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Purpose
Program Participants

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

### In-Custody Phase (7 - 36 Months)

#### Overview

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

#### Cognitive Behavior

- Dr. Edward Latessa, University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute
  - *Thinking for a Change*
- Aggression Replacement Therapy
- Substance Abuse Component

#### Education

- Remedial Classes / High School Diploma (Five Keys Charter School)
- College Courses (LA Mission / College of the Canyons)
- Vocational / CTE Courses (LA Trade Tech / College of the Canyons)

#### Life Skills

- Life Skills Course (Five Keys Charter School)
- Parenting Course (Five Keys Charter School)

#### Re-Entry

- Case Management / LA Probation
- Community Service Providers
- Child Support Services, Dept. of Motor Vehicles, Dept. of Family and Child Services
Out-of-Custody Program Overview

**Out-of-Custody Phase (1 Year)**

**Overview**
Participants complete their sentences and return to the community. The out-of-custody services and support are offered for one year and vary based on individual needs.

**Case Management**
Case Management / LA Probation

**Housing**
Utilize network of community alliance for transitional or licensed facility treatment housing. Healthright360, Amity, YWCA, Goodwill, etc.

**Employment**
Develop employment portfolio to include labor organizations, workforce investment board, college employment networks. Develop partnerships with local businesses and employers. Job Placement

**Child Support Services**
Assist participants in child support obligations. Dr. Golightly, Executive Director of Los Angeles County Child Support Services

**Health Services**
Health Services Support Dr. Mitchell Katz, Director, Los Angeles County Department of Health Services
BOT-LA program evaluation methodology

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCU’s CEST</th>
<th>TCU’s CTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Desire for help</td>
<td>• Entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treatment needs</td>
<td>• Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pressures for treatment</td>
<td>• Power orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self esteem</td>
<td>• Cold heartedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Depression</td>
<td>• Criminal rationalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anxiety</td>
<td>• Personal irresponsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hostility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional measures – BOT-LA group only

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

- CEST, CTS, DVS, COMPAS administered pre
  - @ beginning of treatment for BOT-LA participants
  - @ “Time 1” for control cases
- CEST, CTS, DVS, COMPAS administered post
  - @ or near the end of treatment for BOT-LA participants
  - @ “Time 2” for control cases – equivalent time period
- Time tracked closely – days until release
- Post-release re-arrest
Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: Demographics (only those who have been released)

• Difference in age – non-significant
  – Each group avg. age = between 36 and 37 years
• Difference in race – non-significant
  – Both groups’ plurality ethnicity was Hispanic
Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: Criminogenic risk/criminal history (only those who have been released)

- Initial COMPAS classifications were statistically the same
  - BOT-LA group = 55.7% classified as high risk
  - Control group = 56.6% classified as high risk
Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: Criminal History – groups were statistically equivalent regarding... (only those who have been released)

- Total arrests
- Total drug arrests
- Total “other” arrests
- Total property arrests
- Total drug convictions
- Total “other” convictions
- Total person-related convictions
- Total property convictions
Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: Criminal History

- BOT-LA and Control groups differed significantly regarding
  - Total convictions (BOT-LA had more at 10.8 on avg. vs. 8.61 for control)
  - Person-related *arrests* (BOT-LA had fewer at 1.69 on avg. vs. 2.82 for control)
Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: CEST pre-measures

- The two groups were statistically the same regarding the pre-measures of:
  - Desire for help
  - Treatment needs
  - Pressure for treatment
  - Self-esteem
  - Depression
  - Anxiety
  - Decision making
  - Hostility
  - Risk taking
Analyses & Results – comparing BOT-LA to combined control group: CTS pre-measures

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

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

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

• Re-arrest rates:
  – BOT-LA = 19.7%
  – Control = 24.8%

• No controls; time at risk differed
Current status/Next steps

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

• Randie Chance at Randie.Chance@doj.ca.gov

• Alex Holsinger at HolsingerA@umkc.edu

• Kevin Walker at Kevin.Walker@doj.ca.gov