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Project Overview
Implementing Effective Correctional Management of Offenders in the Community NIC/CJI Project
Four Project Sites

- Maricopa County, Arizona (2007-2009)
- Orange County, California (2008-2010)
What gets **MEASURED** is what gets **DONE**

If you can’t **MEASURE** it you can’t **MANAGE** it
Measuring for Management and Evaluation

- Offender Demographics and Case Info
  - Criminal History
  - Risk Level/Gain Scores
  - Treatment Data

- Offender Outcomes
  - Re-arrest, reconviction, revocations

- Intermediate Measures/Implementation Data
  - Completion of Assessment/Reassessment
  - Completion of Case Plan
  - Treatment Referrals
  - Quality Assurance Information

- Organizational Climate

- Collaboration
Maine: Contextual Background
A Centralized Structure
Staffing Structure

- Associate Commissioner for Adult Community Services
- 4 Regional Administrators
- 4 Assistant Regional Administrators
- 2 Resource Coordinators
- 74 Probation Officers

~Specialized Caseloads in Sex Offenders and Domestic Violence
Supervision Types

- **Parole:** “Has nearly been phased out. Represents a very small number of Inmates”

- **Supervised Community Confinement:** “Generally low risk inmates meeting requirements are allowed to serve the remainder of a sentence under community supervision”

- **Probation:** “A term of supervision ordered as a disposition by a sentencing Court. Is the majority of the Adult Community population”
Offender Management System

CORIS • CORrections Information System

- A fully integrated, web based MIS system designed to manage all aspects of MDOC data.

- In production since 2003 with detailed records for over 60,000 clients

- Extensive operational and reporting functionality including:
  - Adult and Juvenile Facility Corrections
  - Adult and Juvenile Community Services
  - Central Office Administration
Current Functionality

Intake
Alerts
Education
Case Load
Sentence Calculation
Significance
ME: The Data Collection Process
## Subcommittee Members and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Representative(s)</th>
<th>Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MDOC        | Administration NIC Project Manager Business Analyst Management Analyst           | • Chair & staff research subcommittee  
• Liaison and ensure ongoing communication between research subcommittee, internal policy committee, and other DOC staff, RCAs  
• Identify intersection issues between implementation and research  
• Review and provide comment on research reports |
| SAC         | Director’s Office Research Associates                                             | • SAC / Cooperative agreement management & reporting with NIC  
• Lead the research, working in collaboration with DOC to guide the work of the research subcommittee  
• Data collection, compilation, analysis, and reporting |

- **MDOC** – Maine Department of Corrections
- **SAC** – University of Southern Maine, Statistical Analysis Center
Making Sense of It All

Review of Variables

- Data Availability
- Policy / Practice Issues

Divide and Conquer

- Demographic Information
- Individual Case Level (supervision / assessment)
- Case Level Variables (treatment / programs)
- Case Level Outcomes (arrest and revocation)
Step 1 - Interpret and Identify Variables

- What are the data dictionary requirements?
- Matching of the requirement with corresponding data in CORIS
- Working through definition barriers

Step 2 - Analyze

- Location in CORIS database
- Special considerations and filters to be applied

Step 3 – Extract

- Queries written to extract data from CORIS
- Exported to Excel
Step 4 – Quality Assurance

• Spot checking ~ Extraction vs. CORIS
• Validity and Consistency

Step 5 – Reporting

• Excel file sent to S.A.C. for analysis and conversion to SPSS format.
• Queries for each module converted to a single report
  -Reports accessible via intranet site
  -Date parameter allows for flexibility
Study Parameters/Methodology

- Examined 2004, 2005, 2006 populations of individuals entering probation via:
  - Society In
  - DOC Transfer (from a facility)
  - SCCP
  - Interstate compact in (Individuals being monitored by MDOC probation officers for other states and were not incarcerated).
Variable categories

- Demographic (age, gender, race, etc.)
- Individual Case Level (supervision start date, presenting offense, probation office, LSI score (with domain scores), etc.)
- Case Level Outcomes (arrest, revocations, and violations histories)
- Case Level Variables (treatment info.)*

* Not available at this time
Additional Variable Categories

- Office Measures (measures about the probation office the probationers are assigned to)
- Region Measures (measures about the probation region the probationer lives in – i.e. staffing levels, number of quality assurance trainings, etc.)
- Program Measures* (detailed quality measures about the programs probationers are being assigned to)

* Not available at this time
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3. DATA QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistent/Populated (CP)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Risk Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Revocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inconsistent/Populated (IP)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSI Risk Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months to Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days-to-First Violation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ME: Individual Case-Level Data
Two important policy changes in 2004 led to fewer misdemeanants on probation:

1) Limit the use of probation for Class D&E offenses to domestic violence, sex offenders, repeat OUI offenders (1 or more prior convictions in the previous 10 years), and other unusual cases where serious risk to public safety exists as determined by the court.

2) Create deferred disposition: Enact a new sentencing alternative to give judges an alternative punishment to probation or incarceration.
# Top 3 Crimes of Probation Entrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault/ Threatening</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUI</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Initial LSI Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level (risk score 04-05)</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative (0-13)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (14-31)</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (32-40)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum (40-54)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No score</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Admin=0-13, Low 14-20 Moderate=20-25, High=26-35, Maximum=36-54
ME: Case Level Outcomes
## Intermediate Measures (2/1/2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate Measures</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSI completed in 60 days?</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% population with completed re-assessment within 1 year</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain Score</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of medium to high risk offenders with case plan</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of case plans addressing 3 criminogenic needs</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recidivism and Violation Rates while on Probation (2/1/2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recidivism Rates</th>
<th>6 month</th>
<th>1 year</th>
<th>2 year</th>
<th>3 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation Rates</th>
<th>6 month</th>
<th>1 year</th>
<th>2 year</th>
<th>3 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Recidivism**: An arrest (or ticket, and summons) for any municipal, state, or federal misdemeanor or felony crime.

- **Violation**: An arrest for a technical, misdemeanor or felony.
ME: Benefits, Next Steps, Challenges
Informed Decision Making and Benefits

- Has provided us with a real “first look” at many areas; Assessments / populations / caseloads / violations etc..

- Trend and activity identification…. violations handling

- Data entry discrepancies and issues become evident. Can be addressed appropriately with practice, policy or functionality changes.

- Designed with a capacity to continue research beyond the scope of the project.
Informed Decision Making and Benefits

- Policy makers reviewed data on “Administrative” (low risk) cases for case banking.

- Added “Low” category to probation

- Changed risk level ranges of probation supervision

- Implementing “case planning” of all moderate to maximum cases
Challenges and Next Steps

- Time consuming process with limited resources.
- Maintaining accuracy in monitoring recidivism
- Improving data completion rates
- Receiving complete criminal history records
- Learning and understanding effective methods of analyzing all the data.
- Adding treatment data

The good news…...

Once it’s done, it’s done
Dissemination
Lisa Nash – MDOC Project Manager
lisa.k.nash@maine.gov

Chris Oberg – CORIS Business Analyst
christopher.r.oberg@maine.gov

Mark Rubin – Research Associate
mrubin@usm.maine.edu

Maine Justice Policy Center
http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch
Illinois: Contextual Background
Decentralized System

- Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts provides oversight to independent county-or circuit-level probation entities.

- Each pilot site (Lake, Adams, Cook, DuPage, and Sangamon Counties, and the 2nd Judicial Circuit) has a separate data collection system.

- Some systems were automated and some were not.

- Data collection led by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, and is ongoing.

- No case-level outcome data is available yet.
IL: Process Measures
Measuring Implementation

- Despite challenges in measuring long-term outcomes, sites wanted measures of ongoing implementation, organization change, and fidelity to EBP (the “outputs” of the process).
- These data are beneficial for improving quality and assessing the incremental success of the Initiative.
- Diverse data systems still posed a challenge in developing a data collection tool and allowing cross-site comparisons.
Measuring Organizational Development and Collaboration

- Paper and web-based tools overcame MIS challenges.
- Likert Organizational Climate Survey administered annually in pilot sites.
- Larson and Chrislip Collaboration Survey administered annually to statewide EBP Coordinating Council.
- Survey results informed strategic planning and showed annual progress/fallbacks
Intermediate Measures Database

- To overcome MIS issues, an independent Access database was developed to capture case audit data on assessment, case planning, and treatment.

- Pilot sites participated in development and testing.

- Audit data is entered on a random sample of cases, and the database can produce queries and a limited number of pre-programmed reports to the officer level.

- Two counties have piloted the system and the state is planning a wider rollout.
Accountability Through Intermediate Measures (AIM)

- The big question: what to do with the data?
- Adams and DuPage Counties used a modified CompStat approach to review data and set improvement goals.

Challenges:
- Using the right data to answer the right questions
- Understanding the data
- Facilitation
- Accountability

User’s guide available for the IM database and AIM Process
IL: Benefits, Next Steps, Challenges
Benefits

- Ongoing measurement has informed implementation (i.e. Organizational Climate and Collaboration Surveys)
- Intermediate measures data and AIM/CompStat approach provides framework for data-driven decision making and quality assurance.
- Outcome data collection process has highlighted the importance of data quality.
- Statewide research committee has been formed to sustain research efforts.
Challenges/Next Steps

- Planning for future technology
- Balancing consistent measurement/reporting across sites with each site’s needs and capacity
- Disseminating and applying data
- Going forward with evaluation after ICJIA project has ended.
Going Forward with Evaluation
Lessons Learned

- Site selection
- Research planning and process
- Assessment tools
Site Selection

- New accelerated immersion approach
- Well-developed databases/MIS
- New data model
- Less data collection
- Research staff
  - Experience with research projects
  - Experience with outside researchers
- Collect some important intermediate measures data
Research Process

- Research Plan
- *Data matrix* as a guide, not prescriptive
- Review the site’s data
- Interactive process with the site
  - What research questions want answered?
- Key question: “How does the organization change?”
- Research consultant
  - Applied and ‘pure’ research experience
Assessment Tools

- Review our site assessment tools
- Three areas: Organization development, Collaboration, Evidence-Based Practice
- Work with site(s) to develop tool package
- Review of new tools, etc.
- Addition of new leadership assessments
Research Changes

- Learned from 1st implementation
- Challenge with new model
- Sites are more advanced – research-wise
- Assessment tools reviewed, updated
- Less primary data collection needed
- Research process altered to sites
Slides available at: www.cjinstitute.org
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