

TRIAD DRUG TREATMENT EVALUATION SIX-MONTH INTERIM REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Prisons's recently completed an interim evaluation of its residential drug abuse treatment program and findings suggest that the program is effective in reducing recidivism and substance abuse. The evaluation, conducted with funding and assistance from the National Institute of Drug Abuse, revealed that the approximately 600 offenders who completed the drug abuse treatment program and had been released to the community for a minimum of six months were less likely to be rearrested or to test positive for drug use than a similar group of inmates who did not participate in the drug abuse treatment program. The analysis indicated that completion of the treatment program reduced the odds of rearrest and drug relapse by at least 24 percent.

The findings of this preliminary evaluation are noteworthy because the first six months of an offenders release back to the community are particularly difficult and often are critical to a successful reintegration. These findings, which suggest that drug abuse treatment assists inmates during this initial resettlement period, offer encouragement for the conclusion that another correctional program "works," making a difference in the lives of offenders and reducing the likelihood of future criminal conduct.

SAMPLE AND DESIGN

The preliminary results contained in this report represent inmates who were released no later than December 31, 1995, and who were released to the community for six months or more. This report includes data only for the first six months of release for each inmate; the final report will cover a three year post-release period for all individuals. The sample contained in this report includes 1,866 individuals - 1,524 men and 342 women - for whom comprehensive data were available.

We sampled treatment subjects from 20 different institutions, approximately two-thirds of the institutions that currently operate residential treatment programs. These prisons represented all security levels, except maximum security, and serve both male and female populations. The residential programs included two components of treatment - an in-prison component and a transitional services component as part of community placement and supervision. The treatment programs consisted of two levels of intensity - 500-hour, 9-month programs and 1,000-hour, 12-month programs. Male and female comparison subjects were drawn from more than 30 institutions, some of which had residential drug abuse treatment programs and some that did not. The comparison subjects consisted of individuals who had a history of previous drug use and, therefore, would have met the criteria for admission to the residential drug treatment programs. Criminal recidivism and drug use represented the primary outcomes of interest. Criminal

recidivism was defined as: 1) an arrest for a new offense, or 2) an arrest or supervision revocation. Drug use referred to a positive urinalysis (u/a) test. This study examined two other outcomes, failure at a Community Corrections Center (CCC) and post-release employment. CCC outcomes are limited to those receiving a CCC placement.

Up to three different methods of analyses were used to assess treatment effectiveness. These different approaches resulted in similar conclusions, providing significant confidence in the preliminary results. All analyses, except those for employment outcomes, were done 1) for males and females combined, and 2) for males only. Separate analyses of outcome measures other than employment were not possible given the insufficient number of women in the sample.

FINDINGS

While effects of residential drug abuse treatment programs that include an in-prison component and a community component represent the primary focus of this research, individuals who did not receive in-prison treatment may receive treatment during CCC placement and supervision. The role of these services either in isolation or as a component of in-prison residential treatment services is important to understanding the effectiveness of residential treatment programs. Therefore, findings are reported separately for CCC placement and supervision only.

RESIDENTIAL DRUG ABUSE TREATMENT

We examined the effect of residential drug abuse treatment on CCC failures, post-release employment, criminal recidivism, and drug relapse.

Recidivism

Arrest For New Offense – Individuals who had received in-prison residential treatment in conjunction with a community component had a lower probability of being arrested in the six-month follow-up period than comparison subjects. These results were significant for the 9-month program participants and marginally significant for the 12-month program participants.

Arrest For New Offense Or Supervision Revocation – When outcome was defined as arrest for new offense or supervision revocation, no residential drug treatment effects were found. The difference in results between the two definitions of recidivism will be examined in more detail as part of the final report.

Drug Use

The results for drug use, like those for arrests for a new offense, show that individuals who participated in a residential drug abuse treatment program were less likely to have a positive u/a test than comparison subjects. These findings were significant for both levels of program intensity, the 9-month and 12-month programs. Again, there was no evidence of a difference

between these two program types.

CCC Failures

Approximately two-thirds of the individuals received a CCC placement before their release from BOP custody. Some evidence suggests that individuals who had completed a residential drug abuse treatment program were more likely to complete their CCC placement successfully. However, these results were not consistent across different methods of analysis. Evidence does not support a different outcome for individuals who completed a 9-month program and those completing a 12-month program.

Post-Release Employment

Individuals who participated in residential drug abuse treatment during their incarceration were no more likely to be employed full-time for a greater percentage of the six-month post-release period than individuals who did not participate. This finding was true for both men and women.

OTHER TREATMENT SERVICES

Other treatment services represent CCC placement, when such a placement occurs, and supervision; each play an important role in determining program effectiveness.

Treatment Services Received in the Halfway House

In general, treatment services received in the halfway house did not effect post-release outcomes such as arrest, positive u/a, or CCC failure. There is some evidence, however, that women who received these services spent a greater percentage of their post-release period employed full-time.

Post-Release Services

Approximately 40 percent of individuals released to supervision received drug treatment services or were involved in self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous. The results indicated that one or more of these services had a positive effect on most of the post-release outcomes. For example, men required to receive services as a condition of supervision spent a greater percentage of their post-release period employed full-time. For women, voluntary involvement in self-help groups was associated with a longer period of full-time employment. Surprisingly, individuals who were required to receive services and those who received them voluntarily had less positive outcomes.

SUMMARY

The preliminary results of this initial look at residential drug abuse treatment programs suggest important and exciting possibilities for the treatment of drug offenders. The evaluation we have undertaken has been methodologically rigorous and has yielded significant salutary effects on

post-release outcomes. Under our most conservative analysis, drug treatment reduced rearrest and drug relapse by 24 percent compared to drug-dependent comparison subjects. Although we found no effects for transitional treatment services, there were effects of services received while under supervision. Our preliminary data show that when controlling for differences in the composition of inmates in the 20 different programs we evaluated, there were few differences in program effectiveness. Future analyses will examine longer release periods and incorporate data on social-psychological processes that may promote our understanding of the way in which treatment reduces criminal recidivism and drug relapse.

Evaluation of Post-Release Success for the First 4 Classes
Graduating from the Lewisburg Intensive Confinement Center

November 15, 1996

■ Evaluation results for the first four classes graduating from the Lewisburg Intensive Confinement Center (ICC) demonstrate that placement in the ICC achieves the same post-release success rate as does placement in a conventional prison. Lewisburg ICC graduates who were transferred from the general prison population into the program were rearrested at a 13.0 percent rate during the first two years in the community (See Figure 1), while Lewisburg ICC graduates who entered the program directly from the court were rearrested at a 13.9 percent rate. Rates for these two groups are not statistically different from the 13.8 percent adjusted rate for a group of similar program eligible inmates, who did not participate in the ICC program and instead completed their full prison term.

■ Prior to May 1996, the difference in cost for a typical inmate in the ICC program and for an inmate in a minimum security institution was marginal, with the former being approximately \$300 less. However, as of May 1996, ICC graduates with a 30 month or less sentence are eligible for reduction in their prison sentence. Sentence reductions allowed range from a 3 month reduction for persons with a 12-16 month sentence to a 6 month reduction for persons with a sentence of 26-30 months. As shown in Table 2, the estimated incarceration cost saving for an ICC inmate with a one year and a day sentence is \$ 2,519.66 when compared to a non-ICC minimum security inmate with a one year and a day sentence. For an ICC inmate with a 30 month sentence, the incarceration cost saving is \$ 9,330.58 when compared to a non-ICC minimum security inmate with a 30 month sentence.¹ Note, however, that inmates with sentences between 30 and 60 months and who constitute the bulk of transfers into the ICC program are not

¹ Because of current unused minimum security bed space, the actual marginal daily cost per inmate for a minimum security bed may be substantially lower than the full cost used here of \$42.22, and this could dramatically alter cost savings estimates.

eligible for a sentence reduction.

■ In addition to possible cost savings associated with the shorter period of confinement for current ICC participants, the program also has the benefit of returning very low risk offenders sooner to their families and to their jobs, presumably reducing public assistance costs to inmates' families and allowing these former offenders to become taxpayers once more. Furthermore, earlier release contributes to inmate family stability, which criminological research shows to be a key element in reducing juvenile delinquency and crime among future generations.

■ Background measures used to assess differences in recidivism risk between the ICC participant groups and the Control Group were chosen from prior recidivism studies of Federal prisoners, conducted both by the BOP Office of Research and Evaluation and by the United States Parole Commission. These risk measures, listed in Table 1, are: the United States Parole Commission's Salient Factor Score (see Attachment A. for the form used to calculate the Salient Factor Score); age at release to supervision; stable employment during at least six months in the two years prior to the current imprisonment; marital status; alcohol abuse (note in Attachment A, that heroin abuse is a component of the Salient Factor Score); prison misconduct; and planning, while still in prison, for employment upon release to a halfway house or to supervision in the community. Race (percent black) and ethnicity (percent Hispanic) are reported, in Table 1, for comparison purposes only.

■ Comparisons of background characteristics for the two ICC participant groups, ICC Dropouts (persons who entered the ICC program but for whatever reason did not complete it), and the Control Group show the following statistically significant differences (see Table 1): The ICC Prison Transfer Group had significantly higher Salient Factor Scores and were more likely to have made pre-release employment plans than the Control Group. Both of these differences suggest that the ICC Prison Transfer Group had lower risk of rearrest when compared to the control group.

The ICC Direct Court Admissions were significantly more likely to have stable pre-prison employment, less prison misconduct, and to have made pre-release employment plans than the Control Group. All three differences suggest that the Direct

Court Admission group was at a lower risk of rearrest than the control group.

ICC dropouts had significantly lower (i.e., poorer) Salient Factor Scores; were younger; were less likely to be married; were more involved in prison misconduct; and were less likely to have made pre-release employment plans than the control group. Therefore, based on these differences, the ICC dropouts were at a much greater risk of rearrest than the control group. Furthermore, from the risk profiles shown in Table 2, the ICC dropouts were also at higher risk of rearrest than the two other ICC participant groups.

■ Results from the complete (multi variate) analysis of recidivism during release to the community (not shown here, but reported in the full evaluation report) show that for inmates studied as part of this evaluation, those with high Salient Factor Scores, who were older, and who had made pre-release employment plans were significantly less likely to be rearrested than inmates with low Salient Factor Scores, who were younger, and who did not make pre-release employment plans.

■ As already noted, both the ICC prison transfer and ICC direct court commitment groups demonstrated a significantly greater reliance on pre-release employment planning than did the control group. (See Table 1). That is, they were more likely to have arranged for employment prior to release to a halfway house than inmates in a conventional prison camp. Analysis shows that such planning had a significant and dramatic effect in reducing recidivism for both program participants and control group members, when compared to those in either group not making such plans. While differences between the control group and ICC groups in the percent making pre-release employment plans may be due at least in part to ICC program emphasis on such planning, the mean differences may also reflect a larger number of more effective social and community contacts and resources available to those referred to the ICC program compared to those who are not referred. These contacts and resources may reflect a family/community support network in place prior to incarceration that appreciably aids in post-release adjustment beyond that provided by obtaining and maintaining employment alone.

■ As noted above, background characteristics of the ICC Dropouts indicate that they will be rearrested at a higher rate

than either the control group or the two groups of ICC graduates. The rearrest rate for ICC dropouts was 33.3 percent (See Figure 1), which is a substantially higher rearrest rate than for either program graduates or control group members. Since this is a group of inmates who did not complete the ICC program, this finding suggests that, besides providing intensified or accelerated correctional programming, the ICC serves to screen eligible, but more recidivistic, inmates who are unable to benefit from the program and places them back into the general prison population to serve their full prison term. However, because of the small number of program dropouts in this study (N=27), any conclusive statement about a screening effect would be premature.

■ It should be noted that the 13 percent rearrest rate over 2 years for Lewisburg ICC graduates is substantially lower than that for graduates of similar programs run by many State correctional systems, as reported by Mackenzie and Souryal in their 1994, National Institute of Justice final report, "Multisite Evaluation of Shock Incarceration." For example, 37.3% of graduates from a Louisiana program were rearrested in the 2 years following release; 56.5 percent of Florida graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; 49.5 percent of New York program graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; 40.4 percent of South Carolina graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; and 51.7 percent of Texas program graduates were rearrested during the first 2 years in the community. Differences in rearrest rates between graduates from these State run programs and graduates of the Lewisburg ICC are most likely due in large part to the younger age of State program participants when compared to Lewisburg ICC participants.

■ While the evaluation of the Lewisburg ICC was able to assess the effect of the overall program on post-release outcome, it was not possible to assess the effectiveness of individual program components because they continued to be developed through 1995 (see attached chronology). In light of these changes, a work group was assembled by the Correctional Programs Division, including representatives of ICC staff, researchers, and Regional and Central Office administrators to review various program components. Now that ICC program components have matured and stabilized, this work group will develop a set of performance

measures for monitoring the contribution each component makes to a set of outcomes including, but not limited to, post-release rearrest. For example, improvements in academic skills might be monitored by testing at admission, intermittently during participation, and at program completion.

■ Given the ICC's demonstrated success regarding low rearrest rates, consideration might be given to expanding opportunities for transferring eligible inmates from other facilities into the program, especially if referrals from court do not fully utilize the additional bed space capacity provided by the new ICC at Lompoc. Also, since inmates with a sentence of 60 months or less, with no history of violence, and no serious prison misconduct are eligible for ICC placement within 24 months of release, case managers might consider informing potentially eligible inmates at time of admission to prison about the ICC program and the prospects of serving much of their sentence in a halfway house or on home confinement rather than in a prison facility. Such early notification might provide an incentive toward good behavior among this group of new admissions. Currently, inmates with sentences of greater than 30 months are not eligible for a sentence reduction if they successfully complete the ICC, but may be released to a halfway house earlier than comparable minimum security inmates who do not participate in the ICC. As of October 26, 1996 there were 3,095 male inmates (3,043 minimum security and 52 low security) who meet minimum eligibility requirements for placement into the ICC and an additional 368 male inmates (355 minimum security and 13 low security) who will become eligible as they move toward 24 months remaining to serve on their sentences, barring any prison misconduct. Among female inmates there were 751 (747 minimum security and 4 low security) who meet minimum eligibility requirements for placement into the ICC and an additional 32 female inmates (31 minimum security and 1 low security) who will become eligible as they move toward 24 months remaining to serve on their sentences, barring any prison misconduct. In sum, on October 26, there were 3,846 inmates minimally eligible for immediate placement into the ICC and an additional 400 inmates who will be potentially eligible in the future, for a total of 4,246.

■ Both persons admitted to the ICC directly from the court and those transferred from the prison population pass through

multiple review stages during which their appropriateness for the program and their recidivism risk, especially for violent offending, are assessed. For those entering the ICC directly from the court, these are: 1) the initial judicial review and recommendation; 2) the formal program eligibility requirements; 3) the informal review by the ICC staff and administrator prior to actual admission; 4) the rigors of the program itself (see the above discussion regarding program dropouts); 5) the period of observation during halfway house stay; 6) for some, the surveillance during home confinement; and 7) the final period of surveillance during supervised release. Persons transferred to the ICC from the general prison population are subject to the same review and assessment with the addition of a period in prison when their behavior and appropriateness for the program can be observed and assessed by Bureau of Prisons staff.

■ We should highlight the importance of screening ICC participants both for personal characteristics seen as benefiting from ICC programming and for likelihood of recidivating, especially for crimes of violence. In this regard, both formal and informal eligibility requirements and conditions for remaining in the ICC program should be continually reviewed regarding their capability to predict positive returns from program participation and post-release success.

TRIAD DRUG TREATMENT EVALUATION SIX-MONTH INTERIM REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Prisons's recently completed an interim evaluation of its residential drug abuse treatment program and findings suggest that the program is effective in reducing recidivism and substance abuse. The evaluation, conducted with funding and assistance from the National Institute of Drug Abuse, revealed that the approximately 600 offenders who completed the drug abuse treatment program and had been released to the community for a minimum of six months were less likely to be rearrested or to test positive for drug use than a similar group of inmates who did not participate in the drug abuse treatment program. The analysis indicated that completion of the treatment program reduced the odds of rearrest and drug relapse by at least 24 percent.

The findings of this preliminary evaluation are noteworthy because the first six months of an offenders release back to the community are particularly difficult and often are critical to a successful reintegration. These findings, which suggest that drug abuse treatment assists inmates during this initial resettlement period, offer encouragement for the conclusion that another correctional program "works," making a difference in the lives of offenders and reducing the likelihood of future criminal conduct.

SAMPLE AND DESIGN

The preliminary results contained in this report represent inmates who were released no later than December 31, 1995, and who were released to the community for six months or more. This report includes data only for the first six months of release for each inmate; the final report will cover a three year post-release period for all individuals. The sample contained in this report includes 1,866 individuals - 1,524 men and 342 women - for whom comprehensive data were available.

We sampled treatment subjects from 20 different institutions, approximately two-thirds of the institutions that currently operate residential treatment programs. These prisons represented all security levels, except maximum security, and serve both male and female populations. The residential programs included two components of treatment - an in-prison component and a transitional services component as part of community placement and supervision. The treatment programs consisted of two levels of intensity - 500-hour, 9-month programs and 1,000-hour, 12-month programs. Male and female comparison subjects were drawn from more than 30 institutions, some of which had residential drug abuse treatment programs and some that did not. The comparison subjects consisted of individuals who had a history of previous drug use and, therefore, would have met the criteria for admission to the residential drug treatment programs. Criminal recidivism and drug use represented the primary outcomes of interest. Criminal

recidivism was defined as: 1) an arrest for a new offense, or 2) an arrest or supervision revocation. Drug use referred to a positive urinalysis (u/a) test. This study examined two other outcomes, failure at a Community Corrections Center (CCC) and post-release employment. CCC outcomes are limited to those receiving a CCC placement.

Up to three different methods of analyses were used to assess treatment effectiveness. These different approaches resulted in similar conclusions, providing significant confidence in the preliminary results. All analyses, except those for employment outcomes, were done 1) for males and females combined, and 2) for males only. Separate analyses of outcome measures other than employment were not possible given the insufficient number of women in the sample.

FINDINGS

While effects of residential drug abuse treatment programs that include an in-prison component and a community component represent the primary focus of this research, individuals who did not receive in-prison treatment may receive treatment during CCC placement and supervision. The role of these services either in isolation or as a component of in-prison residential treatment services is important to understanding the effectiveness of residential treatment programs. Therefore, findings are reported separately for CCC placement and supervision only.

RESIDENTIAL DRUG ABUSE TREATMENT

We examined the effect of residential drug abuse treatment on CCC failures, post-release employment, criminal recidivism, and drug relapse.

Recidivism

Arrest For New Offense – Individuals who had received in-prison residential treatment in conjunction with a community component had a lower probability of being arrested in the six-month follow-up period than comparison subjects. These results were significant for the 9-month program participants and marginally significant for the 12-month program participants.

Arrest For New Offense Or Supervision Revocation – When outcome was defined as arrest for new offense or supervision revocation, no residential drug treatment effects were found. The difference in results between the two definitions of recidivism will be examined in more detail as part of the final report.

Drug Use

The results for drug use, like those for arrests for a new offense, show that individuals who participated in a residential drug abuse treatment program were less likely to have a positive u/a test than comparison subjects. These findings were significant for both levels of program intensity, the 9-month and 12-month programs. Again, there was no evidence of a difference

between these two program types.

CCC Failures

Approximately two-thirds of the individuals received a CCC placement before their release from BOP custody. Some evidence suggests that individuals who had completed a residential drug abuse treatment program were more likely to complete their CCC placement successfully. However, these results were not consistent across different methods of analysis. Evidence does not support a different outcome for individuals who completed a 9-month program and those completing a 12-month program.

Post-Release Employment

Individuals who participated in residential drug abuse treatment during their incarceration were no more likely to be employed full-time for a greater percentage of the six-month post-release period than individuals who did not participate. This finding was true for both men and women.

OTHER TREATMENT SERVICES

Other treatment services represent CCC placement, when such a placement occurs, and supervision; each play an important role in determining program effectiveness.

Treatment Services Received in the Halfway House

In general, treatment services received in the halfway house did not effect post-release outcomes such as arrest, positive u/a, or CCC failure. There is some evidence, however, that women who received these services spent a greater percentage of their post-release period employed full-time.

Post-Release Services

Approximately 40 percent of individuals released to supervision received drug treatment services or were involved in self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous. The results indicated that one or more of these services had a positive effect on most of the post-release outcomes. For example, men required to receive services as a condition of supervision spent a greater percentage of their post-release period employed full-time. For women, voluntary involvement in self-help groups was associated with a longer period of full-time employment. Surprisingly, individuals who were required to receive services and those who received them voluntarily had less positive outcomes.

SUMMARY

The preliminary results of this initial look at residential drug abuse treatment programs suggest important and exciting possibilities for the treatment of drug offenders. The evaluation we have undertaken has been methodologically rigorous and has yielded significant salutary effects on

post-release outcomes. Under our most conservative analysis, drug treatment reduced rearrest and drug relapse by 24 percent compared to drug-dependent comparison subjects. Although we found no effects for transitional treatment services, there were effects of services received while under supervision. Our preliminary data show that when controlling for differences in the composition of inmates in the 20 different programs we evaluated, there were few differences in program effectiveness. Future analyses will examine longer release periods and incorporate data on social-psychological processes that may promote our understanding of the way in which treatment reduces criminal recidivism and drug relapse.

Evaluation of Post-Release Success for the First 4 Classes

Graduating from the Lewisburg Intensive Confinement Center

November 15, 1996

■ Evaluation results for the first four classes graduating from the Lewisburg Intensive Confinement Center (ICC) demonstrate that placement in the ICC achieves the same post-release success rate as does placement in a conventional prison. Lewisburg ICC graduates who were transferred from the general prison population into the program were rearrested at a 13.0 percent rate during the first two years in the community (See Figure 1), while Lewisburg ICC graduates who entered the program directly from the court were rearrested at a 13.9 percent rate. Rates for these two groups are not statistically different from the 13.8 percent adjusted rate for a group of similar program eligible inmates, who did not participate in the ICC program and instead completed their full prison term.

■ Prior to May 1996, the difference in cost for a typical inmate in the ICC program and for an inmate in a minimum security institution was marginal, with the former being approximately \$300 less. However, as of May 1996, ICC graduates with a 30 month or less sentence are eligible for reduction in their prison sentence. Sentence reductions allowed range from a 3 month reduction for persons with a 12-16 month sentence to a 6 month reduction for persons with a sentence of 26-30 months. As shown in Table 2, the estimated incarceration cost saving for an ICC inmate with a one year and a day sentence is \$ 2,519.66 when compared to a non-ICC minimum security inmate with a one year and a day sentence. For an ICC inmate with a 30 month sentence, the incarceration cost saving is \$ 9,330.58 when compared to a non-ICC minimum security inmate with a 30 month sentence.¹ Note, however, that inmates with sentences between 30 and 60 months and who constitute the bulk of transfers into the ICC program are not

¹ Because of current unused minimum security bed space, the actual marginal daily cost per inmate for a minimum security bed may be substantially lower than the full cost used here of \$42.22, and this could dramatically alter cost savings estimates.

eligible for a sentence reduction.

■ In addition to possible cost savings associated with the shorter period of confinement for current ICC participants, the program also has the benefit of returning very low risk offenders sooner to their families and to their jobs, presumably reducing public assistance costs to inmates' families and allowing these former offenders to become taxpayers once more. Furthermore, earlier release contributes to inmate family stability, which criminological research shows to be a key element in reducing juvenile delinquency and crime among future generations.

■ Background measures used to assess differences in recidivism risk between the ICC participant groups and the Control Group were chosen from prior recidivism studies of Federal prisoners, conducted both by the BOP Office of Research and Evaluation and by the United States Parole Commission. These risk measures, listed in Table 1, are: the United States Parole Commission's Salient Factor Score (see Attachment A. for the form used to calculate the Salient Factor Score); age at release to supervision; stable employment during at least six months in the two years prior to the current imprisonment; marital status; alcohol abuse (note in Attachment A, that heroin abuse is a component of the Salient Factor Score); prison misconduct; and planning, while still in prison, for employment upon release to a halfway house or to supervision in the community. Race (percent black) and ethnicity (percent Hispanic) are reported, in Table 1, for comparison purposes only.

■ Comparisons of background characteristics for the two ICC participant groups, ICC Dropouts (persons who entered the ICC program but for whatever reason did not complete it), and the Control Group show the following statistically significant differences (see Table 1): The ICC Prison Transfer Group had significantly higher Salient Factor Scores and were more likely to have made pre-release employment plans than the Control Group. Both of these differences suggest that the ICC Prison Transfer Group had lower risk of rearrest when compared to the control group.

The ICC Direct Court Admissions were significantly more likely to have stable pre-prison employment, less prison misconduct, and to have made pre-release employment plans than the Control Group. All three differences suggest that the Direct

Court Admission group was at a lower risk of rearrest than the control group.

ICC dropouts had significantly lower (i.e., poorer) Salient Factor Scores; were younger; were less likely to be married; were more involved in prison misconduct; and were less likely to have made pre-release employment plans than the control group. Therefore, based on these differences, the ICC dropouts were at a much greater risk of rearrest than the control group. Furthermore, from the risk profiles shown in Table 2, the ICC dropouts were also at higher risk of rearrest than the two other ICC participant groups.

■ Results from the complete (multi variate) analysis of recidivism during release to the community (not shown here, but reported in the full evaluation report) show that for inmates studied as part of this evaluation, those with high Salient Factor Scores, who were older, and who had made pre-release employment plans were significantly less likely to be rearrested than inmates with low Salient Factor Scores, who were younger, and who did not make pre-release employment plans.

■ As already noted, both the ICC prison transfer and ICC direct court commitment groups demonstrated a significantly greater reliance on pre-release employment planning than did the control group. (See Table 1). That is, they were more likely to have arranged for employment prior to release to a halfway house than inmates in a conventional prison camp. Analysis shows that such planning had a significant and dramatic effect in reducing recidivism for both program participants and control group members, when compared to those in either group not making such plans. While differences between the control group and ICC groups in the percent making pre-release employment plans may be due at least in part to ICC program emphasis on such planning, the mean differences may also reflect a larger number of more effective social and community contacts and resources available to those referred to the ICC program compared to those who are not referred. These contacts and resources may reflect a family/community support network in place prior to incarceration that appreciably aids in post-release adjustment beyond that provided by obtaining and maintaining employment alone.

■ As noted above, background characteristics of the ICC Dropouts indicate that they will be rearrested at a higher rate

than either the control group or the two groups of ICC graduates. The rearrest rate for ICC dropouts was 33.3 percent (See Figure 1), which is a substantially higher rearrest rate than for either program graduates or control group members. Since this is a group of inmates who did not complete the ICC program, this finding suggests that, besides providing intensified or accelerated correctional programming, the ICC serves to screen eligible, but more recidivistic, inmates who are unable to benefit from the program and places them back into the general prison population to serve their full prison term. However, because of the small number of program dropouts in this study (N=27), any conclusive statement about a screening effect would be premature.

■ It should be noted that the 13 percent rearrest rate over 2 years for Lewisburg ICC graduates is substantially lower than that for graduates of similar programs run by many State correctional systems, as reported by Mackenzie and Souryal in their 1994, National Institute of Justice final report, "Multisite Evaluation of Shock Incarceration." For example, 37.3% of graduates from a Louisiana program were rearrested in the 2 years following release; 56.5 percent of Florida graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; 49.5 percent of New York program graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; 40.4 percent of South Carolina graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; and 51.7 percent of Texas program graduates were rearrested during the first 2 years in the community. Differences in rearrest rates between graduates from these State run programs and graduates of the Lewisburg ICC are most likely due in large part to the younger age of State program participants when compared to Lewisburg ICC participants.

■ While the evaluation of the Lewisburg ICC was able to assess the effect of the overall program on post-release outcome, it was not possible to assess the effectiveness of individual program components because they continued to be developed through 1995 (see attached chronology). In light of these changes, a work group was assembled by the Correctional Programs Division, including representatives of ICC staff, researchers, and Regional and Central Office administrators to review various program components. Now that ICC program components have matured and stabilized, this work group will develop a set of performance

measures for monitoring the contribution each component makes to a set of outcomes including, but not limited to, post-release rearrest. For example, improvements in academic skills might be monitored by testing at admission, intermittently during participation, and at program completion.

■ Given the ICC's demonstrated success regarding low rearrest rates, consideration might be given to expanding opportunities for transferring eligible inmates from other facilities into the program, especially if referrals from court do not fully utilize the additional bed space capacity provided by the new ICC at Lompoc. Also, since inmates with a sentence of 60 months or less, with no history of violence, and no serious prison misconduct are eligible for ICC placement within 24 months of release, case managers might consider informing potentially eligible inmates at time of admission to prison about the ICC program and the prospects of serving much of their sentence in a halfway house or on home confinement rather than in a prison facility. Such early notification might provide an incentive toward good behavior among this group of new admissions. Currently, inmates with sentences of greater than 30 months are not eligible for a sentence reduction if they successfully complete the ICC, but may be released to a halfway house earlier than comparable minimum security inmates who do not participate in the ICC. As of October 26, 1996 there were 3,095 male inmates (3,043 minimum security and 52 low security) who meet minimum eligibility requirements for placement into the ICC and an additional 368 male inmates (355 minimum security and 13 low security) who will become eligible as they move toward 24 months remaining to serve on their sentences, barring any prison misconduct. Among female inmates there were 751 (747 minimum security and 4 low security) who meet minimum eligibility requirements for placement into the ICC and an additional 32 female inmates (31 minimum security and 1 low security) who will become eligible as they move toward 24 months remaining to serve on their sentences, barring any prison misconduct. In sum, on October 26, there were 3,846 inmates minimally eligible for immediate placement into the ICC and an additional 400 inmates who will be potentially eligible in the future, for a total of 4,246.

■ Both persons admitted to the ICC directly from the court and those transferred from the prison population pass through

multiple review stages during which their appropriateness for the program and their recidivism risk, especially for violent offending, are assessed. For those entering the ICC directly from the court, these are: 1) the initial judicial review and recommendation; 2) the formal program eligibility requirements; 3) the informal review by the ICC staff and administrator prior to actual admission; 4) the rigors of the program itself (see the above discussion regarding program dropouts); 5) the period of observation during halfway house stay; 6) for some, the surveillance during home confinement; and 7) the final period of surveillance during supervised release. Persons transferred to the ICC from the general prison population are subject to the same review and assessment with the addition of a period in prison when their behavior and appropriateness for the program can be observed and assessed by Bureau of Prisons staff.

■ We should highlight the importance of screening ICC participants both for personal characteristics seen as benefiting from ICC programming and for likelihood of recidivating, especially for crimes of violence. In this regard, both formal and informal eligibility requirements and conditions for remaining in the ICC program should be continually reviewed regarding their capability to predict positive returns from program participation and post-release success.

TRIAD DRUG TREATMENT EVALUATION SIX-MONTH INTERIM REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Prisons's recently completed an interim evaluation of its residential drug abuse treatment program and findings suggest that the program is effective in reducing recidivism and substance abuse. The evaluation, conducted with funding and assistance from the National Institute of Drug Abuse, revealed that the approximately 600 offenders who completed the drug abuse treatment program and had been released to the community for a minimum of six months were less likely to be rearrested or to test positive for drug use than a similar group of inmates who did not participate in the drug abuse treatment program. The analysis indicated that completion of the treatment program reduced the odds of rearrest and drug relapse by at least 24 percent.

The findings of this preliminary evaluation are noteworthy because the first six months of an offenders release back to the community are particularly difficult and often are critical to a successful reintegration. These findings, which suggest that drug abuse treatment assists inmates during this initial resettlement period, offer encouragement for the conclusion that another correctional program "works," making a difference in the lives of offenders and reducing the likelihood of future criminal conduct.

SAMPLE AND DESIGN

The preliminary results contained in this report represent inmates who were released no later than December 31, 1995, and who were released to the community for six months or more. This report includes data only for the first six months of release for each inmate; the final report will cover a three year post-release period for all individuals. The sample contained in this report includes 1,866 individuals - 1,524 men and 342 women - for whom comprehensive data were available.

We sampled treatment subjects from 20 different institutions, approximately two-thirds of the institutions that currently operate residential treatment programs. These prisons represented all security levels, except maximum security, and serve both male and female populations. The residential programs included two components of treatment - an in-prison component and a transitional services component as part of community placement and supervision. The treatment programs consisted of two levels of intensity - 500-hour, 9-month programs and 1,000-hour, 12-month programs. Male and female comparison subjects were drawn from more than 30 institutions, some of which had residential drug abuse treatment programs and some that did not. The comparison subjects consisted of individuals who had a history of previous drug use and, therefore, would have met the criteria for admission to the residential drug treatment programs. Criminal recidivism and drug use represented the primary outcomes of interest. Criminal

recidivism was defined as: 1) an arrest for a new offense, or 2) an arrest or supervision revocation. Drug use referred to a positive urinalysis (u/a) test. This study examined two other outcomes, failure at a Community Corrections Center (CCC) and post-release employment. CCC outcomes are limited to those receiving a CCC placement.

Up to three different methods of analyses were used to assess treatment effectiveness. These different approaches resulted in similar conclusions, providing significant confidence in the preliminary results. All analyses, except those for employment outcomes, were done 1) for males and females combined, and 2) for males only. Separate analyses of outcome measures other than employment were not possible given the insufficient number of women in the sample.

FINDINGS

While effects of residential drug abuse treatment programs that include an in-prison component and a community component represent the primary focus of this research, individuals who did not receive in-prison treatment may receive treatment during CCC placement and supervision. The role of these services either in isolation or as a component of in-prison residential treatment services is important to understanding the effectiveness of residential treatment programs. Therefore, findings are reported separately for CCC placement and supervision only.

RESIDENTIAL DRUG ABUSE TREATMENT

We examined the effect of residential drug abuse treatment on CCC failures, post-release employment, criminal recidivism, and drug relapse.

Recidivism

Arrest For New Offense – Individuals who had received in-prison residential treatment in conjunction with a community component had a lower probability of being arrested in the six-month follow-up period than comparison subjects. These results were significant for the 9-month program participants and marginally significant for the 12-month program participants.

Arrest For New Offense Or Supervision Revocation – When outcome was defined as arrest for new offense or supervision revocation, no residential drug treatment effects were found. The difference in results between the two definitions of recidivism will be examined in more detail as part of the final report.

Drug Use

The results for drug use, like those for arrests for a new offense, show that individuals who participated in a residential drug abuse treatment program were less likely to have a positive u/a test than comparison subjects. These findings were significant for both levels of program intensity, the 9-month and 12-month programs. Again, there was no evidence of a difference

between these two program types.

CCC Failures

Approximately two-thirds of the individuals received a CCC placement before their release from BOP custody. Some evidence suggests that individuals who had completed a residential drug abuse treatment program were more likely to complete their CCC placement successfully. However, these results were not consistent across different methods of analysis. Evidence does not support a different outcome for individuals who completed a 9-month program and those completing a 12-month program.

Post-Release Employment

Individuals who participated in residential drug abuse treatment during their incarceration were no more likely to be employed full-time for a greater percentage of the six-month post-release period than individuals who did not participate. This finding was true for both men and women.

OTHER TREATMENT SERVICES

Other treatment services represent CCC placement, when such a placement occurs, and supervision; each play an important role in determining program effectiveness.

Treatment Services Received in the Halfway House

In general, treatment services received in the halfway house did not effect post-release outcomes such as arrest, positive u/a, or CCC failure. There is some evidence, however, that women who received these services spent a greater percentage of their post-release period employed full-time.

Post-Release Services

Approximately 40 percent of individuals released to supervision received drug treatment services or were involved in self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous. The results indicated that one or more of these services had a positive effect on most of the post-release outcomes. For example, men required to receive services as a condition of supervision spent a greater percentage of their post-release period employed full-time. For women, voluntary involvement in self-help groups was associated with a longer period of full-time employment. Surprisingly, individuals who were required to receive services and those who received them voluntarily had less positive outcomes.

SUMMARY

The preliminary results of this initial look at residential drug abuse treatment programs suggest important and exciting possibilities for the treatment of drug offenders. The evaluation we have undertaken has been methodologically rigorous and has yielded significant salutary effects on

post-release outcomes. Under our most conservative analysis, drug treatment reduced rearrest and drug relapse by 24 percent compared to drug-dependent comparison subjects. Although we found no effects for transitional treatment services, there were effects of services received while under supervision. Our preliminary data show that when controlling for differences in the composition of inmates in the 20 different programs we evaluated, there were few differences in program effectiveness. Future analyses will examine longer release periods and incorporate data on social-psychological processes that may promote our understanding of the way in which treatment reduces criminal recidivism and drug relapse.

Evaluation of Post-Release Success for the First 4 Classes
Graduating from the Lewisburg Intensive Confinement Center

November 15, 1996

■ Evaluation results for the first four classes graduating from the Lewisburg Intensive Confinement Center (ICC) demonstrate that placement in the ICC achieves the same post-release success rate as does placement in a conventional prison. Lewisburg ICC graduates who were transferred from the general prison population into the program were rearrested at a 13.0 percent rate during the first two years in the community (See Figure 1), while Lewisburg ICC graduates who entered the program directly from the court were rearrested at a 13.9 percent rate. Rates for these two groups are not statistically different from the 13.8 percent adjusted rate for a group of similar program eligible inmates, who did not participate in the ICC program and instead completed their full prison term.

■ Prior to May 1996, the difference in cost for a typical inmate in the ICC program and for an inmate in a minimum security institution was marginal, with the former being approximately \$300 less. However, as of May 1996, ICC graduates with a 30 month or less sentence are eligible for reduction in their prison sentence. Sentence reductions allowed range from a 3 month reduction for persons with a 12-16 month sentence to a 6 month reduction for persons with a sentence of 26-30 months. As shown in Table 2, the estimated incarceration cost saving for an ICC inmate with a one year and a day sentence is \$ 2,519.66 when compared to a non-ICC minimum security inmate with a one year and a day sentence. For an ICC inmate with a 30 month sentence, the incarceration cost saving is \$ 9,330.58 when compared to a non-ICC minimum security inmate with a 30 month sentence.¹ Note, however, that inmates with sentences between 30 and 60 months and who constitute the bulk of transfers into the ICC program are not

¹ Because of current unused minimum security bed space, the actual marginal daily cost per inmate for a minimum security bed may be substantially lower than the full cost used here of \$42.22, and this could dramatically alter cost savings estimates.

eligible for a sentence reduction.

■ In addition to possible cost savings associated with the shorter period of confinement for current ICC participants, the program also has the benefit of returning very low risk offenders sooner to their families and to their jobs, presumably reducing public assistance costs to inmates' families and allowing these former offenders to become taxpayers once more. Furthermore, earlier release contributes to inmate family stability, which criminological research shows to be a key element in reducing juvenile delinquency and crime among future generations.

■ Background measures used to assess differences in recidivism risk between the ICC participant groups and the Control Group were chosen from prior recidivism studies of Federal prisoners, conducted both by the BOP Office of Research and Evaluation and by the United States Parole Commission. These risk measures, listed in Table 1, are: the United States Parole Commission's Salient Factor Score (see Attachment A. for the form used to calculate the Salient Factor Score); age at release to supervision; stable employment during at least six months in the two years prior to the current imprisonment; marital status; alcohol abuse (note in Attachment A, that heroin abuse is a component of the Salient Factor Score); prison misconduct; and planning, while still in prison, for employment upon release to a halfway house or to supervision in the community. Race (percent black) and ethnicity (percent Hispanic) are reported, in Table 1, for comparison purposes only.

■ Comparisons of background characteristics for the two ICC participant groups, ICC Dropouts (persons who entered the ICC program but for whatever reason did not complete it), and the Control Group show the following statistically significant differences (see Table 1): The ICC Prison Transfer Group had significantly higher Salient Factor Scores and were more likely to have made pre-release employment plans than the Control Group. Both of these differences suggest that the ICC Prison Transfer Group had lower risk of rearrest when compared to the control group.

The ICC Direct Court Admissions were significantly more likely to have stable pre-prison employment, less prison misconduct, and to have made pre-release employment plans than the Control Group. All three differences suggest that the Direct

Court Admission group was at a lower risk of rearrest than the control group.

ICC dropouts had significantly lower (i.e., poorer) Salient Factor Scores; were younger; were less likely to be married; were more involved in prison misconduct; and were less likely to have made pre-release employment plans than the control group. Therefore, based on these differences, the ICC dropouts were at a much greater risk of rearrest than the control group. Furthermore, from the risk profiles shown in Table 2, the ICC dropouts were also at higher risk of rearrest than the two other ICC participant groups.

■ Results from the complete (multi variate) analysis of recidivism during release to the community (not shown here, but reported in the full evaluation report) show that for inmates studied as part of this evaluation, those with high Salient Factor Scores, who were older, and who had made pre-release employment plans were significantly less likely to be rearrested than inmates with low Salient Factor Scores, who were younger, and who did not make pre-release employment plans.

■ As already noted, both the ICC prison transfer and ICC direct court commitment groups demonstrated a significantly greater reliance on pre-release employment planning than did the control group. (See Table 1). That is, they were more likely to have arranged for employment prior to release to a halfway house than inmates in a conventional prison camp. Analysis shows that such planning had a significant and dramatic effect in reducing recidivism for both program participants and control group members, when compared to those in either group not making such plans. While differences between the control group and ICC groups in the percent making pre-release employment plans may be due at least in part to ICC program emphasis on such planning, the mean differences may also reflect a larger number of more effective social and community contacts and resources available to those referred to the ICC program compared to those who are not referred. These contacts and resources may reflect a family/community support network in place prior to incarceration that appreciably aids in post-release adjustment beyond that provided by obtaining and maintaining employment alone.

■ As noted above, background characteristics of the ICC Dropouts indicate that they will be rearrested at a higher rate

than either the control group or the two groups of ICC graduates. The rearrest rate for ICC dropouts was 33.3 percent (See Figure 1), which is a substantially higher rearrest rate than for either program graduates or control group members. Since this is a group of inmates who did not complete the ICC program, this finding suggests that, besides providing intensified or accelerated correctional programming, the ICC serves to screen eligible, but more recidivistic, inmates who are unable to benefit from the program and places them back into the general prison population to serve their full prison term. However, because of the small number of program dropouts in this study (N=27), any conclusive statement about a screening effect would be premature.

■ It should be noted that the 13 percent rearrest rate over 2 years for Lewisburg ICC graduates is substantially lower than that for graduates of similar programs run by many State correctional systems, as reported by Mackenzie and Souryal in their 1994, National Institute of Justice final report, "Multisite Evaluation of Shock Incarceration." For example, 37.3% of graduates from a Louisiana program were rearrested in the 2 years following release; 56.5 percent of Florida graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; 49.5 percent of New York program graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; 40.4 percent of South Carolina graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; and 51.7 percent of Texas program graduates were rearrested during the first 2 years in the community. Differences in rearrest rates between graduates from these State run programs and graduates of the Lewisburg ICC are most likely due in large part to the younger age of State program participants when compared to Lewisburg ICC participants.

■ While the evaluation of the Lewisburg ICC was able to assess the effect of the overall program on post-release outcome, it was not possible to assess the effectiveness of individual program components because they continued to be developed through 1995 (see attached chronology). In light of these changes, a work group was assembled by the Correctional Programs Division, including representatives of ICC staff, researchers, and Regional and Central Office administrators to review various program components. Now that ICC program components have matured and stabilized, this work group will develop a set of performance

measures for monitoring the contribution each component makes to a set of outcomes including, but not limited to, post-release rearrest. For example, improvements in academic skills might be monitored by testing at admission, intermittently during participation, and at program completion.

■ Given the ICC's demonstrated success regarding low rearrest rates, consideration might be given to expanding opportunities for transferring eligible inmates from other facilities into the program, especially if referrals from court do not fully utilize the additional bed space capacity provided by the new ICC at Lompoc. Also, since inmates with a sentence of 60 months or less, with no history of violence, and no serious prison misconduct are eligible for ICC placement within 24 months of release, case managers might consider informing potentially eligible inmates at time of admission to prison about the ICC program and the prospects of serving much of their sentence in a halfway house or on home confinement rather than in a prison facility. Such early notification might provide an incentive toward good behavior among this group of new admissions. Currently, inmates with sentences of greater than 30 months are not eligible for a sentence reduction if they successfully complete the ICC, but may be released to a halfway house earlier than comparable minimum security inmates who do not participate in the ICC. As of October 26, 1996 there were 3,095 male inmates (3,043 minimum security and 52 low security) who meet minimum eligibility requirements for placement into the ICC and an additional 368 male inmates (355 minimum security and 13 low security) who will become eligible as they move toward 24 months remaining to serve on their sentences, barring any prison misconduct. Among female inmates there were 751 (747 minimum security and 4 low security) who meet minimum eligibility requirements for placement into the ICC and an additional 32 female inmates (31 minimum security and 1 low security) who will become eligible as they move toward 24 months remaining to serve on their sentences, barring any prison misconduct. In sum, on October 26, there were 3,846 inmates minimally eligible for immediate placement into the ICC and an additional 400 inmates who will be potentially eligible in the future, for a total of 4,246.

■ Both persons admitted to the ICC directly from the court and those transferred from the prison population pass through

multiple review stages during which their appropriateness for the program and their recidivism risk, especially for violent offending, are assessed. For those entering the ICC directly from the court, these are: 1) the initial judicial review and recommendation; 2) the formal program eligibility requirements; 3) the informal review by the ICC staff and administrator prior to actual admission; 4) the rigors of the program itself (see the above discussion regarding program dropouts); 5) the period of observation during halfway house stay; 6) for some, the surveillance during home confinement; and 7) the final period of surveillance during supervised release. Persons transferred to the ICC from the general prison population are subject to the same review and assessment with the addition of a period in prison when their behavior and appropriateness for the program can be observed and assessed by Bureau of Prisons staff.

■ We should highlight the importance of screening ICC participants both for personal characteristics seen as benefiting from ICC programming and for likelihood of recidivating, especially for crimes of violence. In this regard, both formal and informal eligibility requirements and conditions for remaining in the ICC program should be continually reviewed regarding their capability to predict positive returns from program participation and post-release success.