

**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY  
(Division of Criminal Justice)  
FY 2011-12 JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE HEARING AGENDA**

**Thursday, January 6, 2011  
1:30 pm – 2:30 pm**

**1:30-1:40      INTRODUCTIONS AND OPENING COMMENTS**

**1:40-1:45      HEARING QUESTIONS FROM JUDICIAL BRIEFING**

- 1) *Background Information: The Judicial Department's FY 2011-12 budget request includes a General Fund appropriation of \$6,156,118 to the Drug Offender Surcharge Fund, based on anticipated savings in the Department of Corrections and consistent with the Legislative Council Staff fiscal note for H.B. 10-1352. The request also includes a request to spend \$7,000,000 from the Drug Offender Surcharge Fund to provide substance abuse treatment services to adult offenders on diversion, on probation, on parole, in community corrections, or in jail.*

*Please provide information about the implementation of H.B. 10-1352 to date, including: (a) any data related to the number of offenders sentenced to probation rather than the Department of Corrections (and the related savings); and (b) the proposed use of moneys appropriated to the Drug Offender Surcharge Fund pursuant to this act.*

**RESPONSE:**

- a) H.B. 10-1352 went into effect on August 11, 2010. A total of 207 offenders were arrested, charged and sentenced during the first 10 weeks of implementation in 2010. The Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) compared this total with 184 offenders who committed an offense, were arrested, charged and sentenced during the same time period in 2009. It is extremely unusual for individuals to commit an offense and receive a final sentence in only 10 weeks. It is unknown at this time the extent to which these cases, including those of the comparison group, represent the larger pool of cases that will be affected by H.B. 10-1352. The small sample and short time-frame caution against generalizing the information. Additionally, the majority of criminal cases have multiple charges. A reduction in penalties for a single charge may not affect the overall costs associated with the case.

During the first 10 weeks of implementation, the 207 offenders received sentences to 218 placements. Please note that individuals may receive more than one placement (e.g. electronic surveillance and probation). This number of placements compares to 184 offenders who received sentences to 201 placements in 2009.

The savings based on these initial sentences and time served during the first 10 weeks of implementation in 2010 compared to the initial sentences and time served during the same 10-week period in 2009 totals \$7,524. Please see the table below.

	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$37,812</b>	<b>\$30,288</b>
Dept of Corrections	\$10,897	\$11,074
Dept of Youth Corrections	\$9,261	0
Intensive Supervision	\$147	\$249
Juvenile Detention	\$3,824	0
Probation/Deferred	\$13,684	\$18,965

At this point, it is too early to fully analyze the impact of H.B.10-1352. The savings assessed thus far for state costs incurred during the 10-week period is only \$7,524. However, over time, the savings will accumulate substantially. The number of days sentenced has decreased to all placements except jail and probation, but the actual savings requires the calculation of actual days served on those sentences, and this information will be available and analyzed in future years.

The Drug Offender Surcharge Fund fees were increased in H.B. 10-1352. For the 10 week comparison period, \$125,825 was assessed during the 10-week period in 2009 compared to \$201,640 assessed during the same period in 2010, which is an additional \$75,815 assessed in 2010. Collection figures will be available in future reports.

It should be noted that the Division of Probation Services estimates that 30% of fees, fines and surcharges are collected by the courts in a given year (offenders have multiple years to pay all ordered costs).

- b) H.B. 10-1352 savings will be directed to State Judicial as the fiscal agent. The statute requires that the distribution of the funds be governed by a representative committee of state agencies, public defenders, prosecutors, county commissioners, and sheriffs. State Judicial has requested spending authority for just over \$1 million, the estimated first year savings. The committee has met and discussed several potential methods for distributing the funds. These efforts will continue over the coming months. Once the spending plan is developed for the initial funds, the committee will focus on the larger issue of distribution methods for the more significant savings expected in the out-years.

- 2) *The General Assembly is interested in tracking the actual impact of statutory changes to sentencing laws, such as H.B. 10-1338, H.B. 10-1347, H.B. 10-1352, and H.B. 10-1360, and H.B. 10-1374. To the extent that the General Assembly has requested that one or more agencies study and quantify the actual impact of these changes, has the General Assembly asked the relevant questions? Do you have the tools to quantify the impact of these acts or of sentencing bills that may be introduced in the future?*

**RESPONSE:**

- a) *Regarding H.B. 10-1338, concerning probation eligibility.*  
Charging practices and agreements, along with the limited availability of data, preclude the ability to calculate the impact of this statutory modification.
- b) *Regarding H.B. 10-1347, concerning misdemeanor penalties for serial DUI/DWAI offenders*  
The impact of this statute will be an increase in jail time and longer county court probation sentences. However, jail data is not systematically collected across the state, and county court data

is incomplete.

- c) *Regarding H.B. 10-1352, concerning changes to crimes involving controlled substances*  
The impact of this bill will be analyzed annually and reported to the General Assembly each January 15<sup>th</sup>. Individual offenders, and the associated costs incurred as that person is processed through the justice system, will be analyzed and compared to 2009, the baseline year.
- d) *Regarding H.B. 10-1360, concerning parole placement for technical violation*  
The mandate to analyze and report the impact of this bill, which is intended to reduce the number of parole technical violators returned to the Department of Corrections (DOC), has been directed to the Division of Parole.
- e) *Regarding H.B. 10-1374, concerning parole release guidelines and evidence based practices*  
DCJ is working with DOC and the parole board chair to identify the necessary data elements to develop the information system that will be used to document and analyze the board's decision making process, including information on recidivism of parolees. Implementation of this statute is underway but currently data are not automated to allow for the analysis of the reasons for parole board decisions. The DCJ's progress to this effect was documented in its November 1, 2009 and 2010 reports, and DCJ will provide the General Assembly information each November 1 as information becomes available.

In answer to the second question, DCJ's annual prison population forecast statistical model requires modification when significant sentencing bills are enacted. To the extent that data are available, DCJ must quantify changes to sentencing laws and incorporate these into the projection model. Because multiple changes occurred simultaneously, it will be a challenge to attribute the effects to individual pieces of legislation. Some distinctions will be possible based on the type of data collected while others will be more difficult.

#### **1:45-1:55      OVERVIEW QUESTIONS**

- 3) *How does the department determine the optimal number of diversion community corrections beds?*

**RESPONSE:** In past years, the Department used a formula approved by the Governor's Community Corrections Advisory Council that blended such data as the capacity of each community corrections facility, the historical performance of each local board and program in the acceptance of Diversion and Transition clients, and the numbers of offenders sent to the Department of Corrections from each judicial district. That formula was then applied to the amount of money appropriated for residential beds by the General Assembly.

Beginning 18 months ago, the Department began the process of Open Allocation, through which the entire standard bed appropriation authorized by the General Assembly became available for whatever Diversion or Transition clients were deemed appropriate for placement without regard to a specific limitation on the number of Diversion or Transition clients accepted by each judicial district or facility.

At the midpoint of the second year of this process, utilization has increased dramatically and the placement of Transition clients has for the first time exceeded the placement of Diversion clients in community corrections.

- 4) *Discuss the impact of additional diversion community corrections beds on the prison population.*

**RESPONSE:** Diversion community corrections beds principally reduce the prison population by diverting from prison to a community corrections facility those probationers who have committed serious technical violations and those offenders who are not eligible for probation at the time of sentencing. The effect can be substantial. In FY 09-10, 2,452 Diversion offenders terminated from community corrections, nearly all of whom would have been sent to prison were it not for the availability of community corrections.

- 5) *What are the barriers to placing individuals in community corrections beds? Could any of those barriers be removed by the General Assembly?*

**RESPONSE:** Program and board representatives across the state often refer to four barriers to the placement of at least some individuals in community corrections beds.

First, the past criminal conduct or prison behaviors of some offenders have been sufficiently egregious that boards and programs hesitate to accept such clients into an unlocked community facility in the interests of public safety. Some sex offenders and certain violent offenders fall into this category.

Second, some applicants have higher needs than can be met in standard community corrections programs. In some cases, appropriate offenders are referred to a residential mental health community corrections facility or to intensive substance abuse treatment, although the locations of treatment are sometimes geographically inconsistent with the offender's parole plan, employment or support system.

Third, offenders who have failed while previously in a community corrections facility may be less attractive upon their second and subsequent applications. Boards and programs do give additional chances to offenders who have absconded or committed serious technical violations while in community corrections, but there is some sentiment that scarce beds should be reserved for individuals who have not previously walked away or been removed from a prior community placement.

Finally, programs may occasionally determine that an offender will require extra time to secure employment or, in a few cases, that the offender may be unsuitable for employment. While providers do accept such clients, they are understandably reluctant to take on increased numbers of offenders who are less likely to be able to pay subsistence.

The General Assembly could, in fact, incentivize boards and programs to accept persons who may require extra time to obtain employment through the consideration of a subsistence support program, as described in the answer to Question 15 below.

Caution may be appropriate with respect to any statutory change that would dilute the authority of local boards and programs to independently select or reject offenders, in part because the Department has noted that boards and programs have become more willing to accept offenders with higher needs and more substantial criminal records. Community corrections remains acceptable to communities across the state because their local officials and citizen representatives can exercise "local control" in the selection of offenders, a responsibility that they cherish and would vigorously defend.

- 6) *How are providers doing in terms of finding employment for offenders in diversion and transition community corrections placements? Has it become more difficult to find jobs given the current economy?*

**RESPONSE:** While offenders are to some degree assisted by programs in finding employment, they actually must seek jobs themselves.

The economy has had a profound impact on initial community corrections offender employment, though offenders have generally found work when given sufficient time. For example, in a comparison of Diversion offenders in FY 2008 and FY 2010, 30% fewer clients were employed at entry in the last fiscal year. However, at discharge for any reason, 75% of Diversion clients were employed in FY 2008 and 72% were employed in FY2010.

Transition clients have traditionally fared less well upon entry to community corrections, with 16% employed at entry in FY 2008 and only 7% employed at entry in FY 2010. However, most Transition offenders eventually found employment, with the number employed upon termination for any reason, at 72% for both fiscal years.

**1:55-2:00      SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS TAKEN FROM FY 2007-08 TO FY 2010-11 TO BALANCE THE BUDGET**

- 7) *How many offenders with mental health or substance abuse issues are transferred to community corrections? How many of these people fail because their medications run out while on community corrections? Should we extend the length of time the State pays for the medications?*

**RESPONSE:** The data from FY 2010 indicates that about 80% of offenders transferred to community corrections have some degree of substance use disorder. The same data reflect that over 17% have mental health diagnoses. Many offenders with mental health issues also have a substance use disorder, making them “dually diagnosed.”

We cannot know how many offenders fail in community corrections due to a lack of medication, in part because many such offenders do not receive medication at all. DOC has effectively increased access to psychotropic and other drugs for many of its Transition clients who were medicated in prison, but there is currently no state-sponsored program for Diversion clients to receive such medicines at all.<sup>1</sup>

The Department of Public Safety (CDPS) believes that the solution to this problem lies in the redefinition of eligibility for government health care programs. Even though community corrections offenders are functionally the working poor, they are not eligible for Medicaid and other health-related programs, in part as the result of the definition of an “inmate,” as interpreted by the Department of Health Care Policy and Financing and others. CDPS and the DOC jointly met with Denver Health in early December to discuss how best to persuade state and federal authorities to reconsider how persons in community corrections are classified for purposes of indigent health care coverage.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Department has received a \$537,000 federal grant to fund a JERP-like program for Diversion clients with serious mental illness as a two year pilot study. Project services include both medicine and medication management.

- 8) *Discuss the effectiveness of the psychotropic medication program and whether the funding for the program is being fully utilized.*

**RESPONSE:** Recent studies of the parole population support the contention that appropriate psychotropic medications can reduce failures. However, the medication program is administered by DOC and only for Transition clients. CDPS does not know which of its Transition clients have received medication sponsored by DOC, or for what period of time.

- 9) *Are we setting people up for failure if offenders in community corrections placements have difficulty finding employment?*

**RESPONSE:** Based upon observation and anecdotal information, CDPS agrees that offenders may fail more frequently when it is difficult to find work. It appears that the financial burden associated with the combined payments of child support, restitution and subsistence can seem overwhelming when jobs become scarce. However, nearly three out of four community corrections offenders eventually do find work, including those who terminated unsuccessfully from community corrections and those deemed physically or emotionally unsuitable to enter the workforce.

Research in Colorado and across the country indicates that the most important characteristic of successful reentry is employment, and that offenders may have greater difficulty in securing employment *outside* of the structure of community corrections. Since so many offenders ultimately do find a job while in community corrections, CDPS believes the proper approach is to mitigate the financial pressures on both programs and providers that are associated with a weak job market.

#### **2:00-2:10      OPEN ALLOCATION FOR COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

- 10) *Discuss why the department has been unable to expend all of its General Fund appropriations for community corrections programs and what could be done by the General Assembly to maximize the utilization of community corrections funding.*

**RESPONSE:** In the latter part of FY 2009 and during the first months of FY 2010, the community corrections system experienced a reduction in the number of appropriate Diversion clients referred for placement. In part, this decrease was occasioned by a reduction in the number of felony filings in many jurisdictions, which in turn resulted from the General Assembly's increase in the dollar amounts necessary for many property crimes to be considered felonies. The state's probation departments also embarked upon a successful effort to decrease the number of felony probationers who committed technical violations while on probation and were therefore sent to community corrections as Diversion clients.

Local community corrections boards have now adjusted to that change by admitting increased numbers of Transition clients, with a resultant increase in utilization of about 150-200 beds. In the current fiscal year, the community corrections system is actually 0.56% *overspent* in relation to its appropriation as of December 1. While CDPS is taking care to control spending, at its current rate of expenditure, CDPS would actually *exceed* its appropriation from the General Assembly for community corrections by \$688,000 by the end of this fiscal year. Therefore, at present, CDPS does not recommend that the General Assembly take action to increase utilization without a related increase in funding.

- 11) *Do other states have programs to provide funding incentives from the savings in prison beds to community corrections programs that accept a wider variety of inmates in their programs? Could the department bring some proposals forward based on this type of concept?*

**RESPONSE:** CDPS is not aware of funding incentives offered by other states that materially differ from those provided in Colorado. Through such initiatives as HB 10-1360, the John Eachon Reentry Program (JERP), the therapeutic community model and community corrections mental health/dual diagnosis beds, Colorado has made a broad range of reentry services more available for appropriate inmates with different needs. Locally, CDPS has successfully partnered with the City and County of Denver to make community corrections beds available to homeless and jobless offenders who are approaching mandatory parole or mandatory release dates in an effort to reduce recidivism in this higher-risk population.

CDPS has also increased the number of available beds for offenders placed as a condition of parole. To date, this effort has been successful, and CDPS recommends the continuation and more formal expansion of that initiative to stabilize new prospective parolees who seem likely to parole homeless or who will likely have difficulty in finding work. CDPS has found that some local community corrections boards and programs are somewhat more likely to accept “borderline” offenders who will shortly be paroling to the community one way or the other.

- 12) *What incentives could the department offer to community corrections boards to accept offenders from outside their communities?*

**RESPONSE:** Under Open Allocation, CDPS currently encourages boards and programs to take as many qualified offenders as they can safely and effectively manage. That process allows boards and programs to more readily accept offenders from other jurisdictions, especially throughout the metropolitan Denver area.

For example, in 300 consecutive admissions to the three community corrections programs in the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District,<sup>2</sup> the principal convictions of the offenders arose from 20 different counties. Fewer than 60 percent originated in the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, with 34% coming from Adams, Boulder, Denver, El Paso and Jefferson Counties.

CDPS respectfully urges caution in the placement of offenders in community corrections programs that are a significant distance from the location where the offender will eventually parole or live in non-residential supervision. Jobs are sufficiently scarce that offenders generally should be placed where they will eventually live.

- 13) *Does the department have statistics on the community corrections boards’ rejection/acceptance rates?*

**RESPONSE:** CDPS does not collect statistics regarding acceptance rates of Diversion clients; acceptance of those referrals is generally strong. DOC collects and shares with CDPS the acceptance and rejection rates for Transition referrals.

District by district, Transition acceptance rates vary from 20% for a small, rural program to virtually 100% in another rural district. The acceptance rate in larger districts varies from 26% to 93%. Statewide, 51% of the primary Transition referrals have been accepted to date in the current fiscal year.

---

<sup>2</sup> Arapahoe, Douglas, Elbert and Lincoln Counties

A review of acceptance rates requires some context. Rates may vary according to local felony filings and facility bed capacity, with more Transition clients accepted when new felony filings have declined or more bed space is locally available.

Further, it is important to remember that essentially all offenders who will eventually be eligible for parole are by statute referred for community corrections consideration, regardless of the nature of the crimes for which they were incarcerated, their criminal histories, or their performance in prison. Local community corrections boards and programs may find it impossible to accept some offenders into unlocked community facilities, simply on the grounds of public safety.

CDPS has also been advised that some programs will favor Diversion clients to some degree in the current economy because it is more likely that Diversion offenders will have employment as they enter community corrections. Although their ultimate levels of employment match those of Diversion clients, the weak labor market is a disincentive for some programs to initially accept Transition clients.

- 14) *What is the current bed capacity in the community corrections system? Are there barriers to adding beds? Are there areas that have beds available or where demand outstrips supply? Is this the reason for high rejection rates?*

**RESPONSE:** “Capacity” in the context of this question includes both a consideration of how many offenders the community corrections system can physically manage at one time *and* a discussion of whether offenders with demonstrably higher levels of risk can be safely and effectively placed in an unlocked community corrections facility.

The Department does not have evidence to support the contention that rejection rates actually are “high” because nearly every offender who is not in prison with an indeterminate sentence or for a capital crime will by law be referred to community corrections eventually. Such referrals must be made without regard to the crime for which the offender was incarcerated, the past criminal history of the offender or how the offender has responded to incarceration.

The risks and needs of community corrections offenders have steadily increased over the past 30 years, to the point that Level of Service Inventory (LSI) scores are about the same for offenders in community corrections as those in prison. Local boards and programs are therefore understandably hesitant to place offenders who are perceived to pose an unacceptable risk, especially when their criminal records reflect past violent behaviors.

CDPS has learned that variations in acceptance rates among boards and programs may reflect more than a philosophical difference over which offenders are appropriate for community corrections generally. Different acceptance rates may also reflect an honest assessment of which offenders are safe for a particular facility, given its individual strengths.

The currently-funded physical capacity of the community corrections system is about 3,200 beds. Present conditions would probably allow capacity to grow within a reasonable time by 300-325 beds, an increase of about 10%.

A principal barrier to such expansion is zoning. So many jurisdictions have adopted the familiar “Not in My Back Yard” philosophy that CDPS has more recently recommended physical expansion onto the campuses of local county jails, sometimes in concert with work release or other county functions.

Jefferson County has adopted this approach and is expected to significantly increase its community corrections capacity in the near term. A similar expansion of community corrections capacity would surely benefit Adams County, the jurisdiction with a perpetually long waiting list for both Diversion and Transition clients, despite its substantial bed capacity.

Providers report that another barrier to expansion may be the degree to which they are compensated. The current per diem, which is essentially unchanged since 2003, reportedly does not provide an economic incentive for expansion.

Some expansion could and should occur in jurisdictions that presently have no facility. For example, the six-county Seventh Judicial District<sup>3</sup> has an excellent community corrections board that can only place a limited number of clients in facilities far from the district. Montrose County has essentially donated vacant property adjacent to its county jail to build a sixty bed facility, and the other counties have signed letters of commitment in support of that process. Unfortunately, the cost of capital construction is more than the counties have been able to raise. An effort to place the program in an existing building in Olathe failed as the result of the zoning process.

CDPS believes that some barriers to expansion could be mitigated through direct appropriations, grants, or loans by the State to local jurisdictions that can obtain donated land and raise at least some portion of the construction costs for new community corrections capacity. Because the state would recoup its appropriation over time through savings generated by the placement of an increased number of Transition clients, this concept would merit further consideration after the State recovers from its acute General Fund shortfall.

## **2:10-2:20 COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS SUBSISTENCE GRACE PERIOD**

15) *What is the best approach in terms of the number of offenders and length of a subsistence grace period? How much of the appropriations identified in the briefing document would be available in the current fiscal year to fund a subsistence grace period?*

**RESPONSE:** In part because the current time for a community corrections offender to find employment is about 4-5 weeks, CDPS recommends a subsistence grace period of 28 days.

In the current fiscal year, the Accelerated Non-Residential Diversion program appropriation (see Question 19 below) could be diverted to fund \$13.50 per day for 28 days for about 500 newly-placed offenders. CDPS believes that such funding would provide an adequate test of the efficacy of the subsistence grace period in the reduction of absconders and technical violators.

16) *Provide a history of the average time it takes for a community corrections resident to find employment (previous 5-10 years).*

**RESPONSE:** Precise figures for the average length of time to find employment are not available as far back as 5-10 years. Anecdotal information supports the widely-held consensus that, prior to the economic recession, offenders in virtually every jurisdiction reliably found full-time employment within 7 to 10 days.

Currently, most offenders require 4 to 5 weeks to get a job. Often, these offenders find only part-time work, typically at no more than the minimum wage. Despite indications that the economy as a whole

---

<sup>3</sup> Delta, Gunnison, Hinsdale, Montrose, Ouray and San Miguel Counties

may be improving, the employment outlook for offenders does not seem better now than it did at this time last year.

- 17) *Do providers write-off the amount that is not collected on the \$17 per day subsistence? Do offenders have to pay the difference after they are released or is the debt forgiven upon release? Does the fact that an offender owes the provider some unpaid portion of this fee impact their date of release in any way?*

**RESPONSE:** Though authorized to collect “up to \$17 per day,” some programs do not expect or attempt to collect the full amount. However, community corrections subsistence debts are not automatically forgiven upon discharge.

Some providers do write off unpaid balances, particularly for those offenders who are returned to prison. Conversely, since almost all successful residential offenders progress to some type of non-residential supervision, some programs can and do continue to collect unpaid subsistence for years. Some programs eventually will refer unpaid accounts to collection.

Community corrections discharge dates are not directly impacted by the amount of unpaid subsistence an offender may owe to the program, though dates of discharge can be significantly affected by the offender's financial status. Most offenders are unable to successfully discharge from residential community corrections until they have money in the bank and can reasonably expect to be self-sufficient. A large unpaid subsistence balance may impact when that degree of self-sufficiency is reached.

- 18) *What additional tasks are providers asked to do under the new standards that were not required before?*

**RESPONSE:** The two principal new tasks in the 2010 edition of the *Colorado Community Corrections Standards* each relate to public safety concerns.

First, programs are now required to verify at least one location where an offender has sought employment each day that the offender is engaged in a job search. Verification may be in the form of personal contact, telephone contact, verifiable correspondence or GPS monitoring, and may include a signed document, business cards, menus or brochures from a business.

A second new requirement specifies that facilities with 50 or more residential offenders must have at least two staff persons on duty at all times.

All provisions of the *Colorado Community Corrections Standards* were developed by a subcommittee of the Governor's Community Corrections Advisory Council that included broad program and local board representation. The 2010 edition was shared for public comment and underwent seven published drafts before adoption. The *Standards* were recommended for approval by the Council after substantial discussion.

CDPS recognizes that verification of job search whereabouts can be time-consuming for both program staff and prospective employers. That burden must be balanced against the demonstrated need to carefully monitor offenders who are typically new to community corrections and at a vulnerable time in their placements. During performance audits, CDPS discovered that offenders in some cases were not engaged in a job search while signed out of the facility for that purpose.

Similarly, CDPS has been concerned about staffing adequacy, particularly since program personnel must step away from the facility security office to perform the required house counts.

Other recent changes in the *Standards* have either eliminated or reduced other requirements for which the consensus was that a lesser degree of performance would still satisfy the requirements of community safety. Further, CDPS is considering individual waivers of the new *Standard* related to staffing during non-peak hours, based upon a demonstration that certain programs with the appropriate floor plans have or are willing to upgrade internal security technology to increase the likelihood that monitoring is appropriate.

- 19) *Why did the department revert funding from the Accelerated Non-Residential Community Corrections Diversion Pilot Program line item and the Outpatient Therapeutic Community Programs line item in FY 2009-10? Is this stilling occurring in the current fiscal year? If so, why is this occurring? What does the department think of the staff suggestion for utilizing this money in a different way?*

**RESPONSE:** The Accelerated Non-Residential Community Corrections Pilot Program was originally designed to permit low risk offenders to progress from residential to less expensive non-residential supervision at the earliest feasible time. The criteria used to identify low-risk offenders were evidence-based and were specifically supported by both local and national data.

Unfortunately, these criteria were partially based on adequacy of employment and a verifiably stable residence with a stable marriage or domestic status. Significantly fewer Diversion offenders can now meet these criteria than at the time that the program was conceptualized. As a result, participating programs have had too few qualifying individuals in the last fiscal year or during the current fiscal year. CDPS agrees that this funding could be redirected.

The Outpatient Therapeutic Community funding was added in FY 2008-09 at the specific request of the affected providers. In FY 2009-10, the Southern Colorado Therapeutic Community at Crossroads in Pueblo had insufficient outpatients in the earlier portion of its first full year of operation to expend its share of the resources. Peer I and The Haven at the University of Colorado's ARTS campus took some of this funding and broadly applied it to many types of offenders, but still did not expend the entire request.

During the current fiscal year, the use of Outpatient Therapeutic Community funding has been robust. At present, the money is principally used for to pay for outpatient treatment groups, with a smaller amount of funding used for psychiatric services, on-site daycare, rent subsidies and transportation.

CDPS has been working with the providers to ensure that these expenditures are sufficiently transparent to permit a proper assessment of their efficacy. While these services may be beneficial, CDPS has insufficient data at this time to affirmatively recommend that this funding should continue.

## 2:20-2:30 POPULATION PROJECTIONS

20) *Discuss the methodology for producing the prison inmate and parole population projections.*

**RESPONSE:** Future prison populations are modeled in terms of three cohorts: new court commitments to prison, parole returns to prison, and the population currently incarcerated. The future *admissions cohort* is used to estimate the composition and number of future admissions, including offenders who fail probation or community corrections and are subsequently incarcerated due to a technical violation of probation. Projected future admissions are based on historical prison admission trends, taking into account crime trends, criminal case filings, conviction rates and sentencing practices. Trends in probation placements and probation revocation rates are also examined.

A variety of time series statistical models are generated to develop the future admissions projections, incorporating recent changes in laws or policy. This projected future admissions cohort is disaggregated into approximately 70 offender profile groups according to governing offense type, felony class and sentence length.

Parole revocations are estimated using a cohort propagation method, which tracks groups of individuals paroled each year and calculates the rate of reduction in the size of each cohort according assumptions regarding length of stay on parole and revocation rates. The estimated number of future parole revocations is then included in the future admissions cohort.

While the number of offenders admitted to prison each month of the projection period is tracked, the duration of their stay in prison is estimated and the point at which they are released from prison is then estimated. The length of stay in prison is estimated using data concerning the length of stay for offenders with similar profiles released in prior years, adjusted to reflect recent changes in law or policy. Cumulative survival distributions are developed and applied to each of the offender profile/sentence length groups to estimate, on a monthly basis, a rate of release and the size of the remaining population.

The cohort of offenders that are currently incarcerated are treated in a similar manner. This cohort is also disaggregated into approximately 70 offender profile and sentence length groups, with cumulative survival distributions estimated to determine their rate of release. These survival distributions are adjusted to reflect changes in law or policy that may impact those currently incarcerated, which may differ from those impacting the future admissions cohort.

The releases of the stock populations, the estimates of future admissions, and the anticipated releases of those admissions are combined to forecast the size of incarcerated populations in the future.

A different approach is used to forecast parole populations. The number of releases to parole each year is estimated in the process of developing the prison population forecast. An average length of stay is applied to determine the number that will remain on parole at the end of each year, and the number that will carry over into the following year. These figures are summed to estimate the number of parolees at the end of each fiscal year.

21) *Why do the parole population projections show growth through FY 2011-12 and then reductions beyond that point?*

**RESPONSE:** Modifications to earned time, and the implementation of earned time per HB 10-1374, are expected to increase releases to parole during the first year of the projection period. Additionally, HB 10-1360 reduces the amount of time revoked parolees will spend in prison before returning to the parole caseload, thus increasing the amount of time spent on parole. Fewer revocations are expected due to the requirement that placement in treatment be considered in lieu of revocation and to the enhanced provision of employment, job training and wrap-around services also mandated by HB 10-1360.

These initiatives are expected to contribute to growth in the parole population during FY 2011 and FY 2012. However, as the prison population is expected to decline throughout the projection period, eventually the number of releases from prison will also decline, resulting in a commensurate reduction of the number of releases to parole. This decline in the number of releases to parole is expected to be realized in FY 2013, resulting in the projected decline in the parole population throughout the remainder of the projection period. Historically, the size of the parole population is correlated with the size of the prison population. The DCJ projections incorporate this certainty.

22) *Why do the DCJ and LCS parole population projections diverge so significantly?*

**RESPONSE:** While both DCJ and LCS projected increases in the parole population during FY 2011 and FY 2012, LCS predicted a greater increase than DCJ. The LCS FY 2013 projection figure indicates a significant slowing in the growth of the parole population, while the DCJ projection indicates a rather significant decline. Since LCS only projects the population through FY 2013, it is impossible to know whether the slowing observed in FY 2013 would lead to a decline in the following years. Given the historical correlation between the prison population and the parole population, and the reduction in the prison population forecast by LCS, it is feasible that this would be the case.

It is possible that the DCJ projection assumed a lesser impact from HB 10-1360 and HB 10-1374 than did LCS, and that the greater impact estimated by LCS carried over into the FY 2013 projection. However, without further information regarding the projection methodology employed by LSC, it is impossible to know with any certainty the reason for the divergence between the DCJ and the LCS projections.

23) *Does the department project the YOS population? If so, provide those projections by gender.*

**RESPONSE:** The Division does not project the YOS population.

**ADDENDUM: QUESTIONS REQUIRING ONLY A WRITTEN RESPONSE**

- 1) *Discuss programs like the John Eachon Re-entry Program that have helped the State cut down on costs and reduce the recidivism rate.*

**RESPONSE:** Individuals in prison cost, on average, \$88.59 per day, according to DOC’s FY 2010 annual report. Individuals placed in community corrections residential mental health services beds (RMHS) cost \$70.76 per day. Those in the John Eachon Re-entry Program cost \$90.54 per day.

Recidivism rates vary by all community corrections programs, in part because the service needs and risk levels vary considerably across programs. Individuals with mental illness represent a very high-needs population, and the structure provided by community corrections – particularly the ability to “step down” from prison into a structured community corrections program – is a considerable asset.

Interviews with participants in the John Eachon Re-entry Program conducted by DCJ researchers during the program’s first year of operation revealed that many struggle with significant confusion at the onset of re-entry. Interviewees mentioned extreme difficulty understanding a bus map and route, the noise and visual disorientation of simply being on a commercial street, the fear of other non-JERP participants at the halfway house, and ongoing feelings of general agitation.

Success rates for those in RMHS beds are lower than the overall community corrections success rate (overall, 51.4% compared to 62.0%) but these rates would almost certainly be lower without the additional services and medication available in programs with RMHS beds.

The tables below provide information on program outcomes. It is important to note the very low proportion of individuals committing new crimes while in the programs.

**FY 2009 and FY 2010 Community Corrections  
Residential Mental Health Services (RMHS) Clients: Discharge Status**

	<b>Total N Terminations</b>	<b>Success</b>	<b>Escape</b>	<b>Technical Violation</b>	<b>New Crime</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Diversion Mental Health</b>	160	44.9%	10.2%	37.7%	1.2%	1.8%
<b>Transition Mental Health</b>	189	60.8%	9.8%	18.6%	0.0%	3.4%
<b>John Eachon Reentry Program (JERP)</b>	45	34.7%	12.2%	42.9%	0.0%	2.0%
<b>Total</b>	394	51.4%	10.2%	29.0%	0.5%	2.6%

Source: Community Corrections Information and Billing (CCIB) system.

**FY 2005- FY 2010 Community Corrections Transition Clients: Discharge Status**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total N Terminations</b>	<b>Success %</b>	<b>Escape %</b>	<b>Technical Violation %</b>	<b>New Crime %</b>	<b>Other %</b>
<b>FY 2005</b>	2,499	58.8	14.1	24.0	3.0	0.1
<b>FY 2006</b>	2,450	62.7	14.0	20.3	3.0	0.0
<b>FY 2007</b>	2,469	65.3	11.7	20.1	2.8	0.1
<b>FY 2008</b>	2,672	65.9	11.5	19.1	3.5	0.0
<b>FY 2009/ FY 2010 combined</b>	5,950	62.0	10.5	24.3	1.43	1.8

Source: Prior to FY 2009: DCJ Office of Research and Statistics analysis of Community Corrections Termination Forms. FY 2009/2010: Community Corrections Information and Billing (CCIB) system.

- 2) *What is the current recidivism rate for those released from prison? Is it higher for certain populations, if so what are those populations and what is the recidivism rate?*

**RESPONSE:** DOC measures recidivism as return to prison within three years of release. The 3-year return rate for women is 46.7% and 54.2% for men, according to DOC’s FY 2010 annual report. Overall, 53.2% of those released in 2006 returned to prison within three years: 35.1% returned due to a technical violation, and 18.1% returned for a new crime. Table 44 of DOC’s report shows that 21.7% of inmates who discharged their sentences and released *without parole* supervision returned to prison for a new crime within 3 years. This rate is 12.9% for women.

An analysis of parolee recidivism conducted by DCJ using arrest data from the Colorado Bureau of Investigation found that 20% of those returned for a technical violation had actually been arrested for a new crime; 80% of these were misdemeanours.

DOC does not analyze return rates by subpopulations. However, the criminology literature shows that those who have a job and are married are most likely to succeed in the transition from prison to community life.

- 3) *When an offender is released from prison, what assessment is done to determine their risk and needs? What steps does the department take to ensure that the programming which a releasee receives matches their risk and needs as determined by the assessment? Does the dept have any data on this?*

**RESPONSE:** For more than 20 years, C.R.S. 17-22.5-404.5(b)(d)(e)(f) has required DCJ to develop and validate a risk assessment instrument for parole releases. The instrument developed by DCJ, the Colorado Actuarial Risk Assessment Scale (CARAS), is revised regularly to maintain predictive accuracy. The parole board is mandated to consider risk in its release decision. Empirical data are currently unavailable to determine the extent to which an individual’s risk category, as determined by the CARAS, is a factor in the release or revocation decision.

DOC also administers other assessments, such as the Level of Supervision Inventory (LSI) and other substance abuse and mental health reviews. How all of this information is used to determine risk and

needs and then matched to programming is not within the control of CDPS and is better answered by DOC.

- 4) *What steps does the department take to ensure the services provided to the offender in the community are evidence based? If an offender is released with multiple criminogenic needs (GED, substance abuse, anger management, employment, mental health etc) what does the department do to meet these multiple needs?*

**RESPONSE:** The Department does not provide direct services to offenders in the community. Through the community corrections funding and the authority to set standards, the Department establishes requirements for assessment and treatment to which community corrections providers must adhere. The standards are set using evidence-based principles wherever possible. Compliance with these standards is subject to regular audits by CDPS. As funding becomes available for special needs, such as sex offender, mental health or substance abuse treatment, CDPS issues specific contracts to providers. These contracts require certain identified performance by the providers that includes assessments and service delivery.

- 5) *If the State devoted resources towards evidence-based services designed to provide the offender the tools needed to re-enter society successfully what does the research show would be the resulting reduction in recidivism?*

**RESPONSE:** Evidence based practice is both a philosophy and a continuum of practices that prioritize recidivism reduction and healthy communities. The question does not provide sufficient information upon which to base a recidivism reduction projection. Which practices would be funded, in which sector of the criminal justice system, and what controls were placed on fidelity to the programming are only some of the factors to consider before any estimate of reduction could be made.

Research can establish that a program reduces recidivism, but those results cannot automatically be replicated. The surrounding conditions from one state to another and the implementation even from one provider to another differ significantly. A significant body of criminological research has addressed this concern. Recidivism reduction can be achieved by implementing evidence-based services, but services must be delivered by skilled and highly trained staff and with careful and consistent adherence to program design. Further, to achieve reductions in recidivism, science-based individual-level assessments of each offender's specific need for services and programming must precede service delivery.

Specific types of programs yield different recidivism benefits. For example, vocational training in prison is expected to reduce crime outcomes by 9%; intensive supervision that is treatment/services oriented rather than law enforcement oriented is expected to reduce recidivism by nearly 17%. Please see the attached "Exhibit 4" from an analysis of several hundred studies (a meta-analysis) conducted by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy for more information. The full report is available at <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/06-10-1201.pdf>.

DOC estimates that 60-80% of its inmates have significant substance use disorders. Studies show that when addicted offenders are provided with well-structured drug treatment while under criminal justice control, subsequent drug use is reduced by 50-60% and criminal behavior is reduced by more than 40%. Further, the effectiveness of substance abuse treatment and the associated cost-benefit, has been confirmed by research which shows that substance abuse treatment provides up to \$7 in taxpayer benefits for every \$1 in cost. When savings related to health care are included, total savings can exceed costs by a ratio of \$12 to \$1. This compares to less than \$.40 in return for every dollar spent

incarcerating drug offenders. In addition, drug treatment reduces the risk of HIV infection by six-fold, improves prospects for employment by 40%. (For more information, see: National Institute on Drug Abuse (2006). *Principles of substance abuse treatment for criminal justice populations: A research-based guide*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. NIJ Publication No. 06-5316.)

These outcomes are likely to be improved when staff are carefully trained to engage offenders in the treatment process. An individual's "readiness to change" has been linked to program participation and drop-out; new research is showing that corrections (including probation and parole officers) and treatment staff who are carefully trained and coached regularly in very specific interaction techniques (Motivational Interviewing®, for example) can positively affect the attitudes of offenders and their efforts to change. Research has linked these efforts to offender behaviors, and the offender behaviors have been empirically linked to recidivism reduction. CDPS, DOC, the Department of Human Services (Division of Behavioral Health) and State Judicial have a large training initiative underway to train hundreds of probation, parole, and DOC staff, along with staff from community mental health centers and other offender treatment providers. This initiative has just completed the first year of a 3-year, grant funded project, and early evaluation data show significant gains in skill levels.

- 6) *What are some examples of evidence-based programs in other states? Please describe them, their costs, their recidivism rates or cost savings as a result of recidivism reductions.*

**RESPONSE:** Please see "Exhibit 4" from the Washington State Institute for Public Policy to see the range of programs for which recidivism reduction data is available. Colorado employs many evidence-based programs, such as Drug Courts and DOC's Sex Offender Treatment and Management Program (which DCJ has evaluated).

Most states, including Colorado, are implementing aspects of evidence based programs, but determining if an individual program "works" requires that specific program to be evaluated.

As an example of another state's efforts, the Kansas Department of Corrections has reduced recidivism by cutting technical violations. In 2000, more than 3000 supervision condition violators were returned to prison; in FY 2010, this number was just above 1,000. In 2001, KDOC began a review of policies, practices, services and programs to determine how to positively "impact the ability of offenders to succeed upon return to their communities" and "safely reduce the number of revocations for condition violations on parole." This included "reviewing hiring, training and supporting staff in doing risk reduction work," engaging local agencies and communities to become "genuinely involved" in being part of the solution, and determining "how to address the many criminogenic issues and needs that arise for offenders." (See the *Kansas Risk and Re-Entry Plan*, November 2006). In 2003, the Legislature passed SB 123, which intended "to provide community supervision and drug treatment to offenders with drug abuse problems in order to reserve correctional facility capacity for more serious, violent offenders" (see <http://www.doc.ks.gov/2003-sb-123>).

Between 2006 and 2009, KDOC reported a 25% reduction in revocations. In 2006 the KDOC developed a 90 page strategy that focused on risk reduction and re-entry planning with measurable goals. In its January 3, 2010 report to the legislature, the KDOC reported the completion of the following evidence-based efforts as one component of "building the infrastructure for change:"

- a) Advanced Communication and Motivational Strategies (ACMS) Refresher

- A four hour refresher class which discusses the advanced communication techniques in depth including an opportunity to practice the advanced skills and a review of thinking reports.
  - 118 Community Corrections staff and 127 Parole staff were trained.
- b) Case Management Series
- A 7-day course designed to build skills in effective case management. Topics include:
    - Evidence based practices,
    - Effective communication,
    - LSI-R rater certification, and
    - Motivational Interviewing ®
  - 29 Community Corrections staff, 13 Facility staff, 3 Re-entry staff, 2 Parole staff and 2 Johnson County Court Services staff members were trained.
- c) Community Supervision Domestic Violence Curriculum
- A two part workshop which defines domestic violence and different forms of abuse, discusses recognition of power and control tactics, and covers supervision strategies for abusers. The workshop also discusses Protection from Abuse orders, No-Contact orders, and third party notifications. Other topics include victim confidentiality, why victims recant, barriers to safety, and the impact of domestic violence on children.
  - 68 Community Corrections staff, 66 Court Services staff, 50 Parole staff, 21 Facility staff members were trained.
- d) Sex Offender Management Training
- A two day course which provides information on assessment and supervision strategies for sex offenders and discusses secondary trauma which may occur for officers who supervise this population. In addition, there is information about the impact of sex offenses on victims and victim services resources in the community. This training provides a forum for exchanging information and resources as well as an opportunity for officers to brainstorm options when working with sex offenders.
  - 98 Community Corrections staff members were trained.
- e) Cognitive Behavioral Intervention Tools Training
- A two day seminar covering skills case managers can use to assist offenders in reshaping their thinking to make more pro-social choices. Topics include: thinking reports and thinking check-ins, social skills, and problem solving skills.
  - 7 Community Corrections staff members were trained.
- f) Offender Workforce Development Overview / Staying in the Game / Stress Awareness

- A one day seminar which provides an overview of the Offender Workforce Development program to raise officer awareness of the programming in which the offenders they supervise are participating. The seminar also addresses “Staying in the Game” which targets correctional fatigue and secondary trauma by assisting case managers in identifying coping techniques and developing individual methods to combat stress and stressors. One specific tool provided to participants to minimize stress is the introduction and practice of time management techniques.
- 63 Parole/Facility staff personnel were trained.

g) Case Management Principles and Practices

- A two day seminar for correctional staff on effective case management. This course includes: The eight evidence-based principles, responsiveness as it applies to case management, motivating and engaging the offender, developing an effective case plan, identifying and deploying resources for the case plan, how to monitor the case plan, and responding to behaviors.
- 35 Facility, 45 Parole staff and 45 Community Corrections staff were trained.

h) Breaking Down the Systems

- A computer lab course focusing on the computer operating systems utilized by KDOC. This course includes an overview of KDOC's technology infrastructure; guidance through OMIS, TOADS, PLONE and KASPER; and step-by-step instructions on the development and content of the Reentry Plan.
- 15 Facility staff (specifically corrections counselors) were trained.

i) LSI-R Update Training

- A mandatory web-based seminar for all LSI-R raters on the new LSI-R© scoring guide which became effective July 1, 2009.
- 289 Community Corrections staff, 7 Parole staff, 3 Facility staff, and 28 Johnson County Court Services staff were trained.

These details are provided to reflect the scope of the KDOC's efforts to improve re-entry outcomes for offenders. **Funding and implementing evidence based programs must be part of a comprehensive approach to improving offender outcomes to reduce recidivism.** In 2009, \$18.5M in grants were allocated from the KDOC to community corrections operations (parole, probation and service organizations) to facilitate jurisdiction- and agency- specific strategic planning, technical assistance, and implementation of initiatives directed to improve the success rates of sentenced offenders. Each grantee is carefully audited to assess performance toward programmatic goals, and detailed monthly and quarterly reports on client outcomes are used to provide ongoing feedback and assessments to both local staff and KDOC officials, and this information is summarized annually in a report to the legislature.

---

**Exhibit 4**

**Reducing Crime With Evidence-Based Options: What Works, and Benefits & Costs**

Washington State Institute for Public Policy Estimates as of October, 2006	Effect on Crime Outcomes Percent change in crime outcomes, & the number of evidence-based studies on which the estimate is based (in parentheses) (1)	Benefits and Costs (Per Participant, Net Present Value, 2006 Dollars)			
		Benefits to Crime Victims (of the reduction in crime) (2)	Benefits to Taxpayers (of the reduction in crime) (3)	Costs (marginal program cost, compared to the cost of alternative) (4)	Benefits (total) Minus Costs (per participant) (5)
<b>Programs for People in the Adult Offender System</b>					
Vocational education in prison	-9.0% (4)	\$8,114	\$6,806	\$1,182	\$13,738
Intensive supervision: treatment-oriented programs	-16.7% (11)	\$9,318	\$9,369	\$7,124	\$11,563
General education in prison (basic education or post-secondary)	-7.0% (17)	\$6,325	\$5,306	\$962	\$10,669
Cognitive-behavioral therapy in prison or community	-6.3% (25)	\$5,658	\$4,746	\$105	\$10,299
Drug treatment in community	-9.3% (6)	\$5,133	\$5,495	\$574	\$10,054
Correctional industries in prison	-5.9% (4)	\$5,360	\$4,496	\$417	\$9,439
Drug treatment in prison (therapeutic communities or outpatient)	-5.7% (20)	\$5,133	\$4,306	\$1,604	\$7,835
Adult drug courts	-8.0% (57)	\$4,395	\$4,705	\$4,333	\$4,767
Employment and job training in the community	-4.3% (16)	\$2,373	\$2,386	\$400	\$4,359
Electronic monitoring to offset jail time	0% (9)	\$0	\$0	-\$870	\$870
Sex offender treatment in prison with aftercare	-7.0% (6)	\$6,442	\$2,885	\$12,585	-\$3,258
Intensive supervision: surveillance-oriented programs	0% (23)	\$0	\$0	\$3,747	-\$3,747
Washington's Dangerously Mentally Ill Offender program	-20.0% (1)	\$18,020	\$15,116	n/e	n/e
Drug treatment in jail	-4.5% (9)	\$2,481	\$2,656	n/e	n/e
Adult boot camps	0% (22)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Domestic violence education/cognitive-behavioral treatment	0% (9)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Jail diversion for mentally ill offenders	0% (11)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Life Skills education programs for adults	0% (4)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
<b>Programs for Youth in the Juvenile Offender System</b>					
Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (v. regular group care)	-22.0% (3)	\$51,828	\$32,915	\$6,945	\$77,798
Adolescent Diversion Project (for lower risk offenders)	-19.9% (6)	\$24,328	\$18,208	\$1,913	\$40,623
Family Integrated Transitions	-13.0% (1)	\$30,708	\$19,502	\$9,665	\$40,545
Functional Family Therapy on probation	-15.9% (7)	\$19,529	\$14,617	\$2,325	\$31,821
Multisystemic Therapy	-10.5% (10)	\$12,855	\$9,622	\$4,264	\$18,213
Aggression Replacement Training	-7.3% (4)	\$8,897	\$6,659	\$897	\$14,660
Teen courts	-11.1% (5)	\$5,907	\$4,238	\$936	\$9,208
Juvenile boot camp to offset institution time	0% (14)	\$0	\$0	-\$8,077	\$8,077
Juvenile sex offender treatment	-10.2% (5)	\$32,515	\$8,377	\$33,064	\$7,829
Restorative justice for low-risk offenders	-8.7% (21)	\$4,628	\$3,320	\$880	\$7,067
Interagency coordination programs	-2.5% (15)	\$3,084	\$2,308	\$205	\$5,186
Juvenile drug courts	-3.5% (15)	\$4,232	\$3,167	\$2,777	\$4,622
Regular surveillance-oriented parole (v. no parole supervision)	0% (2)	\$0	\$0	\$1,201	-\$1,201
Juvenile intensive probation supervision programs	0% (3)	\$0	\$0	\$1,598	-\$1,598
Juvenile wilderness challenge	0% (9)	\$0	\$0	\$3,085	-\$3,085
Juvenile intensive parole supervision	0% (10)	\$0	\$0	\$6,460	-\$6,460
Scared Straight	+6.8% (10)	-\$8,355	-\$6,253	\$58	-\$14,667
Counseling/psychotherapy for juvenile offenders	-18.9% (6)	\$23,126	\$17,309	n/e	n/e
Juvenile education programs	-17.5% (3)	\$41,181	\$26,153	n/e	n/e
Other family-based therapy programs	-12.2% (12)	\$15,006	\$11,231	n/e	n/e
Team Child	-10.9% (2)	\$5,759	\$4,131	n/e	n/e
Juvenile behavior modification	-8.2% (4)	\$19,271	\$12,238	n/e	n/e
Life skills education programs for juvenile offenders	-2.7% (3)	\$6,441	\$4,091	n/e	n/e
Diversion progs. with services (v. regular juvenile court)	-2.7% (20)	\$1,441	\$1,034	n/e	n/e
Juvenile cognitive-behavioral treatment	-2.5% (8)	\$3,123	\$2,337	n/e	n/e
Court supervision vs. simple release without services	0% (8)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Diversion programs with services (v. simple release)	0% (7)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Juvenile intensive probation (as alternative to incarceration)	0% (5)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Guided Group Interaction	0% (4)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
<b>Prevention Programs (crime reduction effects only)</b>					
Nurse Family Partnership-Mothers	-56.2% (1)	\$11,531	\$8,161	\$5,409	\$14,283
Nurse Family Partnership-Children	-16.4% (1)	\$8,632	\$4,922	\$733	\$12,822
Pre-K education for low income 3 & 4 year olds	-14.2% (8)	\$8,145	\$4,644	\$593	\$12,196
Seattle Social Development Project	-18.6% (1)	\$1,605	\$4,341	n/e	n/e
High school graduation	-10.4% (1)	\$1,738	\$2,851	n/e	n/e
Guiding Good Choices	-9.1% (1)	\$570	\$2,092	n/e	n/e
Parent-Child Interaction Therapy	-3.7% (1)	\$268	\$784	n/e	n/e
<b>Program types in need of additional research &amp; development before we can conclude they do or do not reduce crime outcomes:</b>					
<b>Programs needing more research for people in the adult offender system</b>					
Case management in the community for drug offenders	0% (13)				Findings are mixed for this broad grouping of programs.
COSA (Faith-based supervision of sex offenders)	-22.3% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.
Day fines (compared to standard probation)	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.
Domestic violence courts	0% (2)				Too few evaluations to date.
Faith-based programs	0% (5)				Too few evaluations to date.
Intensive supervision of sex offenders in the community	0% (4)				Findings are mixed for this broad grouping of programs.
Medical treatment of sex offenders	-21.4% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.
Mixed treatment of sex offenders in the community	0% (2)				Too few evaluations to date.
Regular parole supervision vs. no parole supervision	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.
Restorative justice programs for lower risk adult offenders	0% (6)				Findings are mixed for this broad grouping of programs.
Therapeutic community programs for mentally ill offenders	-20.8% (2)				Too few evaluations to date.
Work release programs (from prison)	-4.3% (4)				Too few recent evaluations.
<b>Programs needing more research for youth in the juvenile offender system</b>					
Dialectical Behavior Therapy	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.
Increased drug testing (on parole) vs. minimal drug testing	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.
Juvenile curfews	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.
Juvenile day reporting	0% (2)				Too few evaluations to date.
Juvenile jobs programs	0% (3)				Too few recent evaluations.
Juvenile therapeutic communities	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.
Mentoring in juvenile justice	0% (1)				Too few evaluations to date.