

EBDM Research Matrix

Revised, October 2014

What Doesn't Work in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses that demonstrate null or negative outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A review of seven meta-analyses investigating the risk principle (i.e., the principle that correctional treatment should be proportional to an offender's risk to reoffend) found that providing intense correctional interventions to low risk offenders does not decrease recidivism and may even increase recidivism rates. The reasons cited for failure included exposure of low risk offenders to high risk offenders (i.e., antisocial peers) and disruption of the factors that make them low risk (i.e., strong family ties, job, etc.).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Lowenkamp & Latessa (2004)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Latessa, & Holsinger (2006); Latessa, Lovins, & Smith (2010); Lowenkamp, Makarios, Sperber, & Latessa (2014)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>The majority of services and more intensive supervision should be directed to higher risk offenders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Diversion decisions• Plea negotiations• Sentencing recommendations• Sentencing decisions• Community supervision strategies• Correctional program decisions• Reentry decisions

What Doesn't Work in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses that demonstrate null or negative outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A meta-analysis of 29 studies found that there is no overall effect of boot camps on recidivism (i.e., there was nearly equal odds of recidivating between the boot camp and comparison groups). Juvenile boot camps were less effective overall than adult boot camps.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> MacKenzie, Wilson, & Kider (2001)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Mitchell, Wilson, & MacKenzie (2007); Wilson, MacKenzie, & Mitchell (2005)</p>	<p>The study included 29 experimental and quasi-experimental studies and used official data and multiple indices of recidivism.</p> <p>There was considerable variation among the studies. In nine studies, boot camp participants had lower recidivism rates than did comparison groups; in eight studies, comparison groups had lower recidivism rates; and in the remaining studies, no significant differences were found.</p> <p>Of the 29 eligible studies, only 9 were published in peer-reviewed journals and the year of publication was not considered. Also, there was insufficient information on sample demographics (gender, ethnicity) for comparisons, some adult boot camps included juveniles, and programming information was incomplete.</p>	<p>Boot camps (especially juvenile boot camps) are of doubtful efficacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community intervention strategies

What Doesn't Work in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses that demonstrate null or negative outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A meta-analysis of 117 studies involving 442,471 offenders showed that none of the three “treatment” conditions—length of time incarcerated, serving an institutional sentence versus receiving a community-based sanction, and receiving an intermediate sanction—were associated with a reduction in recidivism. In fact, longer time periods in prison were associated with <i>an increase in recidivism</i>, compared to shorter time periods in prison. These effects held across gender, adults/ juveniles, race, and risk level of the offender. There was some evidence that more stringent sanctions may affect females more adversely than males.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau (2002)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Gendreau, Goggin, & Cullen (1999); Lipsey & Cullen (2007)</p>	<p>To be included in the meta-analysis, the study must have used a follow-up period of at least 6 months and must have provided sufficient information to calculate an effect size between the sanction and recidivism. Studies of treatment services that also employed a sanction were eligible for inclusion in the analysis.</p> <p>Many of the prison-based studies included in the analysis lacked essential descriptive information regarding study methodology (e.g., conditions of confinement).</p>	<p>Sanctions on their own do not change offender behavior or reduce recidivism. More severe sanctions (i.e., longer prison sentences) may increase recidivism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plea negotiations • Sentencing recommendations • Sentencing decisions

What Doesn't Work in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses that demonstrate null or negative outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A study of 14 Intensive Supervision Demonstration Programs found that a higher percentage of individuals on ISP were incarcerated during the 1-year follow-up period than the control group. There were no differences in arrests for new crimes between the treatment and control groups. However, ISP was associated with more technical violations: 81% of the ISP offenders had technical violations compared with 33% of those in the control group. In addition, five times as many ISP offenders were returned to prison for technical violations as compared to the control group (21% compared to 4%). The authors also concluded that ISP did not result in cost savings during the 1-year follow-up period and that ISP ultimately cost 50% more than traditional probation or parole supervision.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Petersilia & Turner (1993)</p>	<p>In each site, data were collected on offender demographics, prior criminal history, current offense, and dependence and treatment history. Data on services received, participation in treatment and work programs, and recidivism (technical violations, arrests, and incarceration) were collected at the 6- and 12-month points of supervision.</p>	<p>Stringent supervision conditions tend to produce more technical violations and more incarceration and do not reduce recidivism by themselves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plea negotiations • Sentencing recommendations • Sentencing decisions • Community supervision strategies
<p>A meta-analysis of more than 400 research studies that examined the effects of punishment on recidivism found that punishment produced almost identical effects on recidivism as did no punishment or reduced punishment. This included drug testing, electronic monitoring, fines, intermittent incarceration, restitution, Scared Straight programs, and incarceration.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Gendreau & Goggin (1996)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Cid (2009); McGrath & Weatherburn (2012); Piquero & Pogarsky (2002)</p>	<p>While all studies included had a comparison group, the criteria for study inclusion were not provided and no controls were added (e.g., quality of research design, dosage, etc.).</p>	<p>Sanctions on their own do not change offender behavior or reduce recidivism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plea negotiations • Sentencing recommendations • Sentencing decisions • Community intervention strategies • Correctional program decisions

What Doesn't Work in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses that demonstrate null or negative outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>This study compared recidivism outcomes of 2,738 youths transferred to criminal court in Florida with a matched sample of offenders retained in the juvenile justice system. The matching procedure was applied to control for severity of the index offense, number of charges, number of prior offenses, severity of prior offenses, and sociodemographic factors—namely, age, gender, and race.</p> <p>During the follow-up period that extended up to 1 year, 30% of transferred youths were rearrested compared with only 19% of nontransfer cases. Time to rearrest was also significantly shorter for the transfer group compared with the nontransfer group (135 days vs. 227 days). Finally, severity of the reoffense was found to be greater among the transfer cases. Ultimately, results suggest that transfer to adult court produced no deterrent effect and in fact increased recidivism across all measures considered.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Bishop, Frazier, Lanza-Kaduce, & Winner (1996)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Bishop & Frazier (2000); Redding (2008); Schubert et al. (2010)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Transfer of juveniles to adult criminal court has the potential to aggravate short-term recidivism rates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions around transferring juveniles to adult court • Plea bargaining decisions

What Doesn't Work in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses that demonstrate null or negative outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>An evaluation of a short-term, multimodal, prison-based reentry program called Project Greenlight (GL) was conducted based on a sample of 344 participants (and 391 controls). Applying survival analysis, GL participants were shown to recidivate at higher rates than controls. At 18 months post-release, 47% of GL participants had been rearrested for an offense compared with an average of 37% for the control group.</p> <p>The authors attribute the aggravating effect of Project GL to a number of factors perceived as violations of certain principles of effective correctional intervention. First, GL classes were very large. Second, the program was condensed and delivered in half the time specified as ideal by program designers. Third, there was no community follow-up in place, with the exception of standard parole supervision. Fourth and finally, treatment was not matched to participants' level of risk or to their specific criminogenic needs.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Wilson & Davis (2006)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Andrews et al. (1990); Lowenkamp & Latessa (2005)</p>	<p>The recidivism measure includes new arrests throughout New York State for a minimum of 12 months post-release.</p>	<p>Programs that are poorly designed and implemented (i.e., those that do not adhere to basic principles of effective correctional intervention) are apt to increase recidivism rates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctional program decisions • Reentry planning decisions
<p>A meta-analysis of 85 studies on the effects of imprisonment was conducted. Controlling for a number of potential confounds (e.g., age, risk level, etc.), it was found that compared to noncustodial sentences, custodial sanctions increased post-release offending by 14%. Moreover, placement in harsher confinement conditions (e.g., prison vs. residential program) was associated with a 15% increase in recidivism. Sentence length, however, was negatively associated with recidivism, with longer sentences (i.e., over 5 years) associated with a 5% decrease in reoffending.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Jonson (2011)</p>	<p>Given that age at release was not controlled for, as was the case with Meade et al. (2012), it is possible that those offenders with longer prison sentences were more likely to desist as a result of maturation.</p>	<p>The specific deterrence argument for the use of prison does not appear to be empirically supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion decisions • Sentencing decisions • Plea bargaining decisions

What Doesn't Work in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses that demonstrate null or negative outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>When offenders violate certain technical conditions of a community sentence (e.g., use of drugs, failure to report to correctional officer, neglecting to honor legal financial obligations, etc.), sanctions can range from reprimand to confinement.</p> <p>The sample of offenders under consideration consisted of those who had a single community correctional officer (CCO) and incurred at least one violation during a 36-month follow-up period ($n = 1,273$). After controlling for age, gender, race, and risk level, it was found that those offenders who received confinement as a sanction were nearly 19% more likely to commit a felony offense in the follow-up period.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Drake & Aos (2012)</p>	<p>Note that the Washington State Department of Corrections (DOC) employs a static risk assessment tool to gauge risk level and determine classification (Barnoski & Drake, 2007).</p> <p>While some community corrections officers (CCOs) are more likely to employ confinement as a sanction, the DOC attempts to evenly distribute offenders to CCO caseloads, thus mimicking random assignment.</p>	<p>Confinement was an ineffective sanction for technical violations, and actually resulted in increased recidivism rates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Violation response decisions

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Meta-analyses of more than 100 correctional programs and treatment research studies show that the risk of recidivism is greatly reduced (10–30% on average) when attention is paid to dealing with criminogenic needs (i.e., dynamic risk factors such as antisocial attitudes and values, antisocial peers, certain personality and temperament traits, family and relational factors, substance abuse, employment, school and occupational training, and the use of personal and leisure time). These studies also found the following: the most powerful approaches to changing offender behavior include cognitive behavioral and social learning strategies (e.g., modeling, reinforcement, and skill acquisition) in the context of a quality interpersonal relationship; more intensive levels of treatment are most effective with higher risk offenders (<i>the risk principle</i>); intervention efforts should target multiple criminogenic needs (<i>the need principle</i>); and effective interventions are those that are responsive to the motivation, cognitive ability, and other characteristics of the offender (<i>the responsivity principle</i>).</p> <p>Further findings include the following: recidivism reduction effects are slightly greater when community-based services and interventions are delivered in the community as compared to services delivered in residential/institutional settings; aftercare and follow-up services that provide a continuum of care are also necessary to manage and prevent relapse; and recidivism slightly increased when inappropriate correctional services were provided (i.e., treatment services that do not adhere to the risk, need, and responsivity principles).</p> <p>These findings hold across community corrections, residential corrections, diversionary programs, males and females, juvenile and adult corrections, restorative and nonrestorative justice programs, different types of treatment, and different types of needs targeted.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Andrews (2007)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Andrews & Bonta (2006); Andrews & Dowden (2007); Andrews et al. (1990); Bonta (2007)</p>	<p>The authors acknowledge that further meta-analytic review on responsivity is needed, and that understanding of the risk principle is still limited by the relatively few studies that report separate effects for lower and higher risk cases.</p>	<p>Recidivism is more likely reduced when the justice system focuses on criminogenic needs, uses a cognitive behavioral approach, reserves more intensive services for the higher risk offender, and uses aftercare services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charging decisions • Plea negotiations • Sentencing decisions • Community intervention strategies • Correctional program decisions

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A meta-analysis of more than 800 rigorous program evaluations found that a number of approaches demonstrated a reduction in recidivism rates, including treatment-oriented intensive supervision (22% reduction) compared to no reduction for surveillance-oriented intensive supervision, cognitive behavioral treatment for sex offenders in prison (15%), vocational education in prison (13%), drug treatment in the community (12%), adult drug courts (11%), and cognitive behavioral programs in general (8%). Cognitive behavioral treatment for low risk sex offenders on probation achieved a 31% reduction in recidivism. Overall, cognitive behavioral approaches were consistently found to be more effective in reducing the recidivism rate across a variety of correctional contexts and offender populations.</p> <p>Cost savings were also substantial. Approximate per person cost savings examples include \$11,000 for treatment-oriented intensive supervision, \$13,700 for vocational education in prison, \$10,000 for community drug treatment, and \$10,000 for cognitive behavioral approaches. While the absolute differences in the recidivism rates in some situations may have been modest, even small reductions in the rate can have considerable economic and social benefits.</p> <p><i>Primary Citations:</i> Aos, Miller, & Drake (2006a); Aos, Miller, & Drake (2006b)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Wilson & Hoge (2013a)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Emphasis should be placed on treatment targets (i.e., criminogenic needs) using a variety of interventions, especially cognitive behavioral programming. Decisions regarding correctional investments should consider the cost/benefit of the intervention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plea negotiations • Sentencing recommendations • Sentencing decisions • Community supervision strategies • Probation/parole violation response • Correctional program decisions

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A meta-analysis of several hundred studies of criminal justice interventions found that when core correctional practices (e.g., the effective use of authority, modeling and reinforcing prosocial attitudes, teaching concrete problem-solving skills, advocating for community resources, and building a relationship that allows for open communication and respect) were used, particularly in combination with adherence to the risk, need, and responsivity principles, programs had better treatment outcomes than programs that did not use core correctional practices. The findings were particularly true for higher risk cases, programs that targeted criminogenic needs, and clinically appropriate treatment. The findings of the analysis held for various offender and program characteristics. The only core correctional practice that was not associated with significant reductions in rates of reoffending was the effective use of authority.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Dowden & Andrews (2004)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Bonta et al. (2008); Trotter (1996)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Attention to staff characteristics and skills is necessary to enhance outcomes with offenders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community intervention strategies • Correctional program decisions
<p>A meta-analysis of randomized or quasi-experimental studies found that cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) is effective in reducing recidivism by as much as 25 to 50% under certain conditions. The effects increased when the treatment dosage was increased, when higher risk offenders were targeted, and when the quality of implementation was monitored. The effects held for all brands of curriculum, adult and juvenile offenders, male and female offenders, and minority/non-minority offenders.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Lipsey, Landenberger, & Wilson (2007)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Landenberger & Lipsey (2005); Makarios, Sperber, & Latessa (2014); Wilson, Bouffard, & MacKenzie (2005)</p>	<p>The analysis included a limited number of studies by category.</p>	<p>Programming dosage should match offenders' risk levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plea negotiations • Diversion decisions • Sentencing decisions • Community intervention strategies • Probation violation response • Correctional program decisions

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A synthesis of 18 meta-analyses of correctional interventions found similar results with regard to reducing recidivism. Interventions that utilized “intensive criminal sanctioning” or were exclusively deterrence-based tended to be ineffective or even increased recidivism. On the other hand, there were some interventions that were found to reduce recidivism by an average of 25 to 30%. This group of more effective interventions “predominantly employed behavioral and/or cognitive skills training methods.” The overall conclusion was that the programs that work best</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are founded on an explicit empirically based model of crime causation; • have a sound method of assessing risk of reoffending, and offenders are assigned different levels of service and supervision accordingly; • contain a sound method of assessing criminogenic needs and dynamic risk factors that are linked to offending; • require skilled and structured engagement by staff; • utilize cognitive behavioral approaches; and • are delivered by personnel who have adequate training and resources. <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> McGuire (2001)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Programs designed to reduce recidivism should be monitored through continuous quality improvement techniques to ensure that the program conditions for behavioral change are met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plea negotiations • Sentencing recommendations • Sentencing decisions • Community supervision strategies • Correctional program decisions

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A meta-analysis by Wilson and Hoge (2013a) was designed to determine whether, among juvenile offenders, diversion produced greater reductions in recidivism compared with traditional judicial sanctions such as probation or incarceration. Diversion programs were inclusive and encompassed both caution programs (warnings issued by police officers with no further action) and intervention programs (programming options involving community service referrals, restorative justice, or more direct evidence-based services like cognitive behavioral treatment [CBT]).</p> <p>A total of 73 diversion programs were examined across 45 unique evaluation studies. The general recidivism rate associated with intervention programs was 33.1% versus 41.1% for the comparison group of conventional justice system options. In turn, the recidivism base rate for cautioned youth was 26.8% versus 39.5% for the comparison group. Overall, no significant differences were observed between caution and intervention programs. However, in accordance with the risk principle, caution programs were more effective in reducing recidivism among low risk youth, while intervention programs were more beneficial to medium-high risk youth. Among intervention programs, CBT-based options were most successful.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Wilson & Hoge (2013a)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Loughran et al. (2009); Wilson & Hoge (2013b)</p>	<p>Note noted.</p>	<p>Consistent with research indicating that criminal justice contact can increase offending risk (e.g., Loughran et al., 2009), both caution and intervention diversion programs were more effective in reducing general recidivism compared to the more restrictive traditional forms of criminal justice processing (i.e., incarceration and probation).</p> <p>Low risk youths are more likely to benefit from caution programs, while moderate to high risk youths are more likely to benefit from intervention programs (namely, CBT-based interventions).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrest decisions • Charging decisions • Diversion and deferred prosecution decisions • Correctional programming decisions • Plea bargaining decisions

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>The criminal justice system is often ill-equipped to deal with the high prevalence of mental illness among incarcerated populations. A study by Cowell and colleagues (2013) examines the impact on taxpayer costs of pre-booking diversion options for offenders with serious mental health conditions. Pre-booking diversion involves the initial intervention of a trained police officer (or an officer accompanied by trained mental health staff); rather than being arrested, the offender is linked with appropriate community-based treatment services.</p> <p>The pre-booking diversion sample included 121 people who were (1) eligible for arrest for a misdemeanor offense and (2) displayed indications of a serious mental illness. The comparison group of 347 offenders consisted of an historical sample whose arrest predated the diversion program implementation but who otherwise met the eligibility criteria. Groups were matched as closely as possible on a number of covariates.</p> <p>After 2 years, diversion was associated with a relative savings of \$2,800 per person in contrast to the traditional control group conditions. These savings were primarily the result of the decrease in criminal justice costs associated with traditional processing.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Cowell, Hinde, Broner, & Aldridge (2013)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Pre-booking diversion options for adult offenders with serious mental illness is associated with fiscal savings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrest decisions • Charging decisions • Pre-booking diversion decisions • Community intervention strategies • Plea bargaining decisions

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>This study evaluates costs and savings attributable to the California Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA), legislation mandating probation or continued parole with substance abuse treatment as an alternative to incarceration. SACPA is appropriate for adult offenders convicted of a nonviolent drug-related offense, as well as probation and parole violators.</p> <p>The intervention group, comprised of 41,607 offenders (2001–2002 cohort), was compared to a control group of 41,607 offenders (1997–1998 cohort) meeting the SACPA eligibility criteria prior to the enactment of the legislation. Controlling for potentially confounding variables, results indicated that despite the higher costs associated with drug treatment among the SACPA group, this additional cost was more than offset by the savings associated with reduced levels of incarceration. In total, the SACPA implementation led to a total savings of \$2,317 per offender over a 30-month period.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Anglin, Nosyk, Jaffe, Urada, & Evans (2013)</p>	<p>The broader societal impact, such as victimization costs and insurance reimbursement costs, were not considered.</p>	<p>Diversion of nonviolent drug offenders into substance abuse treatment as opposed to incarceration produces long-term cost savings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion and deferred prosecution decisions • Sentencing decisions • Community supervision strategies • Community intervention strategies • Plea bargaining decisions
<p>Gaes and Camp (2009) applied an experimental design to determine the relationship between prison security level classification and post-release recidivism. A total of 297 California inmates who were classified as risk level III (i.e., high risk) were randomly assigned to level I prisons (i.e., low security). Another 264 inmates also classified as risk level III were randomly assigned to level III prisons (i.e., high security).</p> <p>After an average post-release follow-up period of 5.9 years, those inmates assigned to higher security prisons were 31% more likely than their low security counterparts to return to prison (either for a new offense or for a parole violation). As such, assignment to higher security levels at a constant level of risk actually increased the probability of recidivism.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Gaes & Camp (2009)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Chen & Shapiro (2007)</p>	<p>The authors note that criminal history is a major consideration in guiding post-release supervision levels. Given equivalent levels of criminal history between study groups, it is <i>unlikely</i> that post-release supervision conditions would have confounded results (i.e., group differences were not expected).</p>	<p>Higher levels of security within institutions can exert criminogenic effects. Prison administrators might experiment with classification thresholds to ensure the least restrictive conditions possible given one's level of risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentencing decisions • Security level decisions (institutional)

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Given mixed evidence on the relationship between judicial dispositions and recidivism outcomes for high risk youths, Ryan, Abrams, and Huang (2014) recently examined the likelihood of rearrest for 2,504 first-time violent juvenile offenders sentenced to one of three conditions in the State of California: (1) in-home probation, (2) group-home probation, and (3) probation camp. Whereas in-home and group-home probation are community-based sentences, probation camp is a secure setting—the most restrictive option before a youth is committed to State prison.</p> <p>The authors found that while 48% of juveniles were rearrested for a new offense over the 5-year follow-up period, recidivism trajectories varied as a function of disposition even when controlling for gender, race, and criminal history indicators. Over a 5-year period, 56% of youths assigned to probation camp had recidivated, in contrast to 47% of group-home placements and only 39% of in-home placements.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Ryan, Abrams, & Huang (2014)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Loughran et al. (2009)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>This investigation demonstrates that even among first-time violent offenders, the most effective (and economical) sentencing alternative lies in the least restrictive option (i.e., community supervision).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentencing decisions • Community supervision strategies • Probation/parole intervention decisions (supervision level/conditions)
<p>Vermont’s reparative probation program, based on the principles of restorative justice, was initially implemented in 1995. Offenders are sentenced to probation, with the condition that they will appear before a reparative board of trained citizen volunteers. The offender, the victim, the board, and other implicated parties negotiate a plan whereby the offender agrees to engage in a number of tasks to better understand the negative consequences of his/her behavior, repair damage to victims, and the like. Tasks can include but are not limited to community service, letters of apology, and restitution.</p> <p>Controlling for offense type, age, gender, and criminal history, Humphrey and colleagues (2012) compared the recidivism outcomes of offenders sentenced to either standard ($n = 6,682$) or reparative probation ($n = 2,396$). Over a 5-year follow-up period, placement on reparative probation was found to decrease risk of new convictions by 11% ($p < .01$) relative to traditional probation.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Humphrey, Burford, & Dye (2012)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Grounded in principles of restorative justice, reparative probation as implemented in Vermont is a promising alternative to standard probation with respect to lowering recidivism rates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentencing decisions • Community supervision strategies • Probation intervention strategies

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>In this research, the recidivism patterns between 79,000 felony offenders sentenced to a Florida state prison and 65,000 sentenced to a community-based diversion program (Community Control) were compared. Incorporating a range of control variables (e.g., sex, race, age, index offense, criminal history, sentence recommendation) and applying three different statistical techniques (regression, precision matching, propensity score matching), imprisonment was found to exert a criminogenic effect relative to the diversion program. Compared with Community Control cases, ex-prisoners recidivated 15.4% more within 3 years of release ($p < .001$).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Bales & Piquero (2012)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Cid (2009)</p>	<p>Recidivism was operationalized conservatively as a felony offense committed within 3 years following prison release (or placement in the diversion program) that resulted in a conviction.</p>	<p>Offenders sentenced to a term of imprisonment were significantly more likely to recidivate than those referred to a community-based diversion program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Diversion decisions• Sentencing decisions• Plea bargaining decisions• Community supervision strategies

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Gender-neutral tools used to assess risk of general recidivism and direct case management efforts, including the Level of Service family of assessments (e.g., LSI-R; Andrews & Bonta, 1995), the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS; Northpointe Institute for Public Management, 1996), and the Service Planning Instrument (SPIn; Orbis, Partners, 2006), have generalized well to women and other demographic minority groups in terms of their overall levels of predictive accuracy (Andrews et al., 2012; Jones, Brown, Robinson, & Frey, <i>in press</i>; Olver, Stockdale, & Wormith, 2009; Rettinger & Andrews, 2010; Schwalbe, 2008).</p> <p>However, given gender differences observed in both severity and context of offending behavior, it is frequently argued that mainstream assessments omit criminogenic factors that are unique to women and discount gender differences in the predictive salience of items represented on the tool. Based on samples of prison, probation, and pre-release adult females across four American states, Van Voorhis and colleagues (2010) aimed to assess the incremental predictive validity of the gender-responsive supplements, intended to be used in conjunction with a currently adopted gender-neutral protocol (i.e., the LSI). Support emerged for the relationship of several gender-responsive scales to criminal outcome. The most highly predictive gender-responsive factors included current mental health needs, family support, parental stress, child abuse, and adult victimization. Most notably, the overall gender-responsive supplement (and subsets of these factors) did offer incremental predictive validity over the gender-neutral model. For example, in the Minnesota probation sample, the hierarchical model assessing the unique contribution of optimal gender-responsive scales while controlling for the effects of gender-neutral domains yielded a strong partial correlation with new arrests ($r = .22$, $p < .01$).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Van Voorhis, Wright, Salisbury, & Bauman (2010)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Daly (1994); Jones (2011)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Gender-responsive assessment (and treatment) strategies are recommended for female offenders so as to tap the unique contextual factors surrounding their criminal conduct. In turn, this will serve to improve the prediction of criminal outcomes and the identification of appropriate treatment targets for women.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentencing decisions • Community intervention strategies • Community supervision strategies • Correctional program decisions

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Although mental illness is not considered a principal criminogenic need (Andrews & Bonta, 2010), prior research has shown that mentally ill offenders are less likely to be granted parole compared to their non-mentally ill counterparts (Feder, 1994; Hannah-Moffat, 2004). This disparity is potentially a reflection of the negative stigma associated with mental illness, or an actual increased level of overall risk by mentally ill offenders as a function of their condition acting upon the central criminogenic needs (Hannah-Moffat, 2004).</p> <p>In an effort to assess the factors being used to guide parole decision-making, this investigation included a random sample of 219 inmates from New Jersey exhibiting an Axis I disorder with the exclusion of substance abuse, along with a comparison group of 184 offenders with the absence of mental illness.</p> <p>Although several criminogenic needs were elevated in the mentally ill group relative to the non-mentally ill group as gauged by the LSI-R (e.g., substance abuse, antisocial personality, prior convictions, etc.), having a diagnosed mental health condition <i>per se</i> had no direct effect on release decisions, nor did sociodemographic characteristics such as gender, race, and age. While the decision making process appears to be somewhat evidence-based, it should be noted that the actuarial model accounted for less than 30% of the variance in release decisions. It is clear, then, that parole boards are relying on extraneous factors to guide their decision making processes. For example, although not assessed in this investigation, parole board members may potentially be relying on visual cues to assess honesty—indicators that do not tend to function as valid indicators of deception (DePaulo et al., 2003).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Matejkowski, Draine, Solomon, & Salzer (2011)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> DePaulo et al. (2003); Feder (1994); Hannah-Moffat (2004); Walters & Crawford (2014)</p>	<p>The fact that mental illness was not related to parole decisions in this investigation runs counter to prior research (e.g., Feder, 1994). Given that Feder operationalized mental illness as having psychiatric commitments while incarcerated, it is possible that the current sample reflects a less severely impaired population. It may also be the case that in this more recent study, parole board members are rendering decisions that are increasingly evidence-based (i.e., making a purposeful effort to disregard mental illness in rendering decisions).</p>	<p>A holistic consideration of mental health conditions along with key evidence-based criminogenic needs such as substance abuse and antisocial cognition is recommended in correctional assessment and treatment. However, parole boards should be aware that mental illness <i>per se</i> does not tend to predict recidivism among parolees (e.g., Walters & Crawford, 2014).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parole release decisions (conditions of release)

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Post-sentencing measures of institutional misconduct are frequently key factors used by parole boards to render release decisions (Mooney & Daffern, 2011). The preponderance of the empirical literature suggests that prison misconducts are indeed related to post-release recidivism. For example, Heil and colleagues (2009) found that offenders who engaged in sexual misconduct while incarcerated were more likely to recidivate violently in the community. Furthermore, in a meta-analysis of 68 studies, French and Gendreau (2006) determined that programs that most effectively reduced levels of prison misconduct were also effective in reducing recidivism rates.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Mooney & Daffern (2011)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> French & Gendreau (2006); Gottfredson & Adams (1982); Heil, Harrison, English, & Ahlmeyer (2009)</p>	<p>Note that the literature that calls into question the relationship between institutional behavior and recidivism is often plagued by a failure to account for potential confounds such as age, overall risk level, etc.</p>	<p>Empirical evidence suggests that institutional misconduct is predictive of future criminal outcomes in the community. It is therefore appropriate for parole boards to incorporate this information into their decision making processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parole release decisions (conditions)

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Bonta et al. (2011) evaluated the effectiveness of a training program for probation officers (POs) grounded in the rehabilitative model of intervention and the associated principles of RNR. A total of 80 POs were randomly assigned to either a training or no training condition. Training involved an in-depth discussion of the RNR principles, with a particular focus placed on the targeting of procriminal attitudes. In accordance with the responsivity principle, a cognitive behavioral model of intervention was endorsed, along with various techniques used in behavioral influence (e.g., reinforcement, modeling, problem-solving, etc.). In turn, POs recruited a total of 143 probation clients and agreed to audiotape their interviews at regular intervals over a 6-month period.</p> <p>Relative to the control group, results showed that POs in the training group spent more of their sessions focusing on criminogenic needs and proportionally less time discussing non-criminogenic needs and probation conditions. In situations where less than 15 minutes were spent discussing probation conditions, the recidivism rate was 19% compared to 42% when more time was devoted to discussing probation conditions.</p> <p>Trained POs also used more frequent relationship-building skills and cognitive techniques (as per the responsivity principle). After a 2-year fixed follow-up period, clients of trained officers had a reconviction rate that was 15% lower than that of the control group. While use of cognitive behavioral techniques and general adherence to RNR were associated with reductions in recidivism rates, a greater focus on discussing probation conditions served to increase recidivism rates.</p> <p><i>Primary Citations:</i> Bonta et al. (2008); Bonta et al. (2011)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Andrews & Bonta (2010); Robinson, VanBenschoten, Alexander, & Lowenkamp (2011)</p>	<p>The sample size and limited power resulted in between-group differences only approaching statistical significance. Replication with larger samples is warranted.</p> <p>Self-selection biases may have resulted from the fact that POs were volunteers and, in turn, selected their participating clients.</p>	<p>The enforcement role of the probation officer needs to be balanced with a helping role that is grounded in cognitive behavioral principles.</p> <p>Training probation officers to adhere to the principles of RNR can effectively serve to reduce recidivism rates of clients under community supervision. Specifically, supervision officers should spend the majority of their time (i.e., at least 15 minutes per session) working with offenders on criminogenic needs rather than focusing on conditions that are non-criminogenic, and use appropriate cognitive behavioral techniques (e.g., reinforcement, modeling, etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community supervision strategies • Community intervention strategies • Correctional program decisions

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>The effectiveness of traditional, deterrent-based intensive supervision programs (ISPs) has been called into question given high revocation rates and subsequent imprisonment of ISP failures (e.g., Petersilia & Turner, 1993). However, ISPs specifically adhering to principles of effective correctional intervention have demonstrated more promise.</p> <p>Based on 58 ISPs, Lowenkamp and colleagues (2010) aimed to determine whether program philosophy and treatment integrity impact program effectiveness (i.e., reductions in recidivism). Surveys of staff from each program were based on the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI; Gendreau & Andrews, 1994). Results indicated that ISPs grounded in principles of effective intervention (RNR + treatment integrity—e.g., manualized program, skilled staff, etc.) <i>and</i> adopting a human service philosophy (vs. a punitive philosophy) optimized recidivism reduction.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Lowenkamp, Flores, Holsinger, Makarios, & Latessa (2010)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Andrews & Dowden (2005); Drake, Aos, & Miller (2009); Gendreau & Andrews (1994); Lowenkamp, Latessa, & Smith (2006); Petersilia & Turner (1993)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Both maintaining a high level of treatment integrity <i>and</i> adhering to a human service treatment philosophy increase program effectiveness.</p> <p>It is recommended that agencies implement periodic assessments such as the CPAI to ensure continued program integrity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctional program decisions • Sentencing decisions • Community supervision strategies • Community intervention strategies

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Wodahl and colleagues (2011) examined the impact of applying operant behavioral strategies—namely both sanctions and reinforcement—on 283 adult offenders involved in an Intensive Supervision Program (ISP) between 2000 and 2003. Note that the imposition of rewards to increase desirable behavior and sanctions to reduce noncompliant behavior was dictated by a combination of departmental policy and officer discretion. In this study, agency records were used to record an offender’s sanction and reward history while in the program.</p> <p>Controlling for demographic information, criminal history, and substance abuse history indicators, the reward model was found to be more highly predictive of successful program completion than the sanction model. However, the optimal model encompassed a combination of both rewards and sanctions. Confirming previous research, the probability of successful program completion was optimized when the reward-to-sanction ratio was 4:1.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Wodahl, Garland, Culhane, & McCarty (2011)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Andrews & Bonta (2010); Gendreau (1996); Lester, Braswell, & Van Voorhis (2004); Petersilia (2007)</p>	<p>In this study, program completers were defined as those who satisfied ISP requirements over the specified program period of approximately 1 year. In turn, failures or non-completers either absconded or had their probation or parole revoked.</p>	<p>These results support correctional agencies’ adoption of operant behavioral techniques in the management of offenders on community supervision. Specifically, rewards should exceed sanctions in a ratio of 4:1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctional program decisions • Sentencing decisions
<p>Program integrity and effectiveness were evaluated for 38 halfway house programs in Ohio. A version of the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI; Gendreau & Andrews, 1994) was used to gauge program integrity related to client pre-service assessment, staff practices, presence of manualized protocols, etc. The higher the CPAI score, the larger the reduction in recidivism (e.g., programs scoring lowest on integrity produced an average of 1.7% reduction in recidivism, while programs scoring in the highest range produced a 22% reduction in recidivism).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Lowenkamp & Latessa (2004)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Gray (1997); Holsinger (1999)</p>	<p>Note that only one program scored in the “satisfactory” range on the CPAI.</p> <p>In this study, recidivism was defined as returns to an Ohio correctional facility for any reason (i.e., technical violation or new arrest).</p>	<p>Research indicates a relationship between the integrity with which a correctional program is implemented and recidivism outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community supervision strategies • Community intervention strategies • Correctional program decisions

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>The vast body of correctional research accumulated over the last 25 years supports adherence to three core principles of effective correctional intervention coined and conceptualized by Don Andrews and colleagues: risk, need, and responsivity (RNR; Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Andrews & Dowden, 2006; Andrews et al., 1990, etc.). In brief, interventions that adhere to the RNR principles have been shown to foster the strongest reductions in recidivism (average of 30%) when compared to a group of non-treated offenders (Andrews et al., 1990).</p> <p>Romani and colleagues (2012) recently revisited the literature on 120 groups of offenders from the corpus of articles originally reviewed by Andrews et al. (1990). The goal was to compare the relative cost of service provision for appropriate correctional services (i.e., those adhering to RNR), inappropriate correctional services (i.e., those not adhering to RNR), and traditional sanctions.</p> <p>In terms of total estimated costs per offender per day, appropriate correctional services cost \$66, criminal sanctions cost \$44, and inappropriate correctional treatment costs \$69. However, when considering the relative long-term effectiveness of each option, appropriate RNR-based treatment is significantly more cost-effective at \$2 for a 1% decrease in recidivism, versus \$19 for inappropriate services, and \$40 for traditional sanctions.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Romani, Morgan, Gross, & McDonald (2012)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Andrews & Bonta (2010); Andrews & Dowden, 2006; Andrews et al. (1990)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Correctional interventions that are grounded in the principles of RNR produce recidivism reductions in the most cost-effective manner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctional program decisions • Sentencing decisions (conditions)

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Therapeutic communities (TCs) are rehabilitative reentry programs for offenders with substance abuse issues. The goal is to assist the offender in establishing (or reestablishing) prosocial skills and healthy functioning, and addressing physical and emotional health needs. Evidence-based programs tend to be grounded in social learning (cognitive behavioral) principles, house offenders separately from the general population, and provide aftercare in the community. Much empirical research has demonstrated the effectiveness of such TCs in reducing recidivism (e.g., Aos, Miller, & Drake, 2006; Mitchell, Wilson, & MacKenzie, 2006; Welsh, 2007).</p> <p>In a recent study, Jensen and Kane (2012) examined the effect of TCs delivered across 4 prison sites in Idaho. Their overall sample consisted of 725 male offenders. After a 4-year follow-up period, those who were classified as needing TC and completing treatment had a rearrest rate of 37.7%, compared to 66.7% for those who were classified as needing TC but did not participate in the program. When covariates (potential confounds) were controlled for statistically, it was shown that those who did not participate in TC (but needed the services) were 3 times more likely to recidivate than those who needed and completed the treatment.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Jensen & Kane (2012)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Aos, Miller, & Drake (2006); Mitchell, Wilson, & MacKenzie (2006); Welsh (2007)</p>	<p>Propensity score matching was used to minimize group differences on relevant covariates (e.g., demographic information, risk level, etc.).</p> <p>Note that participants in this research were not self-selected (thus removing the potential self-selection bias).</p> <p>Although TC participation did not have any effect on convictions rates, this is likely an artefact of charging and prosecution policies in Idaho. According to the authors, prosecutors are likely to treat TC participation as an aggravating factor in deciding how to charge a returning offender, and are more likely to process former TC participants aggressively (Jensen & Kane, 2012).</p>	<p>The research by Jensen and Kane (2012) generally confirms results of previous research demonstrating the effectiveness of therapeutic communities in attenuating recidivism rates among reentry samples.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reentry planning decisions • Correctional program decisions

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>The Preventing Parolee Crime Program (PPCP) is a large offender reintegration initiative that was implemented by the State of California in the 1990s. PPCP is multimodal, targeting substance abuse, education/employment, and housing. Zhang and colleagues (2006) completed a population-based evaluation of the program to determine the extent to which it served to reduce recidivism among parolees.</p> <p>The population of offenders consisted of all California parolees released between July 1, 2000 and June 30, 2002. The treatment group comprised all offenders enrolled in PPCP services ($n = 28,708$), while the comparison group comprised offenders who were not (nor had ever been) enrolled in PPCP ($n = 211,211$).</p> <p>Controlling for a number of known recidivism risk variables, including demographic information, criminal history factors, and risk level, 44.8% of PPCP participants recidivated after 1 year compared with 52.8% of non-PPCP offenders. It is notable that the degree of treatment immersion (i.e., dosage) was significantly related to outcome. For example, PPCP participants who met multiple treatment goals ($n = 480$) had a reincarceration rate that was 47.1% lower than that of the comparison group.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Zhang, Roberts, & Callanan (2006)</p>	<p>Recidivism over a fixed 12-month follow-up period included reincarceration due to a new conviction or parole violation, or suspension from parole due to absconding.</p>	<p>Participation and immersion in the Preventing Parolee Crime Program (PPCP)—a multimodal treatment protocol—was consistently associated with lower rates of reincarceration and absconding compared with traditional parole.</p> <p>Given that only 40% of PPCP participants met one or more of their treatment goals, the authors recommend that program designers/administrators consider developing strategies to improve parolee retention and service utilization.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reentry planning decisions • Community interventions strategies

What Works in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Rigorous and methodologically sound research and meta-analyses demonstrating significant positive outcomes</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>In accordance with the responsivity principle, cognitive behavioral programs adapted to correctional populations yield the most notable reductions in recidivism (e.g., Landenberger & Lipsey, 2005). Lowenkamp and colleagues (2009) conducted a quasi-experimental evaluation of a real-world implementation of Thinking for a Change (TFAC), a 22-session correctional program heavily grounded in CBT principles.</p> <p>A total of 217 participants were recruited for the evaluation (121 treatment cases and 96 control cases). All participants had been placed on probation in the State of Indiana. Controlling for race, gender, age, risk level, and time at risk, those offenders referred to TFAC had significantly lower recidivism rates than control subjects (28% vs. 43%).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Lowenkamp, Hubbard, Makarios, & Latessa (2009)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Dowden & Andrews (2000); Golden, Gatchel, & Cahill (2006); Landenberger & Lipsey (2005); Lipsey, Chapman, & Landenberger (2001); Wilson, Bouffard, & MacKenzie (2005)</p>	<p>The treatment group included all offenders who attended at least one TFAC session, regardless of successful treatment completion. In addition, participants must have minimally had a 6-month follow-up period to be included in the study.</p>	<p>Consistent with research supporting CBT interventions with offenders, TFAC participation produced significant reductions in recidivism rates among offenders on probation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community intervention strategies • Correctional programming decisions
<p>Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R) is a multimodal program developed to teach offenders a series of cognitive and behavioral skills ranging from social perspective taking to critical thinking. The program was designed to be delivered to small groups of 6–12 participants across 36 2-hour sessions.</p> <p>In a meta-analysis intended to evaluate the effectiveness of R&R in reducing recidivism, Tong and Farrington (2006) included 16 evaluations featuring a total of 26 effect sizes. Overall results revealed a 14% decrease in reconvictions for program participants compared to control subjects. The effectiveness of R&R transcended setting (community vs. institutional), offender risk level (low vs. high), and country of implementation (Canada vs. US vs. UK).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Tong & Farrington (2006)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Allen, MacKenzie, & Hickman (2001); Pearson, Lipton, Cleland, & Yee (2002); Wilson, Bouffard, & MacKenzie (2005)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Cognitive behavioral programs applied across both institutional and community settings—namely, Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R)—effectively reduce recidivism rates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community intervention strategies • Correctional programming decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A study on a sanctions grid used by parole field staff in Ohio to determine the appropriate response to violations of conditions of post-release supervision indicated that moderate and high risk offenders in all supervision categories had a lower likelihood of recidivism after completing a halfway house program. However, low and low/moderate risk offenders recidivated more frequently when they were placed in these higher security settings than into a straight community placement. In addition, offenders in the parole violator category were the only group that experienced a significantly lower level of recidivism across all risk levels when placed in halfway houses.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Andrews & Janes (2006)</p> <p><i>Secondary Citation:</i> Latessa, Lovins, & Smith (2010)</p>	<p>Offenders in a halfway house program were tracked for 2 years post-release to determine the baseline recidivism rate and the characteristics of those most likely to succeed. Based on this research, a supervision grid was created to classify offenders into four risk levels and three supervision categories.</p> <p>The article does not provide details on the research methodology. The research was conducted with offenders in one state.</p>	<p>Halfway house interventions with supervision geared to level of risk/need can be effective with higher risk offenders. Low risk offenders may do worse when placed in high security/intensive supervision halfway house programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jail or prison release decisions • Reentry decisions
<p>A randomized experiment exploring drug court monitoring found that offenders assigned to adaptive intervention (i.e., a treatment-oriented response as opposed to a judge-oriented response) were more likely to graduate, had fewer warrants issued, and had more negative (i.e., clean) drug screens. The effects were present for both low and high risk offenders, although low risk offenders performed better.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Marlowe et al. (2008)</p>	<p>The sample size was small—31 offenders. In addition, the experiment was conducted in a single drug court, which makes generalization problematic.</p>	<p>Drug courts should be administered with a treatment orientation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plea negotiations • Sentencing decisions • Community intervention strategies • Probation violation response

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A quasi-experimental study compared outcomes between Breaking the Cycle counties and non-Breaking the Cycle counties, with a total sample size of 5,600 adult offenders. (Breaking the Cycle is a community-based drug treatment/intervention program designed to address drug-related crime.) The Breaking the Cycle group had a slight but statistically significantly lower likelihood of arrest for any offense and significantly fewer drug arrests overall. In the Breaking the Cycle counties that administered more drug tests and sanctions, offenders with drug conditions had a statistically significantly lower likelihood of arrest for any offense and significantly fewer drug arrests.</p> <p>An analysis of the costs and benefits of the Breaking the Cycle program found that it returned \$2.30 to \$5.70 for every dollar invested. The conclusion was that the Breaking the Cycle program is an effective strategy for reducing drug arrests for offenders with drug conditions.</p> <p>More recently, the Juvenile Breaking the Cycle program was validated with youths (Krebs et al., 2010).</p> <p><i>Primary Citations:</i> Harrell et al. (2003); Krebs, Lattimore, Cowell, & Graham (2010)</p>	<p>The major limitation is the reliance on secondary data, which limited the analyses (for example, there were no data on treatment utilization). In addition, although some of the findings were statistically significant, most observed differences were modest.</p>	<p>Programs designed to achieve specific outcomes should be evaluated to determine their effectiveness and overall cost/benefit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plea negotiations • Sentencing recommendations • Sentencing decisions • Community intervention strategies
<p>A study of 130 low risk and 57 high risk offenders found strong support for the risk principle in drug courts. High risk offenders (who were scheduled to biweekly status hearings) performed better in drug court than those who were assigned to status hearings as usual (they had more negative drug screens and better attendance at counseling sessions).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Marlowe et al. (2006)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Lowenkamp, Holsinger, & Latessa (2005)</p>	<p>The sample size for the high risk group was small (57 high risk offenders compared to 130 low risk offenders), and there was limited follow-up on illegal behavior, which limits the ability to generalize about the staying power of the effects.</p>	<p>Drug court participants should be selected based on risk level (i.e., the risk principle holds in drug court settings).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion decisions • Plea negotiations • Sentencing decisions • Community intervention strategies

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A study found that judges who used bail guidelines were more consistent in their decision making regarding release on recognizance than judges who did not use bail guidelines. The judges who used guidelines were more likely to grant ROR to non-seriously charged defendants and to be more stringent with defendants facing more serious charges than the control group, who lacked this level of consistency in their decisions. In addition, with regard to defendants classified within the cash bail decision group in the guidelines, 65% of the judges who used guidelines set bail in this range, while only 38% of the judges in the control group set bail similarly.</p> <p>The equity of bail decisions involves decision making in which one would expect "similarly situated" defendants to be treated in a similar manner, which was confirmed by this study. The variation in bail amounts was substantially reduced among the judges using guidelines.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Goldkamp & Gottfredson (1985)</p>	<p>This was an experimental study of bail guidelines looking at 960 cases and conducted over a 14-month period. Judges were randomly assigned to an experimental group, which would use bail guidelines, or a comparison group, which would set bail decisions as they had in the past.</p> <p>This was a single site study.</p>	<p>Providing judicial officers with objective information about offenders' backgrounds and community ties (as well as about the charges against the defendant) coupled with the use of a validated instrument helps produce more equitable and effective pretrial decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pretrial release decisions
<p>A review of 50 studies (of 55 drug courts) found that the recidivism rate (for both drug and non-drug offenses) was lower on average for drug court participants than for those in the comparison group (38% compared to 50%). Three studies that used random assignment and did not have a high participant attrition rate demonstrated a reduction from 50% to 43%. In addition, other studies that used a group of eligible but non-referred offenders as the comparison group also observed a moderate reduction in reoffending.</p> <p>Programs that used either a pre-plea or post-plea model were more effective than those that employed a mixed model. Moreover, programs that offered a clear incentive for completion (e.g., dismissal of charges) had greater success than those that did not. Finally, drug courts that used a single dedicated provider were more successful because they were more likely to use a cognitive behavioral model.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Wilson, Mitchell, & MacKenzie (2006)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Mitchell, Wilson, Eggers, & MacKenzie (2012)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Drug courts should consider adopting a pre-plea or post-plea model, providing offenders with incentives for completion, and using cognitive behavioral techniques.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion decisions • Plea negotiations • Sentencing recommendations • Sentencing decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A meta-analysis of 140 studies of community (intermediate) sanctions and 325 studies of incarceration found that, for intermediate sanctions, there appeared to be a “net widening” effect through the targeting of individuals who would not have previously received as severe a sanction. In addition, there was no indication that these more severe sanctions were more effective than traditional community supervision. In the 47 studies of intensive supervision included in this review, there was no difference between the groups, with each having a recidivism rate of 29%. However, there was an indication that the inclusion of a treatment component with the intensive supervision program resulted in a 10% reduction in recidivism.</p> <p>The analysis of whether longer periods of incarceration produced lower recidivism rates included two components: one comparing similar offenders who spent more time in prison (averaging over 30 months) compared with less (averaging less than 17 months) and the second comparing offenders who were sent to prison for a brief time with a similar group not receiving a prison sentence. Neither of these analyses exhibited different effects on recidivism.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Andrews (2001)</p>	<p>Methodological rigor was not included as a criterion for inclusion in the meta-analysis.</p>	<p>Intermediate sanctions should be utilized with recognition of both their ability to achieve certain outcomes and their limitations, such as accountability as opposed to risk reduction. Careful controls should be put in place when implementing intermediate sanctions to avoid unintended net widening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plea negotiations • Sentencing recommendations • Sentencing decisions
<p>A meta-analysis of 131 studies for almost 750,000 adult offenders found that the strongest predictors of recidivism proved to be criminogenic need, criminal history/history of antisocial behavior, social achievement, age/gender/race, and family factors. Both static and dynamic predictors proved important. Overall, validated risk assessment instruments were superior to static measures and indices of antisociality. Early family factors and pre-adult antisocial behavior are correlated with recidivism but are rarely included in adult offender risk assessments. Focus on personal distress, social class, and, to a lesser extent, intelligence is contraindicated based on the empirical evidence.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Gendreau, Goggin, & Little (1996)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Andrews et al. (1990); Andrews & Bonta (2010); French & Gendreau (2003)</p>	<p>The studies included in the meta-analysis had an over-representation of males in their samples.</p>	<p>Validated risk assessments should be used and include both static and dynamic risk factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charging decisions • Diversion decisions • Plea negotiations • Sentencing recommendations • Sentencing decisions • Community intervention strategy • Correctional program decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A meta-analysis of 70 prison-based treatment studies found higher effect sizes resulting from behavioral programs and programs with greater integrity in terms of implementation. In particular, programs that targeted criminogenic needs had increased effects on recidivism, which increased with the number of criminogenic needs targeted. Overall, the study found that misconduct was reduced by about 26% through programming.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> French & Gendreau (2003, 2006)</p>	<p>The meta-analysis had few studies of women offenders, and it did not control for factors that have been demonstrated to influence misconduct (i.e., prison overcrowding, population instability through transfers, security level, etc.).</p> <p>The authors note that important offender characteristics (risk, need, misconduct history) may moderate the findings.</p>	<p>Enhanced prison management will result through a strategy in which programming has a central role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentencing decisions • Correctional programming decisions
<p>A summary of 30 meta-analyses found that (1) overall treatment reduces recidivism about 9–10%, and slightly higher for “appropriate” services, when the program is matched to the offender’s unique traits; (2) community programs have greater effect sizes; (3) there is some influence of age of offenders on recidivism outcome; and (4) larger effect sizes are derived from programs with higher risk offenders.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> McGuire (2002)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> French & Gendreau (2003)</p>	<p>This is a summary of evaluation studies and does not have any controls. In addition, evaluations of juvenile programs are over-represented in the summary, as are males.</p>	<p>Treatment programming should be targeted to higher risk offenders and their criminogenic needs, and preferably (though not exclusively) be community-based.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plea negotiations • Sentencing recommendations • Sentencing decisions • Community intervention strategy • Correctional program decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>The effectiveness of graduated sanctions in deterring noncompliant acts is contingent on the certainty, swiftness, and fairness (consistency and proportionality) of the response. In addition, the supervision process must be proactive and have the following critical elements: (1) it must inform the offender about the behavior that constitutes an infraction and about the potential consequence for that behavior; (2) it must ensure that the judiciary, supervision agents, and other treatment agencies adhere to the sanctioning model; and (3) it must uphold the offender's dignity throughout the process of change. Thus, a sound graduated sanctions model should clearly define infractions, utilize a swift process for responding to infractions, respond to sanctions using a structured sanction menu with consequences, and employ behavioral contracts for offenders with written offender acknowledgement of violation behavior.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Taxman, Soule, & Gelb (1999)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Fischer & Geiger (2011); Harrell & Roman (2001)</p>	<p>This is not a research project that makes statistical inferences to a larger population; however, the discussion is supported by the citation of numerous individual studies.</p>	<p>Immediacy, fairness, consistency, and proportionality in responding to misbehavior are important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community intervention strategy• Probation/parole violation response

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A study predicting risk using an assessment instrument for pretrial populations examined the following factors: charge type, pending charges, outstanding warrants, prior convictions, prior failures to appear, prior violent convictions, length of time at current residence, employment status, and history of drug abuse. Statistical analysis showed that the instrument predicted equally across gender, race, and geographic location.</p> <p>The study found that not only did the instrument predict for failure to appear (i.e., high risk defendants were less likely to appear), but it also predicted for danger to the community (i.e., higher risk defendants were more likely to be arrested pretrial) and for failure due to technical violations (i.e., higher risk defendants were more likely to have technical violations).</p> <p>A similar test in Federal Court found that offenders with different risk levels may respond to pretrial conditions differently. In addition, most conditions did not have an impact on recidivism risk for low risk offenders. This finding is supported by another study of Federal District Court in the District of Columbia.</p> <p><i>Primary Citations:</i> VanNostrand (2003); VanNostrand & Keebler (2009)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Winterfield, Coggeshall, & Harrell (2003)</p>	<p>There is no measure of association between risk score and outcome (e.g., failure to appear or rearrest).</p> <p>In the Federal study, there were no data on fulfillment of conditions or the quality of services.</p>	<p>By assessing risk, decision makers are able to base the use of pretrial detention and release conditions on level of risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pretrial release decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>In this archival study of 522 spousal assault cases of male-to-female perpetrated violence, the authors examined the link between arrest and recidivism, while controlling for pre-arrest risk gauged through an actuarial assessment tool. The Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment (ODARA, Hilton et al., 2004) is a 13-item instrument pertaining to the perpetrator's history of violence, history of substance abuse, victim circumstances, etc. An offender's score reflects his likelihood of spousal assault recidivism.</p> <p>Police officers arrested approximately half of the perpetrators in the sample. Pre-arrest risk retrospectively coded via the ODARA was significantly related to wife assault recidivism over an average follow-up period of 4.9 years ($r = .41, p < .001$). Although arrest was associated with increased likelihood of recidivism, this effect was attributable to pre-arrest differences in risk level. That stated, police officers also appeared to base arrest decisions on the severity of the index offense—a variable shown to be only weakly related to recidivism (Hilton et al., 2004).</p> <p>In order to ensure the arrest of higher risk cases as per the risk principle, the adaptation of actuarial tools by police officers could be a helpful adjunct.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Hilton, Harris, & Rice (2007)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Hilton et al. (2004)</p>	<p>Note that measures of recidivism were based solely on police reports (official arrest data) rather than victim reports and, as such, recidivism rates may have been underestimated.</p>	<p>The introduction of objective actuarial risk assessment tools (e.g., ODARA) into police decision making tasks is a worthwhile endeavor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrest decisions • Charging decisions • Correctional programming decisions • Sentencing decisions • Plea bargaining decisions
<p>Paternoster and colleagues (1997) studied the impact of male suspects' perceived sense of procedural justice regarding punitive sanctions (i.e., arrest) on subsequent incidents of spousal assault. A total of 476 suspects were interviewed following their arrest regarding the perceived fairness of their treatment by police officers (e.g., "Did the officer take the time to listen to your side of the story?" [<i>representation</i>]; "When the police came, did you expect to be arrested?" [<i>consistency</i>]; "Did police take the time to listen to your story as well as the alleged victim's story?" [<i>impartiality</i>]; "Were you handcuffed in front of the victim? Did the officer use physical force?" [<i>dignity/respect</i>], etc.).</p> <p>Of the arrestees, the effect of perceived fair treatment by police officers was negatively related to spousal assault recidivism.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Paternoster, Bachman, Brame, & Sherman (1997)</p>	<p>Replication with a larger sample is warranted.</p>	<p>Police officers' conscientiousness in treating criminal suspects in a procedurally fair manner may have crime-reducing effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrest decisions (police response style) • Charging decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>The Pretrial Risk Assessment (PTRA) tool is an 11-item measure designed to determine an offender's likelihood of incurring new criminal arrests, technical violations leading to revocation, and failure-to-appear in court. One's final score on the PTRA allows for classification into a risk category, which in turn is associated with likelihood of failure. Preliminary results from implementations in Nebraska and North Carolina indicate that the PTRA increases officer recommendations in favor of release—a desired outcome of the assessment protocol given recommendations of extant literature (e.g., Cadigan & Lowenkamp, 2011b). For example, over a 1-year period, recommendations for release in the Western District of North Carolina increased by 13.5%.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Cadigan & Lowenkamp (2011a)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> VanNostrand & Keebler (2009)</p>	<p>Efforts to gauge predictive validity are warranted once data becomes available.</p>	<p>Use of standardized risk assessment tools is recommended at the pretrial stage to appropriately gauge a defendant's risk level and to subsequently guide release decisions. Use of structured protocols serves to minimize the decision-maker's biases, appropriately place offenders based on their actual level of risk, and improve the allocation of scarce criminal justice resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pretrial release decisions
<p>This investigation conducted by Cadigan and Lowenkamp (2011b) assesses the effectiveness of pretrial release upon subsequent criminal justice outcomes. Based on a large sample of 79,064 offenders released on pretrial supervision between 2000 and 2007, results indicated that defendants detained during the pretrial period were more than twice as likely to fail on post-conviction supervision compared with defendants released during the pretrial period. This effect was generalized across risk levels, save for the highest risk cases who failed at similar rates regardless of pretrial conditions.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Cadigan & Lowenkamp (2011b)</p>	<p>While the authors controlled for risk, no mention was made of controlling for other potential confounds.</p>	<p>Defendants released at the pretrial stage experience more desirable outcomes at later stages of criminal justice processing (i.e., lower recidivism rates) compared with those who are detained in custody.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pretrial release decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>The current study's aim was the construction and validation of a pretrial risk assessment instrument based on a sample of 342 adult offenders from multiple agencies across 2 states. Eight items were selected to comprise the instrument based on both empirical and face validity considerations: age at first arrest, history of failure-to-appear (FTA), recent occurrence of FTA, prior jail incarcerations, employment status, drug use, drug-related problems, and residential stability.</p> <p>The total score was significantly related to both FTA and new arrests while under supervision ($r = .21 - .27, p < .001$). In addition, the increase in failure rates from low, moderate, to high risk categories was statistically significant.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Lowenkamp, Lemke, & Latessa (2011)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> VanNostrand (2003); Winterfield, Coggeshall, & Harrell (2003)</p>	<p>The relationship between the risk assessment aggregate score and new arrests was not significant for the subsample of female defendants. The applicability of this tool to specialized offending populations (e.g., sex offenders) is also contingent on further research. Results should additionally be replicated on larger samples.</p>	<p>Structured and empirically validated risk assessment protocols should be incorporated into the pretrial decision making process. Importantly, risk assessment tools should be validated on the specific population being served.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pretrial release decisions • Plea bargaining decisions
<p>Borne of concern that items encompassing current pretrial risk assessment tools may not adequately reflect the needs of justice-involved females, Gehring and Van Voorhis (2014) compared the criminogenic needs of male and female offenders, and the influence of these needs on pretrial outcomes—namely, failure-to-appear and new arrests. For a sample of 266 pretrial defendants, data were drawn from the Inventory of Need Pretrial Screening Tool implemented in Ohio, a tool that includes items sampled from both the mainstream and gender-responsive literatures.</p> <p>The criminogenic effects of trauma, mental health, and homelessness were especially noteworthy for women. These gender-responsive scales collectively enhanced the prediction of gender-neutral scales (e.g., criminal history, employment, education, substance abuse) when considering new arrests and failure-to-appear at 4-months and 6-months follow-up.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Gehring & Van Voorhis (2014)</p>	<p>Beyond a small sample size, note that follow-up periods were relatively short (4 and 6 months), potentially attenuating the stability of results.</p> <p>Revalidation on additional samples over longer follow-up periods is advisable.</p>	<p>Identifying and addressing gender-responsive needs at the pretrial stage via structured assessments and interventions may contribute to more successful outcomes for women.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pretrial decisions with women • Correctional program decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A recent meta-analysis featuring 28 studies published between 1980 and 2011 included a total of 57 experimental comparisons and 19,301 youths under the age of 18. The goal was to examine the effectiveness of diversion referrals by law enforcement officers or other juvenile justice agencies at the pre-adjudication stage. While the overall effects of diversion were not statistically significant given the heterogeneity of the programs included, capacity to reduce recidivism was clearly moderated by type and quality of intervention. Both family-based programming and restorative justice options with high levels of researcher involvement and monitoring led to significant reductions in recidivism compared to traditional processing.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Schwalbe, Gearing, MacKenzie, Brewer, & Ibrahim (2012)</p>	<p>The authors did not account for risk level among clients, which may have obscured the potential effectiveness of certain programs.</p>	<p>The success of diversion programs is contingent on quality of program design and implementation. Diversion programs that include family-based interventions and demonstrate a high level of fidelity monitoring are especially promising insofar as reducing recidivism rates among juvenile offenders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion and deferred prosecution decisions (pre-adjudication stage)
<p>This study of the effectiveness of jail diversion for offenders with diagnosed mental illness considered a sample of 546 participants across 14 different sites. Being processed through mental health courts resulted in significantly lower 12-month post-enrollment arrest rates relative to the arrest rate in the year prior to enrollment.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Case, Steadman, Dupuis, & Morris (2009)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> DeMatteo, LaDuke, Locklair, & Heilbrun (2012); Lim & Day (2014); Sarteschi, Vaughn, & Kim (2011)</p>	<p>This evaluation was based on a pre-post comparison design. A more methodologically sound design would be to compare the arrest rate of diverted clients against that of a nondiverted comparison group.</p>	<p>Mental health courts (diversion programs) linked to a range of community resources are a promising avenue for the processing of offenders battling mental illness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion and deferred prosecution decisions (adjudication stage) • Community intervention strategies

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Anecdotal reports suggest that few programs currently use standardized assessment tools to determine diversion eligibility (Barber-Rioja et al., 2012). In an effort to determine the accuracy of risk assessment protocols in forecasting diversion noncompliance and reincarceration, a total of 131 offenders arrested for misdemeanor or felony charges in the State of New York were subject to analysis. All defendants had been diagnosed with an Axis I disorder and opted for mental health diversion over incarceration. They were released on their own recognizance and entered a community-based treatment program.</p> <p>Both the HCR-20 and the PCL:SV accurately predicted noncompliance and reincarceration over a 1-year period. Notably, the Clinical scale of the HCR-20 was particularly useful for predicting noncompliance over the short term (3 months).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Barber-Rioja, Dewey, Kopelovich, & Kucharski (2012)</p>	<p>The slightly inferior performance of the PCL:SV is likely attributable to the low base rate of psychopathy in the sample and the consequent restricted score range. Notably, nearly 75% of the sample had initially been charged with a nonviolent offense. Replication with larger samples (including both violent and nonviolent offenders) and longer follow-up periods is advisable.</p>	<p>The application of structured assessment tools such as the HCR-20 and PCL:SV could potentially be used to assess mentally ill offenders' diversion eligibility, thereby reducing the number of noncompliances and reincarcerations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversion eligibility decisions for mentally ill offenders (assessment) • Community intervention strategies
<p>Meade and colleagues (2012) sought to examine the dose-response relationship between time served in prison and recidivism (i.e., rearrest for a felony offense over a 1-year follow-up period). They considered a total of 1,989 adult offenders under post-release supervision in Ohio.</p> <p>Results showed that lengthier prison terms did not have a meaningful effect on recidivism until an offender had served at least 5 years.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Meade, Steiner, Makarios, & Travis (2012)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Loughran et al. (2009)</p>	<p>Although the authors controlled for age at time of imprisonment, they did not control for age at release. Given the significant relationship between age and sentence length, it is possible that those offenders who served at least 5 years were simply incapacitated until they "aged out" of their peak offending years.</p>	<p>Lengthier sentences do not have an appreciable effect on recidivism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentencing decisions (sentence length) • Plea bargaining decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>This research examined whether Kentucky's commutation initiative increases risk to public safety. Vito et al. (2010) compared the recidivism patterns of 883 nonviolent offenders released through sentence commutations within 120 days of the expiration of their sentences with a matched control group of inmates not granted early release. Controlling for age, race, sex, index offense type, and custody level, reincarceration over a 5-year follow-up period was statistically identical for the two groups (40.0% for commuted group vs. 38.7% for comparison group).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Vito, Tewksbury, & Higgins (2010)</p>	None noted.	<p>Inmates who had their sentences commuted posed no greater threat to public safety than those who remained incarcerated until their sentence expiration date. Moreover, by releasing the commuted sentence group, the research team estimated a cost savings of \$13,430,834.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sentence commutation decisions• Release decisions (timing of release)

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Makarios and Latessa (2013) empirically constructed risk/needs instruments to assess two separate outcomes: (1) a classification tool to assess risk of institutional misconduct, and (2) a case management tool to predict community recidivism. Using a prospective research design, the authors tested both instruments on a sample of 414 Ohio inmates.</p> <p>The classification tool accurately predicted prison misconducts (AUC = 0.73), yet performed poorly in the prediction of new arrests at 6 months follow-up (AUC = 0.58). Conversely, the case management tool predicted new arrests with a respectable level of accuracy (AUC = 0.70), yet showed an inferior performance upon the prediction of prison misconducts (AUC = 0.62). The authors propose a streamlined hybrid tool to assess both outcomes effectively and efficiently.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Makarios & Latessa (2013)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Weinrath & Coles (2003)</p>	<p>The relatively short time at risk (5.4 months) and the low base rate of prison misconducts should be noted (16%).</p>	<p>A single one-size-fits-all approach to risk assessment may not be appropriate across all levels of criminal justice processing. For example, dynamic factors that are important for community adjustment (e.g., substance abuse) may not be as important in custodial settings. Ultimately, jurisdiction-specific validation of risk assessment tools vis-à-vis the various outcomes of interest is highly recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional classification decisions (security level) • Release decisions (assessment of conditions)

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>The current study examined the degree to which the composite score of the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) predicted institutional misconduct. The instrument, designed to predict general recidivism in youth populations, contains 42 items across 8 domains. This study is the first to examine the tool's predictive validity with respect to institutional behavior. A total of 80 youths were randomly selected by staff and subsequently assessed. Controlling for age and time spent in the institution, the YLS/CMI total score emerged as a significant predictor of all infraction types ($r = .40, p < .001$). Moreover, results showed that high risk offenders engage in misconducts at a significantly higher rate than their medium risk counterparts (95% vs. 62%).</p> <p>Based on American survey (self-report) data collected from approximately 20,000 male inmates over two time periods (1991 and 1997), Steiner and Wooldredge (2008) specifically showed that younger age, prior incarceration, and pre-arrest drug use were salient predictors of institutional infractions.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Holsinger, Lowenkamp, & Latessa (2006)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Steiner & Wooldredge (2008)</p>	<p>Given the small sample size and the staff selection of participants, further validation work is recommended.</p>	<p>Structured risk/needs tool such as the YLS/CMI are useful for aiding in the classification of young offenders within institutions, and for facilitating the identification of appropriate treatment targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional classification decisions (security level) • Sentencing decisions • Institutional intervention decisions (treatment)

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>The predictive validity of the Violence Risk Scale (VRS) was assessed prospectively on a sample of 60 federal parolees in Canada. The VRS, a 26-item tool tapping both static and dynamic risk factors, was designed to gauge risk of violent recidivism in adult forensic populations. The VRS was scored by researchers subsequent to the parolees' release into the community, and recidivism follow-up data was collected after approximately 7 years.</p> <p>While 60% of participants had been reconvicted of any offense, 35% were reconvicted for a violent offense. Importantly, the VRS aggregate score was significantly related to all measures of recidivism under consideration (e.g., dichotomous indicator of reconviction, days to reconviction, and reconviction severity for both violent and general reoffending). Notably, the predictive accuracy of VRS total scores vis-à-vis any reoffending and violent reoffending yielded AUCs of .72 and .83, respectively. Time to reoffending also decreased significantly from low, moderate, to high risk cases identified based on VRS classifications.</p> <p>VRS scores and recidivism outcomes of the released sample of parolees were compared to those of a normative sample of male federal offenders in Canada ($n = 918$). While the VRS static scores (i.e., historical markers) were statistically equivalent between groups, dynamic scores were lower in the released sample. These lower assessment scores were reflected in lower recidivism rates after a 3-year fixed follow-up period (46.67% vs. 58.50% for general recidivism; 26.67% vs. 31.31% for violent recidivism). Although to an extent the parole board did make appropriate decisions in releasing offenders presenting lower risk, their decision making accuracy would have improved significantly had they additionally relied on the VRS (or a similar validated risk/needs tool) during their actual deliberations and released those identified as low or medium risk. In this latter scenario, there would have been a 30.6% reduction in general recidivists, and a 42.9% reduction in violent recidivists.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Wong & Pharhar (2011)</p>	<p>Power limitations due to low sample size ($n = 60$) resulted in a conservative statistical test. It is impressive that the VRS yielded high levels of predictive accuracy and utility despite this limitation.</p>	<p>Results suggest that scores yielded from structured risk/needs tools such as the VRS should be considered in parole board deliberations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parole release decisions (assessment of conditions)

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>In a synthesis of the empirical literature, Seiter and Kadela (2003) evaluated the effectiveness of various offender reentry programs. For the purposes of the analysis, the authors operationalized reentry programs as (1) American or Canadian correctional programs that focus on the transition from prison to community (among adult populations), and (2) programs that have initiated treatment in a secure custody setting but have established links with community services to ensure continuity of care. Extant empirical studies were categorized by program type and according to scientific rigor.</p> <p>Based on a comprehensive review of 32 published studies, evidence was found for the effectiveness of <i>vocational/work programs</i> at reducing prison misconducts, reducing post-release arrest rates, and improving employment outcomes (e.g., Saylor & Gaes, 1997; Turner & Petersilia, 1996). <i>Drug rehabilitation</i> reentry programs were found to reduce recidivism and subsequent drug use (e.g., Knight et al., 1999). <i>Halfway house programs</i> and <i>pre-release programs</i> were also effective in reducing recidivism (e.g., Castellano, Soderstrom, & Ringel, 1996; Dowell et al., 1985). Finally, <i>education programs</i> showed some success in increasing educational achievement scores but not in reducing the likelihood of future offending (e.g., Vito & Tewksbury, 1999). Note that in a separate meta-analysis, Visser and colleagues (2005) also failed to find a significant effect of employment programs upon recidivism.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Seiter & Kadela (2003)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Castellano, Soderstrom, & Ringel (1996); Dowell et al. (1985); Knight et al. (1999); Saylor & Gaes (1997); Turner & Petersilia (1996); Visser, Winterfield, & Coggeshall (2005); Vito & Tewksbury (1999)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Based on the synthesized results of Seiter and Kadela (2003), reentry programs showing the most promise in reducing recidivism rates include vocational/work programs, drug rehabilitation programs, halfway house programs, and pre-release programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reentry planning decisions • Community intervention strategies • Correctional program decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Research has underscored five broad need domains that are particularly integral to the post-incarceration success of women offenders: (1) childcare and parenting skills, (2) healthcare/mental health, (3) housing and transportation, (4) education and employment, and (5) social support (Arditti, 2006; Petersilia, 2004).</p> <p>Scroggins and Malley (2010) undertook a content analysis of women's reentry programs offered in the 10 largest metropolitan cities of the United States to determine whether currently available programs address the afore-listed needs. A total of 155 reentry programs were considered—all programs were specific to women and operational at the time of the investigation. Moreover, all information pertinent to eligibility and services was publically available.</p> <p>Overall results of the analysis suggest that the needs of reentry women are not being met by currently offered programming. For example, no more than 20% of programs in a given city provide childcare and parenting services, less than 50% of programs in any metropolitan area provide counseling and mental health services, and less than 20% of programs offer housing and transportation services.</p> <p>Employment and education programming was the most readily available, offered by a minimum of five programs in each city.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Scroggins & Malley (2010)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citations:</i> Arditti & Few (2006); Petersilia (2004)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>Many of the needs that are particularly salient to women offenders are not currently being addressed in the context of reentry services. It is therefore important to continue developing gender-responsive treatment strategies for this growing population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community intervention strategies for women offenders • Reentry planning for women offenders

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Wikoff and colleagues (2012) conducted a study to determine whether participation in a reentry program among those no longer under criminal justice supervision is associated with reductions in recidivism. Project Re-Connect (PRC) is a 6-month voluntary program in St. Louis, MO, that provides case management and monetary stipends in the form of bus passes, gift cards to grocery stores, payments towards housing, and the like.</p> <p>PRC participants included 122 inmates released from prison, while the control group was comprised of 158 offenders eligible for the program who chose not to participate. By the end of the observation period (approx. 3.5 years), 20.3% of nonparticipants and only 7.4% of participants had recidivated. Even when controlling for various risk and demographic variables via survival analysis, participation in PRC was associated with a 42.2% reduction in the conviction rate.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Wikoff, Linhorst, & Morani (2012)</p>	<p>Recidivism was defined conservatively and included convictions for a state-level crime that resulted in a new sentence of probation or incarceration. Note that recidivism excluded convictions for offenses that resulted in fines or jail terms.</p> <p>Given participant self-selection, it is plausible that at least some of the apparent success of PRC is attributable to differences in offender motivation.</p>	<p>Particularly in the absence of community supervision, reentry programs such as PRC that address multiple service needs and link offenders to important services (e.g., housing, education, transportation) play a crucial role in the successful reintegration of offenders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reentry planning decisions • Community intervention strategies
<p>Bouffard and Bergeron (2006) sought to evaluate an implementation of the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiatives (SVORI)—a comprehensive program designed to prepare high risk offenders for successful community reintegration through both institutional and community-based programming targeting housing, employment, health issues, and so forth. The sample consisted of 71 SVORI participants and 106 controls who simply received traditional prison/parole services.</p> <p>Controlling for demographic characteristics, risk level, and time-at-risk via survival analysis, results indicated that reentry program completers were 60% less likely to be rearrested than members of the comparison group.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Bouffard & Bergeron (2006)</p>	<p>Analyses should be replicated on larger samples.</p>	<p>The Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiatives (SVORI) successfully reduced likelihood of recidivism in contrast to traditional parole services and supervision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reentry planning decisions • Correctional program decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Hipp et al. (2010) conducted a large-scale investigation of the potential influence of neighborhood context on reentering parolees in California. The total sample included 280,121 offenders released between 2005 and 2006 who were followed up for a maximum period of 24 months. The key outcome variable was whether or not a parolee was returned to prison.</p> <p>The research team found that likelihood of recidivism decreased by 41% when social service providers were located within 2 miles of the offender. This protective effect was especially pronounced for African American parolees. Moreover, greater neighborhood disadvantage and social disorder (as measured by bar and liquor store capacity) was associated with increased recidivism.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Hipp, Petersilia, & Turner (2010)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Kubrin & Stewart (2006)</p>	<p>Note that at the individual level, the authors did not appear to control for offender risk level or criminogenic needs.</p>	<p>The neighborhood context in which parolees return plays an important role in their successful reintegration. In particular, the close proximity of social service providers to offenders appears to be important in attenuating recidivism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reentry planning decisions• Community supervision strategies• Community intervention strategies• Conditions of release

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Outcome evaluations have yielded mixed evidence for the effectiveness of offender reentry programs in reducing recidivism (e.g., Wilson & Davis, 2006; Zhang, Roberts, & Callahan, 2006). Using a well-designed randomized experiment, Duwe (2014) recently evaluated the effectiveness of the Minnesota Comprehensive Offender Reentry Plan (MCORP). MCORP underscores a collaborative relationship between institutional caseworkers and community supervision agents so as to provide greater continuity upon an offender's return to the community. MCORP agents meet with offenders several times prior to release from prison and offer assistance in the domains of employment, education, housing, health, and the like.</p> <p>Between 2008 and 2010, a total of 415 offenders were randomly assigned to participate in MCORP, while 274 offenders were randomly assigned to the control group. Controlling for a number of possible confounds (e.g., age at release, risk level, sentence length, etc.), survival analysis revealed reductions in recidivism ranging from 20% to 25% as defined by rearrest, reconviction, revocations for technical violations, and any return to prison. Moreover, the cost avoidance benefit of MCORP was approximately \$4,300 per participant, which totals \$1.8 million overall.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Duwe (2014)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Duwe (2012)</p>	<p>The average follow-up period for offenders in the study was 3 years, with a minimum of 18 months and a maximum of 53 months.</p>	<p>Well-designed and implemented reentry programs such as MCORP can effectively reduce recidivism rates and yield a positive return on investment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reentry planning decisions • Community supervision strategies • Correctional program decisions

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Aimed primarily at probationers and parolees, halfway houses (HWHs) are an intermediate reentry step between the highly structured setting of prisons and the relatively unstructured conditions of community living. Services commonly offered include employment programming, substance abuse treatment, mental health services, and assistance with housing.</p> <p>Based on a large sample of prison inmates released between 2008 and 2009 ($n = 13,198$), Hamilton and Campbell (2014) evaluated the effectiveness of a collection of 18 HWH programs across New Jersey. Comparing 6,599 HWH participants to a matched sample of comparison subjects, the authors found that HWH participation resulted in 40% lesser odds of having one's parole revoked or of being returned to prison (for any reason).</p> <p>While the effectiveness of treatment did not vary by risk level in the Hamilton and Campbell study (2014), Latessa, Lovins, and Smith (2010) found a treatment by risk interaction in their study of 44 Ohio HWH programs operational in 2006. Based on 6,090 matched offender pairs, the average reduction in recidivism rates associated with HWH interventions was about 5%. However, treatment was only effective for moderate to high risk offenders. In accordance with the risk principle, HWH participation actually aggravated recidivism rates among low risk cases.</p> <p><i>Primary Citations:</i> Hamilton & Campbell (2014); Latessa, Lovins, & Smith (2010)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> Lowenkamp & Latessa (2002)</p>	<p>In the Hamilton and Campbell study, subjects from treatment and control groups were matched based on 14 prerelease characteristics (e.g., age, race, risk) using propensity score methods, and all subjects were followed up for a minimum of 3 years.</p> <p>Note that in the Hamilton and Campbell study (2014), nonsignificant findings were found when comparing halfway house participants and nonparticipants on rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration (following the commission of an offense).</p>	<p>In general, there is support for the effectiveness of halfway house programs in reducing recidivism rates. However, one should be mindful of reserving these services primarily for moderate to high risk offenders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reentry planning decisions • Community supervision strategies
<p>Wright and colleagues (2014) completed a comprehensive narrative review of 35 evaluations of community-based reentry programs published between 2000 and 2010. A total of 29 programs were featured. Nearly 80% of the evaluations reviewed reported positive results (e.g., recidivism reduction, drug relapse reduction). Beyond the commonly offered life skills and substance abuse treatment protocols, programs providing an aftercare component and housing assistance yielded the most positive outcomes.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Wright, Zhang, Farabee, & Braatz (2014)</p>	<p>None noted.</p>	<p>In general, reentry programs tend to yield positive outcomes—particularly when they include housing assistance and aftercare components.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reentry planning decisions • Community supervision strategies

What's Promising in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Studies that show promising outcomes but require more rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Based on data from Washington State, Lovell, Johnson, and Cain (2007) sought to determine whether supermax prisoners (i.e., those segregated from the general prison population in high security settings) would be more likely to reoffend upon release than their non-supermax counterparts. A one-to-one matching procedure was used to pair a total of 200 supermax participants with 200 control subjects. Matching variables included mental illness and a number of demographic and criminal history indicators.</p> <p>Over a 3-year follow-up period, 53% of supermax participants recidivated compared with 46% of their non-supermax matches, reflecting only a trend towards a statistically significant difference. However, a more pronounced difference was observed when comparing supermax prisoners released directly to the community with their matched controls (69% vs. 51%, $p < .016$). Applying survival analysis, direct release status was also associated with reduced time to reoffense (either felony or misdemeanor) compared with later release supermax inmates (14 weeks vs. 8 months).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Lovell, Johnson, & Cain (2007)</p>	<p>Supermax participants were operationally defined as those whose last stay in supermax was less than 4 years before their release date and who had spent at least one continuous period exceeding 12 weeks in supermax, or those who had shorter stays that, when combined, equaled 40% or more of their prison term.</p> <p>Control subjects spent no more than 30 days in supermax over their incarceration history.</p>	<p>Direct release from high security, segregated supermax settings to the community is associated with increases in recidivism rates and shorter time to reoffending. It is advisable to take more gradual steps to aid in offender reentry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional security classification decisions • Reentry planning decisions

What's Not Clear in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Findings that contradict or conflict with other studies and require additional rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Research is somewhat equivocal regarding the effectiveness of post-incarceration supervision (i.e., discretionary or mandatory parole) versus unconditional release at the completion of one's sentence. In a national study of 38,624 prisoners released in 1994 (across 15 states), Solomon and colleagues (2005) found that when controlling for demographic and criminal history variables, discretionary parolees were statistically just as likely to be rearrested over a 2-year follow-up period (57%) compared with mandatory parolees and unconditional releasees (61%). That stated, certain low risk offender subgroups were more likely to benefit from discretionary release—namely, female offenders, public order offenders and technical violators, and individuals with few prior arrests.</p> <p>Other research is more promising with respect to discretionary parole and recidivism outcomes (e.g., Schlager & Robbins, 2008; U.S. Department of Justice, 2001). Arguing that some successful reentry systems might be obscured by the consideration of national-level data, Schlager and Robbins examined the outcomes of 480 offenders released from prison via discretionary release versus offenders released at the expiration of their sentences. Up to 4 years post-release, the latter were rearrested and reconvicted at significantly higher rates than those granted discretionary release (70% and 44%, vs. 60% and 34%). Even when controlling for a number of demographic and criminal history indicators, time to rearrest was significantly longer for discretionary release parolees versus offenders released at sentence expiration (465 days vs. 349 days).</p> <p><i>Primary Citations:</i> Schlager & Robbins (2008); Solomon, Kachnowski, & Bhati (2005)</p> <p><i>Supporting Citation:</i> U.S. Department of Justice (2001)</p>	<p>Although some covariates were included in statistical models, neither Solomon and colleagues (2005) nor Schlager and Robbins (2008) employed case control matching procedures in an attempt to equalize study groups on potential confounds. Matching procedures are recommended in future research.</p>	<p>Some research suggests that the granting of parole via discretionary release is associated with more successful outcomes than mandatory release (i.e., release at sentence expiration).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reentry planning decisions • Parole release decisions • Community supervision strategies

What's Not Clear in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Findings that contradict or conflict with other studies and require additional rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>Using data from six states, Zhang and colleagues (2014) applied survival analysis to study the relative effects of indeterminate versus determinate sentencing on recidivism outcomes for offenders released from custody in 1994. With indeterminate sentences, inmates are generally released at the discretion of parole boards, whereas with determinate sentences, offenders are subject to mandatory release at sentence expiration.</p> <p>Effects of release type varied across the six states under study. Congruent with results of Solomon and colleagues (2005), time to rearrest over a 3-year period was longer for discretionary release cases than for mandatory release cases for New York and North Carolina. In the case of Maryland and Virginia, the reverse pattern emerged. Finally, the statistical models generated for Oregon and Texas show no relationship between release type and time to rearrest.</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Zhang, Zhang, & Vaughn (2014)</p>	<p>Sample sizes were 1,394 for Maryland, 1,853 for Virginia, 1,705 for New York, 1,836 for North Carolina, 1,220 for Oregon, and 1,782 for Texas.</p> <p>Although some demographic and criminal history indices were controlled for in survival models, matching procedures were not employed. As such, group equivalence is questionable.</p>	<p>The effect of different sentencing models on recidivism may actually be dependent on jurisdictional differences in the implementation of these models (e.g., differences in supervision and/or reentry approaches, differing expertise of state parole boards, etc.). Future research is required to disentangle these effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentencing decisions • Parole release decisions
<p>A study of 2,014 adult and juvenile offenders in five sites found that offenders placed in the Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) program had lower drug use in three of the five sites studied. Two of the sites reported fewer drug crimes based on self-report data, and there was no difference in reoffending in three sites. While TASC offenders performed worse in terms of new arrests and technical violations in two sites, a more recent study yielded positive effects on recidivism reduction (i.e., Ventura & Lambert, 2004).</p> <p><i>Primary Citations:</i> Anglin, Longshore, & Turner (1999); Ventura & Lambert (2004)</p>	<p>The follow-up period was only 6 months. Also, the comparisons of TASC were made to other interventions or probation rather than to a treatment/no treatment comparison.</p>	<p><i>Implications:</i> Not applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plea negotiations • Sentencing recommendations • Sentencing decisions • Community supervision strategies

What's Not Clear in Corrections

MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS <i>Findings that contradict or conflict with other studies and require additional rigorous research</i>	METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	IMPLICATIONS & RELEVANT DECISION POINTS
<p>A randomized experiment on the effects of drug testing during pretrial release on offender misconduct found there was no statistically significant difference between the treatment and control groups with regard to failure to appear or rearrest. The overall conclusion is that the use of drug testing during the pretrial period did not significantly reduce pretrial misconduct.</p> <p><i>Primary Citations:</i> Britt, Gottfredson, & Goldkamp (1992); Perry et al. (2009)</p>	<p>There was significant attrition in both study sites. In addition, in one of the sites, 20% of the treatment group did not receive a drug test and, among other individuals, the amount of testing was varied. As such, there are concerns about the integrity of the intervention.</p>	<p><i>Implications:</i> Not applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pretrial release decisions
<p>A study of 1,378 defendants from 12 urban and rural counties in North Carolina found that the seriousness of charges and the presence of codefendants influenced the final disposition. The seriousness of charges affected the severity of the sentence for defendants who were found guilty. The presence of codefendants increased the odds of dismissal for Class 1 felony defendants. Defendants' prior criminal history did not affect odds of dismissal but did increase severity of sentencing. Black defendants charged with Class 2 felonies were more likely to have longer stays in pretrial detention. Longer time in pretrial detention influenced court disposition. Whether the defendant had a private versus public defender did not affect the likelihood of charges being dismissed. Plea bargaining was related to the length of sentence for moderate to high risk groups (where risk is related to detention).</p> <p><i>Primary Citation:</i> Clarke & Kurtz (1983)</p>	<p>Risk was defined as the probability of detention, not the probability of future reoffending.</p>	<p><i>Implications:</i> Not applicable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charging decisions • Plea negotiations • Pretrial release decisions

References

- Aglin, M. D., Nosyk, B., Jaffe, A., Urada, D., & Evans, E. (2013). Offender diversion into substance use disorder treatment: The economic impact of California's Proposition 36. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*, 1096–1102. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2012.301168
- Allen, L. C., MacKenzie, D. L., & Hickman, L. J. (2001). The effectiveness of cognitive behavioral treatment for adult offenders: A methodological, quality-based review. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 45*, 498–514. doi: 10.1177/0306624X01454009
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (1995). *LSI-R: The Level of Service Inventory – Revised*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.
- Andrews, D. A., & Dowden, C. (2005). Managing correctional treatment for reduced recidivism: A meta-analytic review of program integrity. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 10*, 173–187.
- Andrews, D. A., & Dowden, C. (2006). Risk principle of case classification in correctional treatment: A meta-analytic investigation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 50*, 88–100.
- Andrews, D. A., Guzzo, L., Raynor, P., Rowe, R. C., Rettinger, L. J., Brews, A., & Wormith, J. S. (2012). Are the major risk/need factors predictive of both female and male reoffending? A test with the eight domains of the level of service/case management inventory. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 56*, 113–133. doi:10.1177/0306624X10395716
- Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology, 28*, 369–404.
- Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (2006). *Evidence-based public policy options to reduce future prison construction, criminal costs, and crime rates* (Document No. 06-10-1201). Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Arditti, J. A., & Few, A. I. (2006). Mothers' reentry into family life following incarceration. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 17*, 103–123.
- Bales, W. D., & Piquero, A. R. (2012). Assessing the impact of imprisonment on recidivism. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 8*, 71–101. doi: 10.1007/s11292-011-9139-3
- Barber-Rioja, V., Dewey, L., Kopelovich, S., & Kucharski, L. T. (2012). The utility of the HCR-20 and PCL-SV in the prediction of diversion noncompliance and reincarceration in diversion programs. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 39*, 475–492.
- Bishop, D., & Frazier, C. (2000). Consequences of transfer. In J. Fagan & F. Zimring (Eds.), *The changing borders of juvenile justice: Transfer of adolescents to the criminal court* (pp. 13–43). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Bishop, D. M., Frazier, C. E., Lanza-Kaduce, L., & Winner, L. (1996). The transfer of juveniles to criminal court: Does it make a difference? *Crime & Delinquency*, 42, 171–191.
- Bonta, J., Bourgon, G., Rugge, T., Scott, T., Yessine, A. K., Gutierrez, L., & Li, J. (2011). An experimental demonstration of training probation officers in evidence-based community supervision. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38, 1127–1148. doi: 10.1177/0093854811420678
- Bouffard, J. A., & Bergeron, L. E. (2006). Reentry works: The implementation and effectiveness of a serious and violent offender reentry initiative. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 44, 1–29. doi: 10.1300/J076v44n02_01
- Cadigan, T. P., & Lowenkamp, C. T. (2011a). Implementing risk assessment in the federal pretrial services system. *Federal Probation*, 75(2), 30–34.
- Cadigan, T. P., & Lowenkamp, C. T. (2011b). Preentry: The key to long-term criminal justice success? *Federal Probation*, 75(2), 74–77.
- Case, B., Steadman, H. J., Dupuis, S. A., & Morris, L. S. (2009). Who succeeds in jail diversion programs for persons with mental illness? A multi-site study. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 27, 661–674. doi: 10.1002/bsl.883
- Castellano, T. C., Soderstrom, M. S., & Ringel, C. L. (1996, July). *The implementation and impact of Illinois' PreStart program: A final report*. Carbondale, IL: Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
- Chen, M. K., & Shapiro, J. M. (2007). Do harsher prison conditions reduce recidivism? A discontinuity-based approach. *American Law and Economics Review*, 9, 1–29.
- Cid, J. (2009). Is imprisonment criminogenic? A comparative study of recidivism rates between prison and suspended prison sanctions. *European Journal of Criminology*, 6, 459–480. doi: 10.1177/1477370809341128
- Cowell, A. J., Hinde, J. M., Broner, N., & Aldridge, A. P. (2013). The impact on taxpayer costs of jail diversion programs for people with serious mental illness. *Evaluation and Program Programming*, 41, 31–37. doi: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2013.07.001
- Daly, K. (1994). *Gender, crime, and punishment*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- DeMatteo, D., LaDuke, C., Locklair, B. R., & Heilbrun, K. (2012). Community-based alternatives for justice-involved individuals with severe mental illness: Diversion, problem-solving courts, and reentry. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41, 64–71, doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2012.09.002
- DePaulo, B. M., Lindsay, J. J., Malone, B. E., Muhlenbruck, L., Charlton, K., & Cooper, H. (2003). Cues to deception. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 74–118.
- Dowden, C., & Andrews, D. A. (2000). Effective correctional treatment and violence reoffending: A meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 42, 449–467.
- Dowell, D. A., Klein, C., & Krichmar, C. (1985). Evaluation of a halfway house. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 13, 217–226.

Drake, E. K., & Aos, S. (2012). *Confinement for technical violations of community supervision: Is there an effect on felony recidivism?* (Document No. 12-07-1201). Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Drake, E. K., Aos, S., & Miller, M. G. (2009). Evidence-based public policy options to reduce crime and criminal justice costs: Implications in Washington State. *Victims and Offenders, 4*, 170–196.

Duwe, G. (2012). Evaluating the Minnesota Comprehensive Offender Reentry Plan (MCORP): Results from a randomized experiment. *Justice Quarterly, 29*, 247–283.

Duwe, G. (2014). A randomized experiment of a prisoner reentry program: Updated results from an evaluation of the Minnesota Comprehensive Offender Reentry Plan (MCORP). *Criminal Justice Studies, 27*, 172–190. doi: 10.1080/1478601X.2013.850081

Feder, L. (1994). Psychiatric hospitalization history and parole decisions. *Law and Human Behavior, 18*, 395–410.

Fischer, M., & Geiger, B. (2011). What “works” in drug court: A bottom-up female participants’ perspective. *Journal of Human Behavior and the Social Environment, 21*, 752–765. doi: 10.1080/10911359.2011.615678

French, S., & Gendreau, P. (2006). Reducing prison misconduct: What works! *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 33*, 185–218.

Gaes, G. G., & Camp, S. D. (2009). Unintended consequences: Experimental evidence for the criminogenic effect of prison security level placement on post-release recidivism. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 5*, 139–162. doi: 10.1007/s11292-009-9070-z

Gehring, K. S., & Van Voorhis, P. (2014). Needs and pretrial failure: Additional risk factors for female and male pretrial defendants. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 41*, 943–970. doi: 10.1177/0093854814538022

Gendreau, P. (1996). The principle of effective intervention with offenders. In A. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing correctional options that work* (pp. 117–130). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gendreau, P., & Andrews, D. A. (1994). *The Correctional Program Assessment Inventory*. Fredericton, Canada: University of New Brunswick.

Golden, L. S., Gatchel, R. J., & Cahill, M. A. (2006). Evaluating the effectiveness of the National Institute of Corrections’ “Thinking for a Change” program among probationers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 43*, 55–73. doi: 10.1300/J076v43n02_03

Gottfredson, M. R., & Adams, K. (1982). Prison behavior and release performance. *Law and Policy Quarterly, 4*, 373–391.

Gray, G. A. (1997). *Does coercion play a significant role in community treatment programs that reduce offender recidivism?* Unpublished master’s thesis. Fredericton, Canada: The University of New Brunswick.

Hamilton, Z. K., & Campbell, C. M. (2014). Uncommonly observed: The impact of New Jersey’s halfway house system. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 41*, 1354–1375. doi: 10.1177/0093854814546132

- Hannah-Moffat, K. (2004). Losing ground: Gendered knowledges, parole risk, and responsibility. *Social Politics, 11*, 363–385.
- Harrell, A., & Roman, J. (2001). Reducing drug use and crime among offenders: The impact of graduated sanctions. *Journal of Drug Issues, 31*, 207–231.
- Hastings, M. E., Krishnan, S., Tangney, J. P., & Stuewig, J. (2011). Predictive and incremental validity of the Violence Risk Appraisal Guide scores with male and female jail inmates. *Psychological Assessment, 23*, 174–183. doi: 10.1037/a0021290
- Heil, P., Harrison, L., English, K., & Ahlmeyer, S. (2009). Is prison sexual offending indicative of community risk? *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36*, 892–908.
- Hilton, N. Z., Harris, G. T., & Rice, M. E. (2007). The effect of arrest on wife assault recidivism: Controlling for pre-arrest risk. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*, 1334–1344. doi: 10.1177/0093854807300757
- Hilton, N. Z., Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., Lang, C., Cormier, C. A., & Lines, K. J. (2004). A brief actuarial assessment for the prediction of wife assault recidivism: The Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment. *Psychological Assessment, 16*, 267–275.
- Hipp, J. R., Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (2010). Parolee recidivism in California: The effect of neighborhood context and social service agency characteristics. *Criminology, 48*, 947–979.
- Holsinger, A. M. (1999). *Opening the “black box”: Assessing the relationship between program integrity and recidivism* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Cincinnati, OH: The University of Cincinnati.
- Holsinger, A. M., Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2006). Predicting institutional misconduct using the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 30*, 267–285.
- Humphrey, J. A., Burford, G., & Dye, M. H. (2012). A longitudinal analysis of reparative probation and recidivism. *Criminal Justice Studies: A Critical Journal of Crime, Law and Society, 25*, 117–130. doi: 10.1080/1478601X.2012.699731
- Jensen, E. L., & Kane, S. L. (2012). The effects of therapeutic community on recidivism up to four years after release from prison: A multisite study. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 39*, 1075–1087. doi: 10.1177/0093854812442331
- Jones, N. J. (2011). *Merging theoretical frameworks to inform risk assessment for the young female offender* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ottawa, Canada: Carleton University.
- Jones, N. J., Brown, S. L., Robinson, D., & Frey, D. (2014). Incorporating strengths into quantitative assessments of criminal risk for adult offenders: The Service Planning Instrument (SPIn). *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. doi: 10.1177/0093854814547041
- Jonson, C. L. (2011). *The impact of imprisonment on reoffending: A meta-analysis* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Cincinnati, OH: The University of Cincinnati.
- Knight, K., Simpson, D. D., & Hiller, M. L. (1999). Three-year reincarceration outcomes for in-prison therapeutic community treatment in Texas. *The Prison Journal, 79*, 337–351.

Krebs, C. P., Lattimore, P. K., Cowell, A. J., & Graham, P. (2010). Evaluating the Juvenile Breaking the Cycle Program's impact on recidivism. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 109–117. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.02.008

Kubrin, C. E., & Stewart, E. A. (2006). Predicting who reoffends: The neglected role of neighborhood context in recidivism studies. *Criminology*, 44, 165–197.

Landenberger, N., & Lipsey, M. (2005). The positive effects of cognitive behavioral programs for offenders: A meta-analysis of factors associated with effective treatment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 451–476.

Latessa, E. J., Lovins, L. B., & Smith, P. (2010). *Final report: Follow-up evaluation of Ohio's community-based correctional facility and halfway house programs – Outcome study*. Cincinnati, OH: Center for Criminal Justice Research.

Lester, D., Braswell, M., & Van Voorhis, P. (2004). Radical behavioral interventions. In P. Van Voorhis, M. Braswell, & D. Lester (Eds.), *Correctional counseling & rehabilitation* (5th ed., pp. 61–82). New York, NY: Matthew Bender.

Lim, L., & Day, A. (2014). Mental health diversion courts: A two year recidivism study of a South Australian mental health court program. *Behavioral Sciences & The Law*, 32, 539–551. doi: 10.1002/bsl.2126

Lipsey, M. W., Chapman, G. L., & Landenberger, N. A. (2001). Cognitive behavioral programs for offenders. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 578, 144–157.

Loughran, T. A., Mulvey, E. P., Schubert, C. A., Fagan, J., Piquero, A. R., & Losoya, S. H. (2009). Estimating a dose-response relationship between length of stay and future recidivism in serious juvenile offenders. *Criminology*, 47, 699–740.

Lovell, D., Johnson, L. C., & Cain, K. C. (2007). Recidivism of supermax prisoners in Washington State. *Crime & Delinquency*, 53, 633–656. doi: 10.1177/0011128706296466

Lowenkamp, C. T., Flores, A. W., Holsinger, A. M., Makarios, M. D., & Latessa, E. J. (2010). Intensive supervision programs: Does program philosophy and the principles of effective intervention matter? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 368–375. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.04.004

Lowenkamp, C. T., Hubbard, D., Makarios, M. D., & Latessa, E. J. (2009). A quasi-experimental evaluation of Thinking for a Change: A “real-world” application. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 137–146. doi: 10.1177/0093854808328230

Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2002). *Evaluation of Ohio's community based correctional facilities and halfway house programs* (Evaluation No. 56350044). Cincinnati, OH: Center for Criminal Justice Research.

Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2004). *Investigating the relationship between program integrity and correctional program effectiveness* (Ohio Corrections Research Compendium, Volume II). Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2005). Increasing the effectiveness of correctional programming through the risk principle: Identifying offenders for residential placement. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 4, 263–290.

Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E. J., & Holsinger, A. M. (2006). The risk principle in action: What have we learned from 13,676 offenders and 97 correctional programs? *Crime & Delinquency*, 52, 77–93. doi: 10.1177/0011128705281747

Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E. J., & Smith, P. (2006). Does correctional program quality really matter? The impact of adhering to the principles of effective intervention. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5, 201–220.

Lowenkamp, C. T., Lemke, R., & Latessa, E. (2011). The development and validation of a pretrial screening tool. *Federal Probation*, 72(3), 2–9.

Makarios, M., & Latessa, E. J. (2013). Developing a risk and needs assessment instrument for prison inmates. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40, 1449–1471. doi: 10.1177/0093854813496240

Makarios, M., Sperber, K. G., & Latessa, E. J. (2014). Treatment dosage and the risk principle: A refinement and extension. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 53, 334–350. doi: 10.1080/10509674.2014.922157

Matejkowski, J., Draine, J., Solomon, P., & Salzer, M. S. (2011). Mental illness, criminal risk factors and parole release decisions. *Behavioral Science and the Law*, 29, 528–553. doi: 10.1002/bsl.991

McGrath, A., & Weatherburn, D. (2012). The effect of custodial penalties on juvenile reoffending. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 45, 26–44. doi: 10.1177/0004865811432585

Meade, B., Steiner, B., Makarios, M., & Travis, L. (2012). Estimating a dose-response relationship between time served in prison and recidivism. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 50, 525–550. doi: 10.1177/0022427812458928

Mitchell, W., Owen, D. B., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2006). *The effectiveness of incarceration-based drug treatment on criminal behavior*. Oslo, Norway: Campbell Collaboration.

Mitchell, O., Wilson, D. B., Eggers, A., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2012). Assessing the effectiveness of drug courts on recidivism: A meta-analytic review of traditional and non-traditional drug courts. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40, 60–71. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.11.009

Mitchell, O., Wilson, D. B., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2007). Does incarceration-based drug treatment reduce recidivism? A meta-analytic synthesis of the research. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 3, 353–375. doi: 10.1007/s11292-007-9040-2

Mooney, J. L., & Daffern, M. (2011). Institutional aggression as a predictor of violent recidivism: Implications for parole decision making. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 10, 52–63. doi: 10.1080/14999013.2010.550984

Northpointe Institute for Public Management. (1996). *COMPAS* [Computer software]. Traverse City, MI: Author.

- Olver, M. E., Stockdale, K. C., & Wormith, J. S. (2009). Risk assessment with young offenders: A meta-analysis of three assessment measures. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 329–353. doi: 10.1177/009385480933145
- Orbis Partners. (2006). *Service Planning Instrument for Women (SPIn-W)*. Ottawa, Canada: Author.
- Paternoster, R., Bachman, R., Brame, R., & Sherman, L. W. (1997). Do fair procedures matter? The effect of procedural justice on spouse assault. *Law & Society Review*, 31, 163–195.
- Pearson, F. S., Lipton, D. S., Cleland, C. M., & Yee, D. S. (2002). The effects of behavioural/cognitive-behavioural programmes on recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency*, 48, 476–496.
- Perry, A. E., Darwin, Z., Godfrey, C., McDougall, C., Lunn, J., Glanville, J., & Coulton, S. (2009). The effectiveness of interventions for drug-using offenders in the courts, secure establishments and the community: A systematic review. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 44, 374–400. doi: 10.1080/10826080802347560
- Petersilia, J. (2004). What works in prisoner reentry? Reviewing and questioning the evidence. *Federal Probation*, 68(2), 4–8.
- Petersilia, J. (2007). Employ behavioral contracting for “earned discharge” parole. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 6, 807–814.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1993). *Evaluating intensive supervision probation/parole: Results of a nationwide experiment*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Piquero, A. R., & Pogarsky, G. (2002). Beyond Stafford and Warr’s reconceptualization of deterrence: Personal and vicarious experiences, impulsivity, and offending behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39, 153–186.
- Redding, R. E. (2008). *Juvenile transfer laws: An effective deterrent to delinquency?* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Rettinger, L. J., & Andrews, D. A. (2010). General risk and need, gender specificity, and the recidivism of female offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37, 29–46. doi: 10.1177/0093854809349438
- Robinson, C. R., VanBenschoten, S., Alexander, M., & Lowenkamp, C. T. (2011). A random (almost) study of staff training aimed at reducing re-arrest (STARR): Reducing recidivism through intentional design. *Federal Probation*, 75(2), 57–63.
- Romani, C. J., Morgan, R. D., Gross, N. R., & McDonald, B. R. (2012). Treating criminal behavior: Is the bang worth the buck? *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law*, 18, 144–165. doi: 10.1037/a0024714
- Ryan, J. P., Abrams, L. S., & Huang, H. (2014). First-time violent juvenile offenders: Probation, placement, and recidivism. *Social Work Research*, 38, 7–18. doi: 10.1093/swr/svu004
- Sarteschi, C. M., Vaughn, M. G., & Kim, K. (2011). Assessing the effectiveness of mental health courts: A quantitative review. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 12–20. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.11.003
- Saylor, W. G., & Gaes, G. G. (1997). Training inmates through industrial work participation and vocational apprenticeship instruction. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 1(2), 32–43.

- Schlager, M. D., & Robbins, K. (2008). Does parole work? Revisited: Reframing the discussion of the impact of postprison supervision on offender outcome. *The Prison Journal*, 88, 234–251. doi: 10.1177/0032885508319164
- Schubert, C. A., Mulvey, E. P., Loughran, T. A., Fagan, J., Chassin, L. A., Piquero, A. R., ... Cauffman, E. (2010). Predicting outcomes for youth transferred to adult court. *Law and Human Behavior*, 34, 460–475. doi: 10.1007/s10979-009-9209-5
- Schwalbe, C. S. (2008). A meta-analysis of juvenile justice risk assessment instruments: Predictive validity by gender. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 1367–1381. doi: 10.1177/009385808324377
- Schwalbe, C. S., Gearing, R. E., MacKenzie, M. J., Brewer, K. B., & Ibrahim, R. (2012). A meta-analysis of experimental studies of diversion programs for juvenile offenders. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 32, 26–33. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2011.10.002
- Scroggins, J. R., & Malley, S. (2010). Reentry and the (unmet) needs of women. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 49, 146–163. doi: 10.1080/10509670903546864
- Seiter, R. P., & Kadela, K. R. (2003). Prisoner reentry: What works, what does not, and what is promising. *Crime & Delinquency*, 49, 360–388. doi: 10.1177/0011128703253761
- Solomon, A. L., Kachnowski, V., & Bhati, A. (2005). Does parole work? *Analyzing the impact of postprison supervision on rearrest outcomes*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2008). Inmate versus environmental effects of prison rule violations. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 438–456. doi: 10.1177/0093854807312787
- Tong, L. S. J., & Farrington, D. P. (2006). How effective is the “Reasoning and Rehabilitation” programme in reducing reoffending? A meta-analysis of evaluations in four countries. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 12, 3–24. doi: 10.1080/10683160512331316253
- Turner, S., & Petersilia, J. (1996). Work release in Washington: Effects on recidivism and corrections costs. *The Prison Journal*, 76, 138–164.
- Turpin-Petrosino, C. (1999). Are limiting enactments effective? An experimental test of decision making in a presumptive parole state. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 321–332.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2001). *Trends in state parole, 1990-2000* (special report). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- VanNostrand, M. (2003). *Assessing risk among pretrial defendants in Virginia: The Virginia pretrial risk assessment instrument*. Richmond, VA: Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services.
- VanNostrand, M., & Keebler, G. (2009, April). *Pretrial risk assessment in the federal court*. Washington, DC: Office of Federal Detention Trustee.
- Van Voorhis, P., Wright, E. M., Salisbury, E., & Bauman, A. (2010). Women’s risk factors and their contributions to existing risk/needs assessment: The current status of a gender-responsive supplement. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37, 261–288. doi: 10.1177/0093854809357442
- Ventura, L. A., & Lambert, E. G. (2004). Recidivism 12 months after TASC. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 39, 63–82. doi: 10.1300/J076v39n01_04

- Visher, C. A., Winterfield, L., & Coggeshall, M. B. (2005). Ex-offender employment programs and recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 295–315. doi: 10.1007/s11292-005-8127-x
- Vito, G. F., & Tewksbury, R. (1999). Improving the educational skills of inmates: The results of an impact evaluation. *Corrections Compendium*, 24(10), 46–51.
- Vito, G. F., Tewksbury, R., & Higgins, G. E. (2010). Evaluation of Kentucky's early release initiative: Sentence commutations, public safety and recidivism. *Federal Probation*, 74(3), 22–26.
- Walters, G. D., & Crawford, G. (2014). Major mental illness and violence history as predictors of institutional misconduct and recidivism: Main and interaction effects. *Law and Human Behavior*, 38, 238–247. doi: 10.1037/lhb0000058
- Weinrath, M., & Coles, R. (2003). Third generation prison classification: The Manitoba case. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 16, 305–316.
- Welsh, W. N. (2007). A multisite evaluation of prison-based therapeutic community drug treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 1481–1498.
- Wikoff, N., Linhorst, D. M., & Morani, N. (2012). Recidivism among participants of a reentry program for prisoners released without supervision. *Social Work Research*, 36, 289–299. doi: 10.1093/swr/svs021
- Wilson, D. B., Bouffard, L. A., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2005). A quantitative review of structured, group-oriented, cognitive-behavioral programs for offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32, 172–204. doi: 10.1177/0093854804272889
- Wilson, H. A., & Hoge, R. D. (2013a). The effect of youth diversion programs on recidivism: A meta-analytic review. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40, 497–518. doi: 10.1177/0093854812451089
- Wilson, H. A., & Hoge, R. D. (2013b). Diverting our attention to what works: Evaluating the effectiveness of a youth diversion program. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 11, 313–331. doi: 10.1177/1541204012473132
- Wilson, J. A., & Davis, R. C. (2006). Good intentions meet hard realities: An evaluation of the Project Greenlight reentry program. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5, 303–338.
- Winterfield, L., Coggeshall, M., & Harrell, A. (2003, April). *Development of an empirically-based risk assessment instrument: Final report*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center.
- Wodahl, E. J., Garland, B., Culhane, S. E., & McCarty, W. P. (2011). Utilizing behavioral interventions to improve supervision outcomes in community-based corrections. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38, 386–405. doi: 10.1177/0093854810397866
- Wong, S. C. P., & Pharhar, K. K. (2011). Evaluation of the predictive validity of the Violence Risk Scale in a paroled offender sample: A seven-year prospective study. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 22, 790–808. doi: 10.1080/14789949.2011.623172
- Wright, B. J., Zhang, S. X., Farabee, D., & Braatz, R. (2014). Prisoner reentry research from 2000–2010: Results of a narrative review. *Criminal Justice Review*, 39, 37–57. doi: 10.1177/0734016813501192

Zhang, S. X., Roberts, R. E. L., & Callanan, V. J. (2006). Preventing parolees from returning to prison through community-based reintegration. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52, 551–571. doi: 10.1177/0011128705282594

Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., & Vaughn, M. S. (2014). Indeterminate and determinate sentencing models: A state-specific analysis of their effects on recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency*, 60, 693–715. doi: 10.1177/0011128709354047