

Program Evaluation: Back on Track – Los Angeles

American Society of Criminology Meetings – 2018 – Atlanta, GA

KEVIN WALKER, M.S.

ALEXANDER M. HOLSINGER, PH.D.

RANDIE C. CHANCE, PH.D.

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 standardized recidivism measures (3 year outcome period)

Current analysis

- ▶ Utilizes cases (from both groups) that were released before January 1, 2017
 - ▶ 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 w/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

7

- ▶ 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

10

- ▶ 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

Results – CEST data (cont.)

- ▶ Self-esteem
 - ▶ BOT-LA scored significantly higher than control at both pre- and post measures. Higher at post.
- ▶ 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. Higher at post.

- ▶ 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.)

14

- ▶ 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

15

- ▶ 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.)

16

- ▶ 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

One Year Recidivism Measures

17

- ▶ BOT-LA arrested for less “other” offense-level crimes (not felony or misdemeanor)
- ▶ BOT-LA arrested for less “other” crimes (not person, property or drug)
- ▶ BOT convicted for less felony drug crimes
- ▶ Control convicted for less misdemeanor offenses

Conclusions and next steps

18

- ▶ Some evidence of program impact
 - ▶ BOT-LA appears to be performing better on scales
 - ▶ Some pre-programming group differences exist but not critical
- ▶ More recidivism data being collected
- ▶ 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
- ▶ Future analyses to utilize multivariate modeling, incorporating control where needed

Contact

Research.Center@doj.ca.gov

<https://oag.ca.gov/research-center>