The problem

• What California has been faced with
  • Prison populations
  • Judicial orders
  • New legislation
The Program

- Origination
- Purpose
- Target Population
- Program process & description
Program Evaluation Groups and Measures

• Two-group design: BOT-LA vs. Control group
• Both groups assessed/compared regarding criminal history
• Both groups provide pre-and-post measures
  • Client Evaluation of Self and Treatment (CEST)
  • Criminal Thinking Scale (CST)
• Both groups being tracked for changes across psychometric measures
• Both groups being tracked for standardized recidivism measures (3 year outcome period)
Current analysis

• Utilizes only cases (from both groups) that have been released
  • Complete measures for all pre-post assessment

• Focuses on psychometric measures derived from CEST & CTS and the COMPAS risk/needs assessment

• Examined all comparisons (both intra-group and inter-group comparisons were made)
COMPAS risk/needs assessment

• Primary offender risk/need assessment in California
• Includes static and dynamic (mostly dynamic) items
  • Can measure change over time and with intervention
• Assesses a comprehensive array of relevant criminogenic risk and need domains and factors
• Used in risk/need classification, and case planning
TCU’s CEST - several scales derived

- Desire for help
- Treatment readiness
- Treatment needs
- Pressure for treatment
- Self esteem
- Depression

- Anxiety
- Decision making
- Hostility
- Risk taking
- Treatment participation
- Treatment satisfaction
TCU’s CTS

- Entitlement
- Justification
- Power orientation

- Cold heartedness
- Criminal rationalization
- Personal irresponsibility
Results - group equivalency

- BOT-LA and control groups equivalent re: race and age
- BOT-LA and control groups equivalent re: several criminal history measures
  - # arrests and # of convictions for total, person, property, drug, and “other”
- Some criminal history differences (BOT-LA vs. control group)
  - Age @ first arrest (BOT-LA group older)
  - Control group had more person-related ARRESTS
  - BOT-LA group had more person-related CONVICTIONS
- Overall no grave concerns re: criminal history equivalency
Results - COMPAS data

• BOT-LA and control groups:
  • Statistically the same at pre-COMPAS measure
  • Approached significant difference at post-COMPAS measure

• Control group:
  • Statistically the same when comparing pre- to post-COMPAS

• BOT-LA group:
  • Statistically significant decrease in overall risk/need comparing pre- to post-COMPAS

• Note: These results were generated utilizing the COMPAS categorizations as quantitative scores, not raw scores
Results - CEST data

• Desire for help
  • Groups statistically the same at pre-measure
  • BOT-LA scored significantly better than control at post-measure
  • Control scored significantly worse comparing pre- to post internally

• Self-perceived needs for treatment
  • Control nearly significant reduction pre-to post internally
  • BOT-LA remained the same pre- to post

• Pressure for treatment
  • Control had significant reduction comparing pre- to post
  • BOT-LA remained the same pre- to post
• Self-esteem
  • Approaching significant difference at pre-measure (BOT-LA higher)
  • BOT-LA scored significantly higher than control at post-measure

• Depression
  • BOT-LA and control were the same at pre-measure
  • BOT-LA and control significantly different at post (control more depressed)

• Decision making
  • BOT-LA scored significantly higher than control at both pre- and post measures
Results - CTS data

- Entitlement
  - BOT-LA scored significantly lower than control at pre
  - BOT-LA scored significantly lower than control at post
  - Neither group evinced internal change when comparing pre- to post

- Justification (of antisocial behavior)
  - BOT-LA and control were statistically the same at pre
  - BOT-LA scored significantly lower than control at post
  - Neither group evinced statistically significant change internally, however, control group increased, while BOT-LA decreased
Results - CTS data (cont.)

• Criminal rationalization
  • BOT-LA displayed statistically significant decrease from pre- to post
  • Control group the same comparing pre- to post

• Personal irresponsibility
  • BOT-LA and control were the same at pre
  • BOT-LA scored significantly lower than control at post
  • BOT-LA displayed a significant decrease when comparing pre to post
  • Control remained the same when comparing pre to post
Results - COMPAS subscales

• Control displayed significant increase (pre to post) on anger (BOT-LA showed no change pre to post)

• Control displayed significant increase (pre to post) on need for cognitive behavioral interventions (BOT-LA showed no change pre to post)

• Control displayed significant increase (pre to post) re: financial difficulties (BOT-LA showed a non-significant decrease)

• BOT-LA displayed significant decrease on general propensity for recidivism comparing pre to post (control decreased as well, but not significantly)
Results - COMPAS subscales (cont.)

• Control displayed statistically significant increase re: residential instability (pre to post); BOT-LA showed no substantive or significant change pre to post.

• Control group displayed statistically significant increase (pre to post) re: social isolation; BOT-LA showed no substantive or significant change pre to post.
Conclusions and next steps

• Some evidence of program impact
  • BOT-LA appears to be performing better on scales
  • Some pre-programming group differences exist but not critical
• More data being collected (e.g., Time 2 assessments)
• Several measures of recidivism being developed/tracked
  • New arrest post-release
  • New conviction post-release
  • New return to jail post-release
  • New return to prison post-release
• More cases under “released status” being added to dataset
• Future analyses utilize multivariate modeling, incorporating control where needed