



---

Center for Evidence Based Practice  
Center for Adolescent and Family Studies  
Indiana University

**Effectiveness of  
Community Corrections  
in the State of Indiana**





# Table of Contents

---

## Introduction

<b>Indiana Community Corrections Overview</b> .....	5
---	---

## Evaluation of Effectiveness

<b>Study Procedures</b> .....	9
<b>Who Provided the Data</b> .....	10
<b>Results</b> .....	12
1. Who is served in Indiana Community Corrections? .....	12
2. What is the effectiveness of Community Corrections? .....	17
3. What is the effectiveness of the required components of Community Corrections? .....	19
4. What is the effectiveness of Community Corrections services? .....	30
5. What combinations of components and services do offenders participate in? What are the outcomes of these combinations? .....	34
<b>Summary of Findings</b> .....	37
<b>Recommendations</b> .....	41

<b>References</b> .....	43
-------------------------	----

<b>Appendix A</b> .....	45
-------------------------	----

<b>Appendix B</b> .....	47
-------------------------	----



# Introduction

---

In the past decade Community Corrections has become a core component of criminal justice systems around the country, as they provide a useful and less costly alternative to incarceration for state and local governments (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; McGuire, 2002). Community corrections programs are a shift in focus from sanction and deterrence to rehabilitation, with an emphasis on assessment and intervention strategies that serve to identify and address offenders' risk and protective factors (Day & Howells, 2002). This shift in focus has resulted in the expansion and diversification of community corrections programming. In order to improve practice and to respond to the imperative of fiscal responsibility, many criminal justice systems and community corrections have embraced a "what works" agenda focusing on developing, disseminating, and using evidence-based practice (EBP) or those programs with scientific evidence of success. EBP is important because it is more likely to produce desirable outcomes across settings, to save taxpayers' money, and thus increase accountability. EBP rests on principles that emphasize the use of empirical knowledge in making decisions about the case management of individual

offenders (Center for Effective Public Policy, 2010; Sackett, Rosenberg, Haynes, & Richardson, 1997). In the community corrections context, this means the systematic measurement of offenders' behavioral change as it relates to the goals of reducing recidivism and improving public safety (Crime & Justice Institute, 2004), and the use of well-defined programs with a coherent conceptual framework and clearly articulated protocols that specify who the target population is and what the program elements and desired outcomes are (Sexton, Hanes, & Kinser, 2010).

Evidence-based programming is all the more crucial as state and local governments are looking for solutions to the high costs of imprisonment. In 2008 and 2009, the rate of incarceration in the United States was 753 inmates per 100,000 people, the highest in the world (Schmitt, Warner, & Gupta, 2010). Jail and prison populations increased by more than 350 percent between 1980 and 2008 (Schmitt, Warner, & Gupta, 2010). One in 100 adults are now in prison or jail (The PEW Center on the States, 2008). Increasing rates of incarceration constitutes a fiscal burden in times of budgetary constraints. Between 1987 and 2007, total state spending on

Evidence-based practice is all the more crucial as state and local governments are looking for solutions to high costs of imprisonment.

corrections increased by 315 percent. Total state spending was up to \$49 billion in 2009. States are expected to spend an additional \$25 billion on corrections in 2011 (The PEW Center on the States, 2008). There is little empirical evidence that incarceration contributes to reduce criminal behavior and recidivism (Spohn & Holleman, 2002). In fact, scientific studies have shown that inmates are more likely to recidivate than offenders placed on probation (Song & Lieb, 1993). Hence there is a strong need for successful community-based programs that monitor offenders' behaviors, assist in the rehabilitation of offenders, and promote public safety.

## INDIANA COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Indiana Community Corrections involve a series of comprehensive programs implemented at the level of the county with financial support from the Indiana Department of Correction. Indiana is made up of 92 counties, 78 of which offer community-based programming either individually or in collaboration. In total, there are 66 community corrections sites. Under Indiana Code 11-12-1, community corrections is defined as a program composed of seven elements or components which correspond to different levels of community-based supervision. Within each component, individual offenders receive different types of services that are categorized by function: (1) Assessment services whose purpose is to identify the mental health, criminogenic, vocational and other needs of individual offenders; (2) Monitoring services such as drug testing, electronic monitoring; and (3) Intervention services such as drug and alcohol treatment.

In the past decade, the Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC) instituted a "what works" approach to the funding and

implementation of the community corrections program, thus encouraging local community corrections agencies to apply the Crime and Justice Institute's principles of effective interventions and to identify and deliver evidence-based services. The IDOC has emphasized the importance of assessing both program outcomes and program integrity and quality, using the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) (Gendreau & Andrews, 1996). The CPAI is an assessment tool designed to measure the degree to which a program integrates the principles of effective interventions and is implemented in a systematic and consistent manner.

In addition, IDOC contracted the services of the Center for Adolescent and Family Studies (CAFS) at Indiana University-Bloomington to assist community corrections in the state-wide adoption and implementation of evidence-based programming. In 2009, the IDOC and CAFS founded the Center for Evidence-Based Practice (CEBP), an independent research group whose purpose is to describe community corrections practices, evaluate the effectiveness of community corrections, and provide specific recommendations, guidelines and training designed to enhance the delivery, quality, and success of community corrections interventions. The CEBP designs research projects, collects and interprets data that are relevant to evidence-based programming, and translates findings into technical aid. All activities of the CEBP occur under the guidance of an advisory board that is composed of three community corrections directors, a representative of the Indiana Association of Community Corrections Act Counties, three IDOC staff and high officials, an IDOC training contractor, and CAFS researchers. The CEBP Advisory Board functions to support the collaborative nature of the Center's projects by facilitating

communication between practitioners and researchers in an effort to bridge the gap between science and practice.

One of the primary objectives of research conducted by the CEBP is to establish a baseline measure of the effectiveness of current community correction programming in Indiana. A baseline measure of effectiveness would provide Community Corrections with a minimal standard of acceptable programming, and may be used to determine appropriate funding and also to inform policy makers about the potential value of community corrections within the Indiana Department of Correction. Evaluating the specific outcomes of Indiana Community Corrections will help to establish the program as an effective and less costly alternative to incarceration.

In 2009, the CEBP (August, 2009) conducted a survey of current community corrections practices and looked at existing mechanisms for measuring outcomes as well as information about the community corrections program, including program components, population served, goals, interventions, and outcomes. The results of the survey showed that community corrections in Indiana provided a wide range of services to a diverse population of offenders. While the CEBP was able to identify what community corrections components were delivered to whom, the lack of systematic and common data gathering mechanisms across the state of Indiana made it impossible to determine the effectiveness of the community corrections program, components and services. The findings of the survey highlighted the need to develop a standardized data gathering system that would support the collection of information essential to the evaluation of community corrections' effectiveness. That study also found a need to better articulate program protocols

and procedures as well as standards that inform the referral of specific populations to specific components or services in the State of Indiana.

Indiana Community Corrections have made significant progress in the implementation of evidence-based principles. These principles have guided the delivery of the community corrections program, components and services. However, to date, there have been no studies showing that community corrections programming in Indiana successfully works as intended. In order to demonstrate the fiscal value of community-based interventions as an alternative to incarceration and thus to ensure continued funding, it is imperative to establish the effectiveness of the community corrections program. Knowing more about the outcomes of community corrections components and services will make it possible to develop and refine a specific set of best practices.

Knowing more  
about the  
outcomes of  
community  
corrections will  
make it  
possible to  
develop a  
specific set of  
best practices.



# Evaluation of Effectiveness

---

The present study was designed to build upon the findings of the CEBP's survey of current community corrections practices (CEBP, 2009) by measuring the outcome of the community corrections components and services in Indiana. These components and services are delivered sequentially and/or together depending on offenders' criminogenic needs and compliance with the requirements of their probation.

A number of specific questions guided this evaluation:

1. Who are the clients of community corrections programs?
2. What is the effectiveness of the community corrections program?
3. What is the effectiveness of each community corrections component?
4. What is the effectiveness of each community corrections services?
5. What are the most prevalent combinations of components and services that offenders participate in? How effective are these program combinations?

Three criteria were used to measure effectiveness: (1) Program completion, (2)

change in risk scores and/or risk levels and (3) recidivism. Program completion indicates whether or not offenders are able to meet the requirements of the services they receive. If they do meet the requirements for successful termination, they may be transferred to another program component or participate in other intervention programs. Risk scores and risk levels are a measure of offenders' future risk of legal difficulties. Changes in risk scores and risk levels indicate whether individuals are more or less able to function as productive and responsible citizens in community settings. Recidivism provides information about offenders' involvement in the criminal justice system after discharge from community corrections. Recidivism is defined as the number of new adjudicated crimes that resulted in an offender's return to the community corrections program.

## STUDY PROCEDURES

The CEBP identified the list of data elements necessary to conduct a thorough evaluation of the community corrections program (Appendix A). This list was communicated to a research analyst at the

Evidence-based practices are more than principles. They are specific programs based on tried and tested interventions that have the potential to provide cost effective and successful help to adults and adolescents.

Indiana Department of Correction. This research analyst recruited the participants, assigned them a unique identifier, and contacted the contracting agency responsible for data gathering and management in community corrections. The contracting agency entered the data requested into a spreadsheet. The data was de-identified prior to being sent to the CEBP, thus allowing the CEBP to conduct a blind evaluation of the participants' program. The CEBP then developed a coding scheme for the purpose of sorting and analyzing the data (Appendix B).

Despite significant attempts to receive the "best" available data, many of the core data elements were missing, incomplete, or unavailable. Most notably, information about recidivism was missing. When recidivism data were available, they referred to offenders' criminal history prior to their participation in community corrections. Because there was no information about offenders' behavior after they completed the community corrections program, it was not possible to answer the question of what works by examining the impact of community corrections components on recidivism. In addition, few counties reported post-intervention risk scores. As a result, it was not possible to determine if there were any changes in offenders' risk scores at their exit of community corrections. Program completion was the only data element available to determine the effectiveness of community corrections.

Each of the research participants used a data management system developed and operated by an outside vendor (Paperless Business Solutions). It is not clear whether the missing data were or were not collected by the community corrections agencies or whether they were due to errors of data management. Missing data and errors of data management are an important concern because they limit community correc-

tions' ability to share accurate information with the IDOC and to conduct internal evaluations.

## WHO PROVIDED THE DATA

The participants in this research project are four community corrections agencies located in four different counties of the state of Indiana. They were selected by the Indiana Department of Correction based on their representativity and the quality of the data they collected in the year 2009, including demographic and outcome information. These four agencies are representative of the various settings in which community corrections operates: Two of these agencies are situated in counties of less than 100,000 inhabitants with a predominantly White population (92.8% and 98.6%); the other two are located in more densely populated and racially diverse areas of over 300,000 inhabitants, with White individuals making up 68.9% and 84.3% of the county population. On average, Whites account for 87.8% of the state population.

We compared the number of offenders served by each agency to the number of residents in the county where each agency is located, and found an interesting trend. The agencies with the smallest staff (Site 3 and 4) served a higher percentage of their county population than agencies with the largest staff (Site 1 and 2). Specifically, the number of offenders served in Site 3 and 4 represented 2.64% and 2.5% of the respective county population, whereas the number of offenders served in Site 1 and 2 represented 1.36% and 1.8% of the respective county population. An examination of the four community corrections sites' characteristics revealed that there is variation in the staff to offender ratio across the four sites used in this study. For example, Site 1 has 100 staff for 353,888 offenders

**Table 1: CC Site Characteristics**

CC Site	Total Population	Offenders Served	Number of Staff
Site 1	353,888	6,701	100
Site 2	890,879	12,177	65
Site 3	74,426	1,964	10
Site 4	28,000	707	8
<b>Total</b>	1,347,19	21,549	NA

**Table 2: Offender Ethnicity in Each CC Site**

Ethnicity	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
<b>White</b>	3,521 (52.5%)	5,263 (43.3%)	1,6101 (82.7%)	651 (92.1%)	11,045 (51.3%)
<b>Black</b>	2,231 (33.3%)	6,269 (51.5%)	2,231 (33.3%)	14 (2.0%)	8,746 (40.6%)
<b>Hispanic</b>	875 (13.1%)	561 (4.6%)	66 (3.4%)	36 (5.1%)	1,538 (7.1%)
<b>Asian/Pacific Islander</b>	56 (.8%)	18 (.1%)	2 (.1%)	2 (.3%)	78 (.4%)
<b>Other</b>	10 (.1%)	34 (.3%)	2 (.1%)	3 (.4%)	49 (.2%)
<b>Biracial</b>	0	0	34 (1.7%)	0	34 (.2%)
<b>Native American</b>	2 (.01%)	7 (.01%)	0	1 (.1%)	10 (.01%)
<b>Mixed</b>	0	8 (.01%)	0	0	8 (.01%)
<b>American Indiana/ Alaskan Native</b>	3 (.01%)	6 (.01%)	0	0	9 (.01%)
<b>Unknown</b>	1 (.01%)	0	0	0	1 (.01%)

The majority of offenders under some kind of community supervision are male.

(1 staff to every 3,538 offenders) while Site 2 has only 65 staff for 890,879 offenders (1 staff to every 13,705 offenders). (See **Table 1** for an overview of the community corrections site characteristics.)

## RESULTS

### 1. Who is served in Indiana Community Corrections?

#### *Age, Gender & Ethnicity.*

The age of offenders served by the four sites ranges from 14 to 88 years with an average age of 34.39 years. Offenders were primarily White (51.3%) and Black (40.6%). A greater number of African-Americans are involved in the criminal justice system than would be expected given the ethnic composition of the general Indiana population, 9.2% African-Americans and 87.8% Caucasian (U. S. Census Bureau, 2009). **Table 2** provides additional information about the ethnic characteristics of offenders in each site.

While the gender composition of the general Indiana population is 49% male and 51% female (U. S. Census Bureau, 2009), the majority of offenders under some kind of community supervision are male (79.4%) with substantially fewer females (20.6%). Thus, these data suggest that a much larger proportion of males are involved in community corrections than females. It is interesting to note that the male to female ratio in community corrections differs from the male to female

ratio in residential facilities. In 2009, the percentage of male and female offenders behind bars was 91.8% and 8.2% respectively (Indiana Department of Correction, 2009). In both Community Corrections and IDOC significantly more males than females are offending, which is a nationwide trend (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002).

#### *Offender Types.*

Offenders differ in their past history (new offender vs. repeat offender) and in the number and type of crimes committed. The data suggests that community corrections serve significantly more new offenders (Mean = 4,441.33) than recidivists (Mean = 2,056.25). **Table 4** displays the recidivism statistics provided by the four sites. The total percentage of recidivists (38.2%) and new offenders (61.8%) is similar to the percentages across Site 1, 2, and 4. Information about recidivism in Site 3 was not provided. In short, just over one-third of offenders served by CC were labeled as recidivists.

A number of CC participants were repeat offenders that committed one or more crimes prior to their current offense. 8,225 out of 21,549 offenders are reported to be repeat offenders. The number of prior offenses including the present offense ranges from 2 to 11. The average number of repeat offenses across all sites was between 2 and 3. Consistent with the recidivism data discussed above, just over

**Table 3: Gender Composition of the Offender Population in each CC Sites**

Gender	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
Male	5,036 (75.2%)	10,051 (83.4%)	1,370 (70.3%)	529 (77.2%)	17,086 (79.4%)
Female	1,664 (24.8%)	2,026 (16.6%)	578 (29.7%)	156 (22.8%)	4,424 (20.6%)

**Table 4: Recidivism across CC Sites**

Recidivism	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
Re-offender	2,393 (35.7%)	3,646 (29.9%)	1,964 (100%)	222 (31.4%)	8,225 (38.2%)
New Offender	4,308 (64.3%)	8,531 (70.1%)	0	485 (68.6%)	13,324 (61.8%)

one-third of offenders had committed a crime prior to their current involvement in community corrections, and on average, they had committed a total of 2 to 3 crimes (see **Table 11**).

There was also variation in the number and type of offenses committed by offenders in each site. For those offenders who entered CC with multiple offenses, only the highest offense was taken into consideration in the calculation of percentages. Across the four CC sites, a total of 7,588 misdemeanors were reported. The most commonly reported misdemeanor was A misdemeanor (N=4,397) followed by C misdemeanor (N=1,880). A total of 13,946 felonies were reported across the four CC sites. The most commonly reported felony was D felony (N=8,489), which is consistent with 2009 statistics about the highest reported offense of incarcerated offenders in Indiana (Indiana Department of Correction, 2009). C felons (N=3,124) and

B felons (N=1,811) were the second and third most commonly reported offense types, which too is consistent with the IDOC 2009 offender population statistics. **Table 5** provides additional information about offense severity in the four CC sites.

#### *Risk and Need.*

Assessing and addressing offenders' risks and needs are a core part of the CC philosophy. A risk assessment provides a score that corresponds to a particular risk/need level, which is then used to determine the level of risk and the appropriate intervention. Indiana Community Corrections commonly use the Level System Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) (Andrews & Bonta, 2001). The LSI-R is a quantitative survey that evaluates an offender's criminogenic risks and needs and helps guide corrections' decision making related to appropriate levels of supervision and treatment.

**Table 11: Repeat Offender Information Across CC Sites**

Repeat Offense Descriptive	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
# Repeats Reported	2,393	3,646	1,964	222	8,225
Maximum Repeats	11	10	4	6	7.75
Minimum Repeats	2	2	2	2	2
Mean Repeats	2.61	2.33	2.03	2.68	2.41

**Table 5: Offense Severity across CC Sites**

Level of Severity	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
None	0	1 (.01%)	0	2 (.3%)	3 (.01%)
Infraction/Status	4 (.1%)	0	1 (.1%)	0	5 (.01%)
Delinquency Offense/ Formal Probation	0	0	2 (.1%)	0	2 (.01%)
<b>C Misdemeanor</b>	1,249 (18.6%)	297 (2.4%)	212 (10.8%)	122 (17.3%)	1,880 (8.7%)
<b>B Misdemeanor</b>	507 (7.6%)	69 (.6%)	134 (6.8%)	100 (14.1%)	810 (3.8%)
<b>A Misdemeanor</b>	1,876 (28%)	1805 (14.8%)	374 (19%)	342 (48.4%)	4,397 (20.4%)
<b>A Misdemeanor filed as D Felony</b>	52 (.8%)	5 (.01%)	432 (22%)	12 (1.7%)	501 (2.3%)
<b>D Felony</b>	2,132 (31.8%)	5,643 (46.3%)	616 (31.4%)	98 (13.9%)	8,489 (39.4%)
<b>C Felony</b>	537 (8%)	2,464 (20.2%)	102 (5.2%)	21 (3%)	3,124 (14.5%)
<b>B Felony</b>	323 (4.8%)	1,399 (11.5%)	84 (4.3%)	5 (.7%)	1,811 (8.4%)
<b>A Felony</b>	17 (.3%)	492 (4%)	6 (.3%)	3 (.4%)	518 (2.4%)
<b>M Murder</b>	4 (.1%)	0	0	0	4 (.01%)
<b>Other</b>	0	2 (.01%)	0	2 (.3%)	4 (.01%)

In the present sample, a total of 8,084 risk scores were provided out of 21,549 offenders for all four CC sites. Overall, the maximum risk score for the four sites was 45 and the minimum was 0, with an average risk score of 13.93. The LSI-R manual provides information about the meaning of risk scores: Scores ranging between 0 and 13 are indicative of low risks and needs; scores between 14 and 23 represent low-moderate risks and needs; 24-33 indicates moderate risks and needs; 34-40

indicates medium-high risks and needs; and 41-47 indicates high risks and needs (see **Table 6**).

There were significant differences in the overall mean risk scores across counties. At the upper end, Site 3 reports a mean initial risk level of 26.11 which corresponds to a moderate risk and need level. On the low end, Site 2 had a mean score of 9.3, indicating low risks and needs. None of the counties served high-risk individuals.

**Table 6: Offender Risk Scores across CC Sites**

Risk Score Descriptive	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
# of Scores Reported	1,968	5,324	774	18	8,084
Maximum Score	45	45	45	24	45
Minimum Score	0	0	0	3	0
Mean Risk Score	21.51	9.36	26.11	11.28	13.93

In addition to risk scores, many offenders were assigned a risk level. Of those offenders who were given a risk level, the majority was placed in the “medium” to “high” categories. Community corrections sites used the term “medium” rather than the term moderate used by the LSI-R; therefore, it is our best guess that the four sites use the term “medium” in place of “moderate”. It should be noted that Site 2 had a greater number of medium-level offenders than Site 1 and 3, which had a greater number of high-level offenders. Only .5% of the sample fell within the low category and no offenders fell within the low-medium category, according to the risk labels provided by the four sites. Interestingly, in Site 1, almost every offender was classified as high risk. **Table 7** provides a breakdown of the risk levels in the three sites that provided risk data.

The data indicate that the risk level assigned to offenders in the four sites does not correspond to offenders’ risk score on the LSI-R. In other words, an offender that receives a low score may be assigned a higher risk level. This suggests that risk scores are not the only criteria used to determine an offender’s risk level; and it is possible that community corrections staff use their professional judgment to assign a risk level and thus “override” the results of standardized assessment. The data suggest that the act of overriding assessment results is fairly common. Across the four sites, a total of 4,703 offenders

(58% of all offenders with a risk score) were placed in a “risk level” category that was higher than the one corresponding to their risk score. Specifically, 2,493 offenders received scores indicative of low risk, yet were assigned a high-risk level; likewise, 2,210 offenders scored in the low to low-moderate range, yet were assigned a medium risk level. In addition, 61 offenders (less than .1% of the total number of offenders provided a risk score) were prescribed a risk level lower than what their risk score indicated. Specifically, 38 offenders were assigned a low risk level when their score suggested the need for a higher risk level and 23 offenders were assigned a medium risk level when their score indicated a higher level. It is worth noting that in most instances the data included information about offenders’ risk score or risk level. More often than not, both scores and levels were not reported. Thus the conclusions of this report rest on incomplete information.

In short, the majority of offenders (58%) in the three sites that provided information about risk scores and risk levels were labeled as medium to high risk offenders, regardless of their risk score. According to the LSI-R, those offenders with a medium risk level have approximately a 57.3% chance of recidivism and those with high risk have approximately a 76% chance of recidivism (Andrews & Bonta, 2001). The proportion of medium and high risk offenders to low risk offenders in this sam-

The risk level assigned to offenders does not correspond to offenders’ risk score on the LSI-R.

Actually, only .7% of offenders have a high risk level.

**Table 7: Risk Level Distribution across CC Sites**

Risk Level	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
Low	1 (.01%)	40 (.3%)	76 (12.2%)	-	117 (.5%)
Low-Medium	0	0	0	-	0 (0%)
Medium	0	5,533 (45.4%)	226 (36.3%)	-	5,759 (26.7%)
High	3,538 (52.8%)	656 (5.4%)	316 (50.8%)	-	4,510 (20.9%)

\*No data were reported for Site 4.

ple suggests that either some offenders are misclassified as high risk/need level when in fact they have low to moderate risks/needs. It may also suggest that offenders involved in community corrections are in need of high levels of services under close supervision to mitigate the high chance of recidivism.

#### *Adjusted Risk Levels.*

To better understand how Community Corrections use standardized risk assessment to make programming decisions, we looked at the percentage of offenders with low, low-medium, medium and high-risk level in each component based on the information reported by each site (Table 9). As mentioned above, this information shows that the sites do not follow the guidelines of the LSI-R manual in determining offenders' risk level based on their assessment score. Therefore, to obtain a more accurate picture, we used the LSI-R manual to reclassify offenders into the appropriate risk level categories (Table 10). The goal is to see if the variation in risk classification changes our understanding of the effectiveness of Indiana Community Corrections.

When recalculated, only .7% of offenders (n= 59) have a high risk level; 4% (n= 325) have a medium-high level; 17.5% (n= 1418) have a moderate level; 28.4% (n= 2294)

have a low-moderate level; and 49.3% (n= 3988) have a low level (see Table 8).

The mean risk scores for both Site 2 (9.36) and 4 (11.28) were in the low risk range while the mean for Site 1 (21.51) was in the low-moderate range and Site 3 (26.11) in the moderate range. The distribution of offenders across risk levels for all four sites are lower than expected compared to the large number of medium and high risk levels assigned by CC (Table 6). In other words, there is a significant discrepancy between the low number of offenders (n= 59) whose risk scores actually correspond to a high-risk level and the high number of offenders (n= 9,020) who are placed in the category "high risk level."

Before we reclassified offenders into the appropriate risk/need category, we examined what program component they participated in based on the risk level they were assigned by community corrections staff. We found that the majority of offenders with high-risk levels were placed under home detention and day reporting (Table 9). Offenders with medium risk levels participated in work release and home detention. It is worth noting that all sites classified most offenders as high risk. Because of the limited distribution of offenders across risk categories, it is difficult to determine whether there is any relationship between level of risk and assigned programming.

**Table 8: Recalculated Risk Level Using LSI-R Standards**

LSI-R Risk Level	Offender N	Offender %
Low Risk	3988	49.3%
Low/Moderate Risk	2294	28.4%
Moderate Risk	1418	17.5%
Medium/High Risk	325	4.0%
High	59	.7%

**Table 9: Overall Risk Level x Program Offender Distribution**

Program	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
Home Detention	89 (1.6%)	0	2639 (46.9%)	2893 (51.5%)
Work Release	3 (.4%)	0	656 (85.5%)	108 (14.1%)
Day Reporting	0	0	32 (1.3%)	2423 (98.7%)
Forensic Diversion	0	0	0	118 (100%)
Community Transition	0	0	151 (66.2%)	77 (33.8%)

The reclassification of offenders into appropriate risk level categories using the LSI-R manual produced the following results: Considerably fewer offenders fall within the medium and high-risk categories. Instead, the majority of offenders were classified as low to moderate risk. Within the low risk category, the majority of offenders participated in home detention, work release, and community transition. For the low/moderate risk level, the majority of offenders participated in day reporting, forensic diversion, and community service. When we compare **Table 10** to **Table 9**, we see that many offenders were classified as higher risk than indicated by their risk score on the LSI-R.

#### *Summary.*

According to the data provided by the four participating sites, the typical profile of an offender under the supervision of Community Corrections is a 34 year-old White male first-time offender who committed a D felony, with a risk score indicative of a low-moderate risk level. Offenders' risk score and corresponding risk level does not appear to determine the type of programming the offender will receive.

## **2. What is the effectiveness of the community corrections program?**

Of the three common outcome measures (risk change, recidivism, and program completion), only program completion data was available for this analysis.

The majority of offenders with high-risk levels were placed under home detention and day reporting.

Program completion is an important yet quite broad outcome measure.

Program	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
Community Service	0	0	0	47 (100%)
Work Crew	6 (4.4%)	0	30 (21.9%)	101 (73.7%)
Thinking for a Change	10 (1.1%)	0	134 (15.1%)	741 (83.7%)
Alcohol & Drug Program	0	0	0	900 (100%)
Community Control	0	0	0	128 (100%)

\*A limited number of offenders received risk levels within each component. The following percentages represent the number of offenders who received risk levels within each program: home detention = 64.2%; work release = 31.2%; day reporting = 98.4%; forensic diversion = 99.2%; community transition = 19.2%; community service = 7%; work crew = 7.5%; thinking for a change = 66.1%; alcohol & drug program = 89.4%; community control = 100%.

The effectiveness of community corrections is a function of offenders' successful completion of programming. However, program completion is an important yet quite broad outcome measure.

There were a number of categories of program completion used in the data.

- Offenders classified as active are those offenders that were still enrolled in a given component at the time of data collection.
- The consecutive category refers to those offenders that participate in a program under multiple cause numbers. In other words, the offender completed a program for one offense, but is serving additional time within CC because of other offenses.
- The inactive category comprises those offenders who have completed the requirements of a program but have not paid their fees or fulfilled other additional requirements dictated by the court.
- Successful completion of a program means that an offender has completed all court ordered requirements and

has paid all associated fees.

- Unsuccessful completions means that an offender failed to complete all necessary requirements or violated the terms of his or her sentence.
- For the purpose of this analysis, statuses other than successful (active, consecutive, inactive, and unsuccessful) were labeled as "other."

Across all four sites (N=13,692), an average of 56.7% participants were successful (N=7,768) and 43.3% were classified as other (N=5,932). Site 1, 2, and 3 reflected similar trends in completion rates while Site 4 was characterized by a higher overall completion rate; however, it should be noted that Site 4 provided completion data for work release only, which meant that a large portion of programming offered to offenders was not represented (**Table 12**). Furthermore, we looked at the relationship between offender completion rate, assigned risk level, and accurate risk level. Success rates were similar across risk levels, with a higher prevalence of successful completion versus other completion (see **Table 12** and **13**).

**Table 10: Overall LSI-R Recalculated Risk Level x Program Offender Distribution**

Program	Low	Low/Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
Home Detention	2446 (55%)	1299 (29.2%)	603 (13.6%)	92 (2.1%)	8 (.2%)
Work Release	530 (43.7%)	440 (36.2%)	213 (17.5%)	30 (2.5%)	1 (.1%)
Day Reporting	209 (19.8%)	500 (47.3%)	299 (28.3%)	47 (4.4%)	2 (.2%)
Forensic Diversion	8 (7.6%)	57 (54.3%)	36 (34.4%)	4 (3.8%)	0
Community Transition	297 (54%)	178 (32.4%)	69 (12.5%)	6 (1.1%)	0
Community Service	7 (31.8%)	10 (45.5%)	5 (22.7%)	0	0
Work Crew	25 (13.3%)	40 (21.3%)	93 (49.5%)	22 (11.7%)	8 (4.3%)
Thinking for a Change	114 (12.5%)	332 (36.2%)	336 (36.6%)	108 (11.8%)	28 (3.1%)
Alcohol & Drug Program	93 (10.9%)	411 (48.1%)	306 (35.8%)	43 (5%)	1 (.1%)
Community Control	19 (15.6%)	54 (44.3%)	37 (30.3%)	12 (9.8%)	0

\*A limited number of offenders received risk scores within each component. The following percentages represent the number of offenders who received risk scores within each program: home detention = 51%; work release = 49%; day reporting = 42%; forensic diversion = 88%; community transition = 46%; community service = .03%; work crew = 10%; Thinking for a Change = 69%; alcohol & drug program = 85%; community control = 95%.

### 3. What is the effectiveness of the required components of Community Corrections?

Using the same approach, the completion rates of each CC component can be determined. Completion of a program component is a broad measure of the effectiveness of the components. Completion rates were calculated using the data provided by community corrections for each potential offender category: active, consecutive, inactive, successful, and unsuccessful. To evaluate the effectiveness of community corrections components, we looked at the completion rates of each of

the seven mandated community corrections components (Indiana Code 11-12-1) in which community corrections is defined as a program composed of seven elements or components which correspond to different levels of community-based supervision). The components include: Home detention, work release, day reporting, forensic diversion, community transitions, community service, and work crew.

#### *Home Detention.*

Home detention is a type of home confinement where the offender is able

**Table 12: Completion Totals Across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
<b>Total N</b>	6,701	12,177	1,964	707	13,692
<b>Successful</b>	59.6%	54.6%	56.6	82%*	56.7%
<b>Other</b>	40.4%	45.4%	43.3%	18%*	43.3%
<b>Missing N</b>	2,363	4,694	215	585	7,857

\*Only accounts for work release component due to missing data for home detention component.

**Table 13: Completion Totals by Risk Level**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
<b>Total N</b>	80	-	3,339	3,963
<b>Successful</b>	50 (63%)	0	1,832 (55%)	2,327 (59%)
<b>Other</b>	30 (37%)	0	1,507 (45%)	1,636 (41%)

to carry out their daily activities (e.g. work, school, health and legal appointments, court-ordered obligations) under close supervision. Of the four counties in this study 75% offered this component. A total of 8,256 offenders were served across the 3 counties that offer this component. The most common offense severity categories for offenders receiving this component were D Felony (N = 3694) and A Misdemeanor (N = 1835). The overall completion rate for home detention (N = 8,256; average duration: 165.25 days) was: 12.8% active (N=1,050), .3% consecutive (N=27), 3.3% inactive (N=273), 61.1% successful (N=5,043), and 22.6% unsuccessful (N=1,863). Thus, home detention was deemed to be effective with offenders 61.1% of the time across the sites. Individual sites reflected similar trends in completion rates (Table 15). Taking into consideration the risk level of offenders, the successful completion of home detention followed similar patterns across risk levels. According to the recalculated risk

levels, the successful completion rates of home detention was much higher for low risk offenders (63%), versus more severe offenders with completion rates for offenders in the low-moderate, moderate, medium/high, and high risk category being 49%, 40%, 36%, and 50% respectively. These findings suggest that home detention was more effective with lower risk offenders. It is important to note that while a large number of offenders received home detention in County 4, no completion data was provided; thus, the frequencies for home detention completion do not represent the entirety of the four participating CC sites (Table 16 and 17).

#### *Work Release.*

This component allows inmates to maintain employment while living in a jail or in a community treatment center. Of the four counties in this study, 75% offered this component. A total of 2,457 offenders were served across the 3 counties that offer this component. The most common

**Table 14: Completion Totals by Risk Level (Re-Coded by LSI-R Standards)**

Completion	Low	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
<b>Total N</b>	2,707	1,858	1,125	226	42
<b>Successful</b>	1,605 (59%)	1,075 (58%)	669 (59%)	120 (53%)	28 (67%)
<b>Other</b>	1,102 (41%)	783 (42%)	456 (41%)	106 (47%)	14 (33%)

**Table 15: Home Detention Completion across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
<b>Active</b>	6.4%	15.3%	20.5%	-	12.8%
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	.5%	0	-	.3%
<b>Inactive</b>	1%	4.7%	0	-	3.3%
<b>Successful</b>	66.7%	57.7%	67.4%	-	61.1%
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	25.9%	21.7%	12.2%	-	22.60%

**Table 16: Home Detention Completion across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
<b>Total N</b>	89	-	2,639	2,893
<b>Active</b>	18 (20%)	0	260 (10%)	193 (7%)
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	6 (.2%)	0
<b>Inactive</b>	0	0	113 (4%)	28 (1%)
<b>Successful</b>	57 (64%)	0	1635 (62%)	1937 (67%)
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	14 (16%)	0	625 (24%)	735 (25%)

offense severity categories for offenders receiving this component were D Felony (N = 764) and A Misdemeanor (N = 530). The overall completion rate for work release (N=2,457; average duration: 106.8 days) was: 12.2% active (N=299), .3% consecutive (N=7), 4.1% inactive (N=101),

48.5% successful (N=1,191), and 35% unsuccessful (N=859). Thus, work release was deemed to be effective with offenders 48.5% of the time across the sites. Site 3 did not offer work release as a program component. Site 1 and Site 2 reflected similar trends in completion rates. Site 4

**Table 17: Home Detention Completion by Risk Level (Re-Coded by LSI-R Standards)**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
<b>Total N</b>	2,446	1,298	603	92	8
<b>Active</b>	400 (16%)	324 (25%)	122 (20%)	10 (11%)	2 (25%)
<b>Consecutive</b>	13 (.5%)	4 (.3%)	1 (.2%)	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	43 (2%)	42 (3%)	9 (1.5%)	1 (1%)	0
<b>Successful</b>	1,534 (63%)	635 (49%)	238 (40%)	33 (36%)	4 (50%)
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	456 (18%)	294 (22%)	233 (38%)	48 (52%)	2 (25%)

**Table 18: Work Release Completion across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
<b>Active</b>	4%	16.5%	-	2%	12.2%
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	.4%	-	0	.3%
<b>Inactive</b>	0	6.1%	-	1%	4.1%
<b>Successful</b>	57.9%	42%	-	85.9%	48.5%
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	38.1%	35%	-	11.1%	35%

had a much higher success rate at 85.9% (Table 18). Taking into consideration the risk level of offenders, the successful completion of work release followed similar patterns across risk levels. According to these findings, it appears that work release is equally successful across all risk levels (Table 19 and 20).

#### *Day Reporting.*

This component is designed for offenders who require low to high levels of surveillance. It provides close supervision including daily contact with a case officer, as well as referral or/and treatment services such as case management, substance abuse treatment, employment and life

skills programs. Of the four counties in this study, 50% offered this component. A total of 2,494 offenders were served across the 2 counties that offer this component. The most common offense severity categories for offenders receiving this component were D Felony (N = 802) and A Misdemeanor (N = 715). The overall completion rate for day reporting (N=2,494; average duration: 91.2 days) was: 6.4% active (N=159), 0% consecutive, 1% inactive (N=26), 66.6% successful (N=1,661), and 26% unsuccessful (N=648). Thus, day reporting was deemed to be effective with offenders 66.6% of the time across the sites. Both Site 1 and 2 reflected similar trends in completion

**Table 19: Work Release Completion Totals by Risk Level**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
<b>Total N</b>	3	0	656	104
<b>Active</b>	0	0	99 (15%)	3 (3%)
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	2 (.3%)	0
<b>Inactive</b>	0	0	43 (6%)	0
<b>Successful</b>	3 (100%)	0	286 (44%)	29 (28%)
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	0	0	226 (34%)	72 (69%)

**Table 20: Work Release Completion Totals by Risk Level (Re-Coded by LSI-R Standards)**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
<b>Total N</b>	530	440	213	30	1
<b>Active</b>	80 (15%)	119 (27%)	34 (16%)	4 (13%)	0
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	1 (.5%)	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	21 (4%)	29 (7%)	16 (7%)	4 (13%)	0
<b>Successful</b>	259 (49%)	185 (42%)	86 (40%)	6 (20%)	0
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	170 (32%)	107 (24%)	76 (37%)	16 (53%)	1 (100%)

rates while day reporting were not offered at Site 3 and 4 (Table 21). Taking into consideration the risk level of offenders, the successful completion of day reporting followed similar patterns across risk levels. According to the recalculated risk levels, the successful completion rates of day reporting was much higher for low risk offenders (76%) versus more severe offenders with completion rates in the low-moderate (53%), moderate (27%), me-

dium/high (26%) categories. These findings indicate that the program completion rate of day reporting was significantly higher for low and low-moderate risk level offenders (Table 22 and 23).

#### *Forensic Diversion.*

Forensic Diversion is a referral program that targets individuals diagnosed with a serious mental illness and/or a co-occurring substance use disorder. It works

**Table 21: Day Reporting Completion across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
Active	6.5%	0	-	-	6.4%
Consecutive	0	0	-	-	0
Inactive	1%	2%	-	-	1%
Successful	66.7%	63.3%	-	-	66.6%
Unsuccessful	25.8%	34.7%	-	-	26%

**Table 22: Day Reporting Completion Totals by Risk Level**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
Total N	0	0	32	2423
Active	0	0	0	159 (7%)
Consecutive	0	0	0	0
Inactive	0	0	0	24 (1%)
Successful	0	0	25 (78%)	1,614 (67%)
Unsuccessful	0	0	7 (22%)	626 (26%)

**Table 23: Day Reporting Completion Totals by Risk Level (Re-Coded by LSI-R Standards)**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
Total N	209	500	350	47	2
Active	19 (9%)	61 (12%)	32 (9%)	2 (4%)	0
Consecutive	0	0	0	0	0
Inactive	0	5 (1%)	1 (.3%)	0	0
Successful	158 (76%)	266 (53%)	93 (27%)	12 (26%)	0
Unsuccessful	32 (15%)	168 (34%)	173 (49%)	33 (70%)	2 (100%)

**Table 24: Forensic Diversion Completion across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
Active	29.4%	-	-	-	29.4%
Consecutive	0	-	-	-	0
Inactive	11.8%	-	-	-	11.8%
Successful	37%	-	-	-	37%

\*forensic diversion data not reported for sites 2, 3, and 4.

**Table 25: Forensic Diversion Completion Totals by Risk Level**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
Total N	0	0	0	118
Active	0	0	0	34 (29%)
Consecutive	0	0	0	0
Inactive	0	0	0	14 (12%)
Successful	0	0	0	44 (37%)
Unsuccessful	0	0	0	26 (22%)

to divert offenders with mental health problems from jail by referring them to appropriate community-based services. Of the four counties in this study, one (25%) offered this component. A total of 119 offenders were served in the county that offered this component. The most common offense severity category for offenders receiving this component were D Felony (N =101). The overall completion rate for the forensic diversion component (N=119; average duration: 215.5 days) was: 29.4% active (N=35), 0% consecutive, 11.8% inactive (N=14), 37% successful (N=44), and 21.8% unsuccessful (N=26). Thus, forensic diversion was deemed to be effective with offenders 37% of the time in Site 1 (**Table 24**). Taking into consideration the risk level of offenders, the successful comple-

tion of forensic diversion followed similar patterns across risk levels. Due to the low number of offenders in each risk level, meaningful interpretations are limited (**Table 25** and **26**).

#### *Community Transition.*

This component is designed to assist inmates in returning to the community and includes supervision by probation or by a local community corrections program. Of the four counties in this study two (50%) offered this component. A total of 1,187 offenders were served across the 2 counties that offer this component. The most common offense severity categories for offenders receiving this component were C Felony (N = 472) and B Felony (N = 324). The overall completion rate for commu-

For the most part, offenders who participate in Community Transition have a B or C felony.

**Table 26: Forensic Diversion Completion Totals by Risk Level (Re-Coded by LSI-R Standards)**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
<b>Total N</b>	8	57	36	4	0
<b>Active</b>	1 (13%)	19 (33%)	13 (36%)	0	0
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	2 (24%)	9 (16%)	1 (3%)	0	0
<b>Successful</b>	5 (63%)	21 (37%)	14 (39%)	2 (50%)	0
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	0	8 (14%)	8 (22%)	2 (50%)	0

**Table 27: Community Transition Completion across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
<b>Active</b>	5.6%	7.2%	-	-	7.1%
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	-	-	0
<b>Inactive</b>	0	1.3%	-	-	1.2%
<b>Successful</b>	76.1%	71%	-	-	71.3%
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	18.3%	20.6%	-	-	20.5%

\*community transition data not reported for Sites 3 and 4.

**Table 28: Community Transition Completion Totals by Risk Level**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
<b>Total N</b>	0	0	151	77
<b>Active</b>	0	0	5 (3%)	6 (8%)
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	0	0	4 (3%)	0
<b>Successful</b>	0	0	113 (75%)	58 (75%)
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	0	0	29 (19%)	13 (17%)

**Table 29: Community Transition Completion Totals by Risk Level (Re-Coded by LSI-R Standards)**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
<b>Total N</b>	297	178	69	6	0
<b>Active</b>	23 (8%)	30 (17%)	5 (7%)	1 (17%)	0
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	4 (1%)	3 (2%)	2 (3%)	0	0
<b>Successful</b>	221 (74%)	121 (68%)	46 (67%)	2 (33%)	0
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	49 (16%)	24 (13%)	16 (23%)	3 (50%)	0

nity transition (N=1,187; Average duration: 73.9 days) was: 7.1% active (N=84), 0% consecutive, 1.2% inactive (N=14), 71.3% successful (N=846), and 20.5% unsuccessful (N=243). Thus, community transition was deemed to be effective with offenders 71.3% of the time across the sites. Both Site 1 and 2 reflected similar trends in completion rates while community transition was not offered at Site 3 and 4 (Table 27). Taking into consideration the risk level of offenders, the successful completion of community transition programming followed similar patterns across risk levels. According to the recalculated risk levels, the successful completion rates of community transition were high for offenders in the low risk (74%), low moderate (68%), and moderate (67%) risk levels. These findings suggest that community transition was successfully completed by a high rate of offenders from a wide range of risk levels (Table 28 and 29).

#### *Community Service.*

This component is used as a form of non-incarcerative sanction requiring offenders to work without pay for public or not-for-profit corporations, associa-

tions, institutions, or agencies. Of the four counties in this study one (25%) offered this component. A total of 672 offenders were served in the county that offered this component. The most common offense severity categories for offenders receiving this component were A Misdemeanor (N = 361) and C Misdemeanor (N = 173). The overall completion rate for community service (N=672; Average duration: 82.4 days) was: 4% active (N=27), 0% consecutive, 0% inactive, 60.4% successful (N=406), and 35.6% unsuccessful (N=239). Thus, community service was deemed to be effective with offenders 60.4% of the time in Site 1, which was the only site offering this component (Table 30). Taking into consideration the risk level of offenders, the successful completion of community service varied across risk levels. According to the recalculated risk levels, the successful completion rates of day reporting were much higher for low-moderate risk offenders (64%), moderate (76%), and medium (91%) versus low (14%) risk levels. From these findings, we may infer that program completion in community service was significantly higher for more severe offenders (Table 31 and 32).

The higher the level of risk, the more likely an offender is to complete community service.

**Table 30: Community Service Completion across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
Active	4%	-	-	-	4%
Consecutive	0	-	-	-	0
Inactive	0	-	-	-	0
Successful	60.4%	-	-	-	60.4%
Unsuccessful	35.6%	-	-	-	35.6%

\*community service data not reported for Sites 2, 3, and 4.

**Table 31: Community Service Completion Totals by Risk Level**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
Total N	1	0	83	416
Active	0	0	0	24 (6%)
Consecutive	0	0	0	0
Inactive	0	0	0	0
Successful	0	0	10 (12%)	384 (92%)
Unsuccessful	1 (100%)	0	73 (88%)	8 (2%)

#### *Work Crew.*

This component provides low-risk offenders opportunities to meet court-ordered requirements (e.g. fines and community service hours) through working. Of the four counties in this study two (50%) offered this component. A total of 1,840 offenders were served across the two sites that offer this component. The most common offense severity categories for offenders receiving this component were A Misdemeanor (N = 566), D Felony (N = 368), and C Misdemeanor (N = 367). The overall completion rate for work crew (N=1,840; Average duration: 82.4 days) was: 12.4% active (N=229), 0% consecutive, .1% inactive (N=2), 59.8% successful (N=1,100), and 27.7% unsuccessful (N=509). Thus, work crew was deemed

to be effective with offenders 59.8% of the time across the sites. Both Site 1 and Site 3 reflected similar trends in completion rates while work crew were not offered at Site 2 and 4 (Table 33). Taking into consideration the risk level of offenders, the successful completion of work crew followed a pattern similar to that of community service. According to the LSI-R risk levels, the successful completion rate of work crew was much higher for low-moderate risk offenders (57%), moderate (67%), and medium (74%) versus low (18%) risk levels. These findings indicate that program completion of work crew was significantly higher for more severe offenders (Table 34 and 35).

**Table 32: Community Service Completion Totals by Risk Level (Re-Coded by LSI-R Standards)**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
<b>Total N</b>	97	118	97	23	2
<b>Active</b>	4 (4%)	0	3 (3%)	0	0
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Successful</b>	14 (14%)	75 (64%)	74 (76%)	21 (91%)	2 (100%)
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	79 (81%)	43 (36%)	20 (21%)	2 (9%)	0

**Table 33: Work Crew Completion across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
<b>Active</b>	4%	-	17.3%	-	12.4%
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Inactive</b>	0	-	.2%	-	.1%
<b>Successful</b>	60.4%	-	59.4%	-	59.8%
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	35.6%	-	23.1%	-	27.7%

\*work crew data not reported for Sites 2 and 4

**Table 34: Work Crew Completion Totals by Risk Level**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
<b>Total N</b>	1	0	117	501
<b>Active</b>	0	0	4 (3%)	34 (7%)
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Successful</b>	0	0	28 (24%)	421 (84%)
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	1 (100%)	0	85 (73%)	46 (9%)

Home detention was the most commonly mandated component.

**Table 35: Work Crew Completion Totals by Risk Level (Re-Coded by LSI-R Standards)**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
<b>Total N</b>	123	157	147	34	6
<b>Active</b>	15 (12%)	7 (4%)	6 (4%)	2 (6%)	0
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Successful</b>	22 (18%)	90 (57%)	99 (67%)	25 (74%)	4 (67%)
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	86 (70%)	60 (38%)	42 (29%)	7 (10%)	2 (33%)

*Summary.*

Of the seven components offered by the four sites, home detention was the most commonly mandated component (N=8,756). With regard to successful completion, home detention was the third most effective component with a successful completion rate of 61.1% and an unsuccessful rate of 22.6%. Day reporting was the second most frequently implemented component (N=2,494) across two sites. Day reporting was characterized by the second highest successful completion rate with 66.6% of offenders completing successfully and 26% unsuccessfully. The third most utilized component was work release (N=2,457) across three sites. However, despite its prevalent implementation, work release had the second lowest successful completion rate (48.5%) and the second highest unsuccessful completion rate (35%). Forensic Diversion was implemented at one site and was the least utilized component (N=119). Forensic diversion also had the lowest successful completion rate (37%) with 21.8% unsuccessful and 29.4% still active at the time of data collection. A final interesting trend in the data was that community transition was the fourth least utilized component (N=1,187), but yielded the highest comple-

tion rate (71.3%) and the lowest unsuccessful completion rate (20.5%). None of the sites offered electronic monitoring alone.

**4. What is the effectiveness of community corrections services?**

To evaluate the effectiveness of community corrections services, we looked at the completion rates of three programs: Community Control, Alcohol & Drug Programs, and Thinking for a Change, the three most prevalent services offered in Indiana Community corrections.

*Community Control.*

Community Control involves the joint supervision of serious and violent offenders who are on adult probation. Only one of the counties in this study offered Community Control. The most common offense severity categories for offenders receiving this service were D Felony (N = 49) and C Felony (N = 38). The overall completion rate of this service in Site 1 (N=128; average duration: 193.1 days) was (Table 36): 20.3% active (N=26), 0% consecutive, 0% inactive, 27.3% successful (N=35), and 52.3% unsuccessful (N=67). Community Control in Site 1 appears

**Table 36: Community Control Completion across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
Active	20.3%	-	-	-	20.3%
Consecutive	0	-	-	-	0
Inactive	0	-	-	-	0
Successful	27.3%	-	-	-	27.3%
Unsuccessful	52.3%	-	-	-	52.3%

\*Community Control data not reported for Sites 2, 3, and 4.

**Table 37: Community Control Completion Totals by Risk Level**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
Total N	1	0	38	16
Active	0	0	9 (24%)	4 (25%)
Consecutive	0	0	0	0
Inactive	0	0	0	0
Successful	0	0	7 (18%)	4 (25%)
Unsuccessful	1 (100%)	0	22 (58%)	8 (50%)

**Table 38: Community Control Completion Totals by Risk Level (Re-Coded by LSI-R Standards)**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
Total N	37	17	9	1	0
Active	11 (30%)	1 (6%)	1 (10%)	1 (100%)	0
Consecutive	0	0	0	0	0
Inactive	0	0	0	0	0
Successful	8 (22%)	4 (24%)	0	0	0
Unsuccessful	18 (49%)	12 (70%)	8 (90%)	0	0

to be effective with offenders 27.3% of the time. The percentage of successful completion for offenders with medium and high-risk levels was 18 and 25 percent respectively (Table 37). We used offenders' scores on the LSI-R to determine what risk level category they actually fell into and found that most offenders in community control should have been assigned a low to low-moderate risk level (Table 38). Given the low number of offenders participating in this program (n = 128), meaningful interpretations of the data are limited. With so little data related to community control, one cannot make accurate statements about the effectiveness of the program in general.

#### *Alcohol & Drug Programs.*

This is a broad category used by some community corrections sites to describe services provided to offenders that target drug and alcohol treatment needs. Only one site offered substance abuse programming. The most common offense severity categories for offenders receiving this service were D Felony (N = 567) and C Felony (N = 163). The completion status of offenders who participated in an alcohol and drug program in Site 1 (N=1,007; average duration: N/A) was: 12.7% active (N=128), 0% consecutive, .5% inactive (N=5), 35.6% successful (N=358), and 51.2% unsuccessful (N=516). For the purpose of these analyses categories other than successful and unsuccessful were not included when making interpretations

**Table 39: Alcohol & Drug Program Completion across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
Active	12.7%	-	-	-	12.7%
Consecutive	0	-	-	-	0
Inactive	.5%	-	-	-	.5%
Successful	35.6%	-	-	-	35.6%
Unsuccessful	51.2%	-	-	-	51.2%

\*Alcohol & Drug Treatment data not reported for Sites 2, 3, and 4.

**Table 40: Alcohol & Drug Program Completion Totals by Risk Level**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
Total N	0	0	0	896
Active	0	0	0	0
Consecutive	0	0	0	113 (13%)
Inactive	0	0	0	0
Successful	0	0	0	305 (34%)
Unsuccessful	0	0	0	478 (53%)

of the data. In other words, substance abuse services in Site 1 were successfully completed 35.6% of the time (Table 39). Using offenders' LSI-R score, we looked at completion rates by risk levels and found that the successful completion rates of substance abuse programs was much higher for low risk offenders (53%) than low-moderate (39%), moderate (23%), and medium/high (14%) offenders (Table 40 and 41). These findings indicate that low risk offenders are more likely to stay in alcohol and drug treatment than moderate and high-risk offenders.

#### *Thinking for a Change.*

Thinking for a Change is a cognitive-behavioral based treatment program developed by the National Institute of Correc-

tions that targets criminogenic thinking and risk factors in a group format. It is used by three of the four counties in this study. The most common offense severity categories for offenders receiving this service were D Felony (N = 430) and A Misdemeanor (N = 282). On average, offenders participated in Thinking for a Change service (N=1,339) for 33.9 days, and 60% of them (N=803) completed the program successfully. 25.2% did not complete the program successfully (N=337), 14.2% were still active (N=190), and .7% was inactive (N=9). Site 1 and Site 4 had similar completion rates: 67.2 and 66.7%. Site 2 did not provide information about their implementation of Thinking for a Change. Site 3 had a large number of offenders still active in the service and a lower percent-

**Table 41: Alcohol & Drug Program Completion Totals by Risk Level (Re-Coded by LSI-R Standards)**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
<b>Total N</b>	93	410	303	43	1
<b>Active</b>	11 (12%)	47 (11%)	43 (14%)	5 (12%)	0
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Successful</b>	49 (53%)	159 (39%)	69 (23%)	6 (14%)	0
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	33 (35%)	204 (50%)	191 (63%)	32 (74%)	1 (100%)

**Table 42: Thinking for a Change Completion across CC Sites**

Completion Status	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Total
<b>Active</b>	5%	-	41.8%	2%	14.2%
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	-	0	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	.9%	-	0	0	.7%
<b>Successful</b>	67.2%	-	38.8%	66.7%	60%
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	26.9%	-	19.4%	31.4%	25.2%

There is a total of 62 programming profiles.

age of offenders who successfully completed the program (Table 42). Thus, according to the data provided by the sites, Thinking for a Change appeared to be a relatively short-term treatment with high completion rates. Using offenders' LSI-R scores, we looked at the rates of successful completion by offenders' actual risk level and noted that these rates differed from the overall successful completion rate. Offenders with low and low-moderate risk levels were more likely to complete the program (78% and 71% respectively) than moderate (48%), medium/high (36%), and high (7%) risk offenders. These findings indicate that Thinking for a Change was more successful in engaging low-risk offenders.

##### 5. What combinations of components and services do offenders participate in? What are the outcomes of these combinations?

It is typical for offenders to participate in several community corrections components and services either simultaneously or consecutively. In this section, we identify the most common combinations of components and services, and look at the outcomes of these combinations or programming profiles. In particular, we

examine the successful completion rate of each profile.

We found a total of 62 programming profiles in all four sites. Nine of these profiles were most common, that is, they accounted for approximately 90% of the programming offenders received. Home detention was the most frequent profile with 39% of offenders participating in that component. The second most common profile was home detention combined with day reporting with 13.2% of all offenders participating in both components either simultaneously or consecutively. This finding indicates that the majority of offenders receive the same combinations of programming, home detention alone or home detention with day reporting, while under the supervision of Community Corrections.

There were nine common programming profiles used in the four counties surveyed. Five of the most common programming profiles correspond to a component alone and four consists of multiple components (see Table 45). Success rates of stand-alone and combined components are similar (Table 46). In other words, combining components does not increase the rate of successful completion. Only, home detention with day reporting ap-

**Table 43: Thinking for a Change Completion Totals by Risk Level**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Medium	Medium	High
<b>Total N</b>	10	0	134	733
<b>Active</b>	0	0	56 (42%)	87 (12%)
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Successful</b>	10 (100%)	0	62 (46%)	449 (61%)
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	0	0	16 (12%)	197 (27%)

**Table 44: Thinking for a Change Completion Totals by Risk Level (Re-Coded by LSI-R Standards)**

Completion Status	Low	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Medium/High	High
<b>Total N</b>	114	326	335	108	28
<b>Active</b>	2 (2%)	25 (8%)	92 (27%)	28 (26%)	20 (71%)
<b>Consecutive</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Inactive</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Successful</b>	89 (78%)	232 (71%)	161 (48%)	39 (36%)	2 (7%)
<b>Unsuccessful</b>	23 (20%)	69 (21%)	82 (24%)	41 (38%)	6 (21%)

peared to have an additive effect. This profile was associated with the second highest success rate (69.3%), following community transition, which had a success rate of 70.5%. Home detention and day reporting alone had a success rate of 61.1% and 66.6% respectively. When these two components were combined, the success rate increased by 3% compared to day reporting alone.

#### *Profiles over time.*

Community Corrections adapts the implementation of its components and services to better match the risks and needs of offenders. This corresponds to the principle of responsivity. Which components and services offenders participate in at what time also depends on the sanctions offenders have received as a result of their status offense and the degree to which they are complying with the terms of their probation. Offenders who fail to complete a program component or who violate the terms of their probation may be placed under higher levels of supervision. On the contrary, offenders who successfully complete the requirements of their probation may be placed under lower levels of supervision. For example, an offender may

participate in work release, community service, and work crew simultaneously within a period of 2 months, while another offender may first participate in work release for 2 months and then transfer to community service and later work crew. Time and order of programming are factors that may moderate the effects of each profile.

To analyze the data using time as a variable, we looked at beginning and end dates of all programming, whether they were simultaneously or sequentially administered. We also looked for gaps in programming. We defined a gap in programming as a period of 2 months between the end of one program and the beginning of a new program. When there was a period of 2 months between the end date of one program and the start date of another program they were labeled as different time periods. A total of 4 time periods were necessary to account for all offenders programming profiles as some offenders received programming during a single time period while others received programming over the span of 4 time periods.

Thus, an offender's programming profile might be divided over the course of

Home detention was the most frequent profile with 39% of offenders participating in that component.

**Table 45: Most Common Programming Profiles in CC**

Profiles of Programming	Offender N	Percent Given	Success Rate
HD	5,579	39%	60%
HD & DR	1,869	13.2%	69.3%
WR	1,324	9.3%	35.5%
WC	1,047	7.3%	62.1%
CTP	966	6.8%	70.5%
T4C	726	5.1%	58.2%
WR, CS, & WC	617	4.3%	62.6%
HD, DR, & ADP	393	2.8%	59.8%
HD & WR	296	2.1%	24.9%

\*HD=Home Detention, DR=Day Reporting, WR=Work Release, WC= Work Crew, CTP= Community Transition Program, T4C= Thinking for a Change, CS= Community Service, ADP= Alcohol and Drug Program

**Table 47: Most Common Programming Profiles in CC Time 1**

CC Profiles Time 1	Offender N	Percent
HD	5,842	41.2%
HD & DR	1,995	14.1%
WR	1,428	10%
WC	1,064	7.5%
CTP	1,020	7.2%
T4C	849	6%
WR, CS, & WC	635	4.5%

**Table 48: Most Common Programming Profiles in CC Time 2**

CC Profiles Time 2	Offender N	Percent
DP	215	22.6%
WR	130	14%
HD	117	12.3%
CTP	111	11.7%

**Table 49: Most Common Programming Profiles in CC Time 3**

CC Profiles Time 3	Offender N	Percent
T4C	24	15.6%
HD	23	15%
HD & DR	22	14.3%
ADP	21	13.6%

**Table 50: Most Common Programming Profiles in CC Time 4**

CC Profiles Time 4	Offender N	Percent
HD & DR	10	37%
HD	7	26%
ADP	5	18.5%

4 separate time periods. It appears that most offenders participate in multiple program components simultaneously rather than sequentially. We examined the distribution of all nine profiles across the four time categories, and found 238 time-profile combinations.

In summary, the inclusion of time in determining profiles of programming provides increased specificity on what an offender receives during their participation in community corrections. The majority of offenders receive programming simultaneously over the course of a single time period. In other words, most offenders receive a single dose of programming. Moreover, the most common profiles of programming in community corrections consist of a single component or service.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine who is served by Indiana Community Corrections, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the community corrections program, and its components and services.

According to the data provided by the four participating sites, the typical profile of an offender under the supervision of Community Corrections is a 34 year-old White male first-time offender who committed a D felony, with a risk score indicative of a low-moderate risk level. Offenders' risk score and corresponding risk level does not appear to determine the type of programming the offender will receive.

Of the three indices of effectiveness (recidivism, change in risk level, and program completions), only one (program completion) was available for analysis. Overall, community corrections completion rate was 56.7% successful (N=7,768) and 43.3% unsuccessful (N=5,932). This suggests that a majority of offenders successfully complete community corrections. Of the seven components delivered in the four participating sites, home detention was the most commonly mandated component (N=8,756). Home detention appears to be among the third most successful component in terms of completion with a successful completion rate of 61.1% and an unsuccessful rate of 22.6%. Day

A majority of offenders successfully complete community corrections.

The third most utilized component is work release despite its lowest successful completion rate.

reporting was the second most frequently delivered component (N=2,494) in two sites. Day reporting was characterized by the second highest successful completion rate with 66.6% of offenders completing successfully and 26% unsuccessfully. The third most utilized component was work release (N=2,457). However, despite its prevalence, work release was characterized by the second lowest successful completion rate (48.5%) and the second highest unsuccessful completion rate (35%). Forensic diversion was implemented at one site and was the least utilized component (N=119). Forensic diversion also had the lowest successful completion rate (37%) with 29.4% of offenders still active at the time of data collection. A final interesting trend in the data was that community transition was the fourth least utilized components (N=1,187), but yielded the highest completion rate (71.3%) and the lowest unsuccessful completion rate (20.5%). The average duration of the components ranged from 73.85 days for community transition to 215.5 days for forensic diversion. It should be noted that the data about program duration included outliers that may have inflated the program duration mean. These outliers were left in the data calculations, because we were not able to establish whether they were data entry errors.

The most common service provided in Indiana Community Corrections is Thinking for a Change (N=1,339), which is implemented across three of the four participating sites in this study. The average duration of Thinking for a Change was 33.9 days. Thinking for a Change was also the most effective service in terms of successful program completion with 60% of offenders successfully completing and 25.2% failing to complete successfully. Both alcohol and drug programs (N=1,007) and community control

(N=128) were delivered at one site and produced low completion outcomes. Alcohol and drug programs yielded a successful completion rate of 35.6% and an unsuccessful completion rate of 51.2% while Community Control had a successful completion rate of 27.3% and an unsuccessful completion rate of 52.3%. Of the services offered across the four community corrections sites, Thinking for a Change produced the best outcomes. Because only one site provided data about two of the services above, it is not possible to draw conclusions about the superior effectiveness of Thinking for a Change in Indiana. Further research is needed to evaluate the outcomes of community corrections' services.

In all four sites, offenders received one of nine programming profiles during their involvement in community corrections. The nine most common profiles were home detention, home detention combined with day reporting, work release, work crew, community transition program, thinking for a change, and work release combined with community service and work crew. These nine profiles accounted for 90% of the community corrections programming. This programming is typically offered simultaneously rather than sequentially.

Given budgetary constraints and the rising costs of incarceration, criminal justice systems have turned to offender rehabilitation and community corrections as an alternative to imprisonment (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; McGuire, 2002). They also are asking for evidence that community corrections works to increase public safety. To establish the effectiveness of community corrections, it is crucial that community corrections components and services be evaluated in a systematic manner by examining the rates of successful program completion, recidivism, and

reduction in offenders' risk scores.

The results of this study provide some limited evidence in support of the effectiveness of community corrections in Indiana. In particular, they show that the community corrections program has high completion rates and that not all components are equal in their ability to engage offenders in the rehabilitation process. Some components and services were found to be more effective than others. The findings suggest that most programs were more effective with offenders whose risk levels were low, as determined by their score on the LSI-R. These findings are consistent with the literature on criminogenic risks and needs, which states lower risk offenders require less intensive services and have a lower likelihood of recidivating (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Thus, one would expect low risk offenders to have higher completion rates across programming. Consideration of both outcomes (i.e. completion rates) and risk level makes it possible to answer specific questions about effectiveness. In particular, it helps to specify what works for whom.

This study also identified major gaps in the data available to determine the effectiveness of community corrections. Three criteria (recidivism, change in risk level, and program completion) are commonly used to assess program effectiveness. Although the participants in this study were selected based on the quality and comprehensiveness of the data they collected, information about recidivism and risk level was not available for analysis. This points to troublesome deficits in the data collection system that makes it impossible to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of community corrections in Indiana. The high number of inaccurate and missing data elements also calls attention to the need to reconsider the reliability of the current data collection system.

This study highlights other important issues. Community's corrections sites appear to regularly administer and record LSI-R pre-scores, but more often than not, choose to assign a risk level other than the one suggested by the LSI-R manual. It is possible that community corrections staff have a greater reliance on subjectivity rather than measurement-based risk level classifications. Alternatively, it may be the case that counties have problematic data collection and/or reporting methods.

This study also found that Indiana Community Corrections implements a large number of program profiles during an offender's community-based supervision (N=238). Despite this great variation, 9 programming profiles account for 90% of programming delivered across CC sites. This suggests that while there are numerous options for offender rehabilitation, community corrections staff rely primarily on a small number of programming profiles. Most frequently, they refer offenders to a single component or service or a combination of components and services that are administered simultaneously. There is consistency in programming across sites, which suggests that community corrections are implementing common guidelines or protocols, be they explicit or implicit. As more data related to effectiveness of programming is collected, community corrections sites will be better able to compare programming across sites. Uniformity of programming across sites will become increasingly important as sites move toward the implementation of evidence based practices.

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of this study. First, missing data makes it impossible to present a precise and complete picture of community corrections programming. Second, conclusions about the effectiveness of community corrections are based on

It is crucial that Community Corrections base yearly evaluations on a specific set of behavioral outcomes.

data about program completion only. Although this information is an important outcome measure of community corrections practice, it is also limited in scope. Additional measures of outcome, which would strengthen the case for community corrections effectiveness, are not currently readily available. Last, the sample included four sites deemed representative of Indiana Community Corrections. The four sites provide only a snapshot of the community corrections program in Indiana and do not offer a complete picture of the variety of practices that may exist in other sites. This snapshot is particularly relevant as the data analyzed in this study was highlighted as the state of the art data collection in Indiana CC. Thus, this is the same data that would be evaluated by stakeholders in determining the effectiveness of community corrections.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1. Unifying data reporting/collection mechanisms:

Problems with Community Corrections data seem common. The data is either incomplete, difficult to extract accurately from the current data management systems, or not organized in ways that make it possible to determine the effectiveness of community corrections. This issue could be improved in two potential ways, by using:

- Commonly agreed-upon data elements and formats and
- A common data management system

Some progress has already been made in this area. In August 2010, the IDOC instituted new community corrections data requirements that define what data must be submitted and in what format. The IDOC adopted the recommendations of the CEBP's first year report in designing their new data manual. This change will

significantly improve the ability to specifically evaluate the effectiveness of CC. Notably, the IDOC will focus on user level data, with components specifically identified and outcomes clearly determined. Such outcomes as program completion, risk changes, and recidivism are the core elements of successful program evaluation and are part of these new data requirements.

A common data management system is a more complex task. Currently counties contract one of four independent vendors who each have a different proprietary data management system. These systems vary in their sophistication, applicability, and ease in extracting useful data. The best solution would be for a common web-based data management system that could be used by all community corrections agencies in Indiana. Alternatively, the current data management providers should follow the core data element requirements of the IDOC.

### 2. Adopting common applications of risk measurement tools:

This evaluation found that the counties were using subjective information rather than objective assessment data to determine offenders' risk level. If programming is to be linked to risk level, then risk level assessment must be accurate and reliable within and between all the sites that constitute Indiana Community Corrections. With the advent of the new statewide risk assessment tool developed by the Indiana Judiciary, a more reliable and valid risk measurement system may be available. Our recommendation is for all counties to use that tool in similar ways following the established guidelines to calculate risk levels.

### **3. Basing yearly community corrections evaluations on outcome:**

Ultimately, the outcomes of community corrections are what matters. What is most important is that participants complete the programming they are assigned, reduce their level of risk, and ultimately change their future behavior in a way that helps communities remain safe. Thus, we suggest that the mandated yearly community corrections evaluation be conducted with these outcomes in mind. It would be useful for the IDOC to set clear criteria to guide these community-based evaluations. For the next few years it may also be useful for those evaluations to be analyzed by an independent source, like the Center for Evidence Based Practice, so that a baseline of program completion, risk change, and recidivism may be established. This baseline will serve to assess whether counties are making improvements. Second, we suggest that the quality of services be established. The State has made good progress in this arena through the work of Community Corrections Directors and the IDOC, by emphasizing the principles of effective interventions. Two types of assessment are essential to determine the effectiveness of community corrections: (1) One focused on outcome and (2) one focused on the quality of program implementation.

### **4. Adopting a common language and definition for community corrections components and services:**

The activities of community corrections are determined by Indiana Code 11-12-1. This statute defines seven components and various services. It seems evident from our review of the data that while the titles of components and services are common, the definition and meaning of these terms are not. Without a common definition it is difficult to determine what

components are most helpful in promoting positive outcomes. We suggest that IDOC adopt a common definition of each of the CC components. This will allow for the development of benchmarks for each component that will guide the systematic implementation of the CC program and improve the effectiveness of community corrections.

Some progress has already been made in the area. Indeed, one of the research goals of CEBP this year was to identify a common definition of CC program components. The results and recommendations of that study are available. They could become the foundation of how each county defines components. They could also help to bring practices into line and to determine the correct dosage and sequencing of program components. In addition, they would allow for any program adaptation to be made to better fit the needs of those served by community corrections.



## References

---

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2001). *Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R): Users manual*. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). Rehabilitating criminal justice policy and practice. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 16, 39-55.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2002). Correctional populations in the United States. Available at <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov>
- Center for Evidence-Based Practice. (2009). *A Survey of Current Community Corrections Practices in the Indiana Department of Correction (2007-2009)*. Available at: <http://education.indiana.edu/Portals/418/CEBP%20Survey%20of%20CC%20practices%20in%20IDOC%20%204-8-2010.pdf>
- Crime and Justice Institute. (2004). *Implementing Evidence-Based Practice in Community Corrections: The Principles of Effective Intervention*. Available at: [http://www.cj institute.org/files/Community\\_Corrections\\_BoxSet\\_Oct09.pdf](http://www.cj institute.org/files/Community_Corrections_BoxSet_Oct09.pdf)
- Center for Effective Public Policy. (2010). A Framework for Evidence-Based Decision Making in Local Criminal Justice Systems. Available at: <http://nicic.gov/Library/024372>
- Day, A., & Howells, K. (2002). Psychological treatments for rehabilitating offenders: Evidence-based practice comes of age. *Australian Psychologist*, 37, 39-47.
- Gendreau, P. & Andrews, D. A. (1996). *Correctional program assessment inventory (6th ed.)*. Correctional Services Canada: Ottawa, Canada. Available at [www.csc-scc.gc.ca](http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca).
- Indiana Department of Correction (2009). Offender population statistical report: Calendar year 2009. Division of Research & Planning. Retrieved from <http://www.in.gov/idoc/files/CY2009OffenderPopulation.pdf> on 10/22/2010.
- Kazdin, A. E. (1997). A model for developing effective treatments: Progression and interplay of theory, research and practice. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 26(2), 114-129.

- McGuire, J. (2002). Criminal sanctions versus psychologically-based interventions with offenders: A comparative empirical analysis. *Psychology, Crime, & Law*, 8, 183-208.
- PEW Center on the States (2008). One in 100: Behind bars in America 2008. The PEW Charitable Trusts. Retrieved from [http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/8015PCTS\\_Prison08\\_FINAL2-1-1\\_FORWEB.pdf](http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/8015PCTS_Prison08_FINAL2-1-1_FORWEB.pdf) on 10/22/2010.
- Sackett, D. L., Rosenberg, W. M.C., Gray, J. M., A., Haynes, R. B., Richardson, W. S. (1996). Evidence-based medicine: What it is and what it isn't. *BMJ*, 312, 312-371.
- Schmitt, J., Warner, K., & Gupta, S. (2010). The high budgetary cost of incarceration. Center for Economic and Policy Research: Washington, DC.
- Sexton, T. L., Hanes, C. W., Kinser, J. C. (2010). Translating science into clinical practice. In J. Thomas & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Handbook of Clinical Psychology Competencies* (pp. 153-179). New York: Springer.
- Song, L. & Lieb, R. (1993). Recidivism: The effect of incarceration and length of time served. Washington State Institute for Public Policy retrieved from <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov>
- Spohn, C., & Holleran, D. (2002). The effect of imprisonment on recidivism rates of felony offenders: A focus on drug offenders. *Criminology*, 40(2), 329-357.
- U. S. Census Bureau (2009). U. S. census state & county quickfacts: Indiana. Retrieved from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/18000.html> on 10/22/2010.

# Appendix A

---

## Data Elements Requested of Community Corrections Sites for Analyses

- Offense Severity/Type
- Offense
- Repeat offender?
- Risk Level (as indicated by an assessment)
- Risk Score (as indicated by an assessment)
- Community Corrections Components received by offender
- Community Corrections Services/Programs received by offender
- Dates or some way to determine start and end dates of components/services
- Completion or non-completion of program
- Program Outcomes
- Recidivism (after program completion)
- Re-offense or Violations during probation (and any additional sanctions)
- Age
- Ethnicity
- Gender
- Ideally, Thinking for a Change should be one of the services offered.



## Appendix B

### Coding Protocol

Data was received as an excel spreadsheet format as four separate spreadsheets (1 per community corrections site involved in study). The data was cleaned by removing data entry errors. For example, the data included a 2-year-old offender and a risk score of well above the scaling for the assessment. Data categories were coded as numerical values for statistical analysis purposes (see coding key below). Each spreadsheet included an “other” category with a wide range of identified programming. Because of the wide range of programming under the “other” category meaningful statistical analyses were not possible; thus, we created categories to include the information that was subsumed under the “other” category to allow for accurate analyses. Additional data categories were created to summarize existing data and to provide for additional analyses. Categories included:

- **Component combinations:** This category was used to identify each individual component received by an offender during the period of time included in the data. Data was coded in a specific order to enable analyses that aggregated all components received by an offender.
- **Component timing:** This category

was used to identify if the offender received components in a sequential, simultaneous, mixed manner. This allowed the ability to identify treatment packages and progression of treatments received. This category was coded as sequential if components were administered at different times. This distinction was made if the start and end date of the components did not overlap. Simultaneous was coded if the start and end date of the components did overlap. The mixed category was reserved for offenders that received both simultaneous and sequential components.

- **Component x service combinations:** This category was used to identify each individual component and/or services received by an offender during the period of time included in the data. Data was coded in a specific order to enable analyses that aggregated all components and services received by an offender.
- **Component x service timing:** This category was used to identify if the offender received components and/or services in a sequential, simultaneous, mixed manner. This allowed the ability to identify treatment packages and

progression of treatments received. This category was coded as sequential if components and/or services were administered at different times. This distinction was made if the start and end date of the components and/or services did not overlap. Simultaneous was coded if the start and end date of the components and/or services did overlap. The mixed category was reserved for offenders that received both simultaneous and sequential components and/or services.

- All component completion: This category was used to identify whether the offender completed all assigned component and/or services. An offender was required to successfully complete all components and/or services in order to be listed as successful in this category.
- Time 1, 2, 3, 4, 5: This represents multiple categories in the data set (i.e. time 1, time 2, time 3, time 4, time 5). This category was used to identify specifically what each offender received during his or her progression in community corrections. Coders were asked to use the same abbreviations for components and services used previously; however, components and services were now listed in chronological order based on begin dates and end dates provided in the spreadsheet. We developed a rule that programs that go beyond a 2 month period after the end of another program would represent a new treatment period. This was needed to develop a standard cut-off that could be applied across components and services to allow for meaningful analyses. Limited end dates were provided for thinking for a change programming thus it was determined based on a typical thinking for a change treatment duration

that when no end date was provided it would be assumed that treatment lasted 2 months. Additionally, it was determined given the lack of specificity regarding alcohol and drug programming and the fact that no end dates were given for this program it was determined that this program would only be represented during a single time category.

## DOC Data Coding Key

VARIABLE	CODING
<b>RESEARCH ID:</b>	<b>STAYS THE SAME</b>
<b>Ethnicity/Race</b>	White = 0 Black = 1 Hispanic = 2 Asian/pacific islander = 3 Other = 4, Biracial = 5 Native American = 6 Mixed = 7 American Indian/Alaskan Native = 8 Unknown = 9
<b>Gender/Sex</b>	Male = 0 Female = 1
<b>Offense_Severity_Type</b>	None = 0 Infraction/Status = 1 Delinquency offense/Formal Probation = 2 C Misdemeanor = 3 B Misdemeanor = 4 A Misdemeanor = 5 A Misdemeanor filed as D = 6 D Felony = 7 C Felony = 8 B Felony = 9 A Felony = 10 M Murder = 11 Other = 9999
<b>Risk Level</b>	Unknown = 9999 Low = 0 Low-medium = 1 Medium = 2 High = 3
<b>For each program</b>	No = 0, Yes = 1
<b>Completion status</b>	Active = 0 Consecutive = 1 Inactive = 2 Successful = 3 Unsuccessful = 4

VARIABLE	CODING
<b>Outcome</b>	Active = 0 Successful = 3 Unsuccessful = 4 Waiting = 5
<b>Recidivism</b>	0=no Yes=1
<b>Programs</b>	One or more unsuccessful or others = 0 All Successful completion = 1
<b>Timing</b>	0 = simultaneous 1 = sequential 2 = mixed
<b>Component combination</b>	Home detention – hd Work release – wr Day reporting – dr Forensic diversion - fd Community transition program – ctp Electronic monitoring – em Community service – cs Work crew – wc VORP - vorp
<b>Component x service combination</b>	Home detention – hd Work release – wr Day reporting – dr Forensic diversion - fd Community transition program – ctp Electronic monitoring – em Community service – cs Work crew – wc VORP - vorp  Services Thinking for a change – t4c Alcohol drug program – adp Community control – cc
<b>Time 1, Time 2, Time 3, Time 4, Time 5</b>	Same abbreviations above following rules outlined above.



