Community Transitions Impact Evaluation

Introduction

The following report summarizes the major evaluation findings examining the Community Transitions Program (CTP).

The report is designed with the following questions as organizing principles:

1. Who tends to enter the CTP?
2. What types of offenses are committed leading to referral to the CTP?
3. What level of risk do CTP offenders demonstrate?
4. How successful are offenders in completing the CTP?
5. What relationships exist between items 1-4 and program completion?
6. How frequent is recidivism and what form does that recidivism take?
7. What relationships exist between items 1-4 and recidivism?

Allen County Community Corrections Description

The mission of Allen County Community Corrections is to operate a community based program that provides services to offenders, persons charged with a crime or an act of delinquency, persons sentenced to imprisonment, or victims of crime or delinquency to meet the needs of the individual criminal offender, victims of crime and the community at large.

Community Transitions Purpose

The Allen Superior Community Transitions provides returning inmates the tools with which to successfully re-integrate back into the community with the assistance of electronic monitoring, field officers and case management. Offenders work through programming, job search and areas of behavioral change while receiving support from judicial oversight, community/faith-based mentors, and local employers.

History of Community Transitions

In 1999, the Indiana State Legislature passed a law known as the Community Transition Statute. This statute allows each county in the state to develop its own Community Transitions Program to which inmates of the Department of Correction may be released early to community supervision. It allows each county's judges to determine what level of supervision would be used. This program went operational in 2001.

Eligibility for Community Transitions

Individuals committed to the Indiana Department of Correction may be eligible to participate in the Community Transitions Program except in the following instances:

1. Offenders sentenced to less than one year in the Department of Correction.
2. Offenders with warrants, detainers, or pending charges issued by an agency or court other than the Indiana Department of Correction.
   a. Individuals with warrants or detainers from an Allen County court for failure to pay child support, with a small claims judgment, or fines and cost MAY be eligible if the issuing court agrees to recall the warrant and schedule a court date after the offender is released to Allen County Community Corrections.
   b. Offenders with warrants or detainers for new felony charges or serious or violent misdemeanor charges for which the offender has not been sentenced will not be eligible for placement on the program.
   c. An offender with a pending new charge consisting of a traffic offense MAY be eligible for placement on the program if the court agrees to recall the warrant or detainer and set a new court date.

3. Offenders who are not residents of the State of Indiana.
4. Individuals with indeterminate life sentences.
5. Individuals sentenced to life without parole or sentenced to death.

The time of release to the Community Transition Program is determined according to sentencing class.
   1. An offender convicted of a class D felony as the most serious conviction during the commitment period may begin the Community Transition Program 60 days prior to the offender’s earliest projected release date.
   2. An offender convicted of a class C felony as the most serious conviction will:
      a. be eligible for the Community Transition Program 90 days prior to the earliest projected release date.
      b. if all of the offender’s charges fall under I.C. 35-48-4 and/or I.C. 16-42-19, that offender will be eligible to begin the Community Transition Program 120 days prior to the earliest projected release date.
   3. An offender convicted of a class A or B felony as the most serious conviction during the commitment will:
      a. be eligible for the Community Transition Program no more than 120 days prior to the earliest projected release date.
      b. if all of the offender’s charges fall under I.C. 35-48-4 and/or I.C. 16-42-19, the offender will be eligible for the Community Transition Program 180 days prior to the earliest projected release date.

The Community Transition Program require that the incarcerated offender voluntarily participate with the knowledge and agreement of the program participation conditions.
   1. A class D felony offender who returns a letter of acceptance of the program conditions will be transported to the county in which the offender was sentenced unless the court from the sentencing county requests the transfer of the case to Allen County and the Allen County superior Court approves the transfer.
   2. Individuals sentenced to class C, B or A offenses must also return a letter of acceptance but will not be transported unless the Department of Correction receives a letter from the sentencing judge admitting the individual to the Community Transition Program.
   3. The offender must agree to return to the county in which the offender was originally sentenced unless the sentencing Court from another county has requested a transfer of the case to Allen County and the Allen Superior Court has approved the transfer of the case to Allen County.
   4. The offender must agree to obtain a residence that is not with or near the victim or victims of the violent offense that was committed by the offender.
5. If the offender’s expected release date changes as the result of the gain or loss of credit time after notice is sent to each court, the offender may become ineligible for a community transition program.
   a. The loss or gain of credit time shall not automatically cause an offender to be ineligible.
   b. The referral Manager shall consult with the ReEntry Director who will make a determination on eligibility.
6. An offender who is eligible to be assigned to the Community Transition Program is sentenced by more than one (1) court, the offender must be considered for assignment to the Community Transition Program that the offender is actively serving is located.
7. Before an offender may be assigned to the Community Transition Program, each court that sentenced the offender to a period of imprisonment that the offender is actively serving must agree to the assignment.

Preparation of this Evaluation Report

The information presented in this report examines the programs using three different samples of offenders. The first is those who entered supervision between January 1, 2009 and December 31, 2011, the second is comprised of offenders who left supervision between January 1, 2009 and July 14, 2011 and the third consists of offenders who completed the three year follow-up check between January 1, 2009 and July 14, 2011. During this time, a total of 29 offenders entered supervision through the CT, 36 offenders completed supervision, and 145 offenders completed their 3 year post follow-up recidivism check. The information used to prepare this report was extracted from the Allen County data base and provided to the evaluators on two dates: July 14, 2011 and March 22, 2012. This data was used for the examination of all of the information provided in this report.

It is important to know that this report, although looking at factors associated with individual offenders, is designed to assess outcomes at a programmatic level. As a consequence, information provided represents an analysis of offenders under supervision at the three different time points – entry into a community supervision program, exit from community supervision, and at a three-year check on recidivism. It is not designed to follow an offender from entry into supervision through completion and three year post-supervision follow-up. Such an analysis will be provided in a separate document.

It is also important to recognize that this report does not include information on offenders who were not accepted into supervision, and it is crucial to identify that those offenders accepted did not represent a random group of offenders being processed through the Allen County judicial system. In other words, as there is no contrast or control group available to serve as a comparison, it is challenging to claim without uncertainty that the outcomes are exclusively due to the programs implemented. This is especially true for samples seen at completion of supervision and at the three-year recidivism check, as it is not known how representative these samples are. That being said, the information has been examined in comparison to that which has been collected in the past, in an attempt to examine trends over time.
Summary of Evaluation Findings – Community Transitions Programs

- Offenders entering supervision were on average, 35.3 years of age, with a range of 21.6 to 55.4 years.
- 86.2% of offenders entering supervision were male.
- 27.6% entering supervision were Caucasian, 55.2% were African American, 13.8% were Latino and 3.4% bi-racial.
- 72.4% of offenders entering supervision were single, 17.2% were married, 3.4% separated, and 6.9% divorced.
- Offenders reported having 0 to 7 dependent children, with a median number of children of 1.
- At entry into supervision, 27.6% of offenders had obtained a high school diploma and 48.3% completed a GED equivalency exam. None had obtained degrees beyond high school and 24.1% had less than a high school diploma.
- Of those entering CTP between 2009 and 2011, 41.4% lived in quadrant 4, 31.0% in quadrant 3, 20.7% in quadrant 2, and 6.9% in quadrant 1.
- 44.8% of those in this offender group had a primary diagnosis on Axis I. All (100.0%) of these diagnoses were related to alcohol or other substance abuse/dependence.
- 24.1% of those in this offender group had a secondary diagnosis on Axis I. Most all (85.8%) of these diagnoses were related to alcohol or other substance abuse/dependence. One offender (14.3% of those with a diagnosis) was diagnosed with a mood disorder.
- On Axis II, 27.6% of all offenders entering CTP or 80% of those evaluated for a diagnosis on the Axis II were given a diagnosis of Antisocial Personality Disorder. No other Axis II diagnoses were reported.
- Over 4 of every 10 (41.4%) offenders were charged with Class D Felonies, 3 in 10 (31.0%) with Class C Felonies, and 1 in 5 (20.7%) with Class B Felonies. About 1 in 15 (6.9%) were classified with Class A Felonies. No offenders were charged with misdemeanors.
- For those offenders entering CTP with violence classification ratings (65.5%, n=19), 51.7% (n=15) had ratings that indicated crimes that were violent but had no victim, while 13.8% (n=4) of these offenders had convictions for violent crimes involving persons. Using the Hare PCL-R criminal classification coding system, the following offenses were recorded: 13.7% violent offenses (includes robbery, conspiracy to commit robbery and assault), 31.0% drug offenses, 13.7% property offenses, 3.4% public order offenses, and 37.8% major driving offenses.
- Risk of re-offense was measured in various ways. A small number of offenders were classified using the PCL-R (n=13). Of these offenders, 84.6% were classified as low risk and 15.4% as high. According to the LSI-R, 55.0% of those receiving LSI-R risk levels were found to have at least moderate levels of risk to reoffend. The IRAS was reported on 5 offenders; results from this scale are preliminary in nature and subsequently will not be reported.

- Regarding program outcomes and the entire sample, 83.3% successfully completed the program, 2.8% were arrested with new charges while in the program, 8.3% were released after committing a technical violation, and 5.6% had other unidentified completion classifications.

- Given the low number of offenders who were identified in not successfully completing supervision and the small number of those in this phase of the program, results are not deemed to reliably represent those participating in this supervision component and are therefore, not offered.

- About half (49.6%) of all offenders who underwent a three year recidivism check during 2009-2011 were rearrested. The offenders who were rearrested were noted to share some characteristics. These characteristics included being male, of minority race/ethnicity, and successful completion of the program. A direct association was also seen for the number of prior DOC commitments, however, this relationship, while statistically significant, is not one that explains substantive results.
Section 1

Who tends to enter the CTP?  
2009-2011
Demographics of those entering the CTP between 2009 and 2011

The number of offenders entering Community Transitions between 2009 and 2011 was 29.

Offenders were on average 35.3 years of age (Standard Deviation [SD] = 10.3), with a range of just over 21 years of age (21.6) to just over 55 years of age (55.4). Offenders were largely male (86.2%). Close to 3 in 10 (27.6%) were Caucasian, more than half were African American (55.2%), 1 in 7 Latino (13.8%) and less than 1 in 20 (3.4%) other ethnicities (e.g., Asian, bi-racial).

More than 7 of every 10 offenders were single (72.4%), with those who were married (17.2%), separated (3.4%), or divorced (6.9%) representing less than one-third of those entering this supervision component. For these offenders, the median number of children reported was 1, with a range of 0-7 children.

Over 3 in 4 (75.9%) of the members of this group of offenders had obtained a high school diploma (27.6%) or a GED (48.5%) equivalency exam, but only 3.4% had attended school for 12 years or more. None of these offenders (0.0%) had obtained degrees beyond a high school diploma. 24.1% reported less than high school completed.
None of the offenders entering the Community Transitions Program between 2009 and 2011 resided outside of Allen County. More than 2 of every 5 (41.4%) offenders resided in Quadrant 4, and 3 of every 10 (31.0%) lived in Quadrant 3. The remainder of almost 3 in 10 (27.6%) of the offenders lived in Quadrant 1 (6.9%) and Quadrant 2 (20.7%).
Mental Health and Substance Abuse Conditions
Axis I

Offenders entering the Community Transitions Program between 2009 and 2011 were evaluated for mental disorders using the DSM-IV criteria. Of the offenders entering CTP, 44.8% received a primary mental health diagnosis on Axis I. More than half (55.2%) either had no diagnosis or the data were missing.

Further examination of offenders receiving diagnoses found that they were for either alcohol (46.2%) or substance (53.8%) use/abuse/dependence disorders.

Of the offenders in this sample, 24.1% of offenders in PDR received a secondary mental health diagnosis on Axis I.
Of those receiving a secondary mental health diagnosis on Axis I, just over half (57.2%) were diagnosed with a substance use/abuse/dependence disorder, about 3 in 10 (28.6%) with an alcohol use/abuse disorder, and about 1 in 7 (14.3%) were diagnosed with a mood disorder.

About 2 in 5 (37.9%) of those in this offender group had primary (24.1%) or secondary (13.8%) diagnoses of the Axis I disorders involving substance abuse or dependence. Almost 3 in 10 (27.5%) of those in this offender group had primary (20.6%) or secondary (6.9%) diagnoses of the Axis I disorders involving alcohol abuse or dependence. Just less than 1 of every 25 (3.4%) offenders in this group had primary (0.0%) or secondary (3.4%) diagnosis of Mood Disorders.
Of the offenders entering the Community Transitions Program between 2009 and 2011, 34.5% received a diagnosis on Axis II.

Of those with a diagnosis, over 4 in 5 (80.0%) were diagnosed with Antisocial Personality Disorder (ASPD). One (1) person in 5 (20.0%) received no diagnosis or received a deferred diagnosis.

The Mean score on Axis V (Global Assessment of Functioning) of the DSM-IV (APA, 1999) for these offenders was 58.2 with a standard deviation of 8.4. Scores in this range are typical of those who report mild to moderate psychological symptoms and/or mild to moderate impairment in social, educational, or occupational functioning. The GAF scores for the sample ranged from 43 to 70.
Prevalence of Axis I Conditions

Note: In the above graphic, prevalence rates (in percentage of the population) for Axis I diagnoses within the Community Transitions population are compared to lifetime prevalence rates in the general US population (Kessler et al., 2005).

- Substance Use Disorders are 3.5 times more likely to be diagnosed in the CTP sample.
- Alcohol Use Disorders are 1.5 times more likely to be diagnosed in the CTP sample.
- Mood disorders are 6.1 times less likely to be diagnosed in the CTP sample.
- Anxiety Disorders were not diagnosed in offenders from the CTP sample.
- These offenders are equally likely to receive any Axis I diagnosis compared to the general population.
Prevalence of Axis II Conditions

Note: In the above graphic, prevalence rates (in percentage of the population) for Axis II diagnoses within the Community Transitions Program population are compared to lifetime rates in the general US population (DSM-IV-TR, 2000). Prevalence rates of Borderline Intellectual Functioning are estimated based upon normal curve equivalent.

- Antisocial Personality Disorder is 9.2 times more likely to be diagnosed in the CTP sample.
- Other Personality Disorders were not diagnosed in offenders in the CTP sample.
- No one in the CTP sample received a diagnosis of Borderline Intellectual Functioning.
Section 2

What types of offenses are committed leading to referral to the CTP?
Types of Offenses Committed

The chart below shows the percent of primary offenses for offenders entering the CTP. The most frequent charges were for major driving offenses and occurred in almost 4 in 10 offenders (38.7%). The second most frequent offense included those classified as drug offenses, with 3 of every 10 offenders (31.0%) charged for crimes in this category. The third most frequently noted offense category was violent offenses, with almost 1 of every 6 charged (17.1%). Property offenses were reported for just over 1 in 8 (13.7%) of those entering RCP. About 1 in 10 (10.3%) of the primary offenses included convictions of crimes against property. There were no public-order or sexual offenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Offense</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent offenses</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property offenses</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offenses</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major driving offenses</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order offenses</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual offenses</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average number of prior Department of Correction (DoC) commitments for those entering CTP was 2.8 (SD=3.1), with a range of 0-17. The Median number of prior commitments was 2.0.

About two-fifths (41.4%) of the offenders had been charged with Class D Felonies, over 3 in 10 (31.0%) were charged with Class C Felonies and nearly one-fifth (20.7%) were charged with Class B Felonies. Approximately 1 in 14 offenders were charged with a Class A Felony (6.9%) offense. No offenders were charged with murder or Misdemeanor offenses.
Some of the offenders entering CTP were classified as to whether they committed violent crimes. Classifications were done for almost two-thirds of the offenders (65.5%) entering CTP between 2009 and 2011. The remainder (34.5%) was not classified and is shown as missing data.

Of those classified, nearly half the sample (51.7%) committed violent crimes that involved no victim, whereas about 1 in 7 of the sample (13.8%) committed violent crimes against other persons.
Section 3

What level of risk do CTP offenders demonstrate?
Just over 2 in 5 (44.8%) CTP offenders were classified using the Risk Level of the PCL-R. The others, more than one half (55.2%), were not classified and are shown as missing data. More than 4 in 5 (84.6%) of offenders were classified as low risk on the PCL-R. The remaining 15.4% were classified as high risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSI-R Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total at entry</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Employment</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Marital</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Activity</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companions</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional/Personal</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offenders in the CT program tended to have higher scores on the following LSI-R scales: Education/Employment/Financial, Criminal History, Alcohol/Drugs, and Companions. These results suggest that these areas may be a particular risk for those in the program. The average LSI-R Total Score was 27.3 ($SD=6.1$) for offenders on whom the scale was used (62.1% of sample).

Of all offenders including those with missing data, 31.0% were considered to be at Moderate Risk or above of reoffending. Of just those who received LSI-R risk levels, about 55% were found to have at least Moderate levels of risk.

A smaller percentage (20.7%) of all offenders was at Low or Low/Moderate Risk (or 30% of just those offenders receiving LSI-R risk levels).
Section 4

How successful are offenders in completing the CTP?
Of the 36 offenders who completed the CTP, 30 (83.3%) were identified as successful. Of the remaining offenders (n=6):

- 2.8% received new charges (n=1)
- 5.6% were classified as other (n=2)
- 8.3% committed technical violations (n=3)

No offenders were administratively released, transferred, or listed as escaped.

Time in program was also calculated for the categories identified above. Horizontal lines represent the mean length of time on program. The vertical lines represent the range encompassing +/- 1 standard deviation. Those in supervision the longest were those who were terminated due to technical violations (108.7 days). Offenders successfully completed supervision (74.0 days), those receiving new charges (42.0) and those listed as “Other” (50.5) were in supervision for a shorter amount of time. It should be noted that given the small sample size, these figures may not be accurate representations for all offenders in CTP.
Section 5

What relationships exist between items 1-4 and program completion?
Characteristics of offenders who were identified as completing the Community Transitions program were further examined. This investigation compared characteristics of those who successfully completed their program to those who were terminated for technical violations, those for whom new charges were filed. Given the low number of offenders who were identified in not successfully completing supervision and the small number of those in this phase of the program, results are not deemed to reliably represent those participating in this supervision component and are therefore, not offered.
Section 6

How frequent is recidivism and what form does that recidivism take?
In order to evaluate recent recidivism outcomes, a sample of offenders was comprised of those individuals alive and completing the 3 year recidivism check during 2009-2011 (N = 145).

- The sample was largely male (84.1%), Caucasian (46.9%) or African American (45.5%) (Hispanic/Latino offenders made up 7.6% of the sample), averaged 34.5 years of age (SD = 8.7) at entry into supervision, and was single (64.1%).

- On average, this group had 1.9 prior commitments (SD = 1.5, Median number of priors = 1).

- Offense types at intake were for this group of offenders included Class B Felony offenses (9.6%), Class C Felony offenses (16.0%) and Class D Felony offenses (74.3%).

- A minority of these offenders were classified using the PCL-R (n=14). On those receiving this risk classification, 92.9% (n=13) were identified as low risk and 7.1% (n=1) as high risk. 90.3% (n=131) of sample did not have data recorded.

- These offenders were on program an average of 67.5 days (Median = 55.0; SD = 101.2; range = 5 to 1068).

- Just over half (51.7%) of offenders completing the recidivism check were rearrested on at least one occasion during the three-year period. Of those completing this 3 year post program recidivism check, the majority were rearrested once (31.0%), but 15.2% were rearrested on more than one occasion. One in seven (15.2%) of these offenders were arrested twice, while about one in twenty were arrested three or four times (2.8% with 3 arrests and 2.8% with four arrests).
At a six month recidivism check, 7 offenders had been arrested for a Class D Felony, 2 for a Class C Felony, and 2 for a Class B Felony. Of recidivism at the misdemeanor level, 12 were arrested for a Class A Misdemeanor and 5 for a Class B Misdemeanor offense.
At 12 month recidivism check (6-12 months post release), 9 offenders had been arrested for a Class D Felony offense and 3 for a Class C Felony. Of recidivism at the misdemeanor level, 4 were arrested for Class A Misdemeanors and 4 for B Misdemeanor offenses.

At 18 month recidivism check (12-18 months post release), 10 offenders had been arrested for a Class D Felony, 1 for a Class C Felony, and 2 for a Class B Felony offense. Of recidivism at the misdemeanor level, 8 were arrested for Class A Misdemeanors and 8 for Class B Misdemeanor offenses.
At a 24 month recidivism check (18-24 months post release), 8 offenders had been arrested for a Class D Felony, 2 for a Class C Felony and 1 for a Class B Felony. Of recidivism at the misdemeanor level, 10 were arrested for Class A Misdemeanors, and 8 for Class B Misdemeanor offenses.
At a 30 month recidivism check (24-30 months post release), 8 offenders had been arrested for a Class D Felony. Of recidivism at the misdemeanor level, 2 were arrested for Class A Misdemeanors, 7 for Class B Misdemeanors, and 1 for a Class C Misdemeanor offense.

At a 36 month recidivism check (30-36 months post release), 3 offenders had been arrested for a Class D Felony. Of recidivism at the misdemeanor level, 5 were arrested for Class A Misdemeanors, and 2 for Class B Misdemeanor offenses.
Section 7

What relationships exist between items 1-4 and recidivism?
The following summarizes analysis of relationships between recidivism and other variables under investigation.

Characteristics of these offenders are presented below. Some caution is suggested in the interpretation of these findings, as there may be other unmeasured factors present that influence results. In addition, when compared to the larger population of offenders who are and will move though the CTP, the representativeness of these offenders is not established.

- There were no statistically significant bivariate relationships between the following variables and recidivism: age, marital status, level of education or years of education completed, number of dependent children, presence of a substance use disorder, presence of an Axis I or Axis II mental health diagnosis, risk level categorization, number of total days on the program or quadrant of residence at intake.

- Gender was associated with likelihood of rearrest ($X^2$ (1, 144) = 9.8, $p=.002$), in that 21.7% (5/23) of the 23 women in this supervision component were rearrested, while 57.4% (70/122) of the men were. Given these figures, the odds of rearrest were 4.8 times higher for men when compared to women.

- Race/ethnicity, was associated with likelihood of rearrest ($X^2$ (1, 144) = 7.4, $p=.006$), in that 39.7% (27/68) of the 68 majority group members in this supervision component were rearrested, while 62.3% (48) of the 77 minority group members were. Given these figures, the odds of rearrest were 2.5 times higher for minority group members when compared to those in the majority group.

- The number of prior DOC commitments was positively associated with rearrest ($r_s (139) = .18, p=.03$), suggesting as the number of prior commitments increased, so does the likelihood of rearrest.

- Actual release status was related to rearrest ($X^2$ (1, 144) = 5.79, $p=.02$), in that 47.1% (56/119) of those who successfully completed supervision were rearrested, while 73.1% (19/26) of those who did not successfully complete were rearrested. Given these figures, the odds ratio for rearrest was 3.1 times greater for noncompleters compared to the successful completers.