- The article suggested that offenders applied for participation in the program, and upon selection, were provided with a job assignment. Job assignments varied in offenders' skill levels.

### **Study Reference**

Anderson, Stephen V. 1995. "Evaluation of the Impact of Participation in Ohio Penal Industries on Recidivism." Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Office of Management Information Systems.

***Work Release Programs***

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** Turner and Petersilia (1996) evaluated Washington's work release program. Work release programs permit selected prisoners nearing the end of their terms to work in the community, returning to prison facilities or community residential facilities in non-working hours. Such programs are designed to prepare inmates to return to the community in a relatively controlled environment, while they are learning how to work productively. Work release also allows inmates to earn income, reimburse the State for part of their confinement costs, build up savings for their eventual full release, and acquire more positive living habits. The experiment used a random assignment research design, but it was compromised some during the program. The work release program did not reduce offender recidivism rates or corrections costs. The study found that 22 percent of the program group was re-arrested within ten months, while 30 percent of the control group was re-arrested. The difference, however, was not statistically significant ( $p=.18$ ). A study of the comparative costs was also undertaken. There was no difference in costs to the Department of Corrections (DOC) between the two groups: the experimental group cost DOC \$25,833 per offender (a cost which includes the entire average sentence including work release) while the control group cost DOC an average of \$25,494 per offender. Both figures are in 1992 dollars.

<b>Program Name:</b>	Washington State's Prison Work Release Program
<b>Program Type:</b>	Work release
<b>Program Location/Dates</b>	Washington State/1967 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation involved a randomized experiment in Seattle between 1991 and 1994 in which work release eligible offenders who had applied for the program were randomly assigned to work release participation or not. The experimental group went into work release, the control group completed their full term in prison.
- Researchers also created a matched comparison group to supplement the randomized assignment since work release eligible offenders were small in number. The matched offender group was similar to the randomly assigned group on most characteristics, except they had a greater number of prior arrests and parole revocations. The experimental and control groups had several important differences; the control group had significantly more prior arrests and less stable work histories.
- During the ten-month follow-up period, 30 percent of the control group were rearrested, compared to 22 percent of work releasees. This difference across groups was not statistically significant, thus it appears Washington's work release program did not reduce offender recidivism.
- A study of the comparative costs was also undertaken. There was no difference in costs to the Department of Corrections (DOC) between the two groups: the experimental group cost DOC \$25,833 per offender (a cost which includes the entire average sentence including work release) while the control group cost DOC and average of \$25,494 per offender. Both figures are in 1992 dollars.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	4
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 112; control: 106
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes (partial)
<b>Control group</b>	Offenders who did not have work release
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Inmates apply for work release and must meet selection criteria (e.g., minimum security status)
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary given random assignment, however, important differences existed between the treatment and control group
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrests</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Approximately ten months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

**Program Description**

- Initiated in 1967 through legislative action, Washington's work release program allows inmates to serve sentences in the community for the purpose of obtaining work training and experience. Work release programs permit selected prisoners nearing the end of their terms to work in the community, returning to prison facilities or community residential facilities in non-working hours. Such programs are designed to prepare inmates to return to the community in a relatively controlled environment, while they are learning how to work productively.
- In Washington's program, inmates must be within six months of discharge, have minimum security status, and meet other stipulations in order to be eligible for work release. In addition, work releasees must abide by a set of rules; for example, they must abide by work plans, remain in the facility except for approved work-related appointments, remain alcohol and drug free, be employed, and report all earnings.
- The study reports that a close working partnership has developed with private industry; in 1996 a total of 15 residential work release facilities were operational.
- Pioneer Human Services (PHS) is an organization which contracts with the DOC to operate work release facilities. In 1996, four work release facilities were operated by PHS, housing a total of 1,200 work releasees annually. PHS is described as a "full service organization" which provides job training at a manufacturing facility they run, pre- and post-release employment in a food service business they founded, housing for special-need offenders, and electronic monitoring of state and federal offenders.
- Community corrections officers from the Department of Corrections provide case management in the work release facilities, performing such tasks as conducting intake interviews, and making recommendations for special treatment and return to custody.
- Work release also allows inmates to earn income, reimburse the State for part of their confinement costs, build up savings for their eventual full release, and acquire more positive living habits.

**Study Reference**

Turner, Susan, and Joan Petersilia. 1996. "Work Release in Washington: Effects on Recidivism and Corrections Costs," *Prison Journal* 76(2):138-164.

### ***Job Counseling and Job Search Programs for Inmates Leaving Prison***

**Programs with evidence of an effect.** Menon (1995) analyzed a major employment and training program in Texas. Project RIO (the Re-Integration of Offenders) handles 16,000 parolees a year. Inmates in prison work with job counselors, receive some within-prison vocational training and education. After release, the State Employment office provides job search and counseling. During a one-year follow-up period rearrest rates were examined for high, medium, and low risk adult offenders. Multivariate logistic regression was used to analyze the relationship between risk and program participation. The study found that the higher the risk of the inmate, the more the program worked to lower recidivism rates. The study, which rates only a 3 on the Maryland research design scale, tried statistically to control for the inherent self-selection bias in its research design.

Among high risk offenders, 48 percent of Project Rio participants were rearrested, versus 57 percent of nonparticipants. Among average risk offenders, 30 percent of Project Rio participants were rearrested, versus 32 percent of nonparticipants. Among low risk offenders, 16 percent of Project Rio participants were rearrested, versus 19 percent of nonparticipants.

Milkman (1985) analyzed an experiment testing whether post-prison intensive job counseling and placement services reduced recidivism. The evaluation randomly assigned ex-offenders program services and a control group. The program was evaluated in three cities, Boston, Chicago, and San Diego. The combined results are for the cumulative arrest rates at 24 months for Part I offenses. The study found that 48 percent of the program group was re-arrested within 24 months (for Part I offenses from the FBI's data definitions of arrests), while 54 percent of the control group was re-arrested. The difference is marginally statistically significant ( $p=.06$ ).

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** Research by Latessa (1991) compared adults offenders placed in a halfway house (with increased services), in lieu of probation. The setting was in the Midwest in 1986 and the research used a quasi-experimental design. Halfway house participants received significantly more services including employment services, education, and drug and alcohol counseling. In a three-year recidivism follow-up of convictions for new crimes, the treatment group had a recidivism rate of 30 percent while the control group had a rate of 31 percent. The difference was not significantly different.

Maller (1978) tested an experimental program that provided job counseling and financial assistance to former inmates. Maller found marginally significant effects for financial assistance (discussed in another section of this report) but found no significant effect for job counseling. In that experiment, 54 percent of those receiving job counseling were re-arrested after 12 months compared to 52 percent of those with no assistance.

Clark (1992) studied a program that provided enhanced employment development services (vs. standard employment development services) for offenders released from state prison. Random assignment was used in the study, but the groups only had 30 subjects in each group. The outcome measure was parole violations with a six-month follow-up. Clark found no significant difference between the groups: 57 percent of those receiving job counseling were re-arrested after 12 months compared to 52 percent of those with no assistance.

**Program Name:** Living Insurance for Ex-Offenders (LIFE)  
**Program Type:** Job counseling and job search assistance  
**Program Location/Dates:** Baltimore, Maryland/pilot experiment, 1972 to 1974

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation assessed the impact of transitional aid programs (i.e., financial aid and job placement services) upon the recidivism of repeat theft offenders at high risk of reoffending.
- The evaluation utilized a controlled experiment and randomly assigned 432 prisoners to one of four experimental conditions: financial aid and job placement, financial aid only, job placement only, and control.
- Analyzing rates of arrest for all crimes and theft crimes over a one-year follow-up period, the authors found marginally significant effects for financial assistance. However, they found that job placement assistance did not lead to reduced rates of recidivism. Specifically, 54 percent of the job placement group were rearrested for a new crime, compared to 52 percent of the control group (a nonsignificant difference).

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 108; control: 108
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Prisoners randomly assigned to no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	A pilot experiment—program participants had to meet eligibility criteria (i.e., demonstrate history of theft crimes and high risk for reoffending).
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary given random assignment, however simple comparisons suggest similarity of treatment and control groups
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrests for all crimes and property crimes</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Living Insurance for Ex-Offenders (LIFE) program was a pilot experimental program intended to provide transitional economic and employment aid for ex-prisoners for a short period after they were released from prison. The intent of the program was to increase the set of choices available to released prisoners and thus raise the opportunity costs of reoffending.
- In the pilot phase of the program, offenders selected for participation had to meet criteria that indicated a high likelihood of responding to treatment. Eligible offenders had to demonstrate a high probability of committing theft crimes and could not have a history of alcohol or narcotics abuse.

- Offenders involved in the LIFE experiment were offered funds for income maintenance (\$60 week for three months), job placement services for up to one year after release, or a combination of both forms of assistance. The treatment was intended to assist in job search and labor force placement.

### ***Study References***

Mallar, Charles D., and Craig V.D. Thornton. 1978. "Transitional Aid for Released Prisoners: Evidence from the Life Experiment", *The Journal of Human Resources* 8(2):208-236.



<b>Program Name:</b>	Employment Services Programs (Comprehensive Offender Resource System, Project JOVE, and The Safer Foundation)
<b>Program Type:</b>	Job counseling and job search for inmates leaving prison
<b>Program Location/Dates:</b>	Boston, Chicago, San Diego/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation utilized an experimental design to test whether post-prison, intensive job counseling and placement services reduced recidivism. Program services and recidivism outcomes were jointly evaluated in three large cities (Chicago, Boston, and San Diego).
- The evaluation randomly assigned ex-offenders to either comprehensive employment-related services (treatment) or to a control group offering limited, standard job services (control).
- Combined results for the three sites demonstrate that 48 percent of the treatment group was rearrested within 24 months (for Part I offenses from the FBI's data definitions of arrests), compared to 54 percent of the control group. This difference was marginally statistically significant, suggesting that job placement and counseling services led to a slight, but nontrivial, reduction in recidivism.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	4
<b>Sample size</b>	Cumulative numbers for three-site experiment: Treatment: 565; control: 412
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Received "normal" employment services
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Random assignment: all participants met terms of eligibility (e.g., pattern of income-producing crimes, served at least three months in prison).
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary given random assignment, however, statistical tests demonstrate comparability with a few minor exceptions.
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrests</b> (for total, Part I, and income-producing offenses)
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- This evaluation assessed three ongoing employment services programs (the Comprehensive Offender Resource System in Boston, the Safer Foundation in Chicago, and Project Jove in San Diego). Each program was intended for recently released adult offenders with a history of income-producing crime.
- The treatment group received comprehensive employment-related services that included the following components: job development classes, job counseling, job readiness training, needs assessment, screening and evaluation, and referral to other agencies for additional services. Special follow-up services were also offered for six months after job placement.

***Study Reference***

Milkman, Raymond H. 1985. *Employment Services for Ex-Offenders Field Test--Detailed Research Results*, McLean, VA: Lazar Institute.

**Program Name:** Project RIO (Re-Integration of Offenders)  
**Program Type:** Job training and placement  
**Program Location/Dates:** Texas/1985 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared the rates of arrest for two groups of parolees: a treatment group who participated in Texas' Project RIO employment training and placement program, and a comparison group who did not. The comparison group was not selected randomly, although multivariate logistic regression analyses were used to attempt to control for some of the self-selection bias.
- During a one-year follow-up period, arrest rates were examined for high-, medium-, and low-risk adult offenders (risk was assessed with a tool used by the Texas Pardon and Parole Division).
- Among high-risk offenders, 48 percent of the treatment group were arrested, versus 57 percent of the comparison group. Among average-risk offenders, 30 percent of the treatment group were arrested, versus 32 percent of the comparison group. Among low-risk offenders, 16 percent of the treatment group were arrested, versus 19 percent of the comparison group. A multivariate analysis revealed that participation in Project RIO for all types of offenders did not significantly reduce recidivism. After adjusting for risk-level, participation in Project RIO did make a statistically significant contribution to reduced recidivism. The authors found that stronger results were achieved with higher risk offenders.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 9,200 (number in treatment/comparison not stated)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Received no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteer
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Multivariate logistic regression, with controls for race, age, type of crime, and an index measuring risk of reoffense
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest; reincarceration</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Some evidence of effect for high risk offenders</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Project RIO is a state employment/training program in Texas, handling 16,000 parolees per year.
- The program begins in prison, as inmates work with job counselors to receive assessment and testing, assistance with employment documentation, and job readiness training. Counselors assist inmates in creating an Employment Development Plan to be used by parole officers upon their release.

- The program continues with a two-pronged approach after release. First, State Employment offices provide courses on interviewing and life skills to assist with job preparation and job placement. Second, Project RIO staff encourage awareness of the program for employers, offer incentives for hiring parolees (e.g., the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit), and develop ongoing relationships with employers to ensure a steady, continuous pool of employment options for clients.
- Given the diverse social needs of Project Rio clients (needs which may interfere with job placement and job retention), the program also provides a variety of social service referrals.

### **Study References**

Menon, Ramdas, Craig Blakely, Dottie Carmichael, and Don Snow. 1995. "Making a Dent in Recidivism Rates: Impact of Employment on Minority Ex-Offenders." In Gail E. Thomas (ed.) *Race and Ethnicity in America: Meeting the Challenge in the 21st Century*, Washington, D.C.: Taylor and Francis, pp. 279-293.

Finn, P. 1998. "Texas' Project RIO (Re-Integration of Offenders)," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice (June).

**Program Name:** Enhanced Employment Development Services  
**Program Type:** Job counseling and job search programs for inmates leaving prison  
**Program Location/Dates:** Michigan/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation utilized a randomized, experimental design and compared recidivism of offenders assigned to standard versus enhanced employment development services.
- Over a brief, six-month follow-up period, 67 percent of offenders in the standard employment services group were cited for misconduct violations, compared to 57 percent of the enhanced employment development services group. This difference was not statistically significant, suggesting that the enhanced employment development treatment had no effect on recidivism.
- This evaluation possessed several research design shortcomings, such as a small sample size, short follow-up period, and a questionable recidivism measure. These shortcomings call for a cautious reading of research conclusions.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 30; control: 30
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Standard employment development program
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Offenders referred by corrections to a community agency for employment development
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary given random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Misconduct violations</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Six months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The enhanced employment development services program provided nine to twelve hours of classroom instruction on job acquisition skills, such as completing employment applications, developing interview and telephone skills, and forming job search plans. This nine-to-twelve hour session was also received by individuals in the standard employment development program (i.e., the control group).
- Additional services were offered to offenders in the enhanced employment development services program. A central feature of the enhanced condition was access to services based upon the expressed need of clients. Offenders in the enhanced condition were able to freely access employment services and resources at a community job center each weekday afternoon. Furthermore, individuals were offered assistance from employment specialists in order to meet their special needs.
- The core of the enhanced employment development condition was provision of access to a facility, telephones, phonebooks, and newspapers to assist in the job search process.

***Study References***

Clark, Patrick M., Steve Hartter, and Evelyn Ford. 1992. "An Experiment in Employment of Offenders," A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology. New Orleans, Louisiana.

<b>Program Name:</b>	Halfway House Services
<b>Program Type:</b>	Job counseling and job search assistance for inmates leaving prison
<b>Program Location/Dates:</b>	Two Midwestern Halfway Houses/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The evaluation examined whether treatment in a halfway house yielded lower rates of new convictions over a three-year follow-up period.
- It should be noted that comparisons of the treatment and control group demonstrated that the halfway house group had a higher *a priori* chance of new convictions, due to their more serious criminal involvement and substance abuse histories.
- Data analyses revealed that 30 percent of halfway house participants were convicted over the three-year follow-up period, compared to 31 percent of routine probationers. This difference was not statistically significant. Thus, enhanced delivery of services among halfway house participants did not bring a substantial reduction in recidivism.

<b>WSIPP Evaluation Checklist</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 132; control: 140
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Control group</b>	Felony probationers not receiving treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Not specified
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Statistical comparison of groups demonstrates significant differences; halfway house group had higher <i>a priori</i> chance of new convictions
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>New crime convictions</b> (felony and misdemeanor)
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Three years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The halfway houses under investigation were not identified by name or location. Offenders who moved into the halfway houses following their period of imprisonment received significantly more services than probationers.
- With the exception of one type of service (i.e., welfare service) halfway house participants received significantly more services than routine probationers. These services included the following: employment, education, budget/finance, drug and alcohol, family counseling, and group counseling.

### ***Study References***

Latessa, Edward J., and Lawrence F. Travis. 1991. "Halfway House or Probation: A Comparison of Alternative Dispositions," *Journal of Crime & Justice* 14(1):53-75.

### ***Short-Term Financial Assistance for Inmates Leaving Prison***

In the late 1970s a series of experiments tested whether payments to ex-inmates would lessen the rate at which they re-commit crime. The idea was that an income supplement would aid the transition period when it is hard for ex-offenders to gain employment.

**Programs with some evidence of an effect.** The idea was tested and found to have a marginally statistically significant effect in the Baltimore LIFE (Living Insurance for Ex-Offenders) trial (Maller, 1978;  $p=.10$ ). In that experiment, 50 percent of those receiving aid were re-arrested after 12 months compared to 57 percent of those with no aid.

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** Based in part on the finding by Maller, the federal government then funded a well-designed evaluation, Berk (1980), of the TARP (Transitional Aid Research Project) program in Georgia and Texas for prisoners released in 1976. They found that the crime reduction benefits of the payments were eliminated by the negative effect the payments had on the incentive to become employed. This finding of no significant difference was confirmed by a long-term follow-up by Needels (1996).



**Program Name:** Living Insurance for Ex-Offenders (LIFE)  
**Program Type:** Short-term financial assistance for inmates leaving prison  
**Program Location/Dates:** Baltimore, Maryland/pilot experiment 1972 to 1974

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation assessed the impact of transitional aid programs (i.e., financial aid and job placement services) upon the recidivism of repeat theft offenders at high risk of reoffending.
- The evaluation utilized a controlled experiment and randomly assigned 432 prisoners to one of four experimental conditions: financial aid and job placement, financial aid only, job placement only, and control.
- Analyzing rates of arrest for all crimes and theft crimes over a one-year follow-up period, the authors found marginally significant effects for financial assistance ( $p=.10$ ). Specifically, 50 percent of those receiving aid were re-arrested after 12 months compared to 57 percent of those who did not receive aid. These figures suggest receiving financial assistance brought some reduction in recidivism.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 108; control: 108
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Prisoners randomly assigned to no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	A pilot experiment—program participants had to meet eligibility criteria (i.e., demonstrate history of theft crimes and high risk for reoffending).
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary given random assignment, however simple comparisons suggest similarity of treatment and control groups
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrests for all crimes and property crimes</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Some evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Living Insurance for Ex-Offenders (LIFE) program was a pilot experimental program intended to provide transitional economic and employment aid for ex-prisoners for a short period after they were released from prison. The intent of the program was to increase the set of choices available to released prisoners and thus raise the opportunity costs of reoffending.
- In the pilot phase of the program, offenders selected for participation had to meet criteria that indicated a high likelihood of responding to treatment. Eligible offenders had to demonstrate a high probability of committing theft crimes and could not have a history of alcohol or narcotics abuse.

- Offenders involved in the LIFE experiment were offered funds for income maintenance (\$60 per week for three months), job placement services for up to one year after release, or a combination of both forms of assistance. The treatment was intended to assist in job search and labor force placement.

***Study Reference***

Mallar, Charles D., and Craig V.D. Thornton. 1978. "Transitional Aid for Released Prisoners: Evidence from the Life Experiment", *The Journal of Human Resources* 8(2):208-236.

**Program Name:** Transitional Aid Research Project (TARP)  
**Program Type:** Short-term financial assistance for inmates leaving prison  
**Program Location/Dates:** Texas and Georgia/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This randomized experiment tested whether post-prison financial assistance, delivered in a form similar to unemployment insurance, reduced recidivism among offenders released from Texas and Georgia prisons in 1976.
- Offenders in the two states were randomly assigned to either a treatment group (eligibility for unemployment benefits or job counseling) or a control group and their recidivism was monitored for one year.
- The researchers report that TARP treatment produced no reduction in arrests after taking into consideration that the income support payments had a disincentive on the amount of employment of the recipients.

<b>WSIPP Evaluation Checklist</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 1,149; control: 401 (numbers for Texas and Georgia combined)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Offenders released from prison who did not receive TARP treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Random assignment; all participants needed to
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary given random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrests</b> (property and non-property crimes)
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The TARP experiment was designed to assess whether relatively modest changes in an ex-prisoner's economic circumstances affect post-prison behavior, specifically recidivism. The experiment involved offenders who had just finished a minimum of one year in state prison and had relatively extensive criminal records.
- Participants in TARP were assigned to one of several treatment categories. Two treatment groups received transfer payments, analogous to unemployment compensation, for either 26 or 13 weeks. In addition, any earnings obtained by this group was subject to a 100 percent tax. A third unemployment compensation group received 13 weeks of payment, with a 25 percent tax on earnings. The job treatment group received special job counseling efforts and grants of up to \$1,000 for tools and other work-related expenses. The TARP experiment was administered on a day-to-day basis by state employment offices.

### ***Study Reference***

Berk, Richard A., Kenneth J. Lenihan, and Peter H. Rossi. 1980. "Crime and Poverty: Some Experimental Evidence from Ex-Offenders," *American Sociological Review* 45:766-786.

***Subsidized Jobs for Inmates Leaving Prison***

**Programs with evidence of mixed effects.** Uggen (1996) re-evaluated the findings from the National Supported Work Demonstration Project, a subsidized job program for ex-offenders. The project was originally conducted in the mid-1970s in seven US cities. Random assignment was used in the evaluation. The treatment groups were offered the opportunity to take part in a subsidized job program. Participants were assigned to work crews of eight to ten persons led by a supervisor who also acted as a counselor. Uggen analyzed the effects of the program on older and younger ex-inmates. He found that after three years the program lowered the (self-reported) re-arrest rates of offenders 27-years and older from 61 percent to 49 percent. This result was statistically significant. For ex-offenders under 27 years of age, however, the program participants had a higher recidivism rate (61 percent for the program participants, 55 percent for the control group). The difference for the younger ex-offenders was not statistically significant.

**Program Name:** National Supported Work Demonstration Project (NSWDP)  
**Program Type:** Subsidized job placement  
**Program Location/Dates:** Nationwide, seven cities/1975 to 1977

### ***Evaluation Results***

- In this retrospective statistical study, recently incarcerated and currently unemployed ex-offenders were randomly assigned to either a treatment group, which involved participation with a small work crew in a subsidized job program, or a control group, which did not receive a subsidized work assignment.
- Multivariate analyses demonstrated that during a three-year follow-up period there was no significant difference in the rate of self-reported arrest for the treatment and control groups as a whole—both groups demonstrated a 57 percent rate of arrest.
- This finding changed when the effect of the program on different age groups was examined. For offenders under age 27, 61 percent of the treatment group were arrested compared to 55 percent of the control group. While this difference was not statistically significant, it was in a direction opposite than anticipated. For offenders over age 27, those with program jobs demonstrated a significantly lower rate of arrest than the control group, with 49 percent of the job placement group and 61 percent of the control group arrested during the three-year follow-up period.
- Overall, the evaluation suggested the National Supported Work program was effective in reducing the recidivism of older, but not younger, ex-offenders.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Under age 27: 1,032; age 27 and older: 509
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	No treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Criminal justice or social service agency referral
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary given random assignment, however estimates are adjusted for program attrition
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Self-reported arrests</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Time series, up to three years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Evidence of effect (for older offenders only)</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The National Supported Work Demonstration Project was a subsidized job placement program for ex-offenders.
- Treatment involved the opportunity for ex-offenders to take part in a subsidized job program. Ex-offenders were assigned to work crews of eight to ten persons led by a supervisor who also acted as a counselor. Work crews involved a variety of industries, with the majority in the construction or services sector.
- A central goal of the Supported Work program was "to provide transitional jobs and the opportunity to succeed at them, as well as a chance for placement into permanent, unsubsidized employment" (Uggen et al., 1997).

***Study References***

Uggen, Christopher. 1996. "Estimating the 'True Effect' of Work on Crime: A Dynamic Analysis of Supported Employment and Desistance." Unpublished Paper.

Uggen, Christopher, Irving Piliavin, and Ross Matsueda. 1997. "Job Programs and Criminal Desistance," Forthcoming paper in Urban Institute publication.

## SECTION VII: SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT

---

In an effort to reduce sex offender recidivism, various treatment programs have been developed. The majority of the programs funded by government in the United States have concentrated on psychological and behavioral strategies. Surgical interventions have been studied in other countries, but are not reviewed here because at present they are unlikely to be found constitutional. Similarly, we have not reviewed pharmacological interventions. Our review is divided by the treatment setting: in-prison and community-based programs.

Psychological/behavioral treatment of sex offenders includes the traditional psychotherapies, insight therapy, and cognitive behavioral therapy. Cognitive behavioral treatment is targeted at reducing deviant arousal, improving social skills, increasing appropriate sexual desires, and modifying distorted thinking (Marshall, Law, and Barbaree, 1990). Because many professionals in the field consider deviant sexual behavior to be a life-long problem, it has been argued that the current goal of treatment is to manage or control, rather than to cure (Freeman-Longo and Knopp, 1992).

The United States' General Accounting Office concluded in 1996 that the research results are inconclusive regarding the effectiveness of sex offender treatment in reducing recidivism. We have reached the same conclusion for both in-prison and community-based treatment. Given the small number of rigorous studies on this subject, scientific conclusions about the effectiveness of sex offender treatment are likely to remain ambiguous for a number of years.

### ***Prison-Based Programs***

The overwhelming majority of sex offenders who are in American prisons have no specific treatment aimed at their sexual aggression. A 1995 survey by the Bureau of Justice Statistics received responses from 42 states; of these, approximately half reported offering treatment programs for sex offenders. The capacity of the programs ranged from 2 to 21 percent of the incarcerated sex offenders, with an average of 11 percent (Maquire and Pastore, 1996). Washington State has one of the largest of these programs, with capacity for approximately 200 offenders in a residential program.

The treatment programs in prison vary as to the timing of treatment, but most concentrate it toward the end of the sentence. Some programs involve living units for those in treatment.

**Programs with evidence of an effect.** The director of Washington State's Sex Offender Treatment Program, Arthur Gordon, is the co-author of a study demonstrating a positive effect on recidivism reduction. The prison-based program located in Canada, Clearwater Sex Offender Treatment Program, relied on cognitive behavioral treatment and relapse prevention (Nicholaichuk and Gordon, 1996). The study population completed the program between 1981 and 1996. High-risk sex offenders, both child molesters and rapists, were offered opportunities to participate in the program. The evaluation relied on a comparison group that was carefully matched on several characteristics with the treatment group.

The average follow-up time was six years. The treatment group was found to have a lower proportion of sexual convictions than the comparison group (14.5 and 33.2 percent); as well as

a lower proportion of non-sexual convictions (32.1 and 35 percent). Only the difference for the sexual convictions was significant.

**Programs where effectiveness cannot be determined.** A few states have studied the treatment effects of their sex offender programs, but the research designs have not allowed strong conclusions. The states in this group include Washington (Song and Lieb, 1995), Minnesota (Huot, 1997), and Alaska (Mander et al., 1996).

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** The state of California established a state-of-the-art treatment program for sex offenders in the mid 1980s and also invested in an experimental research design (Marques and Day, 1997). The study recruited volunteers and then randomly selected participants. The program relied on highly-qualified staff who developed very precise treatment components, emphasizing relapse prevention. The participants received one year of follow-up in the community after release. The program ended in the early 1990s, but the follow-up on recidivism patterns continues. The 1997 update did not demonstrate any significant differences in the recidivism patterns of the treatment and control groups.

A study focusing on child molesters in a Canadian correctional institution found no significant differences between a treatment group that received aversive conditioning and counseling versus a no-treatment comparison group (Hanson et al., 1993). Another Canadian study evaluating the effect of laboratory-based behavioral therapy to alter sex-age preferences for a small group of child molesters also showed no differences between the treatment and comparison group (Rice and Harris, 1991). An evaluation of sex offenders receiving treatment at a regional treatment center in Canada indicated a higher rate of sexual arrests for the treatment group than the comparison (refusers and those judged unsuitable or not requiring treatment) (Quinsey et al., 1998).



**Program Name:** Sex Offender Treatment and Evaluation Project  
**Program Type:** Cognitive-behavioral inpatient treatment  
**Program Location/Dates:** Atascadero, California/1985 to 1995

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Using a rigorous evaluation design, including random assignment to treatment, this study is considered by many experts the "gold standard" in terms of methodology. The study examines a treatment group, a treatment drop-out group, a volunteer comparison group, and a nonvolunteer comparison group.
- The 1997 results did not demonstrate a statistically significant difference between treated and untreated offenders in arrest for sex crimes or violent non-sex crimes. The recidivism analysis is ongoing, thus the results could change over time.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	204 treatment, 225 comparison
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Volunteer group
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Offenders were selected based on conviction history of rape or child molestation and proximity of release date (18 to 30 months before release)
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Treated and untreated were matched on variables of age, criminal history and type of offense, and one of the pair was assigned at random to treatment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Sex crimes, violent crimes, and other crimes</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Average of 4.8 years (study is ongoing)
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The program was an intensive cognitive-behavioral treatment program focused on relapse prevention. Treatment was very structured, with both group and individual treatment by highly trained professionals. The treated group received aftercare in the community for one year following release.

### ***Study Reference***

Marques, Janice K., and David M. Day. 1997. "Sex Offender Treatment and Evaluation Project: 1997 Progress Report," Sacramento, CA: California Department of Mental Health.

**Program Name:** Clearwater Sex Offender Treatment Program  
**Program Type:** Residential, cognitive-behavioral, relapse prevention  
**Program Location/Dates:** Correctional Service of Canada's Regional Psychiatric Centre (Prairies)/1981 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Recidivism rates for treated sex offenders (296) were compared with a matched sample of sex offenders from the same region of Correctional Service of Canada (283). The mean follow-up time was six years.
- Participants in program were volunteers and described as "high risk" (recidivists and possessing extensive criminal histories). Recidivism data were analyzed using tests of proportion, survival analysis, and analysis of Career Criminal Profiles.
- The study found treatment participants had a lower proportion of sexual and non-sexual convictions (15 percent and 32 percent) than the comparison group (33 percent and 35 percent). The difference was significant, with an effect size of -.45.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 296; comparison: 283
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Offenders matched with treatment group on age at offense, date of index offense, and prior criminal history
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No, however treatment group was matched on several characteristics
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Four measures: sexual felony convictions, nonsexual convictions, sex offense convictions resulting in return to federal prison, nonsexual convictions resulting in return to federal prison</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Average of six years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Clearwater sex offender treatment program, operated by the Correctional Service of Canada's Psychiatric Centre (Prairies Region), has been in existence since 1981. This residential treatment program has adopted a structured, cognitive-behavioral approach and a relapse prevention treatment framework.
- The program treats a diverse set of sex offenders.

***Study Reference***

Nicholaichuk, Terry, and Arthur Gordon. 1996. "Treatment Reduces Sexual Recidivism: Clearwater Outcome Data Summary," in press.

**Program Name:** Child Molester Treatment Program  
**Program Type:** Multimodal  
**Program Location/Dates:** Southern Ontario Correctional Institution/1965 to 1973

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The comparison group was selected from offenders at the same Canadian institution during the same time period. This group included persons who did not receive treatment for a variety of reasons including insufficient time remaining on their sentence, elderly age, major mental illness.
- The differences between the groups were not significant. The treatment group had a 44 percent arrest rate and the comparison group had a 33 percent arrest rate.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 106; comparison: 60
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Comparison groups were matched to treatment group on some factors; prior conviction histories were dissimilar
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteers
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Conviction for sexual or violent offense</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Average of 19 years for the treatment group; 20 years for the comparison group
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Treatment program included aversive conditioning, individual and group counseling, and other treatments within the institution (vocational counseling, etc.). Offenders attended the program for an average of five months (range one to 12 months). Voluntary follow-up services were given to 59 percent of the offenders.
- Researchers also identified differences in the reoffense patterns of various types of sex offenders within the populations and examined risk predictors.

### ***Study Reference***

Hanson, R. Karl, R.A. Steffy, and Rene Gauthier. 1993. "Long Term Recidivism of Child Molesters," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 61:646-652.

**Program Name:** Sex Offender Treatment Program (SOTP)  
**Program Type:** Multi-phase institutional sex offender treatment  
**Program Location/Dates:** Hilland Mountain Correctional Center (HMCC), Anchorage, Alaska/1982 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The SOTP evaluation examined arrest rates for three groups of male sex offenders: 1) 411 offenders who received treatment at HMCC between 1987 and 1995 ("treatment group"); 2) 74 offenders who requested but did not receive treatment due to insufficient sentence/lack of space ("motivated offenders"); 3) 86 randomly selected offenders who did not request/refused treatment ("unmotivated offenders").
- Survival analyses demonstrated that offenders who received treatment had a greater survival rate for any arrest compared to the unmotivated and motivated comparison groups. Arrest rates were lower for the treatment group (4.4 mean arrests) than they were for the unmotivated and motivated comparison groups (4.7 and 4.9 mean arrests), but the differences were non-significant.
- The length of time elapsed to first reoffense and first sex reoffense was longer for the treatment group than either of the comparison groups.
- Methodological shortcomings, such as absence of statistical controls and potential for sample selection bias, limit a scientific assessment of treatment effects.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 411; motivated nontreatment: 74; unmotivated nontreatment: 86
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No; groups were compared on demographic and other factors and no significant differences were found
<b>Comparison group</b>	"Motivated" and "Unmotivated" nontreatment groups (see description above)
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary; admission based on eligibility criteria
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest for any offense; arrest for sex offense</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Time series analysis, two years average time at-risk
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The HMCC program houses approximately 85 sex offenders in a milieu setting. The program, set in a medium-security facility, is designed for adult male sex offenders convicted and sentenced for sexual offenses with 18 months to six years until release.
- HMCC is a multi-phase, institutional program offering specialized services to developmentally disabled sex offenders and female sex offenders. Services are provided by four contract therapists and specially trained correctional officers who serve as wing counselors and assist contractors in maintaining the intensive therapeutic environment.

- HMCC utilized a relapse prevention model. The relapse prevention model is a cognitive-behavioral approach to treatment, which is oriented to self-control and teaching sex offenders to recognize if they are entering into high risk, re-offend situations, self-destructive behaviors, and/or deviant cycle patterns. The model combines behavioral management skills with cognitive processes to intervene and thereby modify targeted, sexually-deviant behaviors.
- The program consisted of four phases—pretreatment, beginning treatment, intermediate treatment, and advanced treatment. The objectives of each phase evolved from assessment, use of feedback and self-regulation, self-management skill development and internalization, and application and generalization of skills to new situations.

### ***Study Reference***

Mander, Anthony M., Martin E. Atrops, Allan R. Barnes, and Roseanne Munafo. 1996. "Sex Offender Treatment Program: Initial Recidivism Study," Anchorage: Alaska Department of Corrections.

**Program Name:** Penetanguishene Mental Health Center Treatment Program  
**Program Type:** Residential, laboratory-based behavior therapy  
**Program Location/Dates:** Correctional Services of Canada, Ontario/1972 to 1983

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This study compared recidivism rates for treated child molesters (29) and untreated (29) from the same high security psychiatric institution. The mean follow-up time was six years. The treatment group received laboratory-based behavioral therapy designed to alter sexual age preferences.
- Outcome data was obtained from a variety of sources, including several national sources.
- No evidence of program efficacy was found. The sexual conviction rate for the treatment group was 31 percent; the comparison group was 38 percent; the difference was not statistically significant.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 29; comparison: 29
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Offenders within institution who did not receive laboratory treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteer
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Groups were compared on several factors and showed differences. Subjects were carefully matched and no differences in outcome emerged.
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Sexual conviction; violent failure; any failure</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Six years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Phallometric testing was used to uncover sexual age preferences and test whether they changed over time.
- Some individuals were able to demonstrate changes in their test results; however this success did not translate into differences in recidivism rates. The program graduates may have learned to fake results, or the treatment effect may not have been sustained following release.

### ***Study Reference***

Rice, Marnie E., and Grant T. Harris. 1991. "Evaluation of an Institution-Based Treatment Program for Child Molesters," *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation* 6:111-129.

**Program Name:** Minnesota Sex Offender Prison Treatment  
**Program Type:** Not specified  
**Program Location/Dates:** Minnesota prisons/ongoing

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The study compared sex offenders who were successfully discharged from treatment in 1992 with sex offenders released at the same time who did not complete or never entered treatment.
- No significant differences were found in the arrest rates between the treatment and comparison groups (treatment group results incorporated completers and non-completers).
- The study design makes it impossible to conclude if the observed differences were caused by the treatment or due to selection bias.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 65; comparison: 186
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Offenders who did not enter treatment or those who quit or were terminated
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Unclear
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest for sex offense</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	4.5 years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- No description was provided.

### ***Study Reference***

Huot, Stephen J. 1997. "Sex Offender Treatment and Recidivism: Research Summary," St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Corrections.



**Program Name:** Twin Rivers Sex Offender Treatment Program  
**Program Type:** Residential; cognitive-behavioral program  
**Program Location/Dates:** Monroe, Washington/ongoing

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Arrest patterns of treated sex offenders were compared to a cohort of sex offenders who did not receive treatment.
- Estimated recidivism rates of the treatment group were slightly lower (11 percent) than the rates of the comparison group (12 percent), however the results were not statistically significant.
- The research design makes it impossible to discern the effects of treatment from selection bias.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 119; comparison: 159
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Sex offenders incarcerated in Washington prisons during same time period; the comparison group differed in terms of race, prior sex offenses, and type of offense.
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Statistical tests were applied to control for differences between treatment and comparison groups. Survival analysis was used to control for variable time at risk.
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrests for sex offenses and violent offenses</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	20 months average
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined.</i>

### ***Program Description***

- This study examined the recidivism rates of the first 119 sex offenders to complete the treatment program and reside in the community for at least one month by March 1993.

### ***Study Reference***

Song, Lin, and Roxanne Lieb. 1995. "Washington State Sex Offenders: Overview of Recidivism Studies," Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

<b>Program Name:</b>	Regional Treatment Centre Sex Offender Treatment Program
<b>Program Type:</b>	Behavioral and cognitive-behavioral treatment
<b>Program Location/Dates:</b>	Correctional Services of Canada/ongoing

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Of the 438 inmates referred to a sex offender treatment program, 38 percent were arrested for new violent or sexual offenses after an average of 44 months follow-up time. Treated offenders were most frequently arrested for sex offenses.
- Inmates judged unsuitable for treatment were arrested less frequently, particularly for sex offenses. Inmates judged to not require treatment and those who refused treatment also had fewer arrests for sex offenses than did treated participants, although they had more arrests for violent offenses.
- After controlling for the static variables that predicted reoffending, the treatment program was associated with a higher rate of sexual arrests but had no effect on the composite variable of variable or sexual arrests.
- Among treated offenders, clinical assessment of treatment progress was not associated with recidivism.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 213; judged as not needing treatment: 183; refused treatment: 52; unsuitable for treatment: 27; required, but did not receive treatment: 9
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Comparison groups described above
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Evaluation by staff and agreement to participate
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Extensive statistical controls used in evaluation
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Sexual recidivism; violent recidivism</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Approximately four years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Negative effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The early version of the program emphasized sex education and training designed to increase social skills, assertiveness, and anger management. Since 1974, the program has emphasized cognitive-behavioral treatment, aversion control, covert sensitization, biofeedback, and psychotherapeutic elements such as confrontation and role playing.
- Empathy skills training were added in 1986 and relapse prevention was added in 1989.

**Study Reference**

Quinsey, Vernon L, Arunima Khanna, and P. Bruce Malcolm. 1998. "A Retrospective Evaluation of the Regional Treatment Centre Sex Offender Treatment Program," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 13(5):621-644.

### ***Community-Based Programs***

In many states, sex offenders with limited or no criminal history, who committed their offenses without the direct use of violence or force, and are judged amenable to treatment, receive a probation sentence with the requirement to receive outpatient treatment. Depending on the locality, the treatment may or may not be specific to sex offending. The research on treatment effectiveness has included programs that emphasize general psychological counseling as well as those with specific focus on sex offending.

The sex offenders typically accepted into community-based programs have been found to have relatively low base rates for re-offending. Using re-arrest as a measure, research in Washington State revealed a recidivism rate of 11 percent with an average follow-up period of seven years. The same study found a 31 percent recidivism rate for sex offenders who were not eligible for community-based treatment and were released from prison (Song and Lieb, 1995).

One cannot assume, however, that in all circumstances the community-based programs treated low-risk offenders and those in prison were high-risk. Sentencing law and policies for sex offenders have received more attention in the last decade, with greater emphasis on appraising risk as well as greater sensitivity to the harm caused by sex offenses. This progress, however, is not universal. In addition, studies involving follow-up periods of several years are based on sentencing practices from the past.

**Programs where effectiveness cannot be determined.** Research on community-based treatment for sex offenders can be difficult because an experimental design is rarely feasible. Comparison groups are the only realistic option, and it can be difficult to find a perfectly comparable group. These studies all have low ratings on the Maryland scale, thus, we only have minimal confidence in the results.

The Kingston Sexual Behavior Clinic treated child molesters with a cognitive behavioral program from 1975 to 1985 (Marshall and Barbaree, 1982). The comparison group consisted of admitted child molesters who changed their mind about wanting treatment or lived at some distance from the program. The treated group was found to have fewer sexual offenses (defined by police reports, agency records, and self-report) than the comparison group (13.2 percent compared to 34.5 percent), however, differences between the treatment and comparison group make it difficult to be certain about program effectiveness.

The study in Washington State examined sex offenders convicted between 1985 through 1986 (Song and Lieb, 1995). The population was divided into three groups: those receiving community-based treatment (Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternative); those eligible for this treatment but not selected to receive it and instead were incarcerated, and those who were not eligible for the treatment and were incarcerated. Statistical controls were used to estimate the effects of selection bias and control for this factor. The research did not find a statistically significant difference in regards to sexual reoffenses, however, a significant difference was found in the reoffense rate for other felony offenses.

A recently published study from Vermont (McGrath et al., 1998) examined three groups of sex offenders with probation sentences: those who received specialized sex offender treatment; those who received generic psychological treatment, and those who did not receive any treatment. The specialized treatment group had a sexual reoffense rate of 1.4 percent,

compared to 15.6 for the non-specialized group and 10.5 for the no treatment group. The treatment effect was statistically significant. The authors report, however, that differences in the groups may have biased the results. The specialized treatment group had the highest proportion of incest offenders, and this group typically has the lowest reoffense rate of sex offenders. The no-treatment group also had individuals with more extensive criminal histories.

A study from Ohio used a very small sample (30 in both groups) to test a theoretical treatment model with offenders serving probation sentences (Hall, 1995). The treatment group consisted of volunteers, and only those who completed treatment were included. The treatment group did show a reduced rate of recidivism but the research design makes it impossible to conclude that the treatment caused this reduction.

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** The National Institute of Mental Health funded a ten-year follow-up for an experimental study of the effects on group psychotherapy on sex offender recidivism (Romero and Williams, 1983). The study compared recidivism rates of offenders who received group psychotherapy in addition to probation with a control group receiving only intensive probation supervision. No statistically significant differences were found between the groups.

**Program Name:** Joseph H. Peters Institute (NIMH funded study)  
**Program Type:** Intensive probation supervision and group psychotherapy  
**Program Location/Dates:** Philadelphia, Pennsylvania/1966 to 1969

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The study compared the recidivism rates of offenders who received group psychotherapy in addition to probation with a control group of offenders receiving only intensive probation supervision.
- No statistically significant differences were found in arrests for a sex offense between the two groups.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Total 231: (148 treatment, 83 control)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Offenders who received probation services
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Probation sentence
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest for a sex offense</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	10 years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- A pilot study without randomized assignment was conducted in 1965. The NIMH grant was awarded in 1966.
- Most offenders in treatment attended a psychotherapy group for 40 weeks

### ***Study Reference***

Romero, Joseph J. and Linda M. Williams. 1983. "Group Psychotherapy and Intensive Probation Supervision with Sex Offenders: A Comparative Study," *Federal Probation* 47:36-42.

**Program Name:** Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternative (SSOSA)  
**Program Type:** Community treatment  
**Program Location/Dates:** Washington State/1984 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This study compared the recidivism rates for three groups of sex offenders convicted between January 1985 and June 1986: those who received SSOSA, those eligible but did not receive SSOSA, and those statutorily excluded from SSOSA. The follow-up was up to seven years, with an average of 5.7 years at-risk.
- Survival analysis was used to assess treatment effects and demonstrated that offenders receiving SSOSA treatment had an arrest rate for sex offenses (11 percent) that was lower than that observed among the eligible and noneligible nontreatment groups (14 percent, 31 percent). However, after statistical controls for age, race, criminal history, and type of conviction were introduced, the difference between the treatment group and SSOSA-eligible group was no longer significant. The SSOSA treatment group also exhibited lower arrest rates for other felony offenses and this difference remained significant after introducing statistical controls.
- This analysis could not determine whether lower arrest rates were due to treatment effectiveness, or because low-risk offenders were selected for the treatment sentence.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 321; comparison: 306
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Two groups: sex-offenders who did not receive SSOSA treatment but were eligible, and sex offenders not receiving SSOSA who were ineligible
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary and must meet program eligibility criteria
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No statistical controls for main analysis
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest for: felony sex offense, felony violent offense, and all other felony offenses</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Up to seven years; average 5.6 years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternative (SSOSA) is a Washington State community treatment sentence granted to certain first-time sex offenders. To be eligible for SSOSA, offenders must meet the following conditions: 1) a first-time conviction for a felony sex offense; 2) a conviction other than First or Second Degree Rape; and 3) a sentence range, defined under state guidelines, not exceeding eight years.

- Offenders who receive SSOSA are subject to crime-related prohibitions, such as restricted contact with minors. In addition, judges may order SSOSA offenders to spend up to six months in jail, and can revoke the suspended sentence if the offender fails to comply with treatment or demonstrates a threat to public safety.

***Study Reference***

Song, Lin, and Roxanne Lieb. 1995. "Washington State Sex Offenders: Overview of Recidivism Studies," Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.



**Program Name:** Vermont Treatment Program for Sexual Aggressors  
**Program Type:** Cognitive-behavioral treatment and correctional supervision  
**Program Location/Dates:** Addison County, Vermont/ongoing

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The study compared nonrandomized sex offenders who received specialized outpatient treatment (cognitive-behavioral and relapse-prevention), those who received less specialized mental health treatment (traditional psychotherapy), and those who received no treatment.
- The groups were not similar in critical variables: the specialized group had a higher proportion of incest offenders and the no-treatment group had more extensive criminal history.
- At follow-up, the specialized treatment group demonstrated a statistically significant difference in recidivism rates.
- The study design, however, makes it impossible to conclude if the observed differences were caused by a treatment effect or selection bias.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Specialized treatment: 71; less specialized treatment: 32; no treatment: 19
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	The specialized treatment group had a higher proportion of incest offenders; the no treatment group had the highest rate of criminal history and longest sentences.
<b>Means of program entry</b>	For specialized treatment, offender had to admit offense and agree to participate. Those who participated for at least three months were included in the analysis. The nonspecialized group had to admit offense and enroll in some type of nonspecialized program for at least three months.
<b>Statistical controls</b>	None
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrests or convictions for sexual, nonsexual-violent, and nonviolent offenses; probation violations</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	62.9 months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The specialized treatment group received cognitive-behavioral treatment with a relapse prevention model, as well as ancillary treatments. Probation officers were closely involved with the treatment program.
- The non-specialized treatment group received a variety of mental health interventions, primarily individual counseling.

**Study Reference**

McGrath, Robert J., Stephen E. Hoke, and John E. Vojtisek. 1998. "Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of Sex Offenders: A Treatment Comparison and Long-Term Follow-Up Study," *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 25:203-225.

**Program Name:** Kingston Sexual Behaviour Clinic  
**Program Type:** Cognitive behavioral treatment for child molesters  
**Program Location/Dates:** Ontario, Canada/1975 to 1985

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Follow-up histories were compared between two groups of admitted child molesters: the treated and the untreated.
- The untreated offenders failed to participate for one of two reasons: they lived too far away and did not want to travel, or they were incarcerated and by the time of their release, changed their mind about treatment.
- Fewer treated offenders were rearrested or self-reported any sexual offenses (13.2 percent), than the non-treatment group (34.5 percent).
- Differences between the two groups make it difficult to be certain about the treatment effects.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 126 (68 treated, 58 not treated)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Comparison group of admitted child molesters who changed their mind about wanting treatment or said they lived too far away to participate.
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Referred to program by courts, police, agencies, etc.
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Analysis of variance conducted on certain factors
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Sexual recidivism as reported by police and courts, agency records, and offenders</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One to 11 years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Outpatient treatment program for child molesters relying on behavioral interventions, including familial and non-familial offenders.
- Program approaches were modified over time to take advantage of increasing knowledge and changing trends in therapy.

### ***Study Reference***

Marshall, W.L and H.E. Barbaree. 1988. "The Long-Term Evaluation of a Behavioral Treatment Program for Child Molesters," *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 26:499-511.

**Program Name:** Ohio Community Treatment for Sex Offenders  
**Program Type:** Testing of theoretical model; program addressed deviant sexual arousal, cognitive distortions and affective controls.  
**Program Location/Dates:** Ohio/1989 to 1992

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Evaluation compared those who completed treatment with those who did not.
- One offender of the 17 who completed treatment recidivated compared to seven recidivists in the pool of 13 who did not complete treatment.
- The results may be a function of differential offender motivation rather than treatment effects.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 17; non-completers: 13
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No; small number of referrals precluded this option.
<b>Control group</b>	No
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Referral by probation staff person
<b>Statistical controls</b>	None
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Violation of probation or parole</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	10 to 14 months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The program was based on a theoretical model developed by one of the study authors (Hall). Treatment addressed a combination of the following theorized precursors of sexual aggression: physiological, cognitive, and affective motivation.

### ***Study Reference***

Hall, Gordon C. Nagayama. 1995. "The Preliminary Development of Theory-Based Community Treatment for Sexual Offenders," *Professional Psychology: Review and Practice* 26(5):478-483.

## SECTION VIII: COGNITIVE BEHAVIORAL TREATMENT

---

The integration of cognitive and behavioral therapies in the field of psychology has led to treatment programs that focus on both the thinking processes and actions of an individual to implement change. According to Wanberg and Milkman (1998), cognitive therapy, which helps individuals see alternative ways of thinking and appraising situations, and behavioral therapy, with its focus on self-control and client responsibility, reinforce each other. Cognitive change leads to changes in behavior, which in turn strengthens a change in thought patterns.

Several cognitive behavioral treatments have been tested with offenders under criminal justice supervision. The major programs include Moral Reconciliation Therapy, Reasoning and Rehabilitation, anger management, and cognitive self-change.<sup>8</sup> We consider many of these programs promising, although few have been extensively researched with designs that produce definitive results on program effectiveness.

### ***Moral Reconciliation Therapy***

#### **Overview**

Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT) is a step-by-step process designed to raise offenders' personality, identity and moral development in order to insulate them against criminal behavior (Little et al., 1988). The program identifies 12 steps in the development of moral reasoning. The program is specifically for use with populations considered resistant to treatment, such as drug abusers, criminals, and persons with antisocial personality disorders.

We find MRT to be a promising program, but the research findings are not yet conclusive. The research demonstrating recidivism reductions has been conducted primarily by the program developers and replication of these results is necessary to know whether this methodology can be transferred to other practitioners. Second, in most instances, the program has been delivered to volunteers and the positive results to date may have been influenced by this motivated group.

**Programs with evidence of an effect.** The program at the Shelby County Correctional Center, a county-operated prison facility housing offenders with sentences of up to six years has been shown to be effective (Little et al., 1998). The study involves a long-term follow-up of five cohorts of offenders receiving treatment from 1987 to 1992. At the latest follow-up, felony offenders released for five years exhibit significantly lower rates of reincarceration for a new conviction. Approximately 38 percent of the treatment group return to prison or jail for a new conviction, versus 53 percent of the comparison group, an effect size of  $-.30$ . The differences in recidivism are also significant for felony offenders who have been released for six to nine years.

**Programs where effectiveness cannot be determined.** Other tests of MRT have been conducted in Delaware, Washington State, and other locations, but the research designs are not strong enough to determine program effectiveness. An evaluator for the Delaware prisons made an attempt to implement random assignment to treatment, but succeeded only at two of four institutions, resulting in very small sample sizes (Miller, 1997). The first year results from

---

<sup>8</sup> We include the cognitive behavioral treatment for sex offenders in Section VII.

this program show no statistically significant differences in recidivism rates between the treatment and control groups in the two institutions with randomization, or the four combined institutions.

In Washington State, results for a MRT program in community corrections are also non-significant (Granberry, 1988). However, the matched comparison group in this study showed fewer violations and lower self-reported rates of substance abuse compared to the treatment group. Another study involving three counties in Washington State (Burnett, 1997) shows differences in the direction of reducing recidivism, however, the sample size is extremely limited. In other studies (Godwin et al., 1995; Krueger, 1997), MRT participants show lower rates of recidivism than a comparison group, however, the appropriateness of the comparison group is not addressed, casting doubt on the findings.

**Program Name:** Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT)  
**Program Type:** Moral reconciliation therapy/cognitive behavioral  
**Program Location/Dates:** Shelby County Correctional Center, Memphis, Tennessee/  
 1985 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation presented the latest results from an ongoing study of offenders who participated in MRT from 1987 to 1992. Participants were followed for a minimum of five and a maximum of nine years after release.
- Comparison of the treatment and comparison groups five years after release revealed that those receiving MRT treatment exhibited significantly lower rates of reincarceration for a new conviction. 38 percent of the treatment group were returned to prison or jail for a new conviction, compared to 53 percent of the comparison group, an effect size of  $-.30$ .
- Statistically significant differences were found in reincarceration for a new conviction between the treatment and comparison groups for offenders who had been released for six to nine years. In the nine-year follow-up, 44 percent of the treatment group were returned to jail or prison for a new conviction versus 62 percent of the comparison group, an effect size of  $-.36$ .

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Five-year follow-up: 1,052 treatment, 329 comparison Nine-year follow-up: 70 treatment, 82 comparison
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment; MRT volunteers not treated due to lack of program space
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Simple comparisons show similarity on race, age, pre-treatment arrest records
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Reincarceration in jail/prison for new conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Five to nine years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Moral Reconciliation Therapy is a systematic, cognitive behavioral approach designed to reduce recidivism by restructuring the manner whereby offenders make decisions and judgments.
- MRT was first implemented in the drug therapeutic community for offenders at the Shelby County-operated prison. The MRT program was subsequently expanded to treat the general population of offenders, and often offenders continued treatment through post-release aftercare. This prison facility housed offenders with up to a six-year sentence.
- MRT involved two weekly meetings, lasting one to two hours, and typically involving 10 to 15 offenders. Meetings focused on completing the MRT program of step exercises and tasks to enhance levels of moral reasoning.

### **Study References**

Little, Gregory L., Kenneth D. Robinson, Katherine D. Burnette, and E. S. Swan. 1998. "Nine-Year Reincarceration Study on MRT-Treated Felony Offenders: Treated Offenders Show Significantly Lower Reincarceration," *Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review* 6(1):2-3.

The same authors have published yearly follow-ups on this program in their journal, *Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review*, in addition to articles in *Psychological Reports* that are listed in the bibliography.



**Program Name:** Delaware Life Skills Program  
**Program Type:** Moral reconnection therapy/cognitive behavioral/life skills  
**Program Location/Dates:** Delaware State Prisons/1994 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation involved life skills participants in four Delaware state prisons. Moral reconnection therapy was the major component of the program.
- In two institutions, Sussex and Gander Hill, offenders were randomly assigned to the treatment and control groups. At Sussex, 26 percent of the treatment group recidivated compared to 35 percent of controls, while at Gander Hill 32 percent of the treatment group recidivated versus 20 percent of the controls. Neither difference is statistically significant.
- The author presented an overall recidivism rate of 19 percent for participants in all four institutions compared to 27 percent rate for the combined control groups noted above. Again, the difference was not statistically significant.
- At Gander Hill, the recidivism rate was higher for life skills participants than the control group. Participants in this prison received less program time and remained incarcerated longer after graduation than students in other programs.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	4
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 131; control: 48
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	At two of four institutions
<b>Control group</b>	Randomly selected from volunteers at two institutions only; recidivism statistics were computed by averaging the control groups
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteer
<b>Statistical controls</b>	None
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Pending charges and convictions for misdemeanor and felony offenses</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The life skills program ran three hours a day and continued for four months. Instructors conducted a morning and afternoon class of 12 to 15 students. Originally, participation was restricted to minimum- or medium-security inmates with six to 22 months left on their sentence, but in 1996 the program was opened to long-term inmates.
- Inmates were housed separately, good time could be earned for program participation, and inmates in the women's facility had more freedom than in other units.
- The program focused on the acquisition of moral values and life skills an offender needed for successful reintegration into society. The major component of the life skills program was moral reconnection therapy (MRT). Two instructors estimated that 65 percent of classroom time was spent on MRT, 20 to 25 percent on applied life skills and 10 to 15 percent on academics.

- Instructors involved family in the program by contacting a family member named by the inmate and informing him or her about the program and the inmate's progress. A family event was held for each class, as was a graduation ceremony.

***Study Reference***

Miller, Marsha L. 1997. Evaluation of the Life Skills Program, Division of Correctional Education, Department of Correction, Delaware. Wilmington, Delaware.

Finn, Peter. 1998. "The Delaware Department of Correction Life Skills Program." Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

**Program Name:** Moral Reconciliation Therapy Program (MRT)  
**Program Type:** Moral reconciliation/cognitive behavioral  
**Program Location/Dates:** Washington State Community Corrections/1994 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared rates of arrest during a one-year follow-up period for offenders on supervision who participated in the moral reconciliation therapy program versus a matched group of offenders on supervision who did not receive treatment.
- During the one-year following program entry, 44 percent of MRT participants were arrested compared to 40 percent of the no treatment comparison group. The difference was not statistically significant.
- There were preexisting differences between the treatment and comparison groups. The treatment group was recommended to the MRT program because of their higher incidence of violations. The treatment group also had a higher incidence of reported substance abuse problems.
- A subsequent WSIPP analysis of felony convictions found no significant differences between the treatment and comparison groups in rate or mean number of convictions approximately three years after program entry.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 109; comparison: 101
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Offenders on supervision, no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary; recommendation by community corrections officer due to treatment group infractions
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Matched groups; however, treatment and control show some differences on violations and substance abuse
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest for all offenses</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year following program entry
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Department of Corrections staff, including community corrections officers, managers, supervisors, and substance abuse counselors were trained to facilitate MRT programs in numerous community settings and institutions. MRT sessions, 90 minutes in length, took place once a week; the average time spent attending MRT sessions was 5.2 months.
- MRT is a systematic, cognitive-behavioral approach that emphasizes moral development theory. Moral development theory focuses on growth to higher stages of moral judgement in order to insulate against criminal behavior. The theory suggests there are 12 steps of moral reasoning, and program efforts are intended to increase the step at which offenders typically make moral judgements.

- MRT focuses on seven basic issues: confrontation of beliefs, attitudes, and behavior; assessment of current relationships; reinforcement of positive actions; formation of positive identity; improvement of self-concept; reduction of self-indulgence and improvement of tolerance of frustration; and overall heightened levels of moral reasoning.

***Study Reference***

Grandberry, Gina. 1998. "Moral Reconciliation Therapy Evaluation, Final Report," Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Corrections.

**Program Name:** Moral Reconciliation Therapy Program (MRT)  
**Program Type:** Moral reconciliation/cognitive behavioral  
**Program Location/Dates:** Washington State Community Corrections/1994 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared rates of arrest and reincarceration during a one-year follow-up period for offenders on supervision in three counties randomly selected from among those who participated in the moral reconciliation therapy program versus a matched group of offenders on supervision who did not participate.
- During the one-year follow-up period, 10 percent of MRT participants were arrested compared to 20 percent of the comparison group. The difference was not statistically significant.
- During the one-year follow-up period, none of the treatment group was reincarcerated versus 10 percent of the comparison group. The difference was statistically significant ( $p=.10$ ).

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 30; comparison: 30
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Offenders on supervision, no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Matched groups on age, sex, ethnicity and sentence length
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest, reincarceration</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Department of Corrections staff, including community corrections officers, managers, supervisors, and substance abuse counselors were trained to facilitate MRT programs in numerous community settings and institutions. Treated offenders in this study attended an average of 23 MRT groups and completed a mean of 9 steps.
- MRT is a systematic, cognitive-behavioral approach that emphasizes moral development theory. Moral development theory focuses on growth to higher stages of moral judgement in order to insulate against criminal behavior. The theory suggests there are 12 steps of moral reasoning, and program efforts are intended to increase the step at which offenders typically make moral judgements.
- MRT focuses on seven basic treatment issues: confrontation of beliefs, attitudes, and behavior; assessment of current relationships; reinforcement of positive actions; formation of positive identity; improvement of self-concept; reduction of self-indulgence and improvement of tolerance of frustration; and overall heightened levels of moral reasoning.

**Study Reference**

Burnett, Walter. 1997. "Treating Post-Incarcerated Offenders with Moral Reconciliation Therapy: A One-Year Recidivism Study," *Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Review* 6 (3/4):2.

**Program Name:** Moral Reconciliation Therapy Program (MRT)  
**Program Type:** Moral reconciliation/cognitive behavioral  
**Program Location/Dates:** Wayne County Jail, Wooster, Ohio/1992 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared rates of arrest during a five-year follow-up period for offenders who participated in the MRT program versus a randomly selected group of jail inmates who did not receive treatment.
- During the five-year follow-up period, 62 percent of MRT participants were arrested compared to 95 percent of the no treatment comparison group. The difference was statistically significant.
- The lack of information on the appropriateness of the comparison group and its small number cast doubt on the findings.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 82; comparison: 25
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	None
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Five years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The MRT program in this county jail involved an ongoing and open-ended group with a trained facilitator.
- MRT is a systematic, cognitive-behavioral approach that emphasizes moral development theory. Moral development theory focuses on growth to higher stages of moral judgement in order to insulate against criminal behavior. The theory suggests there are 12 steps of moral reasoning, and program efforts are intended to increase the step at which offenders typically make moral judgements.
- MRT focuses on seven basic treatment issues: confrontation of beliefs, attitudes, and behavior; assessment of current relationships; reinforcement of positive actions; formation of positive identity; improvement of self-concept; reduction of self-indulgence and improvement of tolerance of frustration; and overall heightened levels of moral reasoning.

### ***Study Reference***

Krueger, Sally. 1997. "Five-Year Recidivism Study of MRT-Treated Offenders in a County Jail." *Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Review* 6(3/4):3

**Program Name:** Moral Reconciliation Therapy Program (MRT)  
**Program Type:** Moral reconciliation/cognitive behavioral  
**Program Location/Dates:** Lake County Detention Center, Florida/1992 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared rates of return to the facility for any reason during a two-year follow-up period for offenders who participated in the MRT program in 1993 versus all other inmates released in 1993.
- During the two-year follow-up period, 25 percent of MRT participants were arrested compared to 37 percent of the comparison group. The difference was statistically significant.
- The lack of information on the appropriateness of the comparison group casts doubt on the findings.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 98; comparison: 5,119
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	No treatment, all other offenders released from the facility in 1993
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	None
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Return to facility</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The MRT program in this short-term facility was employed in the Genesis Program as substance abuse treatment.
- MRT is a systematic, cognitive-behavioral approach that emphasizes moral development theory. Moral development theory focuses on growth to higher stages of moral judgement in order to insulate against criminal behavior. The theory suggests there are 12 steps of moral reasoning, and program efforts are intended to increase the step at which offenders typically make moral judgements.
- MRT focuses on seven basic treatment issues: confrontation of beliefs, attitudes, and behavior; assessment of current relationships; reinforcement of positive actions; formation of positive identity; improvement of self-concept; reduction of self-indulgence and improvement of tolerance of frustration; and overall heightened levels of moral reasoning.

### ***Study Reference***

Godwin, Greg, Sharon Stone and Kenneth Hambrook. 1995. "Recidivism Study: Lake County, Florida Detention Center." *Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Review* 4(3):12.



## ***Reasoning and Rehabilitation***

### **Overview**

Reasoning and rehabilitation (R&R) is a program designed to teach social cognitive skills to offenders. It is based on the premise that many offenders lack the cognitive skills and attitudes essential for social competence, and that acquiring such skills will better enable them to achieve success in legitimate pursuits and withstand pressures towards criminal behavior (Ross and Ross, 1995). The central goals are to modify offenders' impulsive, rigid, and illogical thinking patterns and replace these with thought before action, consideration of behavioral consequences, and conceptualization of alternative responses to interpersonal problems.

As with MRT, a great deal of publicity and enthusiasm surrounds the program but strong evaluations are few in number and not definitive regarding program effectiveness. We think R&R is a promising program, but the research at present offers mixed evidence on its effectiveness.

**Programs with evidence of an effect.** Two studies demonstrate a significant reduction in recidivism for R&R participants. A small experimental study (23 in treatment) shows a reconviction rate of 18 percent for high-risk probationers randomly assigned to R&R versus 70 percent for the regular probation control group, an effect size of  $-1.11$ . This study, involving two field offices in Ontario and carried out by the program developers, has a follow-up time of nine months (Ross et al., 1988). A large nationwide quasi-experimental study involving community and institutional sites conducted by the Correctional Services of Canada shows a significant reduction in reconvictions after one year for low-risk offenders only, with an effect size of  $-.16$  for that group (Robinson, 1995).

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** Several R&R program evaluations find no evidence of a program effect. A pilot study conducted by the Correctional Services of Canada shows a reduction in recidivism at both an 18- and 32-month follow-up, however, neither difference is statistically significant. Since the sample size is small and in the direction of reducing reoffense, this program led to the larger experiment described above. A randomized experiment in Colorado assigning drug offenders to increased supervision, increased supervision and R&R, or regular probation indicates no significant difference between intensive supervision alone or combined with R&R (Johnson and Hunter, 1995). Offenders receiving intensive supervision have a 29 percent revocation rate, compared to 26 percent for offenders receiving intensive supervision and R&R, and 42 percent assigned to regular probation. Several follow-ups of an R&R program, Straight Thinking on Probation (STOP) in Wales have been conducted (Knott, 1995; Raynor and Vanstone, 1996). The latest, a 24-month follow-up, shows no difference between high-risk probationers participating in MRT and the most equivalent comparison group, offenders who receive a custodial sentence.

**Program Name:** Reasoning and Rehabilitation Project  
**Program Type:** Reasoning and rehabilitation/cognitive behavioral  
**Program Location/Dates:** Ontario, Canada/late 1980s to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared the rates of conviction for high-risk probationers randomly assigned to the Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R) cognitive-behavior training or the control group receiving regular probation.
- For the nine-month follow-up, the randomized experiment demonstrated a 70 percent rate of conviction for the control group opposed to an 18 percent rate of conviction for probationers receiving R&R treatment, a significant difference, and effect size of  $-1.11$ .

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	4
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 23; control: 22
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	No treatment, received regular parole conditions
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Random assignment of high risk probationers by judges in regional courts
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary, given random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Nine months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Reasoning and rehabilitation, a comprehensive cognitive skills program, consisted of 35 multi-faceted, small group sessions (70 hours total). The program was conducted by probation officers in the Oshawa and Pickering Probation Offices of Ontario, Canada.
- The R&R program employed techniques intended to impact offenders' thinking. The central goals were to modify offenders' impulsive, rigid, and illogical thinking patterns in favor of thought before action, consideration of behavioral consequences, and conceptualization of alternative responses to interpersonal problems.
- Particular programmatic strategies included teaching the following techniques: structured learning therapy to teach social skills; lateral thinking to teach creative problem-solving; assertiveness training; negotiation skills training; social perspective training; values education; and role playing and modeling.
- Program sessions were conducted by trained probation officers, as an R&R program objective was to involve corrections line staff in program delivery, rather than mental health professionals.

### ***Study Reference***

Ross, Robert R., Elizabeth A. Fabiano, and Crystal D. Ewles. 1988. "Reasoning and Rehabilitation," *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 32:29-36.

**Program Name:** Canadian Cognitive Skills Training Program  
**Program Type:** Reasoning and rehabilitation/cognitive behavioral  
**Program Location/Dates:** Correctional Services of Canada, Nationwide program/1990 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This quasi-experiment testing the Reasoning and Rehabilitation/Cognitive Skills Training program for high-risk offenders assessed the recidivism of program participants in nationwide institutional and community sites between 1990 and 1994.
- Measuring recidivism as conviction during a one-year follow-up period, the evaluation demonstrated that 20 percent of the participants were arrested, compared to 25 percent of the control group. The difference was not statistically significant.
- The evaluation results did indicate a significant effect for low-risk offenders. Low-risk offenders had a recidivism rate of 14 percent versus 20 percent for the control group, an effect size of -.16.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	4
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 1,746; comparison: 379
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Random assignment to receive treatment immediately or placement on a waiting list
<b>Comparison group</b>	On waiting list but did not receive treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary, selection procedure based on demonstration of need and risk
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Simple comparisons show similarity
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Readmission for new conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Evidence of effect among low-risk offenders only</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Cognitive Skills Training Program following the reasoning and rehabilitation program model, was operated by the Correctional Service of Canada. Treatment consisted of 36 two-hour group sessions offered in institutional and community settings.
- Treatment sessions were conducted by staff trained as "coaches," who completed an intensive, two-week training program, and often obtained additional training.
- The program addressed and attempted to change cognitive deficits such as impulsive decision-making, absence of goal-setting behavior, and poor interpersonal skills.
- The program emphasized various techniques and learning styles to broaden the program appeal to a variety of offender types and enable rehearsal of skills in diverse settings.

***Study References***

Robinson, David. 1995. "The Impact of Cognitive Skills Training on Post-Release Recidivism Among Canadian Federal Offenders." Research Report, Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Research and Development, Correctional Service of Canada.

<b>Program Name:</b>	Specialized Drug Offender Program (SDOP) Cognitive Program
<b>Program Type:</b>	Reasoning and rehabilitation/cognitive behavioral
<b>Program Location/Dates:</b>	Two districts in Colorado/1991

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The Specialized Drug Offender Program (SDOP) provided offenders with more supervision than regular probation (a 40- as opposed to 60-client caseload for probation officers with SDOP). As part of a pilot study, offenders were randomly assigned to SDOP, SDOP with Reasoning and Rehabilitation/cognitive skills or regular probation. This evaluation compared the rates of revocation for the three groups.
- During the one-year follow-up period, 42 percent of the group who received regular probation were revoked compared to 29 percent for SDOP and 26 percent for SDOP with the cognitive treatment. The differences between the groups receiving SDOP or SDOP/cognitive versus the probation group were both significant, but the difference was not significant between the SDOP and SDOP/cognitive groups.
- Increased supervision reduced revocations compared to regular probation, but R&R did not demonstrate an additional effect.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	4
<b>Sample size</b>	Probation: 36; SDOP/cognitive: 47; SDOP: 51
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Regular probation, SDOP
<b>Means of program entry</b>	ASI drug score of at least five on a nine-point scale
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary, given random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Revocation</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year after program entry
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Reasoning and rehabilitation is a comprehensive cognitive program consisting of multi-faceted, small group sessions. The program in two districts in Colorado involved seven groups and spanned 17 to 18 weeks. The program was conducted by probation officers.
- The R&R program employed techniques intended to impact offenders' thinking. The central goals were to modify offenders' impulsive, rigid, and illogical thinking patterns in favor of thought before action, consideration of behavioral consequences, and conceptualization of alternative responses to interpersonal problems.
- Particular programmatic strategies included teaching the following techniques: structured learning therapy to teach social skills; lateral thinking to teach creative problem-solving; assertiveness training; negotiation skills training; social perspective training; values education; and role playing and modeling.

- Program sessions were conducted by trained probation officers, as an R&R program objective was to involve corrections line staff in program delivery, rather than mental health professionals.

**Study Reference**

Johnson, G. and R.M. Hunter. 1995. "Evaluation of the Specialized Drug Offender Program," pp. 214-234 in R.R. Ross and R.D. Ross, *Thinking Straight: The Reasoning and Rehabilitation Program for Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation*. Ottawa: Air Training and Publications.

**Program Name:** Cognitive Skills Training Program  
**Program Type:** Reasoning and rehabilitation/cognitive behavioral  
**Program Location/Dates:** Correctional Service of Canada/pilot study 1988 to 1989

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation reported the results for the pilot Cognitive Skills Training Program targeted at high-risk offenders that led to subsequent national implementation in Canada.
- The evaluation compared rates of readmission for the treatment and comparison groups. The 18-month follow-up indicated that 20 percent of the treatment group returned with new convictions as opposed to 30 percent of the comparison group, a non-significant difference.
- The 32-month follow-up demonstrated that among those receiving the cognitive skills training, 35 percent were readmitted for a new conviction, versus 55 percent of the comparison group. Again, the difference was not significant.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	18-month follow-up: 40 treatment, 23 comparison 32-month follow-up: 44 treatment, 20 comparison
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Volunteered and selected for treatment; no treatment given lack of program space
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary, selection based on meeting program criteria
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Simple comparison shows similarity on some offender characteristics
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Readmission for new conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Approximately 18 and 32 months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Cognitive Skills Training Program, operated by the Correctional Service of Canada was based on the reasoning and rehabilitation program model. Treatment during the pilot program lasted eight to 12 weeks, for a total of 36 two-hour group sessions. Treatment was provided in a classroom setting with groups of six to eight participants.
- The sessions involved individual and group exercises, such as role playing, modeling techniques, and video feedback. These sessions were designed for offenders to practice and acquire cognitive skills.
- The program emphasized a variety of techniques and learning styles in order to broaden the appeal of the program to a variety of offender types and to enable rehearsal of the skills in diverse settings.
- Treatment sessions were conducted by staff trained as "coaches," who completed an intensive, two-week training program, often followed by additional training and certification.

***Study Reference***

Porporino, F.J. and D. Robinson. 1995. "An Evaluation of the Reasoning and Rehabilitation Program with Canadian Federal Offenders," pp.155-192 in Ross, R.R. and Ross, R.D., Thinking Straight: The Reasoning and Rehabilitation Program for Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation. Ottawa: Air Training and Publications.

Porporino, Frank J., Elizabeth A. Fabiano, and David Robinson. 1991. "Focusing on Successful Reintegration: Cognitive Skills Training for Offenders." Research Report, Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Research and Development, Correctional Service of Canada.



**Program Name:** Straight Thinking on Probation (STOP) Programme  
**Program Type:** Reasoning and rehabilitation/cognitive behavioral  
**Program Location/Dates:** Mid Glamorgan Probation Service, Wales/late 1991 to present

### **Evaluation Results**

- The conviction rates for high-risk probationers receiving the Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R) cognitive-behavior training were compared to a comparison group receiving a custodial sentence.
- In the 24-month follow-up, the treatment group had a 65 percent rate of conviction, identical to the comparison group receiving the custodial sentence.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 107; comparison: 164
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Control group</b>	No treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	High risk probationers
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No, treatment group had a higher number of previous convictions
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	24 months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### **Program Description**

- Reasoning and rehabilitation is a comprehensive cognitive program consisting of 35 multi-faceted, small group sessions (70 hours total). The program was conducted by probation officers in the Mid Glamorgan, Wales.
- The R&R program employed techniques intended to impact offenders' thinking. The central goals were to modify offenders' impulsive, rigid, and illogical thinking patterns in favor of thought before action, consideration of behavioral consequences, and conceptualization of alternative responses to interpersonal problems.
- Particular programmatic strategies included teaching the following techniques: structured learning therapy to teach social skills; lateral thinking to teach creative problem-solving; assertiveness training; negotiation skills training; social perspective training; values education; and role playing and modeling.
- Program sessions were conducted by trained probation officers, as an R&R program objective was to involve corrections line staff in program delivery, rather than mental health professionals.

### **Study Reference**

Raynor, Peter and M. Vanstone. 1996. "Reasoning and Rehabilitation in Britain: The Results of the Straight Thinking on Probation (STOP) Programme," *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 40(4): 272-284.

## ***Anger Management***

### **Overview**

Treatment programs focusing on anger management and stress reduction are used in community and institutional settings. The premise behind these programs is that violence results from an offender's inability to identify and control anger (Serin and Brown, 1996). The programs are varied, but focus on developing an understanding of emotional states, irrational thoughts, anger and violent offending, and learning strategies to reduce stress, anger and ultimately, violence. The objectives are to help offenders understand the concepts, patterns and situations that lead to anger, and modify and improve behavioral coping skills to reduce stress and control anger.

**Programs where effectiveness cannot be determined.** Three program evaluations have been conducted for anger management programs that use recidivism as an outcome measure. However, all of the evaluations are rated as a level 2 on the Maryland scale, and their effectiveness cannot be determined (Hughes, 1993; Marquis et al., 1996; Motiuk et al., 1996).

**Program Name:** Rideau Anger Management Program  
**Program Type:** Anger management/cognitive behavioral  
**Program Location/Dates:** Rideau Correctional and Treatment Centre, Ontario, Canada/dates unknown, most likely ongoing

### **Evaluation Results**

- This evaluation involved two separate assessments of offender recidivism. The first analysis examined 216 violent and non-violent offenders who completed substance abuse treatment, anger management or a combination of the two programs in 1992-93 to a no-treatment comparison group. The second analysis examined 190 offenders, those completing in similar programming in 1991-92.
- In the first evaluation, treatment and comparison group members were categorized by violent or non-violent convictions. Non-violent offenders completing substance abuse programming had a 68 percent recidivism rate versus 33 percent for the comparison group, a significant difference. Violent offenders completing substance abuse relapse program had a 59 percent recidivism rate versus 51 percent for the comparison group, a non-significant difference. Violent offenders completing both programs had a 59 percent rate of recidivism versus 34 percent for the comparison group, a significant difference. In this study, substance abuse relapse was effective for non-violent offenders who completed treatment, but not for violent offenders, however, the combination of substance abuse relapse and anger management treatment for violent offenders appeared to be effective.
- In the second evaluation, the comparison group had a 60 percent recidivism rate compared to 48 percent for those completing substance abuse relapse, 33 percent for anger management completers and 36 percent for the combined group. Thus, the anger management program did not add much to the effects of substance abuse relapse programming in this analysis.
- The use of treatment completers only in the analyses limits its usefulness.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Analysis 1: 216 Analysis 2: 190
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Nontreatment group on waiting list for treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No, simple comparisons revealed similarity across groups on age, substance use, criminal history, employment, and other factors for analysis 1 sample; not clear if analysis 2 sample
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Readmission to custody for violations or conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	At least one year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Rideau Treatment Centre operates a 24-bed assessment unit and 64-bed treatment unit. The Centre features both a substance abuse relapse program and an anger management program which targets criminogenic factors such as violent behavior and criminal attitudes through cognitive/behavioral strategies. The programs emphasize peer pressure and support in the treatment process.
- Rideau's treatment programs are individualized—caseworkers oversee the offender treatment plans of three to four inmates. The goal of individualized treatment is to focus on relevant situations and emotional states specific to particular inmates.
- Treatment programs are described as "intensive." The programs run for half-days for at least 20 days. Inmates are released from institutional work placements in order to pursue their treatment goals on a full time basis.

### ***Study Reference***

Marquis, Hugh A., Guy A. Bourgon, Barbara Armstrong, and Jon Pfaff. 1996. "Reducing Recidivism Through Institutional Treatment Programs," *Forum on Corrections Research*, 8(3) [Http://198.103.98/crd/forum/e083/e083a.htm](http://198.103.98/crd/forum/e083/e083a.htm).

<b>Program Name:</b>	Correctional Service of Canada—Intensive Treatment Program for Violent Male Offenders
<b>Program Type:</b>	Anger management/cognitive behavioral
<b>Program Location/Dates:</b>	Canada's Pacific Regional Health Centre/1990 – final date not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation assessed the treatment effects of a cognitive-behavioral anger management program for male offenders with a history of criminal violence.
- The treatment group consisted of 60 males who had participated in the intensive treatment program during their incarceration. The comparison group consisted of 60 offenders who did not participate in treatment; these offenders were matched with the treatment group on release date, age at release, and sentence length. Substantial differences did exist in the types of crimes committed by the treatment versus comparison groups (homicide offenders were more prevalent in the treatment group).
- Offenders who received treatment demonstrated a slightly higher rate of conviction for violent and all offense types; 40 percent of the treatment group and 35 percent of the comparison group were arrested. Conviction rates for violent offenses were 18 percent for the treatment group and 15 percent for the comparison group. None of the differences were statistically significant.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Total 120: (treatment 60, comparison 60)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Received no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Not specified
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Treatment and comparison group matched on release date, age at release, and sentence length; higher number of homicide offenders in treatment group
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two-year average; range: three months to six years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Correctional Service of Canada's Regional Health Centre implemented its intensive program for treating violent male offenders in 1990. The program emphasizes cognitive-behavioral and psychosocial dynamic approaches to changing the antisocial behaviors of violent males.
- 12 to 16 offenders participate at any given time. Participants are involved in eight months of intensive treatment; the treatment sessions are co-led by two or more professional staff members.

- The goal is to help offenders deal with patterns related to their crime cycles. Offenders learn about the behavioral, cognitive, interpersonal, and affective components of violent offending. Specific behaviors and strategies emphasized are communication, addictions, thinking errors, human sexuality/relationships, anger management, and empathy.

***Study Reference***

Motiuk, Larry, Carson Smiley, and Kelley Blanchette. 1996. "Intensive Programming for Violent Offenders: A Comparative Investigation," *Forum on Correctional Research*, 8(3)  
<http://198.103.98.138/crd/forum/e083/e083c.htm>.

**Program Name:** Ontario Anger Management Program  
**Program Type:** Anger management/cognitive behavioral  
**Program Location/Dates:** Kingston Penitentiary of Ontario, Canada/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This research evaluated the effect of participating in a cognitive-behavioral anger management program on the recidivism of adult male offenders.
- Four years after the completion of the treatment program, Canadian Police Information Records were used to assess the conviction rates for all offenses and violent offenses across two groups of offenders—those who had participated in at least six treatment sessions (treatment group) and those assessed as fit for treatment but declined participation or dropped out of treatment (comparison group).
- The evaluation did not reveal a statistically significant difference in recidivism rates for all offenses between the treatment and comparison groups (56 versus 69 percent). Rates of conviction for violent offenses were greater for the comparison group than the treatment group (40 versus 69 percent), but again not statistically significant.
- The small sample size and dissimilarity of the comparison group make it difficult to assess program effectiveness.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 41
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Included both program dropouts and clients selected and eligible for the program who decided not to participate
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary participation, clients referred and psychologically assessed for treatment suitability
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No, groups compared only on initial psychometric assessments
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Conviction for violent and all offenses</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Unspecified
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The anger management program, operated by the district parole offices in Ontario, Canada, took place during 12 weekly two-hour treatment sessions at the Kingston Penitentiary. The anger management group was jointly run by a clinical psychologist with advanced training in rational-emotive therapy, and a university drama teacher and student (the latter two being well versed in behavioral analysis and role-playing exercises, which were heavily emphasized in treatment).
- The first objective of the program was to develop an understanding of the concept of anger as well as strategies to control anger. Techniques used to facilitate this goal were arousal awareness, anger recognition, basic moral reasoning and concepts of self-interest.

- The second major objective of the program was cognitive reduction of anger through strategies such as coping self-statements, problem-solving exercises, and the basic tenets of rational-emotive therapy.
- The final major objective of the program focused on modifying and improving behavioral coping skills through relaxation training, assertiveness training, and role-playing various behavioral responses.

**Study Reference**

Hughes, Gareth V. 1993. "Anger Management Program Outcomes," *Forum of Corrections Research*, 5(1). <http://198.193.98.138/crd/forum/e05/e051c.htm>.



## ***Cognitive Self-Change***

### **Overview**

The Cognitive Self-Change (CSC) program is intended to assist offenders in recognizing their cognitive distortions, understanding their role in criminal behavior and reasoning, and developing interventions that modify or counteract criminogenic thought patterns (Henning and Frueh, 1996). The program looks promising, but the research design does not allow certainty regarding the results. As with many programs, it is voluntary and the research has not corrected for selection bias. In addition, it does not appear to have been replicated.

**Program with evidence of an effect.** A two-year follow-up of participants using survival analysis found a 38 percent chance of recidivism for treatment participants within two years as opposed to 67 percent for the comparison group, an effect size of  $-.59$ . An analysis controlling for differences in background characteristics (e.g., age, prior criminal history) between the treatment and comparison groups indicates that significant reductions in recidivism remain.

**Program Name:** Cognitive Self-Change Program  
**Program Type:** Prison-based, cognitive-behavioral treatment  
**Program Location/Dates:** Vermont Department of Corrections/1988 to 1994 (or later)

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The recidivism rates of male offenders who participated in the Vermont Cognitive Self-Change program (CSC) were compared to a group of offenders possessing similar characteristics as the treatment group, who did not receive CSC treatment.
- Offenders receiving CSC treatment exhibited a significantly lower rate of recidivism during the two-year follow-up period (50 percent) than the comparison group (71 percent), an effect size of -.43.
- A survival analysis demonstrated that among CSC participants, there was a 38 percent chance of recidivism in the two-year follow-up period, compared to a 67 percent chance of recidivism for the comparison group. This difference was statistically significant, with an effect size of -.59.
- A Cox regression analysis indicated that program participation predicted longer survival times after controlling for background differences.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 55; comparison: 141
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Received no treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Voluntary, following referral by case worker
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Treatment group had more previous violent crime convictions and fewer property convictions: Cox regression analysis conducted to control for differences
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>New criminal charge or violation of conditions</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The basic goal of the Vermont Department of Corrections' Cognitive Self-Change program was to help offenders recognize their own cognitive distortions and understand the role of these distortions in their criminal behavior and reasoning. The program was directed primarily toward incarcerated male offenders with histories of interpersonal aggression, and secondarily toward nonviolent male offenders.
- CSC took place at the Northwest State Correctional Facility in St. Albans, Vermont, a 220-bed medium-security prison for men. The program was staffed by correctional officers, case workers, and counselors and took place in a separate unit of the prison. The CSC unit housed approximately 25 offenders who shared occupational, recreational, and educational facilities with the general inmate population.

- Treatment groups met three to five times per week, and while the overall treatment length depended on an offender's remaining length of sentence, the average treatment was 9.8 months.
- During treatment sessions, CSC participants were assisted in understanding their thinking patterns and developing interventions that modified or counteracted their criminogenic thought patterns.
- Efforts were made to help offenders develop a relapse plan to rely upon after their release. Relapse plans include cognitive strategies and behavioral interventions for avoiding high risk situations.

***Study Reference***

Henning, K. R., and B. C. Frueh. 1996. "Cognitive-behavioral Treatment of Incarcerated Offenders: An Evaluation of the Vermont Department of Corrections' Cognitive Self-Change Program." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 23(4):523-541.



## SECTION IX: LIFE SKILLS

---

Life skills is a program designed to teach a variety of daily living skills. Programs cover a variety of topics that may include employment skills (career planning, goal setting, job skills, time management), money management, social skills (communication, relationship building, and anger management), and personal health issues, including alcohol and drug education. Some programs offer case management and individualized guidance, and most involve group instruction and topical workshops. More program evaluations would help in making a final conclusion on life skills programs, but the existing evaluations indicate that this type of programming is not effective for reducing criminal recidivism.

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** Of the three life skills programs we reviewed, none show significant differences in recidivism between participants and control/comparison groups. A randomized experiment of a life skills program in a medium security jail and a work-camp setting in San Diego shows an identical rate of arrest (50 percent) after one year for low-risk non-violent offenders randomly assigned to the program and a control group who did not participate (Melton and Pennell, 1998). A small experiment carried out in Canada shows no significant differences between the treatment and control groups. A third study involving female offenders at the Columbia River Correctional Institution in Oregon, shows a nearly identical rate of conviction two years after release for offenders who completed the program and a comparison group that included program dropouts (Jolin et al., 1997). Since most studies that compare graduates and dropouts show the largest significance levels, this is further evidence of a lack of program effect.

**Program Name:** Staying Out Successfully (SOS)  
**Program Type:** Life skills  
**Program Location/Dates:** San Diego County, California/1994 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This experiment tested the effects of a life skills program in jails involving low risk, non-violent offenders.
- The arrest rate for those who did and did not receive treatment was identical one year after release (50 percent) indicating no evidence of a program effect.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 335 (188 treatment, 147 control)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	No treatment
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteers, classified low risk by custody staff, and screened by counselors for program appropriateness, then random assigned to treatment/control groups
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary as random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- This six-week, in-custody program in two San Diego County jail facilities, a medium security and work camp setting, involved case management and delivery of a life skills program.
- Case management involved individualized guidance with instructors at least once every other week—a minimum of three times during the program.
- The basic life skills workshop curriculum focused on communication, anger management, career planning and goal setting, time management, job skills, relationship building, and budgeting and financial issues, community resources, reentry/recovery plan and one week of recovery issues focusing on each major drug.
- The program used an adult learning interactive approach, as well as cognitive learning strategies for the life skills instruction. The classroom instruction was delivered through various mediums, including television, videos, games, lectures, etc.
- The program was designed to meet the needs of low-risk security level, non-violent offenders with 60 or more days to serve.

### ***Study Reference***

Melton, Roni and Susan Pennell. 1998. "Staying Out Successfully: An Evaluation of an In-custody Life Skills Training Program," San Diego, CA: Association of Governments.

**Program Name:** Reasoning and Rehabilitation Project  
**Program Type:** Life skills  
**Program Location/Dates:** Ontario, Canada/late 1980s to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This small experimental evaluation, the focus of which was the Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R) cognitive skills program, also randomly assigned offenders to a life skills program. They included life skills as an attention-control group, as participants received the same number of training hours as the R&R group. Since it was a randomized test of life skills versus other groups, we have included it in the life skills section.
- For the nine-month follow-up period, the randomized experiment demonstrated a 70 percent rate of conviction for the control group opposed to an 48 percent for probationers receiving life skills treatment, a non-significant difference.
- Life skill participants who were jailed for new offenses before completing the program were not included in the analysis, a factor that would have increased the conviction rate for the life skills group.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 14; control: 22
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	No treatment, received regular parole conditions
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Random assignment of high risk probationers by judges in regional courts
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary, given random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Nine months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The life skills program consisted of training in money management, leisure activities, family law, criminal law, employment-seeking skills, and alcohol and drug education.
- The program was 70 hours in total and was conducted by probation officers in the Oshawa and Pickering Probation Offices of Ontario, Canada.

### ***Study Reference***

Ross, Robert R., Elizabeth A. Fabiano, and Crystal D. Ewles. 1988. "Reasoning and Rehabilitation," *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 32:29-36.

**Program Name:** Women in Community Service Lifeskills Program (WICS)  
**Program Type:** Life skills  
**Program Location/Dates:** Columbia River Correctional Institution, Oregon/1992 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The evaluation results showed that 24 percent of WICS graduates were convicted of a new offense compared to 26 percent of the comparison group. The difference was not significant.
- The use of graduates for the treatment group and inclusion of dropouts in the comparison group probably cast the program in the best light possible.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Total: 479 (187 treatment, 292 comparison)
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	A combined group of WICS dropouts, and inmates released between 1993 and 1995 with at least one stay of more than 120 days and participation of less than 30 days in the institutional substance abuse program
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Volunteer
<b>Statistical controls</b>	None
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The program participants were female offenders nearing the completion of their sentences.
- The WICS program instruction consisted of a personal skills assessment and life skills empowerment workshops. The workshop topics included time and budget management, personal safety and health, and re-entering the workforce.
- The classes were eight weeks in length and the participants spent six hours a day, four days a week in instruction.
- For one year, community mentors aided WICS graduates in their transition.
- Graduates were expected to complete a 40 hour community volunteer internship.

### ***Study Reference***

Jolin, Annette, Michael Day, Kristin Christophersen, Sharon Friedman, Sophie Newton, and Richard Hooper. 1997. "An Evaluation of the WICS Lifeskills Program for Women at the Columbia River Correctional Institution: Preliminary Results." Portland, OR: Portland State University, College of Urban and Public Affairs.



## SECTION X. INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAMS

---

Intensive supervision programs (ISP) provide criminal sanctions that approximate a middle-ground between prison and community corrections. Typically, the programs are characterized by more intense levels of surveillance and supervision than found in routine probation and parole. ISP programs also increase controls on offenders by closely monitoring curfews, restitution, community service obligations, drug and alcohol testing, substance abuse treatment, and employment/education requirements.

The key features of intensive supervision programs differ substantially across jurisdictions. Many states have implemented “frontdoor” programs that are intended to prevent the imprisonment of a low-risk offender by diverting him/her to community control during the sentencing phase. Many of these programs have been used instead for high-risk probationers (Petersilia, 1998). Other states have implemented “backdoor” programs—designed to provide early and conditional release of persons who have served prison terms. Some states restrict eligibility based on criminal history and offense types. Thus, programs vary in the types and risk levels of offenders participating in the programs.

Evaluation research suggests that these programs are not successful in reducing recidivism. The quasi-experimental or randomized experimental evaluations share a common finding that participation in ISP versus routine probation does not reduce recidivism, regardless of the level of surveillance. Additional studies have reached the conclusion that ISP does not reduce prison crowding, does not lead to reduced recidivism, and poses significantly greater costs than routine supervision.

Several researchers point to evidence that a combination of treatment and surveillance increases the effectiveness of ISP (Byrne and Kelly, 1989; Pearson, 1987, 1988; Petersilia and Turner, 1990, 1993); however, research on this combination approach has not been extensive and has produced mixed results (Latessa et al., 1998; Jolin and Stipak, 1992; also see Nurco et al., 1995 and Johnson and Hunter, 1995).

Research on ISP programs is complicated because the tested intervention (increased supervision) offers more opportunities to observe criminal behavior. In studies that find higher rates of arrest for ISP offenders compared to those with routine supervision, the higher rate may be caused by the increased surveillance. The same dilemma occurs in measuring technical violations.

**Programs with some evidence of effect.** Several evaluations suggest that ISP participation reduces offender recidivism, however, these studies were characterized by research design limitations and therefore prevent definitive conclusions regarding program effectiveness. An evaluation of Wisconsin’s ISP found a similar proportion of ISP offenders and routine probationers were returned to prison (Byrne and Pattavina, 1992). However, a higher proportion of ISP offenders were returned to prison for technical violations, while the comparison group was more likely to return for new crimes (U.S. GAO, 1990). In a program carried out in New Jersey, ISP participants were found to have lower rates of arrest and conviction than routine probationers over a two-year follow-up period, but efforts at statistical matching were of questionable reliability (Pearson, 1987).

**Programs with no evidence of effect.** Most studies fell in this category. Researchers at RAND evaluated a total of 14 ISP programs across the nation using very strong research designs (Petersilia et al., 1990, 1992, 1993). At nearly every site, recidivism was not significantly reduced through ISP participation (Petersilia et al., 1993). Overall, the RAND evaluations found that the rate of rearrest (37 percent) among offenders randomly assigned to the ISP programs was not significantly higher than that observed among those randomly assigned to routine community supervision (33 percent). A subset of seven ISP programs designed specifically for drug-involved offenders, as well as a three-site California experiment, also found that ISP participation exerted no significant effect on recidivism (Petersilia et al., 1992, 1990). A final study conducted by RAND researchers in Minnesota indicated no significant differences between the treatment and control groups in arrests or convictions for programs that involved offenders diverted from or parolees released from prison (Deschenes et al., 1995). A recent experimental study by Latessa and colleagues (1998) of an ISP prototype combining substance abuse treatment with supervision also found no significant differences in recidivism.

ISP programs in Massachusetts, Ohio, and Florida did not detect reduced levels of recidivism among offenders who participated in ISP. The evaluation of Massachusetts' ISP, which employed survival analyses and statistical controls, demonstrated that during a one-year follow-up period, 18 percent of ISP offenders were convicted for felonies, compared to 23 percent of regular probationers—this difference was not statistically significant (Byrne and Kelly, 1989). Likewise, evaluation of Ohio's ISP revealed a nonsignificant difference in recidivism across study groups—with 6 percent of ISP participants convicted during the one-year follow-up, compared to 7 percent of routine probationers (Latessa and Gordon, 1994). In Florida, the level of recidivism among ISP participants was actually higher than that observed among offenders in routine probation, with 61 percent of ISP participants convicted, compared to 56 percent of routine probationers (however, the difference across groups was not statistically significant; Smith and Akers, 1993).

**Programs where effectiveness cannot be determined.** Several evaluations of ISP incorporated study designs that did not allow a concrete assessment of program effectiveness. These included an evaluation of substance abuse treatment and home confinement with electronic monitoring in Clackamas County, Oregon (Jolin and Stipak, 1992), Erwin's evaluation of Georgia's ISP program (1987), and an evaluation of ISP in Iowa (U.S. GAO, 1990).

**Program Name:** RAND Intensive Supervised Probation Demonstration Project  
**Program Type:** Intensive supervised probation/parole  
**Program Location/Dates:** 14 sites nationwide/1987 to 1990

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This research featured the largest randomized experiment in corrections ever undertaken in the United States. 14 sites implemented ISP programs in which offenders were randomly assigned to either an ISP program or to routine probation/ parole programs. Systematic data collection documented offender characteristics and recidivism (measured as arrests and technical violations). The follow-up was for one year.
- The results were largely consistent across study sites: more ISP offenders than control group offenders had technical violations, and a higher percentage of ISP offenders were incarcerated. However, when all site samples were pooled, the rates of arrest (37 percent for ISP and 33 percent for control group) did not differ significantly across experimental and control groups.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Variable; ranged from 458 to 24, with mean of 129
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Random assignment to regular probation or parole
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Random assignment (both treatment and control groups demonstrated eligibility for ISP)
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary, given random assignment. Simple comparisons showed that experimental and control groups had similar demographic and criminal backgrounds.
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Technical violations and arrests</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Each site designed and implemented its own unique ISP program. While there was noticeable variation in the type of offenders and treatment objectives across sites, each site admitted only adult offenders who had not been convicted of homicide, robbery, or a sex crime. Most study participants were males in their late 20s or early 30s with lengthy criminal records.
- Several sites designed ISP programs for drug offenders (Georgia, Des Moines, Contra Costa, Santa Fe, Seattle, and Winchester), others utilized electronic monitoring to monitor curfew restrictions (Macon, Los Angeles, and Des Moines), while others attempted to focus on treatment participation (Santa Fe and Winchester).
- A common element across sites was heightened probation-officer and offender contact. This goal was accomplished largely by reducing probation officer caseloads.

**Study Reference**

Petersilia, Joan and Susan Turner. 1993. "Intensive Probation and Parole," pages 281-335 in Tonry, Michael (ed). *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Program Name:** Intensive Supervised Probation  
**Program Type:** Intensive supervised probation/parole for drug-involved offenders  
**Program Location/Dates:** Seven nationwide sites/1987 to 1990

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This was a subset of the 14-site experiment involving seven sites that focused on drug-involved offenders. The evaluation used a randomized, experimental design in which offenders from seven sites were assigned either to community supervision or ISP.
- Each evaluation compared the rate of arrest and conviction for ISP and routine community supervision offenders over a one-year follow-up period.
- The evaluation demonstrated that ISP was not effective in reducing recidivism among these drug-involved offenders. Furthermore, at several sites, the ISP group actually exhibited a significantly higher rate of recidivism than offenders in routine community supervision.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Varied across sites; ISP ranged from 26 to 30; control ranged from 24 to 89
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Offenders randomly assigned to routine community supervision
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Random assignment
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary given random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrests and new convictions</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Intensive Supervision programs were designed and implemented across seven jurisdictions. Programs were designed for male and female drug-involved offenders.
- The ISP's had lower caseloads than those observed in routine community supervision. They also implemented urinalysis, risk assessment, counseling and treatment, and team supervision at each of the seven study sites.
- The demographics and criminal history of offenders varied across sites, but in general the offenders were seriously drug-involved and at moderate to high risk to reoffend.

### ***Study Reference***

Petersilia, J, Turner, S. and Deschenes, E.P. "Intensive Supervision Programs for Drug Offenders." In Byrne, J.M., Lurigio, A.J. and Petersilia, J. (eds.), *Smart Sentencing: The Emergency of Intermediate Sanctions*. Newbury Park: Sage, 18-37.

**Program Name:** California Intensive Supervision Demonstration Project  
**Program Type:** Intensive supervised probation/parole  
**Program Location/Dates:** Contra Costa, Los Angeles, and Ventura Counties, California/experimental programs began in 1987

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This research utilized an experimental design and examined six-month and one-year recidivism outcomes for offenders in three California counties. Offenders were randomly assigned to either regular probation or an ISP program.
- In Los Angeles and Contra Costa counties, no statistically significant differences in arrest rates were found between the regular probation and ISP groups. In Ventura county, only 32 percent of ISP offenders were arrested compared to the 54 percent of routine probationers. This difference was statistically significant.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Los Angeles County: 52 ISP; 51 control Ventura County: 80 ISP; 86 control Contra Costa County: 85 ISP; 85 control
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Offenders randomly assigned to regular probation
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Offenders screened for ISP eligibility after sentencing (screening usually occurred in jail); eligibility based on risk-needs assessment
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary, given random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest for drug, property, violent and all crimes; technical violations</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- All three California ISPs were probation-enhancement programs. The ISPs differed in design and implementation across counties, however in each county ISP was distinguished by the enhanced frequency of probation officer contact. Intensity of supervision started at high levels, was reduced over several phases, and after one year offenders were placed into regular probation.
- Ventura's ISP, a nine-month, three-phase program, was the most intensive of the California ISPs. Caseload limits were set at 19, and offenders had four face-to-face, two phone contacts, one drug test, and two monitoring contacts per week during the first phase of ISP. The program also emphasized social support services such as job training, remedial education, and parenting skill classes. This ISP was intended for adults convicted of felonies.

- In Los Angeles' ISP, a one-year, three-phase program. Caseload limits were set at 33; during the first phase of ISP clients had three to five face-to-face, and two phone contacts, and 90 minutes of electronic monitoring per week. The Los Angeles program established curfews and emphasized maximization of surveillance through coordination with other community agencies. This ISP was intended for adults convicted of felonies.
- Contra Costa's ISP was a one-year, three-phase program which featured heightened probation officer contacts and required random drug testing. Caseload limits were set at 40; During the first phase of ISP clients had one face-to-face, two telephone contacts, one monitoring contact, and less than one drug test per week. Other goals of the program were to increase payment of restitution, increase employment, and quickly revoke ISP upon violation of conditions. This ISP was intended for adults convicted of drug offenses.

**Study Reference**

Petersilia, Joan and Susan Turner. 1990. *Intensive Supervision for High-Risk Probationers: Findings from Three California Experiments*, Santa Monica: RAND.

<b>Program Name:</b>	Minnesota Intensive Community Supervision (ICS) and Intensive Supervised Released (ISR)
<b>Program Type:</b>	Diversion from prison/intensive supervised parole
<b>Program Location/Dates:</b>	Several Minnesota Counties/1990 to 1994

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Using an experimental design, the one-year recidivism outcomes for offenders in the ICS (prison diversion) and ISR (parolee) programs were examined, as well as the two-year recidivism outcomes for the ICS program. Offenders were randomly assigned to either treatment (ICS OR ISP) or a control group (prison or routine supervised release).
- For the ICS, a significantly higher rate of technical violations were found for the treatment versus the control group (only because most of the control group was still in prison), but found no statistically significant differences in arrest rates in the first-year follow-up. In the second year follow-up, when more of the control group was out of prison, no significant differences were found for arrests or convictions.
- For the ISR, no statistically significant differences in arrest rates or technical violations were found between the treatment and control groups during the one-year follow-up.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	ICS: 76; control: 48 ISR: 81; control: 95
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Offenders randomly assigned to prison or routine supervised release
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Offenders screened for eligibility after sentencing; eligibility is based on legislative and DOC criteria, offender interest, court approval, and residential criteria for ISR only
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary, given random assignment; analyses showed no significant differences
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest, technical violation and conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year; two years for ICS
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The program involved four phases, including a lengthy home detention and close contact with an agent with a reduced caseload. Participants were required to participate in at least 40 hours of work, job-search activity, education or training, or chemical dependency treatment.
- In the first phase of approximately six months, offenders were under house arrest, had four face-to-face meetings per week with an agent, and submitted to random, weekly and unannounced drug tests.
- In the second phase of approximately four months, offenders met with an agent two times a week, were subject to two drug tests a month, and were under modified house arrest. In the



third phase of at least two months, meetings went down to once a week with discretionary drug testing and modified house arrest. In the fourth phase, which lasted until the end of supervised release or sentence expiration, meetings were required twice a month and offender had a curfew instead of house arrest.

- Offenders violating rules in the ICS program may have been sent back to prison, while ISR offenders were likely to have conditions of release restructured.

***Study Reference***

Deschenes, Elizabeth P, Susan Turner, and Joan Petersilia. 1995. "A Dual Experiment in Intensive Community Supervision: Minnesota's Prison Diversion and Enhanced Supervised Release Programs," *Prison Journal* 75(3):330-357.

**Program Name:** "Prototypical Model" for ISP  
**Program Type:** Intensive supervision  
**Program Location/Dates:** Connecticut and Iowa sites/1996 to 97

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This randomized experiment tested an ISP prototype model that focused on treatment and surveillance, rather than surveillance alone. The test was conducted in one northeast and one midwest site.
- High-risk probationers were randomly assigned to the ISP or a control group. ISP offenders were to receive a significantly higher level of supervision contacts, drug tests, and services than the control group.
- The treatment group had a significantly lower percentage of positive drug tests than the control group, with the midwest region supplying the strongest effect. However, scores for progress in substance abuse, employment, and overall progress were not significantly different between the treatment and control groups.
- Overall, no significant differences between the treatment and control groups were found for technical violations, arrests, or success on supervision in the relatively short follow-up time. However, when looking at specific sites, ISP offenders in the northeast were significantly more likely to be arrested or fail on supervision.
- The authors suggested that the quality of intervention was more important than the quantity.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	5
<b>Sample size</b>	Treatment: 210; control: 191
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	Yes
<b>Control group</b>	Received regular probation supervision, also received treatment services, particularly in midwest
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Agency discretion based on initial risk assessment
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Not necessary with random assignment
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Average of seven months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The ISP prototype model targeted a high risk/high need population through a risk assessment instrument. The intervention included smaller caseloads, more frequent contact, and correctional treatment interventions meeting principles of effectiveness.
- The northeast site involved a 25-offender caseload, with teams of two officers. In addition, the northeast had a higher-risk population than the midwest site. Officers referred offenders to outside treatment programs.

- The midwest site involved a 20-offender caseload and referrals to outside treatment but had some services on-site, including a cognitive skills development program, a batterers group, and Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC). The midwest program better reflected the principles of effective intervention, as shown by a higher Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) score.

***Study Reference***

Latessa, Edward, Lawrence Travis, Betsy Fulton, Amy Stichman. 1998. "Evaluating the Prototypical ISP, NIJ Final Report," Division of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati.

**Program Name:** Massachusetts Intensive Supervised Probation  
**Program Type:** Intensive supervised probation  
**Program Location/Dates:** Massachusetts/1985 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared high-risk offenders placed on ISP and a similar group of ISP-eligible offenders placed on routine probation. It is important to interpret the findings cautiously, as the researchers observed less supervision of ISP offenders relative to that prescribed by program design.
- Survival analyses that employed statistical controls for differences across offender groups revealed that for both the ISP and regular probation groups, 35 percent of offenders were arraigned during the one-year follow-up period. Furthermore, 18 percent of ISP offenders were convicted for felony offenses, compared to 23 percent of the regular probation group (not statistically significant).
- Researchers thus concluded that participation in intensive supervision, as implemented in Massachusetts, did not result in reduced recidivism among high-risk offenders.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	ISP: 834; comparison: 2,534
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	ISP-eligible offenders who were placed on routine probation during same year
<b>Means of program entry</b>	ISP participation based upon offender's risk-classification score
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Yes, controls for differences across ISP and control group
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest and conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Massachusetts ISP was designed to manage high-risk probationers more effectively. Offenders sentenced to probation were placed into one of four levels of supervision. Among all probationers, approximately 15 percent were designated as "high risk" and selected for ISP probation.
- The ISP required 10 contacts per month, mandatory referrals to meet social/personal needs related to criminal behavior, and strict enforcement of probation conditions. Offenders had to regularly verify their residence and employment, and were given referrals for substance abuse, employment, and other forms of counseling.

***Study Reference***

Byrne, J.M and L. Kelly. 1989. Restructuring Probation as an Intermediate Sanction: An Evaluation of the Massachusetts Intensive Probation Supervision Program. Final Report to the National Institute of Justice, Research Program on the Punishment and Control of Offenders. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

**Program Name:** Florida's Community Control Program  
**Program Type:** Intensive supervised probation  
**Program Location/Dates:** Florida/1983 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation of Florida's Community Control Program (FCCP) employed a quasi-experimental design to compare recidivism of offenders in FCCP to a group of partially matched offenders who had been released from prison.
- Participation in the community control program did not reduce recidivism among offenders.
- 61 percent of the FCCP group was convicted over the five-year study period, compared to 56 percent of the comparison group (not statistically significant).

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	ISP: 133; comparison: 149
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Partially matched group of convicted felons following release from prison (prison group had larger percentage with prior felonies)
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Statutory sentencing guidelines demarcate those offenders who may be sentenced to community control
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Yes
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest, conviction, reimprisonment</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Approximately five years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Florida's Community Control Program was a prison diversion program with severe restrictions. Offenders sentenced to the program were confined to their residence during all non-working hours, except when given special permission by their supervising officer.
- Offenders in the program received 28 officer contacts per month—a combination of home visits, job visits, and telephone contacts.
- Participants in the program had to be employed or enrolled in an education program, pay supervision fees, perform community service, cooperate with random drug and alcohol testing, and maintain a daily activity log. In some instances, electronic monitoring was used.

### ***Study Reference***

Smith, Linda G. and Ronald L. Akers (1993), "A Comparison of Recidivism of Florida's Community Control and Prison: A Five-Year Survival Analysis," *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30(3):267-292.

**Program Name:** New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program  
**Program Type:** Prison diversion to ISP  
**Program Location/Dates:** New Jersey/1983 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The first evaluation compared ISP participants to a matched sample of regular parolees, the ISP group exhibited a lower rate of arrest (25 percent) in the two-year follow-up than the comparison group of parolees (35 percent), suggesting that participation in ISP had a marked effect on recidivism. However, when recidivism was measured as a combination of arrests and technical violations, the ISP group was actually returned to prison at a higher rate (40 percent) than the comparison group (32 percent) during the first year of follow-up.
- A second evaluation compared ISP participants to a more closely matched sample of regular parolees and reported similar findings. This study revealed that 26 percent of ISP offenders, compared to 35 percent of regular parolees were arrested over the two-year follow-up. Findings for conviction were similar, with 12 percent of ISP participants convicted, compared to 23 percent of regular parolees. Differences in recidivism between the ISP and comparison group were statistically significant.
- Methodological limitations, especially improper sample matching in the first evaluation and errors of omission in the recidivism data reported by researchers, call for a cautious reading of these results.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	Evaluation 1: 2 Evaluation 2: 3
<b>Sample size</b>	Evaluation 1: Treatment: 208; comparison: 95 Evaluation 2: Treatment: 553; comparison: 132
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Eval. 1: "Matched sample" of regular parolees (comparison revealed significant differences) Eval. 2: "matched sample" of regular parolees
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Offenders diverted from prison; must apply, meet selection criteria and be selected by re-sentencing panel
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Yes
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Evaluation 1: Arrest; technical violation</b> <b>Evaluation 2: Arrest and conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Two years
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Some evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The New Jersey ISP program represented one of the first large-scale attempts to reduce prison overcrowding through diversion of offenders from prison into the ISP program. This multiple-jurisdiction ISP targeted "typical" felons who had not been convicted of a violent offense.

- In order to obtain entry to the program, offenders had to have served at least two months of their prison sentence and had to meet criteria for selection into the program. The criteria for selection into the ISP was rigorous, requiring offenders to present a personal living plan detailing their goals and methods for adhering to the ISP regulations. Only approximately 18 percent of applicants were admitted to the ISP.
- The conditions of the New Jersey ISP were stringent. Offenders maintained a minimum of 30 contacts per month in the first six months of the program and an average of 20 contacts per month for the first 14 months of the program.
- The New Jersey program also required mandatory curfews, drug and alcohol testing, compulsory treatment for individual needs, regular employment verification, payment of fines and restitution fees, community service, and electronic monitoring. In addition, all ISP participants had community sponsors and other support persons to assist with program completion and monitor their progress.
- The intensity and strictness of supervision in the New Jersey ISP meant that a significant number of ISP participants were returned to prison for violations.

### ***Study References***

Pearson, F.S. 1987. "Final Report of Research on New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program." Institute for Criminological Research, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Pearson, F.S. 1988. Evaluation of New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program. *Crime and Delinquency*, 34(4): 437-448.



**Program Name:** High-Risk Offender Intensive Supervision Project  
**Program Type:** Intensive supervised probation/parole  
**Program Location/Dates:** Madison, Wisconsin/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared the rates of return to prison for 64 probationers and parolees participating in ISP and 56 offenders in conventional parole. The ISP and comparison groups were followed for a one-year period, during which 45 percent of ISP and 41 percent of regular parole offenders were returned to prison, a non-significant difference.
- Further analyses revealed that many more ISP offenders were returned to prison for technical violations (40 percent of ISP) than for committing new crimes (5 percent of ISP), whereas the opposite was true for the comparison group—29 percent were returned for new crimes and 12 percent for technical violations. The authors suggest that ISP was effective in controlling recidivism by identifying “at-risk” offenders and returning them to prison prior to their commission of new crimes.
- The evidence of ISP participation reducing recidivism is still limited in this evaluation, given the short follow-up period, relatively small offender samples, and absence of stringent statistical controls.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	3
<b>Sample size</b>	ISP: 64; comparison: 56
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Parolees released to maximum-level conventional supervision; same minimum eligibility requirements as ISP offenders
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Probationers and parolees screened and selected for ISP based on classification that indicates high-risk, history of assaultive behavior, and need for maximum-supervision.
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No, but ISP and comparison group matched on personal and legal variables
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Return to prison</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	One year
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Some evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- The Madison, Wisconsin program was designed to provide enhanced surveillance and control for high-risk offenders who exhibited a history of assaultive behavior and problems with treatment and supervision programs.
- The Madison program involved intensive supervision of probationers and parolees with drug and alcohol monitoring.

**Study Reference**

U.S. General Accounting Office, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division. 1990. Intermediate Sanctions: Their Impacts on Prison Crowding, Costs, and Recidivism Are Still Unclear. Washington, D.C.: GAO.

Byrne, James M. and April Pattavina. 1992. "The Effectiveness Issue: Assessing What Works in the Adult Community Corrections System," In Byrne et al. (Eds.) *Smart Sentencing: The Emergence of Intermediate Sanctions*, Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

**Program Name:** Iowa's Intensive Supervised Probation  
**Program Type:** Intensive supervised probation  
**Program Location/Dates:** Iowa/1985 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This evaluation compared 101 ISP probationers to a random sample of 269 probationers selected from districts without ISP programs. Comparison over 21 months of follow-up revealed that each group had approximately 40 percent of offenders with probation revocation.
- A different pattern of recidivism emerged when revocations for new crimes versus revocations for technical violations are assessed separately. Specifically, revocations for new crimes were twice as high for regular probationers (24 percent) than for ISP offenders (12 percent), a significant difference. However, when technical violations were considered, ISP offenders had more revocations (17 percent) than regular probationers (6 percent), a significant difference. These findings suggested that the ISP program's treatment and surveillance aspects may have assisted in controlling recidivism, however the heightened levels of surveillance meant that more technical violations were detected among this group.
- Methodological limitations prevent conclusive interpretation of study results. Specifically, the evaluation did not employ statistical controls, and offenders in the two groups were not matched on offender traits. As such, there is a strong possibility that sample selection bias is present.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	ISP: 101; comparison: 269
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Regular probationers from districts without ISP programs
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Direct sentence or referral to the program
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Revocation for new crimes or technical violations</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	21 months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Established in 1985, the Iowa ISP program was intended for high-risk, violent probationers and parolees. Offenders entered the program through direct sentence or referral if they were deemed likely for revocation from regular probation or community treatment facilities.
- The Iowa ISP emphasized enhanced treatment and intensive surveillance. It utilized a relatively highly structured, progressive disciplinary system for dealing with program infractions.

***Study Reference***

U.S. General Accounting Office, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division. 1990. Intermediate Sanctions: Their Impacts on Prison Crowding, Costs, and Recidivism Are Still Unclear. Washington, D.C.: GAO.

**Program Name:** Cuyahoga County Intensive Supervised Probation  
**Program Type:** Intensive supervised probation  
**Program Location/Dates:** Cuyahoga County, Ohio/1984 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- This study compared a sample of offenders sentenced to ISP to a sample of offenders drawn from the routine probation caseload. A comparison of the samples revealed that the ISP group possessed characteristics that suggested a greater chance of recidivating.
- Measuring recidivism as felony arrests and convictions over a nine-month period, participation in Cuyahoga County's ISP did not have a significant effect on offender recidivism.
- Specifically, 11 percent of ISP offenders were arrested for felonies during the nine-month follow-up, compared to 10 percent of the routine probation group. Furthermore, 7 percent of the routine probation group was convicted of a felony during the follow-up period, compared to 6 percent of the ISP group. These differences across groups were not statistically significant.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	ISP: 401; comparison: 404
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Routine probationers
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Direct sentence, amended prison sentence, probation violation.
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Felony arrests and convictions</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Nine months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>No evidence of effect</i>

### ***Program Description***

- Created in 1984, the Cuyahoga County ISP involved offenders with direct sentences to ISP, as well as those with amended prison sentences, and violators of routine probation.
- The program featured reduced caseloads, with officers supervising an average of 35 offenders. Offenders had at least one officer contact per week.
- Other program features include repayment of restitution and court costs, random drug testing, employment and educational training, and various other court-mandated stipulations.

### ***Study Reference***

Latessa, Edward J. and Jill A. Gordon. 1994. "Examining the Factors Related to Success or Failure with Felony Probationers: A Study of Intensive Supervision," Pp. 63-83 in Charles B. Fields (ed.), *Innovative Trends and Specialized Strategies in Community Based Corrections*. N.Y.: Garland.

**Program Name:** Georgia ISP  
**Program Type:** Intensive supervised probation  
**Program Location/Dates:** Georgia/1982 to present

### ***Evaluation Results***

- The Georgia ISP study compared the recidivism (arrest, conviction, and reincarceration) of ISP participants and comparison groups in regular probation and parole. A comparison over an 18-month follow-up revealed that 40 percent of ISP offenders were arrested, compared to 36 percent of regular probation and 58 percent of regular parole offenders. Differences between ISP and regular parolees were significant.
- When convictions were measured separately, 24 percent of ISP offenders were convicted, compared to 24 percent of regular probation and 42 percent of regular parole offenders. Differences between ISP and regular parolees were significant. As such, it was originally concluded that Georgia's ISP was a success in controlling recidivism, since ISP offenders' recidivism was lower than that of regular parolees and they displayed rates of recidivism similar to those among regular probationers.
- The study possessed significant methodological limitations that prevent one from concluding whether or not program participation reduced recidivism. The Georgia evaluation involved a control group that was significantly smaller than the ISP treatment group. Furthermore, the control and treatment groups differed markedly on numerous traits that have been found in other studies to influence recidivism.

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	ISP: 542; comparison: 173 parolees and 753 probationers
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Routine probationers and parolees who may have met criteria for selection into ISP; limited effort was made to match comparison group with ISP offenders.
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Selection criteria imposed; offenders enter program via direct sentence, amended sentence, or probation revocation.
<b>Statistical controls</b>	No
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest, conviction</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	18 months
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

**Program Description**

- One of the earliest ISP programs, the Georgia program was a multiple-jurisdiction, “front-door” diversionary program in which offenders entered ISP via direct sentence, amended sentence, or probation revocation. The target subjects for Georgia’s program were largely nonviolent, lower-risk, prison-bound offenders.
- Program caseloads were limited to 25 offenders. Cases were managed by a supervision team consisting of a surveillance officer—whose duty was to monitor the offender, and a probation officer—whose duty was to provide counseling and act as legal authority over the case.
- The Georgia program required unscheduled drug testing, strict probation conditions, mandatory community service, mandatory curfew, employment, weekly arrest checks, and payment of fines and probation supervision fees.

**Study References**

Erwin, Billie S. 1987. “Turning Up the Heat on Probationers in Georgia,” *Federal Probation* 50 (2): 17-24.

U.S. General Accounting Office, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division. 1990. *Intermediate Sanctions: Their Impacts on Prison Crowding, Costs, and Recidivism Are Still Unclear*. Washington, D.C.: GAO.

**Program Name:** Clackamas County Electronically Monitored Home Confinement  
**Program Type:** Electronic monitoring intensive supervision  
**Program Location/Dates:** Clackamas County, Oregon/dates not specified

### ***Evaluation Results***

- Rates of arrest were compared for three groups of offenders. They included offenders involved in an intensive supervision program with electronic monitoring, offenders in intensive supervision program with electronic monitoring and drug treatment, and offenders in a work release program.
- Offenders were partially matched on risk assessment score, however, comparison across groups revealed that the ISP/drug offender group had more serious criminal histories than other groups.
- Electronic monitoring was not found to be more effective in reducing recidivism than the work release program. Specifically, 33 percent of work release offenders were arrested during the follow-up, compared to 47 percent of those in electronic monitoring with drug treatment. Furthermore, the arrest rate for offenders in the electronic monitoring and drug treatment program (47 percent arrested) was significantly higher than among offenders in the electronic monitoring (32 percent arrested).

<b>WSIPP EVALUATION CHECKLIST</b>	
<b>Evaluation rating</b>	2
<b>Sample size</b>	Eval 1: 64 electronic monitoring; 96 work release Eval 2: 64 electronic monitoring with drug treatment; 98 electronic monitoring without drug treatment
<b>Random assignment to treatment</b>	No
<b>Comparison group</b>	Offenders in work-release and offenders in home monitoring program without drug treatment.
<b>Means of program entry</b>	Offenders with prior failures in treatment or with parole/probation violations.
<b>Statistical controls</b>	Partially matched on offender risk assessment score, but home monitoring group had more serious offenses, were younger, and all were substance abusers.
<b>Recidivism measure(s)</b>	<b>Arrest</b>
<b>Length of follow-up</b>	Not specified
<b>Program effectiveness</b>	<i>Cannot be determined</i>

### ***Program Description***

- This was an intensive outpatient drug program in Clackamas County, Oregon. The target populations was adult offenders whose substance abuse had led to failures in prior treatment or probation/parole violations.
- The program provided offenders with structured living and treatment, but without incarceration. It involved around-the-clock electronic surveillance, weekly treatment meetings, and drug and alcohol testing.



- The program featured a one to eight offender/counselor ratio, continuous signal and programmed contact, electronic surveillance, two weekly drug treatment group sessions, one weekly life structuring group session, attendance in at least two weekly self-help group meetings, and routine and unscheduled drug and alcohol testing.
- Program participants had to be employed or seeking employment, and contributed to the program by paying a daily fee. There were 14 weeks of surveillance plus treatment, with 14 weeks of aftercare. During the first 14 weeks the offender moved through five levels of supervision/privileges, from most/least to least/most supervision/privileges. Rule violations resulted in variety of consequences depending on severity and nature of violation ranging from increased surveillance level and frequency of drug tests, to loss of earned privileges, to return to jail.

***Study Reference***

Jolin, Annette and Brian Stipak, "Drug Treatment and Electronically Monitored Home Confinement: An Evaluation of a Community-Based Sentencing Option," *Crime and Delinquency* 38: 158-170(1992).



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

Adams, Kenneth, Katherine Benneth, Timothy J. Flanagan, James W. Marquart, Steven J. Cuvelier, Eric Fritsch, Jurg Gerber, Dennis R. Longmire, and Velmer S. Burton. 1994. "A Large-scale Multidimensional Test of the Effect of Prison Education Programs on Offender Behavior." *The Prison Journal* 74:433-449.

Anderson, Stephen V. 1995. "Evaluation of the Impact of Participation in Ohio Penal Industries on Recidivism." Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Office of Management Information Systems.

Anglin, M. Douglas. 1991. "Ensuring Success in Interventions with Drug-Abusing Offenders." Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Anglin, M. Douglas, Douglas Longshore, Susan Turner, Duane McBride, James Inciardi, and Michael Prendergast. 1996. "Studies of the Functioning and Effectiveness of Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime Programs, Final Report," Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Drug Abuse Research Center.

Anglin, M. Douglas and William H. McGlothlin. 1984. "Outcome of Narcotic Addict Treatment in California." Pp. 106-128 in Frank M. Tims and Jacqueline P. Ludford (eds.), *Drug Abuse Treatment Evaluation: Strategies, Progress, and Prospects*. NIDA Research Monograph 51. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Aos, Steve. 1998. Costs and Benefits: Estimating the "Bottom Line" for Crime Prevention and Intervention Programs. Olympia, Wash.: Washington State Institute for Public Policy (September).

Barnoski, Robert. 1997. Standards for Improving Research Effectiveness in Adult and Juvenile Justice. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Berk, Richard A., Kenneth J. Lenihan, and Peter H. Rossi. 1980. "Crime and Poverty: Some Experimental Evidence from Ex-Offenders," *American Sociological Review* 45:766-786.

Bloom, Howard S., Larry L. Orr, Stephen H. Bell, George Cave, Fred Doolittle, Winston Lin, and Johannes M. Bos. 1996. "The Benefits and Costs of JTPA Title II-A Programs: Key Findings From the National Job Training Partnership Act Study," *The Journal of Human Resources* 32(3):549-576.

Brame, Robert, Doris L. MacKenzie, Arnold R. Waggoner, and Kenneth D. Robinson. 1994. Moral Reconciliation Therapy and Problem Behavior in the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. <http://www.doc.state.ok.us/DOCS/OCJRC/Ocjrc96/Ocjrc63.htm>.

Buck, Janeen and Shelli Rossman. 1998. "Examining Early Outcomes of the Opportunity to Succeed Program: A Preliminary Analysis of the Follow-up Self Report Data." Presented at the Consensus Meeting of Drug Treatment in the Criminal Justice System, Washington, D.C. (March).

Burnett, Walter. 1997. "Treating Post-Incarcerated Offenders with Moral Reconciliation Therapy: A One-Year Recidivism Study," *Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Review* 6 (3/4):2.

Byrne, J.M and L. Kelly. 1989. Restructuring Probation as an Intermediate Sanction: An Evaluation of the Massachusetts Intensive Probation Supervision Program. Final Report to the National Institute of Justice, Research Program on the Punishment and Control of Offenders. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Byrne, James M. and April Pattavina. 1992. "The Effectiveness Issue: Assessing What Works in the Adult Community Corrections System," In Byrne et al. (Eds.) *Smart Sentencing: The Emergence of Intermediate Sanctions*, Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. 1994. Screening and Assessment for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Among Adults in the Criminal Justice System. Treatment Improvement Protocol Series. DHHS 94-2076. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Clark, Patrick M., Steve Hartter, and Evelyn Ford. 1992. "An Experiment in Employment of Offenders," A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology. New Orleans, Louisiana.

Clear, Todd R. and Anthony A. Braga, 1995. "Community Corrections." Pp. 421-444 in James Q. Wilson and Joan Petersilia (eds.), *Crime*. San Francisco, Calif.: Institute for Contemporary Studies Press.

Cohen, Jacob. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Correctional Service of Canada. 1996. Literature Review-Substance Abuse Treatment Modalities. [www.csc-scc.gc.ca/crd/litrev/lit4e.htm](http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/crd/litrev/lit4e.htm).

Cullen, F.T., J.P. Wright and B.K. Applegate. 1996. "Control in the Community: The Limits of Reform?" pp. 69-116 in A.T. Harland (ed.), *Choosing Correctional Options that Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Department of Corrections, Office of Substance Abuse Programs. 1993. "An Evaluation of Program Effectiveness for the Forever Free Substance Abuse Program at the California Institution for Women, Frontera, California." Sacramento, CA: Department of Corrections.

Deschenes, Elizabeth P, Susan Turner, and Joan Petersilia. 1995. "A Dual Experiment in Intensive Community Supervision: Minnesota's Prison Diversion and Enhanced Supervised Release Programs," *Prison Journal* 75(3):330-357.

Downes, Elizabeth A., Katherine R. Monaco, and Sheila Ortega Schreiber. 1989. "Evaluating the Effects of Vocational Education on Inmates: A Research Model and Preliminary Results," *The Yearbook of Correctional Education*:249-262.

Du, Can, and Polly Phipps. 1997. "Trading Time for Treatment: Second Year Evaluation of the Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative." Olympia, WA: Sentencing Guidelines Commission.

- Eisenberg, M., and T. Fabelo. 1992. "Evaluation of the Texas Correctional Substance Abuse Treatment Initiative: The Impact of Policy Research," *Crime and Delinquency* 42(2):296-308 (April).
- Erwin, Billie S. 1987. "Turning Up the Heat on Probationers in Georgia," *Federal Probation* 50 (2): 17-24.
- Field, G. 1985. "The Cornerstone Program: A Client Outcome Study," *Federal Probation* 49:50-55.
- Field, G. 1989. "The Effects of Intensive Treatment on Reducing the Criminal Recidivism of Addicted Offenders," *Federal Probation* 53:51-56.
- Finigan, Michael. 1996. Societal Outcomes and Cost Savings of Drug and Alcohol Treatment in the State of Oregon. Report prepared for the Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs, Oregon Department of Human Resources and the Governor's Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs. Salem, Oregon: Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs (February).
- Finigan, Michael. 1997. "Evaluation of Three Oregon Pre-Release Day Treatment Substance Abuse Programs for Inmates." Prepared for Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, West Linn, OR.
- Finn, Peter. 1998. "The Delaware Department of Corrections Life Skills Program." Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Finn, P. 1998. "Texas' Project RIO (Re-Integration of Offenders)," Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice (June).
- Freeman-Longo, R.E. and F.H. Knopp. 1992. *State-of-the-Art Sex Offender Treatment: Outcome and Issues*. Orwell, VT: The Safer Society Program.
- Gerstein, Dean R. and Henrick J. Harwood (eds.). 1990. *Treating Drug Problems, Volume 1*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Godwin, Greg, Sharon Stone and Kenneth Hambrook. 1995. "Recidivism Study: Lake County, Florida Detention Center." *Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Review* 4(3):12.
- Grandberry, Gina. 1998. "Moral Reconciliation Therapy Evaluation, Final Report," Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Corrections.
- Gransky, Laura A., and Robert J. Jones. 1995. "Evaluation of the Post-Release Status of Substance Abuse Program Participants." Report of the Illinois Criminal Justice Authority. Chicago, IL (September).
- Hall, Gordon C. Nagayama. 1995. "The Preliminary Development of Theory-Based Community Treatment for Sexual Offenders," *Professional Psychology: Review and Practice* 26(5):478-483.
- Hanson, R. Karl, R.A. Steffy, and Rene Gauthier. 1993. "Long Term Recidivism of Child Molesters," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 61:646-652.

- Harer, Miles D. 1994. "Recidivism Among Federal Prisoners Released in 1987." Washington, D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research and Evaluation.
- Harer, Miles D. 1995. "Prison Education Program Participation and Recidivism: A Test of the Normalization Hypotheses." Washington, D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research and Evaluation.
- Henning, K. R., and B. C. Frueh. 1996. "Cognitive-behavioral Treatment of Incarcerated Offenders: An Evaluation of the Vermont Department of Corrections' Cognitive Self-Change Program." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 23(4):523-541.
- Hiller, M. L., K. Knight, J. Devereux, and M. Hathcoat. 1996. "Posttreatment Outcomes for Substance-Abusing Probationers Mandated to Residential Treatment," *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs* 28(3):291-296 (July-September).
- Hser, Yih-Ing, Christine Grella, Chih-Ping Chou, and M. Douglas Anglin. 1998. "Relationships Between Drug Treatment Career and Outcomes. Findings from the National Drug Abuse Treatment Outcome Study. *Evaluation Review* 22 (4):496-519.
- Hubbard, Robert L., Mary Ellen Marsden, J. Valley Rachal, Henrick J. Harwood, Elizabeth R. Cavanaugh and Harold M. Ginzburg. 1989. *Drug Abuse Treatment. A National Study of Effectiveness*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Hughes, Gareth V. 1993. "Anger Management Program Outcomes," *Forum of Corrections Research*, 5(1) <http://198.103.98.138//crd/forum/e05/e051c.htm>.
- Huot, Stephen J. 1997. "Sex Offender Treatment and Recidivism: Research Summary," St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Corrections.
- Inciardi, J.A., S.S. Martin, C.A. Butzin, R.M. Hooper, and L.D. Harrison. 1997. "An Effective Model of Prison-Based Treatment for Drug-Involved Offenders," *Journal of Drug Issues* 27(2):261-278.
- Johnson, G. and R.M. Hunter. 1995. "Evaluation of the Specialized Drug Offender Program," pp. 214-234 in R.R. Ross and R.D. Ross, *Thinking Straight: The Reasoning and Rehabilitation Program for Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation*. Ottawa: Air Training and Publications.
- Jolin, Annette, Michael Day, Kristin Christophersen, Sharon Friedman, Sophie Newton, and Richard Hooper. 1997. "An Evaluation of the WICS Lifeskills Program for Women at the Columbia River Correctional Institution: Preliminary Results." Portland, OR: Portland State University, College of Urban and Public Affairs.
- Jolin, Annette, and Brian Stipak. 1992. "Drug Treatment and Electronically Monitored Home Confinement: An Evaluation of a Community-Based Sentencing Option," *Crime and Delinquency* 38:158-170.
- Knight, K., and M. Hiller. 1997. "Community-Based Substance Abuse Treatment: A One-Year Outcome Evaluation of the Dallas County Judicial Treatment Center," *Federal Probation* 61(2):61-68 (June).

- Knight, K., D. Simpson, L. Chatham, and L. Camacho. 1997. "An Assessment of Prison-Based Drug Treatment: Texas' In-Prison Therapeutic Community Program," *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 24:75-100.
- Knott, Christine. 1995. "The STOP Programme: Reasoning and Rehabilitation in a British Setting," pp. 115-126 in J. McGuire, *What Works: Reducing Reoffending—Guidelines from Research and Practice*. London: John Wiley and Sons.
- Krueger, Sally. 1997. "Five-Year Recidivism Study of MRT-Treated Offenders in a County Jail." *Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Review* 6(3/4):3.
- Latessa, Edward J. and Jill A. Gordon. 1994. "Examining the Factors Related to Success or Failure with Felony Probationers: A Study of Intensive Supervision," pp. 63-83 in Charles B. Fields (ed.), *Innovative Trends and Specialized Strategies in Community Based Corrections*. N.Y.: Garland.
- Latessa, E. J., and M. M. Moon. 1992. "The Effectiveness of Acupuncture in an Outpatient Drug Treatment Program," *Journal of Contemporary Justice* 8(4):317-331.
- Latessa, Edward J., and Lawrence F. Travis. 1991. "Halfway House or Probation: A Comparison of Alternative Dispositions," *Journal of Crime & Justice* 14(1):53-75.
- Latessa, Edward, Lawrence Travis, Betsy Fulton, Amy Stichman. 1998. "Evaluating the Prototypical ISP, NIJ Final Report," Division of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati.
- Lattimore, Pamela K., Ann D. Witte, and, Joanna R. Baker. 1990. "Experimental Assessment of the Effect of Vocational Training on Youthful Property Offenders." *Evaluation Review* 14(2):115-133.
- Little, Gregory L., Kenneth D. Robinson, and Katherine D. Burnette. 1991. "Treating Drug Offenders with Moral Reconciliation Therapy: A Three-year Recidivism Report." *Psychological Reports* 69:1151-1154.
- Little, Gregory L., Kenneth D. Robinson, and Katherine D. Burnette. 1993. "Cognitive Behavioral Treatment of Felony Drug Offenders: A Five-year Recidivism Report." *Psychological Reports* 73:1089-1090.
- Little, Gregory L., Kenneth D. Robinson, Katherine D. Burnette. 1994. "Treating Offenders with Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy: Five-year Recidivism Outcome Data on MRT." *Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review* 3(2):1-3.
- Little, Gregory L., Kenneth D. Robinson, Katherine D. Burnette, and E. S. Swan. 1996. "Review of Outcome Data with MRT: Seven Year Recidivism Results," *Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review* 5(1):1-7.
- Little, Gregory L., Kenneth D. Robinson, Katherine D. Burnette, and E. S. Swan. 1998. "Nine-Year Reincarceration Study on MRT-Treated Felony Offenders: Treated Offenders Show Significantly Lower Reincarceration," *Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review* 6(1):2-3.

- Lockwood, Dorothy, James A. Inciardi and Hilary L. Suratt. 1997. "Crest Outreach Center: A Model for Blending Treatment and Corrections," pp. 70-82 in Frank M. Tims, James A. Inciardi, Bennett w. Fletcher and Arthur M. Horton, *The Effectiveness of Innovative Approaches in the Treatment of Drug Abuse*. Westport, CN: Greenwood.
- MacKenzie, Doris L., and Laura J. Hickman. 1998. "What Works in Corrections? An Examination of the Effectiveness of the Type of Rehabilitation Programs Offered by Washington State Department of Corrections," Olympia: Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee.
- Maguire, Kathleen and Ann L. Pastore, eds. 1996. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics 1995*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Maguire, Kathleen E., Timothy J. Flanagan, and Terence P. Thornberry. 1988. "Prison Labor and Recidivism," *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 4(1):3-18.
- Mallar, Charles D., and Craig V.D. Thornton. 1978. "Transitional Aid for Released Prisoners: Evidence from the Life Experiment", *The Journal of Human Resources* 8(2): 208-236.
- Mander, Anthony M., Martin E. Atrops, Allan R. Barnes, and Roseanne Munafo. 1996. "Sex Offender Treatment Program: Initial Recidivism Study," Alaska Department of Corrections.
- Marshall, W.L., D.R. Law, and H.E. Barbaree. 1990. "The Long-Term Evaluation of a Behavior Treatment Program for Child Molesters." *Behavior Research Therapy* 26(6):499-511.
- Martin, Steven S., Clifford A. Butzin, Christine A. Saum, and James A. Inciardi. 1998. "Drug Treatment for Offenders Works! But for How Long? Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology annual meeting, Washington, D.C. (November).
- Marquart, James, S. Cuvelier, V. Burton, K. Adams, J. Gerber, D. Longmire, T. J. Flanagan, K. Bennett, and E. Fritsch. 1994. "A Limited Capacity to Treat: Examining the Effects of Prison Population Control Strategies on Prison Education Programs." *Crime and Delinquency*, 40(3):516-531.
- Marques, Janice K. and David M. Day. 1997. "Sex Offender Treatment and Evaluation Project: 1997 Progress Report," Sacramento, CA: California Department of Mental Health.
- Marquis, Hugh A., Guy A. Bourgon, Barbara Armstrong, and Jon Pfaff. 1996. "Reducing Recidivism Through Institutional Treatment Programs," *Forum on Corrections Research*, 8(3). <http://198.103.98.138/crd/forum/e083/e083a.htm>.
- Marshall, W.L and H.E. Barbaree. 1988. "The Long-Term Evaluation of a Behavioral Treatment Program for Child Molesters," *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 26:499-511.
- McGrath, Robert J., Stephen E. Hoke, and John E. Vojtisek. 1998. "Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of Sex Offenders: A Treatment Comparison and Long-Term Follow-Up Study," *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 25:203-225.
- Melton, Roni and Susan Pennell. 1998. "Staying Out Successfully: An Evaluation of an In-custody Life Skills Training Program." San Diego, CA: Association of Governments.



- Menon, Ramdas, Craig Blakely, Dottie Carmichael, and Don Snow. 1995. "Making a Dent in Recidivism Rates: Impact of Employment on Minority Ex-Offenders." In Gail E. Thomas (ed.) *Race and Ethnicity in America: Meeting the Challenge in the 21st Century*, Washington, D.C.: Taylor and Francis, pp. 279-293.
- Milkman, Raymond H. 1985. *Employment Services for Ex-Offenders Field Test--Detailed Research Results*, McLean, VA: Lazar Institute.
- Miller, Marsha L. 1997. Evaluation of the Life Skills Program, Division of Correctional Education, Department of Correction, Delaware. Wilmington, Delaware.
- Motiuk, Larry, Carson Smiley, and Kelley Blanchette. 1996. "Intensive Programming for Violent Offenders: A Comparative Investigation," *Forum on Correctional Research*, 8(3). <http://198.103.98.138/crd/forum/e083/e083c.htm>.
- Needels, Karen E. 1996. "Go Directly to Jail and Do Not Collect? A Long-Term Study of Recidivism, Employment and Earnings Patterns Among Prison Releasees," *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 33(4):471-496.
- Nemes, Susanna, Eric D. Wish, and Nena Messia. 1998. "Comparing the Impact of Standard and Abbreviated Treatment in a Therapeutic Community." College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Nicholaichuk, Terry, and Arthur Gordon. 1996. "Treatment Reduces Sexual Recidivism: Clearwater Outcome Data Summary," in press.
- Nurco, David, Thomas E. Hanlon, Richard W. Bateman, and Timothy W. Kinlock. 1995. "Drug Abuse Treatment in the Context of Correctional Surveillance," *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 12 (1):19-27.
- Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. 1995. Evaluation of the Impact of Correctional Education Programs on Recidivism, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.
- Oregon Department of Corrections. 1994. Comparison of Outcomes and Costs, Residential and Outpatient Treatment Programs for Inmates, Alcohol and Drug, Mental Health, Sex Offender, and Social Skills Treatment, Corrections Treatment Program and Corrections Treatment Services. Executive Summary. Salem, Oregon: Department of Corrections..
- Oregon Department of Corrections, Research Unit. 1996. "Evaluation of the Powder River and Turning Point Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs," Salem, Oregon: Department of Corrections (January).
- Orr, Larry L., Howard S. Bloom, Stephen H. Bell, Fred Doolittle, Winston Lin, and George Cave. 1994. "Does Training for the Disadvantaged Work? Evidence From the National JTPA Study." Cambridge, Massachusetts: ABT Associates, Inc.
- Owens, S., K. Klebe, S. Arens, R. Durham, J. Hughes, C. Moor, M. O'Keefe, J. Phillips, J. Sarno, and, J. Stommel. 1997. "The Effectiveness of Colorado's TASC Programs," *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 26:161-176.

Pearson, F.S. 1987. "Final Report of Research on New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program." Institute for Criminological Research, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Pearson, F.S. 1988. Evaluation of New Jersey's Intensive Supervision Program. *Crime and Delinquency*, 34(4): 437-448.

Pelissier, B., G. Gaes, W. Rhodes, S. Camp, J. O'Neil, S. Wallace, and W. Saylor. 1998. "TRIAD Drug Treatment Evaluation Project Six-month Interim Report." Washington D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research and Evaluation (January 31).

Petersilia, Joan. 1998. "A Decade of Experimenting with Intermediate Sanctions: What Have We Learned?" Perspectives on Crime and Justice: 1996-1997 NIJ Lecture Series. <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/166609.pdf>.

Petersilia, Joan and Susan Turner. 1990. Intensive Supervision for High-Risk Probationers. Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND.

Petersilia, J., S. Turner, and, E. P. Deschenes. 1992. "Intensive Supervision Programs for Drug Offenders." In J. M. Byrne, A. J. Lurigio, and J. Petersilia (eds.), *Smart Sentencing: The Emergence of Intermediate Sanctions*. Newbury Park: Sage, pp. 18-37.

Petersilia, J. and S. Turner. 1993. "Intensive Probation and Parole." In Michael Tonry (ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of the Research* (Vol. 17). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Piehl, Anne M. 1995. "Learning While Doing Time," Cambridge, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Porporino, F. J., and R. Robinson. 1992. "The Correctional Benefits of Education: A Follow-up of Canadian Federal Offenders Participating in ABE." *Journal of Correctional Education* 43(2):92-98.

Porporino, F. J., and R. Robinson. 1995. "An Evaluation of the Reasoning and Rehabilitation Program with Canadian Federal Offenders," pp. 155-191 in Ross, Robert R. and Roslynn D. Ross. 1995. *Thinking Straight. The Reasoning and Rehabilitation Program for Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation*. Ottawa, Canada: Air Training and Publications

Porporino, Frank J., Elizabeth A. Fabiano, and David Robinson. 1991. "Focusing on Successful Reintegration: Cognitive Skills Training for Offenders." Research Report, Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Research and Development, Correctional Service of Canada.

Prendergast, Michael, M. Douglas Anglin, and Jean Wellisch. 1995. "Treatment for Drug-Abusing Offenders Under Community Supervision," in Ronald P. Corbett, Jr. and M. Kay Harris, *Up To Speed. A Review of Research for Practitioners* 59(4):66-75.

Prendergast, M. L., J. Wellisch, and M. M. Wong. 1996. "Residential Treatment for Women Parolees Following Prison-Based Drug Treatment: Treatment Experiences, Needs and Outcomes," *Prison Journal* 76(3):253-274.

Quinsey, Vernon L, Arunima Khanna, and P. Bruce Malcolm. 1998. "A Retrospective Evaluation of the Regional Treatment Centre Sex Offender Treatment Program," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 13(5):621-644.

Raynor, Peter and M. Vanstone. 1996. "Reasoning and Rehabilitation in Britain: The Results of the Straight Thinking on Probation (STOP) Programme", *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 40(4): 272-284

Rhodes, W., and M. Gross. 1997. "Case Management Reduces Drug Use and Criminality Among Drug-Involved Arrestees: An Experimental Study of an HIV Prevention Intervention." Final Summary Report to the National Institute of Justice and the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Rice, Marnie E., and Grant T. Harris. 1991. "Evaluation of an Institution-Based Treatment Program for Child Molesters," *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation* 6:111-129.

Robinson, David. 1995. "The Impact of Cognitive Skills Training on Post-Release Recidivism Among Canadian Federal Offenders." Research Report, Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Research and Development, Correctional Service of Canada.

Romero, Joseph J. and Linda M. Williams. 1983. "Group Psychotherapy and Intensive Probation Supervision with Sex Offenders: A Comparative Study," *Federal Probation* 47:36-42.

Ross, Robert R., Elizabeth A. Fabiano, and Crystal D. Ewles. 1988. "Reasoning and Rehabilitation," *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 32:29-36.

Ross, Robert R. and Roslynn D. Ross. 1995. *Thinking Straight. The Reasoning and Rehabilitation Program for Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation.* Ottawa, Canada: Air Training and Publications.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). 1997. *Uniform Facility Data Set: Data for 1996 and 1980-1996.* Rockville, MD: Department of Health and Human Services.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). 1998. *Services Research Outcomes Study. Analytic Series A-5.* Washington, D.C.: Department of Health and Human Services.

Saylor, William G., and Gerald G. Gaes. 1996. *PREP: "A Study of 'Rehabilitating' Inmates Through Industrial Work Participation, and Vocational and Apprenticeship Training."* Washington, D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Serin, R. and Brown, B. 1996. "Strategies for Enhancing the Treatment of Violent Offenders." [www.csc-scc.gc.ca/crd/forum/e083/e083n.htm](http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/crd/forum/e083/e083n.htm).

Sherman, Lawrence W., Denise C. Gottfredson, Doris L. MacKenzie, John Eck, Peter Reuter and Shawn Bushway. 1997. *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Simpson, D. Dwayne and H. Jed Friend. 1988. "Legal Status and Long-Term Outcomes for Addicts in the DARP Followup Project," pp. 81-98 in Carl G. Leukefeld and Frank M. Tims (eds.), *Compulsory Treatment of Drug Abuse: Research and Clinical Practice*. Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Smith, Linda G. and Ronald L. Akers (1993), "A Comparison of Recidivism of Florida's Community Control and Prison: A Five-Year Survival Analysis," *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30(3):267-292.

Song, Lin, and Roxanne Lieb. 1995. "Washington State Sex Offenders: Overview of Recidivism Studies," Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Stevens, Reid D. 1986. "The Effect on Recidivism of Attaining the General Education Development Diploma." *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation*, (October):3-9.

Sturgeon, Vikki Henlie, and John Taylor. 1980. "Report of a Five-Year Follow-Up Study of Mentally Disordered Sex Offenders Released from Atascadero State Hospital in 1973," *Criminal Justice Journal* 4:31-63.

Turner, Susan, and Joan Petersilia. 1996. "Work Release in Washington: Effects on Recidivism and Corrections Costs," *Prison Journal* 76(2):138-164.

Uggen, Christopher. 1996. "Estimating the 'True Effect' of Work on Crime: A Dynamic Analysis of Supported Employment and Desistance." Unpublished Paper.

Uggen, Christopher, Irving Piliavin, and Ross Matsueda. 1997. "Job Programs and Criminal Desistance," Forthcoming paper in Urban Institute publication.

U.S. General Accounting Office, Program Evaluation and Methodology Division. 1990. *Intermediate Sanctions: Their Impacts on Prison Crowding, Costs, and Recidivism Are Still Unclear*. Washington, D.C.: GAO.

U.S. General Accounting Office. 1996. *Research Results Inconclusive about What Works to Reduce Recidivism*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. GAO.

U.S. General Accounting Office. 1998. *Studies Show Treatment is Effective, but Benefits May Be Overstated*. GAO/T-HEHS-98-185. Washington, D.C.

Van Stelle, K. R., E. Mauser, and D. P. Moberg. 1994. "Recidivism to the Criminal Justice System of Substance-Abusing Offenders Diverted into Treatment," *Crime and Delinquency* 40(2):175-196 (April).

Van Stelle, Kit R., Julie R. Lidbury, and D. Paul Moberg. 1995. "Final Evaluation Report: Specialized Training and Employment Project (STEP)," Wisconsin Department of Corrections, Center for Health Policy and Program Evaluation.

Vito, G. F. 1989. "The Kentucky Substance Abuse Program: A Private Program to Treat Probationers and Parolees," *Federal Probation* 53 (1):65-72.

- Vito, G. F., D. G. Wilson, and S. T. Holmes. 1993. "Drug Testing in Community Corrections: Results From a Four-year Program," *The Prison Journal* 73(3 & 4):343-354.
- Walsh, Anthony. 1985. "An Evaluation of the Effects of Adult Basic Education on Arrest Rates Among Probationers." *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation* 9(4):69-76.
- Wanberg, Kenneth W. and Harvey B. Milkman. 1998. *Criminal Conduct and Substance Abuse Treatment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Washington State Department of Corrections, Division of Management and Budget, Planning and Research Section. 1988. "Substance Abuse Treatment Program: Evaluation of Outcomes and Management Report," Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Corrections (April).
- Wexler, H. K., G. P. Falkin, and D. S. Lipton. 1990. "Outcome Evaluation of a Prison Therapeutic Community for Substance Abuse Treatment," *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 17(1):79-92.
- Wexler, H. K., G. P. Falkin, D. S. Lipton, and A. B. Rosenblum. 1992. "Outcome Evaluation of a Prison Therapeutic Community for Substance Abuse Treatment." In Carl G. Leukefeld and Frank M. Tims (eds.), *Drug Abuse Treatment in Prisons and Jails*, NIDA research Monograph 118, Rockville, MD: NIDA. pp. 156-174.
- Wexler, H. and W. Graham. 1995. "The Amity Program: A Prison-Based Therapeutic Community for Substance Abusers." In R. R. Ross, D. H. Antonowicz, and G. K. Dhaliwal (eds.) *Going Straight*. Ottawa, Ontario: Air Training and Publications, pp. 233-242.
- Wexler, H. K., G. Thomas, and J. Peters. 1997. "Prison Substance Abuse Treatment: Recidivism and Relapse," American Society of Criminology Annual Meeting.