LECC Reentry Initiative

Mission

A broad coalition of stakeholders promoting the successful reintegration of ex-offenders in order to reduce crime and recidivism, increase the safety of communities, and ensure the rights and safety of victims of crime.
LECC Reentry Initiative Goals and Objectives

- Strengthen coordination and information sharing among reentry stakeholders.
- Address gaps in transition from courts to corrections to community service.
- Educate and prepare communities for the reintegration of ex-offenders.
- Strengthen faith-based partnerships, mentoring, and community-based partnerships to promote reintegration.
Initiative Recommendations

- TREATMENT & HEALTH: Streamline continuity of medical and behavioral health services from prison to the community and increase treatment capacity.
- HOUSING & TRANSPORTATION: Improve access to quality and safe housing opportunities.
- EMPLOYMENT & EDUCATION: Collaborate across agencies to eliminate employment and education barriers.
- COMMUNITY EDUCATION, LINKAGES & OUTREACH: Raise public awareness, involvement and commitment to successful reentry.
- FAITH-BASED & MENTORING: Cultivate collaboration in mentoring programs and streamline from pre to post prison release.
Evidence-Based Decision Making in Local Criminal Justice Systems Initiative

One less offender.  One less crime.  One less victim.
Partners

• **Federal Sponsors**
  - National Institute of Corrections
  - With support from the Office of Justice Programs

• **Technical Assistance Consortium**
  - Center for Effective Public Policy
  - Pretrial Justice Institute
  - The Justice Management Institute
  - The Carey Group
Key Assumptions/Recognitions

- We *can* do better (achieve improved outcomes)
- There is sufficient evidence to support a Framework for evidence-based decision making
- Lessons from the private sector around organizational development can be applied to the justice system
- Where evidence is lacking, it should be built
- The justice system can achieve more than risk reduction – harm reduction is also possible
The Vision: One Million Fewer Victims

“The problem with most people is not that they aim too high and miss the mark, but that they aim too low and hit it.”

Michelangelo
The Institute of Healthcare Improvement (IHI)

- A national campaign to reduce 100,000 accidental hospital and clinical deaths to zero
- With roughly 3,100 of the nation's hospitals-representing 75% of the available patient bed space-enrolled in “100,000 Lives Campaign”, an estimated 122,342 deaths were prevented

Application to the Initiative: One million fewer victims is possible; the time to start is now
Public Opinion Survey Results

- 74% agreed with this statement: “We should increase spending on approaches proven to reduce the chances that offenders will commit new crime.”

- 61% said that when justice system professionals make decisions, research should be the most important thing they rely on.
According to the U.S. DOJ, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 67% of individuals released from prison are rearrested within three years after discharge.

An estimated 30% of probationers supervised in the community are reconvicted for a new crime.

These recidivism rates have remained relatively stable for decades.
Key CJS Research Findings

- Over the past two decades, it has been demonstrated that better results from our justice system's efforts and investments can be realized.
- 30% reduction in recidivism is possible if the justice system applies current knowledge consistently and with fidelity.
- The research also shows that application of this knowledge can produce significant cost benefits to cities, counties, and states.
Core Values

- Nothing in the Initiative is meant to contradict or change the core criminal justice system values of:
  - Public safety
  - Fairness
  - Individual liberty
  - Respect for the rights, needs, and concerns of victims
  - Respect for the rights of people accused of crimes
  - Respect for the rule of law
  - Discretion
  - Appreciation for differences in perspectives and practices across jurisdictions
Key Decision Points

Arrest Decisions → Pretrial Status Decisions → Charging Decisions → Plea Decisions

Local Institutional Release Decisions

Local Institutional Intervention Decisions

Sentencing Decisions

Community Intervention Decisions

Violation Response Decisions

Discharge from Criminal Justice Intervention
Harm Reduction

• The justice system has a number of goals, recidivism reduction being just one

• Harm reduction is the overarching objective; many possible outcomes:
  ▫ Fewer crimes and
  ▫ Reduced erosion of property values
  ▫ Less money spent on the justice system
  ▫ Increased sense of safety
  ▫ Less financial loss by victims
  ▫ Greater confidence by citizens in the CJS

Harm reduction includes decreases in the ill effects of crime by communities, victims, citizens, families of offenders, and by offenders themselves.
EBDM Principle #1

The professional judgment of criminal justice system decision makers is enhanced when informed by evidence-based knowledge.

*Examples: use of risk tools; effectiveness of interventions under certain conditions*

Evidence-based knowledge does not replace discretion but instead, informs decisions.
EBDM Principle #2

Every interaction within the criminal justice system offers an opportunity to contribute to harm reduction.

Examples: law enforcement officer at the point of arrest, pretrial officer at assessment, judicial officer on the bench

To be effective, justice system players must understand how their interactions influence others and have the knowledge and skills to enhance this influence.
EBDM Principle #3

Systems achieve better outcomes when they operate collaboratively at the individual, agency, and system levels.

Example: Community based service providers and Faith based organizations are part of the collaboration

Decision making responsibilities remain at the individual and agency level, however under the collaborative approach, input is received and other’s interests are taken into account.
EBDM Principle #4

The criminal justice system will continually learn and improve when professionals make decisions based on the collection, analysis, and use of data and information.

Examples: Establishment of agency and system wide performance measures; feedback loops to examine efficacy of current practice.

Where evidence is not immediately available, the justice system may need to use its own data to determine what is or is not working.
Increased Public Safety, measured by:

- Fewer released offenders arrested for a more serious offense than their original offense;
- Decreased average number of new offenses for released offenders;
- Faster case processing times (i.e., shorter elapsed time from arrest to final adjudication) that decrease the likelihood of pretrial misbehavior and increase swiftness of punishment;
- Fewer people victimized by released offenders;
- Fewer victims “revictimized” by original perpetrators;
- Decreased number of protection orders violated;
- Fewer reports of crime from "hot spots/l involving either known offenders or new offenders; and increases in the proportion of jail and prison beds occupied by high risk offenders compared to low risk offenders.
Increased Community Wellness, measured by:

- Decreased number of drug/alcohol-related traffic accidents;
- Fewer drug/alcohol-related traffic fatalities;
- Decreases in emergency-room admissions for crime-related and drug-related injuries;
- Increased number of drug-free babies born;
- Fewer child welfare interventions in families of offenders;
- Increases in the number of people successfully completing treatment programs; and
- Fewer jail and prison admissions for people with mental health issues.
Increased satisfaction with the CJS, measured by:

- Increased number of victims satisfied with the justice system's responses;
- Increased number of offenders making restitution payments;
- Increased victim cooperation with the justice system;
- Increased cooperation of the public with the criminal justice system;
- Fewer people who believe the justice system is a "revolving" door;
- Increases in the number of positive media reports about the justice system
Social & fiscal costs of CJS interventions improve, Measured by:

- fewer family members of known offenders who become involved with the justice system;
- decreases in the costs for incarceration;
- greater financial return on investment in treatment, rehabilitation, and alternatives to incarceration;
- decreased crime rate;
- increased tax base;
- increases in timely child support payments; and
- increases in court-imposed fees collected.
Supervision that Reduces Crime and Recidivism, “Evidence Based Practices”

KATHY WATERS, DIRECTOR, ADULT PROBATION, ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
Why Evidence-Based Practice in General?

- Challenges the blind adoption of practices, counters naïve adherence to the status quo
- Especially when we can’t explain the rationale for our practices
Why Policy Makers Care About EBP

- Improves outcomes, especially recidivism
- Reduces victimization
- Prevents harm
- Enhances collaboration
- Establishes research-driven decision making
- Targets funding toward the interventions that bring greatest returns
Definition

Evidence Based Practices: A progressive, organizational use of direct, current scientific evidence to guide and inform efficient and effective correctional services.
Forerunner Was Evidence Based Medicine

- 1836: Bloodletting was routine
- French physician Pierre Louis: One of first clinical trials in medicine
- Found bloodletting was linked to far more deaths
- Too Late for George Washington: Died two days after treated for sore throat by draining almost five pints of blood
Research Supported Principles

1) Assess Actuarial Risk / Needs
2) Enhance Intrinsic Motivation
3) Target Interventions
4) Skill Train with Directed Practice
5) Increase Positive Reinforcement
6) Engage On-going Support in Communities
7) Measure Relevant Practices
8) Provide Measurement Feedback
Impact of Adhering to the Core Principles of Effective Intervention: Risk, Needs, and Responsivity*

* meta-analysis of 230 studies (Andrews et al., 1999)
What Does Work?

Features of Effective Interventions:

- Target criminogenic risk and need
- Cognitive/behavioral in nature
- Incorporate social-learning practices
- Balanced integrated approach to sanctions and interventions
- Incorporate the principle of responsivity
- Therapeutic integrity
The Big Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminogenic Need</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of anti-social behavior</td>
<td>Build non-criminal alternative behaviors to risky situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social personality</td>
<td>Build problem solving, self management, anger management, and coping skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social cognition</td>
<td>Reduce anti-social cognition, recognize risky thinking and feelings, adopt an alternative identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social companions</td>
<td>Reduce association with criminals, enhance contact with pro-social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ed Latessa, Ph.D.
## The Next Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminogenic Need</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and/or marital</td>
<td>Reduce conflict, build positive relationships and communication, enhance monitoring/supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>Reduce usage, reduce the supports for abuse behavior, enhance alternatives to abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and/or work</td>
<td>Enhance performance rewards and satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and/or recreation</td>
<td>Enhance involvement and satisfaction in pro-social activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ed Latessa, Ph.D.
The Big Three

- Risk
- Need
- Responsivity
In Summary

**WHO**
Target supervision and treatment to high/medium risk

**WHAT**
Focus treatment interventions on dynamic criminogenic needs

**WHERE**
Link targeted offenders to the appropriate supervision and treatment

**HOW**
Ensure treatment is effective
Develop information systems, engage leadership support and promote organizational change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 08 Base Line</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
<th>FY 11</th>
<th>FY 12</th>
<th>Base Line to FY 09 (%)</th>
<th>FY 09 to FY 10 (%)</th>
<th>FY 10 to FY 11 (%)</th>
<th>FY 11 to FY 12 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>7,720</td>
<td>6,733</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>4,573</td>
<td>4,456</td>
<td>-12.8</td>
<td>-29.3</td>
<td>-41.0</td>
<td>-42.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Percent of Revocations to ADOC-Year to Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 08 Base Line</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
<th>FY 11</th>
<th>FY 12</th>
<th>Base Line to FY 09 (%)</th>
<th>FY 09 to FY 10 (%)</th>
<th>FY 10 to FY 11 (%)</th>
<th>FY 11 to FY 12 (%)</th>
<th>Base Line to FY 12 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide</strong></td>
<td>6,801</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>4,913</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>3,794</td>
<td>-12.6</td>
<td>-17.3</td>
<td>-16.1</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-44.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of Probationers with a New Felony Conviction – Year to Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 08 Base Line</th>
<th>FY 09</th>
<th>FY 10</th>
<th>FY 11</th>
<th>FY 12</th>
<th>Base Line to FY 09 (#)</th>
<th>FY 09 to FY 10 (#)</th>
<th>FY 10 to FY 11 (#)</th>
<th>FY 11 to FY 12 (#)</th>
<th>Base Line to FY 12 (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-926</td>
<td>-331</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-1,195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Integrated Model

Evidence-Based Principles
(content)

Organizational Development
(internal strategy)

Collaboration
(external strategy)
Best Sources for “Cleaned Up” Research

Links from NIC website:
http://www.nicic.org/WebPage_387.htm

- **Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado**: Conducts studies, provides information, and offers technical assistance regarding violence prevention.
- **The Corrections Institute, University of Cincinnati**: Assists agencies seeking to change offender behavior.
- **Bureau of Government Research, University of Maryland**: Helps government agencies identify and implement "best practices."
- **Institute of Behavioral Research at TCU**: Studies addiction treatment in community and correctional settings.
- **Campbell Collaboration**: Studies the effects of interventions in social, behavioral, and educational arenas.
- **National Criminal Justice Reference Service**
LECC Re-Entry Initiative
Steering Committee

Billie Grobe, Yavapai County Adult Probation, billie.grobe@co.yavapai.az.us
Brian Colgan, United States Probation, Brian_Colgan@azd.uscourts.gov
Erinn Herberman, Maricopa County Manager’s Office, herberman@mail.maricopa.gov
Jan Wethers, Arizona Department of Corrections, JWETHERS@azcorrections.gov
Kathy Waters, Arizona Supreme Court, KWaters@courts.az.gov
Mark Stodola, Arizona Supreme Court, MStodola@courts.az.gov
MaryEllen Sheppard, Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office, M_Sheppard@MCSO.maricopa.gov
Paul O’Connell, Arizona Department of Corrections, POCONNELL@azcorrections.gov
Robert Cherkos, Maricopa County Adult Probation, rcherkos@cox.net
Ron Reinstein, Arizona Supreme Court, rreinstein@courts.az.gov
Sean Connolly, Phoenix Police Department, sean.connolly@phoenix.gov
Susan Savoy, Maricopa County Adult Probation, ssavoy@apd.maricopa.gov
Toni Davis, Arizona Women’s Education & Employment, tonidavis@awee.org
Vicki Staples, Arizona State University, Vicki.Staples@asu.edu