



Pilot Program Evaluation

Randie C. Chance, Ph.D.
California Department of Justice

Alexander Holsinger, Ph.D.
University of Missouri, Kansas City

Kevin Walker
California Department of Justice

72nd Annual
American Society of Criminology Meeting
November 18, 2016

I. Purpose

II. Program Participants

III. Program Components

IV. Evaluation Design

V. Analyses and Results

VI. Preliminary Programmatic Impact

VII. Next Steps

Purpose



Program Participants

- Male
- Incarcerated for a non-serious, non-sexual, non-violent (N3) crime
- Between the ages of 18 and 65 years old
- Between 7 and 18 months remaining on sentence
- Security classification between level between 1 and 7
- Medium to high risk to recidivate
- No medical or psychological needs that disqualify them from being housed at the Pitchess Detention Center

In-Custody Program Overview

In-Custody Phase (7 -36 Months)

Overview

Participants are housed together at Pitchess Detention Center in northeast LA County.
Program is full-time, 5 days per week.

Cognitive Behavior

Dr. Edward Latessa, University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute
Thinking for a Change

Aggression Replacement Therapy

Substance Abuse Component

Education BOT-LA College Academy

Remedial Classes / High School Diploma (Five Keys Charter School)

College Courses (LA Mission / College of the Canyons)

Vocational / CTE Courses (LA Trade Tech / College of the Canyons)

Life Skills

Life Skills Course (Five Keys Charter School)

Parenting Course (Five Keys Charter School)

Re-Entry

Case Management / LA Probation

Community Service Providers

Child Support Services, Dept. of Motor Vehicles, Dept. of Family and Child Services

Out-of-Custody Program Overview

	Out-of-Custody Phase (1 Year)
Overview	Participants complete their sentences and return to the community. The out-of-custody services and support are offered for one year and vary based on individual needs.
Case Management	Case Management / LA Probation
Housing	Utilize network of community alliance for transitional or licensed facility treatment housing. Healthright360, Amity, YWCA, Goodwill, etc.
Employment	Develop employment portfolio to include labor organizations, workforce investment board, college employment networks.
	Develop partnerships with local businesses and employers.
	Job Placement
Child Support Services	Assist participants in child support obligations. Dr. Golightly, Executive Director of Los Angeles County Child Support Services
Health Services	Health Services Support Dr. Mitchell Katz, Director, Los Angeles County Department of Health Services

BOT-LA program evaluation methodology

- Equivalent group comparison
 - BOT-LA participants
 - Control group
 - Control group participants were selected from the same population as the BOT-LA participants, but do not receive any of the Back on Track programming or services.

Measures – all groups

- Demographic information
- Criminal history
- COMPAS risk/need classification
- Substance abuse issues – DSV
- TABE scores
- TCU's CEST scales
- TCU's CTS scales
- Post-release re-arrest
 - Other recidivistic measures as they become available
 - 3-year standardized follow-up per California DOJ definition

Scales used in the evaluation

TCU's CEST

- Desire for help
- Treatment needs
- Pressures for treatment
- Self esteem
- Depression
- Anxiety
- Decision making
- Hostility
- Risk taking

TCU's CTS

- Entitlement
- Justification
- Power orientation
- Cold heartedness
- Criminal rationalization
- Personal irresponsibility

Additional measures – BOT-LA group only

- Programming completion
- Vocational certifications
- Other out-of-custody measures to come (eg. child support payments, job retention, etc.)

Procedures – all groups

- CEST, CTS, DVS, COMPAS administered pre
 - @ beginning of treatment for BOT-LA participants
 - @ “Time 1” for control cases
- CEST, CTS, DVS, COMPAS administered post
 - @ or near the end of treatment for BOT-LA participants
 - @ “Time 2” for control cases – equivalent time period
- Time tracked closely – days until release
- Post-release re-arrest

Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: Demographics (only those who have been released)

- Difference in age – non-significant
 - Each group avg. age = between 36 and 37 years
- Difference in race – non-significant
 - Both groups' plurality ethnicity was Hispanic

Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: Criminogenic risk/criminal history (only those who have been released)

- Initial COMPAS classifications were statistically the same
 - BOT-LA group = 55.7% classified as high risk
 - Control group = 56.6% classified as high risk

Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: Criminal History – groups were statistically equivalent regarding... (only those who have been released)

- Total arrests
- Total drug arrests
- Total “other” arrests
- Total property arrests
- Total drug convictions
- Total “other” convictions
- Total person-related convictions
- Total property convictions

Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: Criminal History

- BOT-LA and Control groups differed significantly regarding
 - Total convictions (BOT-LA had more at 10.8 on avg. vs. 8.61 for control)
 - Person-related *arrests* (BOT-LA had fewer at 1.69 on avg. vs. 2.82 for control)

Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: CEST pre-measures

- The two groups were statistically the same regarding the pre-measures of:
 - Desire for help
 - Treatment needs
 - Pressure for treatment
 - Self-esteem
 - Depression
 - Anxiety
 - Decision making
 - Hostility
 - Risk taking

Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: CTS pre-measures

- The two groups were statistically the same regarding the pre-measures of:
 - Entitlement
 - Justification
 - Power orientation
 - Cold heartedness
 - Criminal rationalization
 - Personal irresponsibility

Preliminary Program Impact

- Mean COMPAS classification significantly lower for BOT-LA group (comparing pre-measures to post-measure)
- Mean COMPAS classification stayed statistically the same for control group cases

Preliminary Program Impact

- Criminal rationalization scale (as assessed via the CTS) decreased significantly for BOT-LA group (comparing pre-measure to post-measure)
- Criminal rationalization scale stayed statistically the same for control group

Preliminary Program Impact

- Re-arrest rates:
 - BOT-LA = 19.7%
 - Control = 24.8%
- No controls; time at risk differed

Current status/Next steps

- All background and pre-measure assessment data has been gathered
- Analyses will continue (replication) regarding all comparisons (both intra- and inter-group comparisons, at pre, post, and pre-to-post)
- Recidivism will continue being tracked
- Multivariate models used when standardized follow-up period has been achieved for all cases
- Continuing efforts to test program efficacy

For additional questions and information please contact

- Randie Chance at Randie.Chance@doj.ca.gov
- Alex Holsinger at HolsingerA@umkc.edu
- Kevin Walker at Kevin.Walker@doj.ca.gov