

February 2018
Inventory of Evidence-Based, Research-Based, and Promising Programs for Adult Corrections

Program/intervention	Inventory definition					Percent minority	Outcome	Effect size		
	Manual	Prior classification	Current classification	Cost-beneficial	Reason program does not meet evidence-based criteria (see full definitions at the end of the inventory)			Effect size (adjusted)	p-value	Number in treatment group
"Swift, certain, and fair" supervision	Yes	N/A	●	87%		38%	Crime	-0.095	0.069	6,790
Case management ("swift, certain, and fair") for drug-involved persons	Varies*	●	●	100%		54%	Crime	-0.183	0.023	4,570
Case management (not "swift, certain, and fair") for drug-involved persons	Varies*	N/A	●	85%		72%	Crime	-0.047	0.163	3,625
Circles of Support and Accountability	Yes	N/A	●	93%		77%	Crime	-0.321	0.032	110
Civil legal aid	Varies*	N/A	◎	N/A	Weight of the evidence	77%	Court burden	0.027	0.789	248
							Litigation success	0.278	0.051	860
Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) (for individuals classified as high- or moderate-risk)	Varies*	●	●	100%		24%	Crime	-0.109	0.001	32,831
Community-based correctional facilities (Halfway houses)	Yes	N/A	⊖	0%	Weight of the evidence	60%	Crime	0.016	0.071	22,371
Correctional education (basic skills) **	Varies*	●	●	97%		62%	Crime	-0.114	0.008	8,603
Correctional education (post-secondary education) **	Varies*	●	●	100%		38%	Crime	-0.227	0.001	486
Correctional industries in prison	Varies*	●	●	100%		43%	Crime	-0.057	0.001	1,182
Day fines	Varies*	N/A	P	N/A	Weight of the evidence	47%	Crime	-0.163	0.343	191
							Payments/fines/restitution	0.327	0.267	383
							Technical violations	-0.556	0.002	191
Day reporting centers	Varies*	N/A	●	75%		89%	Crime	-0.242	0.030	400
Deferred prosecution of DUI offenses	Varies*	N/A	◎	N/A	Heterogeneity	12%	Alcohol-related offenses	-0.165	0.003	3,647
Dialectical behavior therapy	Yes	N/A	●	N/A		43%	Psychiatric symptoms	-0.356	0.082	49

● Evidence-based ◎ Research-based P Promising ⊖ Poor outcomes Null Null outcomes NR Not reported

Notes:

N/A: Information not available at this time and/or program was not classified in previous inventory

* This is a general program/intervention classification. Some programs within this classification have manuals and some do not. The results listed on the inventory represent a typical, or average, implementation.

^ Heterogeneity criterion is achieved because at least one of the studies has been conducted on adults in Washington, and a subgroup analysis demonstrates the program is effective for minorities (p < 0.20).

** Program was collapsed into larger category in previous inventory.

*The classifications in this document are current as of February 2018.
For the most up-to-date results, please visit the program's page on our website <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost>*

February 2018
Inventory of Evidence-Based, Research-Based, and Promising Programs for Adult Corrections

Program/intervention	Inventory definition					Reason program does not meet evidence-based criteria (see full definitions at the end of the inventory)	Percent minority	Outcome	Effect size		
	Manual	Prior classification	Current classification	Cost-beneficial	Cost-beneficial				Effect size (adjusted)	p-value	Number in treatment group
Domestic violence perpetrator treatment (Duluth-based model) **	Yes	Null/poor	Null	24%	Weight of the evidence	N/A	Crime	0.016	0.894	1,140	
Domestic violence perpetrator treatment (Non-Duluth models) **	Varies*	N/A	●	N/A		47%	Alcohol use	-0.026	0.756	38	
							Crime	-0.071	0.046	560	
							Domestic violence	-0.064	0.045	713	
							Substance use	0.109	0.197	38	
Driving Under the Influence (DUI) courts	Varies*	N/A	⊙	19%	Benefit-cost/heterogeneity	17%	Crime	-0.223	0.001	474	
Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative (for persons convicted of drug offenses) ^	Yes	⊙	●	99%		N/A	Crime	-0.272	0.014	264	
Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative (for persons convicted of property offenses) ^	Yes	⊙	P	71%	Single evaluation	N/A	Crime	-0.151	0.504	59	
Drug courts	Varies*	●	●	100%		42%	Crime	-0.255	0.001	29,452	
Electronic monitoring (parole) **	Varies*	●	●	100%		41%	Crime	-0.069	0.001	11,777	
Electronic monitoring (probation) **	Varies*	●	●	93%		40%	Crime	-0.164	0.130	7,036	
Employment counseling and job training (transitional reentry from incarceration into the community)	Varies*	N/A	●	97%		58%	Crime	-0.224	0.019	338	
Employment counseling and job training in the community **	Varies*	●	⊙	73%	Benefit-cost	56%	Crime	-0.059	0.111	2,830	
Employment counseling and job training with paid work experience in the community **	Varies*	●	⊙	46%	Benefit-cost	91%	Crime	-0.087	0.021	4,973	
Housing assistance with services	Varies*	N/A	Null	3%	Weight of the evidence	80%	Crime	-0.079	0.267	1,143	
Housing assistance without services	Varies*	N/A	●	92%		36%	Crime	-0.098	0.021	1,794	
Ignition interlock devices for alcohol-related offenses	Varies*	N/A	⊙	N/A	Heterogeneity	18%	Alcohol-related offenses	-0.265	0.004	3,363	
Inpatient or intensive outpatient drug treatment during incarceration	Varies*	●	●	98%		58%	Crime	-0.123	0.013	1,968	

● Evidence-based ⊙ Research-based P Promising ⊖ Poor outcomes Null Null outcomes NR Not reported

Notes:

N/A: Information not available at this time and/or program was not classified in previous inventory

* This is a general program/intervention classification. Some programs within this classification have manuals and some do not. The results listed on the inventory represent a typical, or average, implementation.

^ Heterogeneity criterion is achieved because at least one of the studies has been conducted on adults in Washington, and a subgroup analysis demonstrates the program is effective for minorities (p < 0.20).

** Program was collapsed into larger category in previous inventory.

The classifications in this document are current as of February 2018.
For the most up-to-date results, please visit the program's page on our website <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost>

February 2018
Inventory of Evidence-Based, Research-Based, and Promising Program for Adult Corrections

Program/intervention	Inventory definition					Reason program does not meet evidence-based criteria (see full definitions at the end of the inventory)	Percent minority	Outcome	Effect size		Number in treatment group
	Manual	Prior classification	Current classification	Cost-beneficial	Effect size (adjusted)				p-value		
Inpatient or intensive outpatient drug treatment in the community	Varies*	●	Null	33%	Weight of the evidence	59%	Crime	-0.007	0.239	8,683	
Intensive supervision (surveillance and treatment)	Varies*	●	●	100%		50%	Crime	-0.156	0.004	3,078	
Intensive supervision (surveillance only)	Varies*	Null/poor	Null	53%	Weight of the evidence	65%	Crime	-0.005	0.921	2,095	
Jail diversion for individuals with mental illness (post-arrest)	Varies*	N/A	Null	50%	Weight of the evidence	58%	Crime	-0.020	0.627	556	
Legal financial obligation repayment interventions	Varies*	N/A	●	N/A		41%	Payments/fines/restitution	0.158	0.151	1,116	
Life skills education	Varies*	N/A	Null	34%	Weight of the evidence	61%	Crime	0.009	0.877	1,130	
Mental health courts	Yes	●	●	95%		65%	Crime	-0.168	0.001	1,424	
Offender Reentry Community Safety Program (for individuals with serious mental illness)	Yes	⊙	●	96%		28%	Crime	-0.756	0.001	172	
Outpatient or non-intensive drug treatment during incarceration	Varies*	●	●	99%		66%	Crime	-0.098	0.008	2,205	
Outpatient or non-intensive drug treatment in the community	Varies*	●	●	100%		44%	Crime	-0.122	0.014	42,338	
Parenting programs (for incarcerated parents)	Varies*	N/A	●	N/A		58%	Parenting success	0.280	0.074	49	
Police diversion for individuals with mental illness (pre-arrest)	Varies*	N/A	P	1%	Single evaluation	64%	Crime	0.089	0.275	290	
Police diversion for low-severity offenses (pre-arrest)	Varies*	N/A	Null	87%	Weight of the evidence	61%	Crime	-0.093	0.260	247	
Reentry courts	Yes	N/A	●	95%		98%	Crime	-0.174	0.008	584	
Restorative justice conferencing	Varies*	N/A	Null	58%	Weight of the evidence	28%	Crime	-0.072	0.641	266	

● Evidence-based ⊙ Research-based P Promising ⊖ Poor outcomes Null Null outcomes NR Not reported

Notes:

N/A: Information not available at this time and/or program was not classified in previous inventory

* This is a general program/intervention classification. Some programs within this classification have manuals and some do not. The results listed on the inventory represent a typical, or average, implementation.

^ Heterogeneity criterion is achieved because at least one of the studies has been conducted on adults in Washington, and a subgroup analysis demonstrates the program is effective for minorities ($p < 0.20$).

** Program was collapsed into larger category in previous inventory.

*The classifications in this document are current as of February 2018.
For the most up-to-date results, please visit the program's page on our website <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost>*

February 2018 Inventory for Evidence-Based, Research-Based, and Promising Programs for Adult Corrections

Program/intervention	Inventory definition					Reason program does not meet evidence-based criteria (see full definitions at the end of the inventory)	Percent minority	Outcome	Effect size		Number in treatment group
	Manual	Prior classification	Current classification	Cost-beneficial	Effect size (adjusted)				p-value		
Revocation reduction programs	Varies*	N/A	⊙	N/A	Single evaluation	68%	Crime	-0.328	0.084	162	
							Technical violations	-0.203	0.312	162	
Risk Need and Responsivity supervision (for individuals classified as high- and moderate-risk)	Varies*	●	●	98%		36%	Crime	-0.109	0.001	8,575	
Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI)	Varies*	N/A	●	89%		64%	Crime	-0.279	0.001	1,772	
Sex offender registration and community notification	Varies*	N/A	Null	33%	Weight of the evidence	30%	Crime	0.016	0.836	19,142	
Therapeutic communities (during incarceration) for individuals with substance use disorders	Varies*	●	●	96%		55%	Crime	-0.089	0.001	6,263	
Therapeutic communities (in the community) for individuals with co-occurring disorders	Varies*	●	●	87%		66%	Crime	-0.160	0.001	588	
Therapeutic communities (in the community) for individuals with substance use disorders	Varies*	●	●	80%		86%	Crime	-0.102	0.001	669	
Therapeutic communities for individuals with personality disorders	Varies*	N/A	⊙	N/A	Single evaluation	N/A	Crime	-0.175	0.159	694	
Treatment during incarceration for individuals convicted of sex offenses	Varies*	●	⊙	62%	Benefit-cost	28%	Crime	-0.070	0.013	2,939	
Treatment in the community for individuals convicted of sex offenses	Varies*	●	⊙	60%	Benefit-cost	44%	Crime	-0.050	0.090	960	
Violence reduction treatment	Varies*	N/A	Null	29%	Weight of the evidence	34%	Crime	-0.019	0.765	409	
Vocational education in prison	Varies*	●	●	97%		47%	Crime	-0.167	0.001	1,950	
Work release	Varies*	●	●	99%		38%	Crime	-0.036	0.061	24,013	

● Evidence-based ⊙ Research-based P Promising ⊕ Poor outcomes Null Null outcomes NR Not reported

Notes:

N/A: Information not available at this time and/or program was not classified in previous inventory

* This is a general program/intervention classification. Some programs within this classification have manuals and some do not. The results listed on the inventory represent a typical, or average, implementation.

^ Heterogeneity criterion is achieved because at least one of the studies has been conducted on adults in Washington, and a subgroup analysis demonstrates the program is effective for minorities ($p < 0.20$).

** Program was collapsed into larger category in previous inventory.

*The classifications in this document are current as of February 2018.
For the most up-to-date results, please visit the program's page on our website <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost>*

Definitions and Notes:**Classification Definitions:**

Evidence-based:	A program or practice that has been tested in heterogeneous or intended populations with multiple randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluations, or one large multiple-site randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluation, where the weight of the evidence from a systematic review demonstrates sustained improvements in outcomes of interest. Further, "evidence-based" means a program or practice that can be implemented with a set of procedures to allow successful replication in Washington, and when possible, has been determined to be cost-beneficial.
Research-based:	A program or practice that has been tested with a single randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluation demonstrating sustained desirable outcomes, but does not meet the full criteria for "evidence-based."
Promising:	A program or practice that, based on statistical analyses or a well-established theory of change, shows potential for meeting "evidence-based" or "research-based" criteria, which could include the use of a program that is evidence-based for outcomes other than the alternative use.
Null:	A program or practice that has been tested in a heterogeneous or intended population with multiple randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluations, and yet has no significant effect on improvements in outcomes of interest.
Poor:	A program or practice that has been tested in a heterogeneous or intended population with multiple randomized and/or statistically controlled evaluations where the weight of the evidence from a systematic review demonstrates produces poor (undesirable) effects on outcomes of interest.

Other Definitions:

Cost-beneficial:	A program or practice where the monetary benefits exceed costs with a high degree of probability according to the Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
Manual/implementation	A program has a manual to allow implementation with a set of procedures to allow successful replication. WSIPP operationalizes this element by following the recommendations of Lipsey et al., (2010). ¹ Lipsey et al., (2010) found four important characteristics for effective programs. First, programs must be targeted towards higher-risk offenders. Second, programs should follow theoretical principles of a therapeutic approach that focuses on changing behaviors or skills (as opposed to programs that are rooted in punishment or deterrence). Third, model programs such as <i>Thinking 4 a Change</i> are good choices, but generic or local programs are rooted in those same principles are also effective. Lastly, quality assurance and fidelity to the model are essential and indicators such as high dropout rates or staff turnover can indicate poor quality assurance. When a broad grouping of programs, such as cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT), does not have a specific manual, but follow the aforementioned four principles of implementation, we classify the program as evidence-based. However, some programs within these categories (e.g., <i>Thinking 4 a Change</i> in the CBT category) have very specific "off-the-shelf" manuals as indicated in the column, "Manual," on the inventory.

Reasons Programs May Not Meet Suggested Evidence-Based Criteria:

Benefit-cost:	The proposed definition of evidence-based practices requires that, when possible, a benefit-cost analysis be conducted. We use WSIPP's benefit-cost model to determine whether a program meets this criterion. Programs that do not have at least a 75% chance of a positive net present value do not meet the benefit-cost test. The WSIPP model uses Monte Carlo simulation to test the probability that benefits exceed costs. The 75% standard was deemed an appropriate measure of risk aversion.
Heterogeneity:	To be designated as evidence-based, the state statute requires that a program has been tested on a "heterogeneous" population. We operationalize heterogeneity in two ways. First, the proportion of program participants belonging to ethnic/racial minority groups must be greater than or equal to the proportion of minority children aged 0 to 17 in Washington. From the 2010 Census, for adults aged 18 or older, 81% were white and 19% were minorities. Thus, if the weighted average of program participants in the outcome evaluations of the program is at least 19% ethnic/racial minority, then the program is considered to have been tested in heterogeneous population.
Single evaluation:	The program does not meet the minimum standard of multiple evaluations or one large multiple-site evaluation contained in the current or proposed definitions.
Weight of the evidence:	To meet the evidence-based definition, results from a random effects meta-analysis (p-value < 0.20) of multiple evaluations or one large multiple-site evaluation must indicate the practice achieves the desired outcome(s). To meet the research-based definition, one single-site evaluation must indicate the practice achieves the desired outcomes (p-value < 0.20). If results from a random-effects meta-analysis of multiple evaluations are not statistically significant (p-value < 0.20) for desired outcomes, the practice may be classified as "Null." If results from a random-effects meta-analysis of multiple evaluations or one large multiple-site evaluation indicate that a practice produces undesirable effects (p-value < 0.20), the practice may be classified as producing poor outcomes.

¹ Lipsey, M., Howell, J., Kelly, M., Chapman, G., & Carver, D. (2010). *Improving the effectiveness of juvenile justice programs: A new perspective on evidence-based practice*. Center for Juvenile Justice Reform.

For further information, contact:

Paige Wanner at 360.664.9078, paige.wanner@wsipp.wa.gov

For the full report on WSIPP's Inventory of Evidence-Based, Research-Based, and Promising Programs for Adult Corrections, please visit our website at <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/1681>.