

## EBDM Decision Point: Violation Response

### Why this Decision Point is Important:

- Ensuring swift and appropriate responses to offender violations are crucial to protecting public safety while reducing harm and further victimization.
- This decision point offers an opportunity to provide thorough and timely responses to respect offender rights and ensure valuable resources are not being used unnecessarily.
- Probation and parole revocations account for 30% of the prison population. Improving community supervision outcomes will effectively reduce recidivism, community safety, and prison costs.

### What Should Happen at this Decision Point:

1. Collaboration occurs between probation & parole, local law enforcement, the prosecutor, and public defender during an investigation process involving new criminal behavior.
2. Supervision holds are not unnecessarily extended so as to cause collateral consequences or damage to an individual's employment or housing status.
3. Responses to violations are swift, certain, evidence-based, and fair.
4. Probation and Parole agents have manageable caseloads to allow for thorough and timely investigations of violations.
5. Responses to violations are evidence-based and consistent statewide.
6. Alternatives to Revocation are fully available in a timely manner for all offenders deemed appropriate.
7. Victims' rights are prioritized in the investigation process, and victims are notified of outcomes.

### Selected Research:

- A model that encompasses both rewards and sanctions is more highly predictive of successful program completion than a reward model or a sanction model alone. The probability of successful program completion is optimized when the reward-to-sanction ratio is 4:1. *Primary Citation:* Andrews & Bonta (2010)
- Stringent supervision conditions tend to produce more technical violations and more incarceration and do not reduce recidivism by themselves. *Primary Citation:* Petersilia & Turner (1993)
- Sanctions on their own do not change offender behavior or reduce recidivism. More severe sanctions may increase recidivism. *Primary Citations:* Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau (2002); Gendreau & Goggin (1996)
- Even graduated sanctions (i.e., incrementally escalating the severity of penalties for noncompliant behavior) can ultimately lead to noncompliance; specifically, individuals may become habituated to punishment such that future sanctions are rendered ineffective at suppressing unwanted behavior. *Primary Citation:* Wodahl (2007)
- Immediacy, fairness, consistency, and proportionality in responding to misbehavior are important to shaping behavior. *Primary Citation:* Taxman, Soule, & Gelb (1999)
- For responses to noncompliance (i.e., punishers) to be effective, they must be (1) swift (happen as quickly as possible), (2) certain (be applied each time the undesirable behavior occurs), (3) fair (be perceived as fair and consistent with similar situations), (4) responsive (take into consideration the unique characteristics of the individual), (5) proportional (be no more severe than the behavior warrants), and (6) parsimonious (employ as few interventions and resources as possible). *Primary Citation:* Carter (2015)
- Confinement is an ineffective sanction for technical violations, and actually can result in increased recidivism rates. *Primary Citation:* Drake & Aos (2012)
- Attention to staff characteristics and skills is necessary to enhance outcomes with offenders. *Primary Citation:* Dowden & Andrews (2004)

### Resources:

Further resources on the topic

