



SEVENTH ANNUAL
INSTITUTIONAL CORRECTIONS RESEARCH NETWORK (ICRN)/
NATIONAL CORRECTIONS REPORTING PROGRAM (NCRP)
DATA PROVIDERS MEETING

September 19th and September 20th, 2019

Robert A. Young (RAY) Federal Building
St. Louis, Missouri

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| | |
| THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19TH..... | 5 |
| Welcome and Introductions | 5 |
| Keynote speaker | 5 |
| BJS and CES Initiatives: Research studies using NCRP and CES data | 6 |
| BJS and CES Initiatives: Current and Future Plans | 8 |
| Plenary: Exploring Recidivism – Conditions of Confinement on Recidivism..... | 8 |
| Plenary: Exploring Recidivism – Using Prison Days and Total Costs as an Alternative to Return to Prison Measures..... | 10 |
| Plenary: Exploring Recidivism – Recidivism of Sex Offenders | 13 |
| Plenary: Research in Corrections Practices – Pracademic Research: Engaging Corrections Practitioners in Research through Innovation and Experimentation..... | 16 |
| Plenary: Research in Corrections Practices – Idaho Prison Compstat Reporting | 18 |
| Breakout Session #1: Impact of Technical Revocations on Recidivism for More Serious Crime | 19 |
| Breakout Session #1: The Technicalities of Technical Violations..... | 22 |
| Breakout Session #1: Development and Validation of New Classification Assessment: The MN Severe and Frequent Estimate for Discipline (MnSafeD) | 23 |
| Breakout Session #1: NCRP for Newcomers | 28 |
| Breakout Session #2: The Path to Removing Restrictive Housing in Delaware – | 30 |
| Breakout Session #2: Results from Survey on Research Capacity within Local Jails and State Departments of Correction..... | 32 |
| | |
| FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20TH | 37 |
| Breakout Session #3: Source and Use of Firearms Involved in Crimes: Survey of Prison Inmates 2016 and Time Served in State Prison, 2016 | 37 |
| Breakout Session #3: Parole Recovery Opportunity (PRO) Supervision | 38 |
| Breakout Session #3: The New On-Line NCRP data analysis tool: A Preview | 40 |
| Breakout Session #4: National Institute of Justice Correction’s Portfolio and new Corrections Strategic Research Plan..... | 41 |

Breakout Session #4: Hate Crimes and Sex Offenders: Exploring the NCRP’s Unique Capabilities for Research on Rare and Specialized Crime Types..... 44

A Review of Educational Strategies and their Impacts 47

Ongoing BJS Activities and Closeout 50

APPENDIX.....53

APPENDIX A – Meeting Contact List..... 53

APPENDIX B – Meeting Agenda 61

INTRODUCTION

The seventh annual data providers meeting was sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) and the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). It took place at the Robert A. Young (RAY) Federal Building St. Louis, Missouri, on September 19 and 20, 2019. Participants included data suppliers to the National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP), members of the Institutional Corrections Research Network (ICRN), and staff from Abt Associates (Abt), NIC, BJS, and the Crime and Justice Institute (CJI) at Community Resources for Justice (CRJ).

The meeting began on the morning of September 19th, with a presentation from Anne Precythe (Director at the Missouri Department of Corrections) that highlighted the importance of using risk data to drive decision making. Director Precythe's presentation was followed by presentations on research studies using NCRP and CES data, by Abt Associates, and the current and future plans at BJS, by Danielle Kaeble (BJS). The introductory presentations were followed by plenary sessions on exploring recidivism and research in corrections. These sessions were followed by breakout sessions and small group discussions about topics including: technical violations, classification assessments, restrictive housing, and NCRP data collection and results. Throughout the day, participants had the opportunity to informally network, discuss the dynamic relationship between criminal justice policy and data, and participate in discussions on research and performance management efforts across states.

The second day, September 20th, began with another round of breakout sessions with topics including: BJS publications, parole supervision, the NCRP analysis tool, the National Institute of Justice Correction's Portfolio and new Corrections Strategic Research Plan, hate crimes and sex offenses, and educational strategies in corrections. Participants later had an opportunity to listen in on upcoming BJS initiatives. The meeting ended with a discussion of key points, lessons learned, and action steps for moving forward.

This document provides a detailed summary of what transpired during the meeting, a list of participants and the meeting agenda. All presentations and meeting materials can also be found on the meeting website, <https://www.cj institute.org/resources/icrn/>.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19TH

Welcome and Introductions

Shaina Vanek, Acting Director, National Institute of Corrections (NIC)

- Welcomed participants to the 7th Annual Institutional Corrections Research Network/National Corrections Reporting Program meeting.
- This meeting is a great chance to bring people together to share and learn from one another.
- NIC also thanked the partners (Crime and Justice Institute, Bureau of Justice Statistics and Abt Associates) in bringing about this meeting.

Danielle Kaeble, Statistician, Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and Ann Carson, Acting Corrections Unit Chief, BJS

- Discussed the importance of data and opportunities such as this meeting forward work done in the field of corrections.
- Thanked partners for meeting preparation, participants who traveled to the meeting and participants who prepared presentations.

Tom Rich, Senior Associate, Abt Associates

- There will be sessions throughout the meeting on how to use the NCRP data.

Michael Kane, Senior Associate, Crime and Justice Institute (CJI) at CRJ

- The great benefits of these meetings is meeting people who do similar work.
- Each meeting provides the opportunity for networking and learning from one another; lessons that can be applied in every day work and improve professional efforts.
- Informed participants of logistics for the following days.
- Thanks partners for support and all participants for their interest and participation in the meeting.

Keynote speaker

Anne Precythe, Director, Missouri Department of Corrections

- Faith versus Fact:
 - Often times government offices operate on faith: they know what they're doing and expect higher ups to recognize that. It is important to supplement this with data and be able to provide research to demonstrate that what you're doing works.
 - "Faith" and "fact" are both important. Initiating policy changes requires faith, validating them requires data and research.
- Mental health:
 - Unlike mental health systems, people leave corrections. This makes continuing support difficult to provide if people's first access to mental health resources was while they were involved in the corrections systems.

- Communities need the resources to care for people with mental illnesses. Law enforcement need to have mental health responses that keep people out of prisons. The business communities need to provide job opportunities for people with mental health problems.
- Coal Ridge Project:
 - Missouri is in the process of taking big data elements tracked by different agencies in order to answer research questions that require information about the same people over time. For example, they want to determine whether prison employment programs improve employment outcomes post release.
 - This will help build understanding across different agencies. While corrections officials all know that what they do influences social services, employment, education, etc., the agencies dealing with these issues don't always understand the impact that their policies have on recidivism.
- Reentry:
 - Missouri is in the process of piloting reentry centers. These centers will:
 - Be carpeted, painted, and have computers with unrestricted internet access.
 - Allow people to work with employers to try and line up jobs pre-release.
 - Allow access to supportive housing officials and resources.
 - Include other outside partners in other government areas that will help people with access to resources and social services prior to reentry.
 - Philanthropic groups
 - While there are many non-profits interested in corrections reforms, they need to be given data in order to understand where their resources are best spent.
 - Education groups need to be able to partner with prisons on educational reforms.
- Corrections as a working environment:
 - Correctional Officers (COs) have lower life expectancy. Missouri is working to reduce mandatory overtime.
 - There is a nationwide shortage of COs. The solution to this is to change how people think of corrections work: get people involved who are coming from different background.

BJS and CES Initiatives: Research studies using NCRP and CES data

Ryan Kling, Abt Associates

- NCRP Data was created by BJS in 1983.
 - The data set has basic data, including offender demographics.
 - Includes identifying information (state ID, FBI numbers, and social security numbers), which allows researchers to look across states.
 - In this way, it created a national data set researchers can use to answer previously unanswerable questions.
 - What information NCRP has for each state and for how many years varies depends on each state's data capacity.
- There are a number of classic and recurring studies that Abt does with NCRP data.
 - Description of prison population:
 - Different agencies/organization use this to do data visualization/analysis.

- Recidivism studies including offender based recidivism rates – so, how often does this individual come back?
 - This helps identify frequent fliers and how to help them break the cycle of incarceration.
- Prison population projections:
 - Many other places do this as well – the benefit of Abt’s prison projections is it’s the same methodology so can accurately compare states.
- Prevalence by subgroups:
 - This method helps shine a light on particular populations (for example, looking at imprisonment rate in rural vs urban areas).
 - NCRP makes it very easy to look at imprisonment by demographics (such as race/ethnicity as well as age, gender).
- Mass incarceration - The subgroups and time series let you look at mass incarceration.
 - Best policy prescriptions are the ones that identify causes of incarceration in the first place. Most of the studies doing that use NCRP data to do that.
- Offender characteristics:
 - NCRP allows for investigating into characteristics.
 - For example, looking at aging or mortality in prison.
 - Because NCRP has data across so many states, observers can look at some smaller populations.
 - For example, looking at female sex offenders or those imprisoned for hate crimes.
 - Those are both small populations, but taking all state’s data together, can have a population big enough to study.
- Release and reentry services:
 - It is possible to link other data sets to the NCRP data using social security numbers.
 - For example, linking NCRP and HIV data to see what sort of care formerly incarcerated people with HIV were able to access.
 - Or, another example would be looking up what sort of public housing people coming out of prison are getting.
- Social policy’s impact on recidivism:
 - Observers can look at how policies impact recidivism.
 - For example: does access to health care granted by the ACA/Medicaid expansion impact recidivism? Did changes to TANF or SNAP eligibility impact recidivism?
 - NCRP make it possible to investigate those questions.
- All these studies research wouldn’t be possible without this data. Thank you for sharing your data to make all this possible.
- Data Access:
 - The BJS Corrections Statistical Analysis Tool (CSAT) is publically available from NACJD at ICPSR.
 - Less detailed data are freely downloadable – to get more detailed info, it is necessary to do an IRB request.
 - For more information: askbjs@usdoj.gov

BJS and CES Initiatives: Current and Future Plans

Danielle Kaeble, BJS

- BJS is working with the Center on Economic Studies on some studies.
 - This is done behind a firewall so only a select group of people can access, but able to do some really cool things with the data.
- Post-release mortality:
 - This is a pretty big and diverse group from the 2010 release cohort.
 - The study investigates the role demographics and length of stay have on mortality; how timing and rate of mortality interact differently with race and Hispanic origin; and an investigation of the general population and the 35 states they have data from for this set.
 - BJS is hoping to release this data through the Census in 2020.
- Employment data:
 - This data aims to link sets to examples of employment and earning outcomes.
 - Data contains demographic, criminal history, and geographic characteristics.
 - BJS is exploring the possibility of a 2010 release cohort and community supervision and hopes to be looking at employment post-release and during and after community supervision.
 - Combining census data on earnings and employment with NCRP data.
 - Data contains earnings and employment rates by demographics and geographic areas, as well as earnings by sector.
 - Currently Abt is looking at employment before and after incarceration, and during and after community supervision.
 - Data demonstrates that both the type of sentence and the type of offense is linked to employment.
 - Since data is national and observers can look across state, it is possible to track employment and earnings if someone moves out of state post incarceration.

Plenary: Exploring Recidivism – Conditions of Confinement on Recidivism

Brian Kowalski, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

- Some recent studies examined institutional misconduct and recidivism have started to include measures of prison context within various empirical analyses. This study borrows from these empirical analyses.
- The data shows a pretty steady increase in violence over the past seven to eight years, which was policy driven.
 - There were around 12-13 specific policies that changed and impacted these numbers.
 - For the Annual Rates of Physical and Sexual Assault RIB Rule Infractions for males, all security levels stabilized with the except for reception.
 - Security Level 3 had a steady increase until 2017, and was the second impetus for the study.
- What is going on in these broad security levels that matters?
 - Population as of September 2019: 48,890

- Number of Ohio Prisons: 28
 - High Security Focus: 10
 - Level 3 Prisons: 7
 - Level 4 Prisons: 2
 - ERH (Level 5) Prisons: 1
 - Restrictive Housing Population as of September 2019: 1,972
 - Level 4 = max security
 - Level 5 = Super max
 - Rates of assaultive misconduct are consistently highest at Level 4 and ERH (Level 5).
 - Rate of assaults at Level 3 steadily increased over the last 9 years.
- An increase in violence led to a number of agency-wide reform efforts aimed at curtailing institutional violence.
 - What is really going on here because the institutions are different?
 - Borrowed from the literature and moved beyond the individual level factors.
 - One of the primary strategies has been to concentrate violent offenders and active/disrupt gang members into higher security “control” prisons with various conditions of confinement.
- Research and Study Design:
 - We wanted to move beyond just a simple look at the data.
 - Research Questions:
 - What was the most appropriate way to conceptualize high security incarceration history and movements into and out of restrictive housing settings?
 - What is the effect of high security incarceration history measures on recidivism net of important individual-level controls?
 - Do prison-level factors, such as ecological deprivation and prison climate measures, that contextualize the immediate environment prior to release impact recidivism?
 - Do the cumulative conditions of confinement vary in their effects across these facility-level measures?
- Prison Security Levels:
 - Level 1/2: least secure setting, mostly dorm-style environment, and free range of movement.
 - There is not a lot of differences between Level 1 and Level 2.
 - Level 3: more secure setting, cellular environment (with cellmate), limited out-of-cell time (4 to 6 hours), and controlled movement.
 - There is still out of cell time, but they are locked in a day room type area and released by tier.
 - Level 4: secure setting, cellular environment (without cellmate), limited out-of-cell time (3 to 4 hours) with some congregate activity.
 - ERH: most secure setting, confinement to a cell 23 hours a day for more than 30 days (with a cellmate in segregation area and alone with ERH as security level), and no congregate activity.
- Variation within Security Level:
 - We were looking to see if the variation between levels matters.
 - As part of the analysis, we are going to go into the housing units and observe.

- Data, Key measures and Analytic Strategy:
 - The broader sample population consists of the entire release cohort of male inmates in 2014 that served at least 6 months in prison before release.
 - Did not include reception centers (2) or private prisons (2 for males) because we don't have access to the staffing levels for the climate data.
 - Wanted to look at the immediate context before release:
 - What matters more: the entirety of your incarceration history or right before immediate release?
 - Time spent in segregation across the whole sentence.
- Descriptive Statistics for Outcome Measures and Individual-Level Control Variables:
 - The impetus for Individual level control was to factor in individual risk for recidivism.
 - Outcome measure: Overall incarceration within 2 years was 23.6%
 - There isn't any individual level gang involvement because the focus was more on prison context, with a large concentration at Security Level 2.
- Descriptive Statistics for High Security History, Ecological Deprivation Factors, and Prison Climate Measures:
 - Percentages of young offenders: Mean was 15.96
 - Weighted average of total housing square footage: Mean was 26.96
- Cox Proportional Hazards Models Predicting the Risk of Overall Reincarceration:
 - Program data is not the greatest, but recently received some findings with interesting effects, but those are not included in this presentation.
 - There are cumulative effects on recidivism and how they relate to segregation history.
 - Preliminary work: They have really strong individual effects, but also have some correlated effects so working through those effects. There are also effects of the immediate environment, as well as, above and beyond the individual factors.
 - One finding was that the more square footage you have, the higher rate of recidivism.
- Preliminary Conclusions:
 - This study demonstrates the effects of cumulative exposure to high security settings have pronounced and persistent effects on recidivism despite the more recent environmental prison context.
 - There are implications for step down units and it could be possible to move beyond Restrictive Housing.

Plenary: Exploring Recidivism – Using Prison Days and Total Costs as an Alternative to Return to Prison Measures

Mark Harris, Wyoming Department of Corrections and Ethan Harris, Casper College

- This study looks to analyze:
 - The differences between those released to the street and those released to adult community corrections centers.
 - How different are the release options, the number of days a person spends in prison, and the associated cost?

- The database used for the study has been around long enough in time that it is able to look back about 10 years to determine first time inmate status.
- Looked at a July to June cycle:
 - Extracted 6 cohorts- comparison between Adult Community Corrections (ACC) participants and those who parole to the street (and then those ‘jammers’ who are released without any supervision)
 - The ACC Work release program:
 - Takes inmates (who are within 2 years of parole eligibility date/qualify and are accepted to the program) to work release from the prisons.
 - Those who do not qualify can apply to the program and can be approved.
 - The program requires off site employment, with onsite supervision when not engaged with programming or off site employment.
 - There is additional substance abuse testing, and the program has an onsite housing curfew.
 - Lower levels of supervision than at the ACC’s include private living accommodations for street release
 - Discharge with no supervision (‘jammers’)
- Inmates with One Prison Intake for the First Time During FY2010-FY2015 by Three-Year Return to Prison Rates:
 - The No Supervision cohorts had the lowest return rate at 11%.
 - The ACC cohorts have the highest return to prison.
- Gender Demographics:
 - Gender differences: There were more males than females in the study across all supervision statuses.
 - Parole to Street has the highest number of females in the cohort.
- Race Demographics:
 - ACC and Parole to street cohorts, there were 20% non-white.
 - The No Supervision cohort had the highest number of non-whites at 23%.
- Age Demographic:
 - The average age for first time exit-ers: 36.9 years
 - The average age for the No Supervision cohort: 38.7 years
 - The average age for the ACC cohort: 35.5 years
- Logistic Regression:
 - Control Variables:
 - Age, gender, race, and COMPAS
 - Does the model help identify true positives vs false positives?
 - AUC was .69 so decided to run the model.
- Logistic Regression Results:
 - Ran the model and the results showed that the ACC recidivism rate was 24% - 70% higher for Street parole.

- Instead of looking at the rate of return, we looked at how many days people actually stay in prison vs how many resources are used:
 - Distribution of how many prison days are consumed by each of these three groups:
 - Average number of days is pretty close to being the same across all 3 groups.
 - There are a few people in each of the groups that consume a larger number of days (outliers).
- We considered removing the outliers (but decided not to in the end). They are rare but they are consistent.
- Prison Days and Cost:
 - Took the average of all the prison sentences' first exits for the different groups and looked at 3 years after your first exit:
 - 1st people to exit are the ACC group- have the earliest opportunity to be offsite
 - 2nd group is the street parole group
 - 3rd group is the no supervision group
 - Although ACC has the higher recidivism rate, they consume fewer resources at the prison level.
 - This breaks down to 80 fewer days on average per inmate, whether they were in the ACC group as compared to the street parole group.
 - ACC group consumed more resources once out of prison. The ACC group was more expensive than street parole but less expensive than being in prison.
 - If going to increase the number of beds, then a new facility would have to be built. Those costs were not included.
 - We think it is much more expensive when factoring in the operation costs to build the new prison, etc.
 - ACC group still has justification to exist because it does reduce the number of needed prison beds.

Discussion

- Question: For average cost: cost average taking into variable cost or does it incorporate fixed cost such as custodial cost?
 - Answer: The average operation costs so they don't factor in anything that has to do with repair/rehab on facilities, etc. There is no cost associated of capital, however, it does include costs such as programming, staff costs, etc.
- Question: Work release: are they able to have jobs in the community?
 - Answer: They have to have a job in community because they have to pay for part of their participation (so it is offsetting some of the costs).
- Question: Was there a "sweet spot" by age or any other demographics that showed a specific cohort/grouping that was better if released from ACC?
 - Answer: Across the board they were worse if released from ACC.
- Comment: You should try to encourage spotlighting work of ACC because they also do volunteering in the community.

Plenary: Exploring Recidivism – Recidivism of Sex Offenders

Zach Baumgart, Wisconsin Department of Corrections

- The presentation centers upon two interests:
 - General policy interested in reducing, preventing, and eliminating sexual offending
 - Sex offending itself, and particularly sex offenders themselves
- There is a known difference in general recidivism between sex offenders vs non-sex offenders. Studies have shown that there is a lower rate of recidivism for sex offenders, about 18% less than for non-sex offenders.
- Reasons why the recidivism rate is lower for sex offenders?
 - Sexual offending is easier to hide.
 - Sexual offending is more poorly reported.
 - How to accurately capture this without looking at it?
- Explanation 1: A Demographic Artifact
 - Control argument:
 - Sex offenders tend more likely to be white, higher level of education, and older.
 - Sex offenders tend to be overwhelmingly male.
 - This study is only focusing on men.
- Explanation 2: A Difference in treatment
 - Differences in treatment are associated with difference in recidivism by size of the reduction, characteristics of the offender, and treatment area.
 - Treatment programming continues to drive correctional interventions within institutional settings.
- Explanation 3: A difference in community supervision
 - Community supervision looks different for sex offenders vs non-sex offenders.
 - As a result of the tighter supervision, sex offenders may be revoked more often than non-sex offender.
 - This higher rate of revocation is related to reduced recidivism:
 - Through simple incapacitation
 - Through sanctions that are applied before criminal behavior occurs
 - Through some other mechanism
- Sample of releases:
 - Looked at all releases of men from WI DOC institutions between 1990 and 2013.
 - Removed:
 - Releases from new sentences or from revocations
 - Civil commitments
 - Multiple releases in a year
 - Death within three years
 - Multiple release for same recidivism event
 - The final sample was 112,552 releases.

- Recidivism as Reconviction:
 - There are 2 measures of recidivism: rearrest and reincarceration, but the event for reincarceration was a new admission to the Wisconsin DOC.
- Sex offender status:
 - Sex offense at release:
 - The person must have been released for an active sex offense.
 - Based mostly on UCR categories and WI registry offenses.
 - Registered as sex offender at release:
 - The data should capture those missed by the first status.
 - Must have been registered within seven days after release from community supervision.
 - There are some offenses that are not on their face a sex offense but if they do something under certain characteristics then it is considered a sex offense.
- Other Variables:
 - When looking at the sex offender treatment, the data only focused on 2010-2013.
 - Must have completed while incarcerated, prior to release.
 - Only tracking completion for a given release.
 - Revocation:
 - As a type of reincarceration.
 - As a flag, sometime after release.
 - Features gathered at intake, from the offender:
 - Race, age, education level.
- Analysis Technique:
 - Survival analysis:
 - Controls for differences in follow-up periods.
 - Controls for differences in when tracking begins and ends.
 - Standard for predicting likelihood of an event occurring at some point in the future.
 - Logistic regression with fixed follow-up periods:
 - As a secondary check on the robustness of the survival analysis
 - Easier for interpretation.
- Kaplan-Meier Survival Curve of Recidivism:
 - Survival Curve: as you go across time, the number of people who have not recidivated within the first 3-5 years and across time stabilizes.
 - Sex offenders have a lower risk of recidivating than non-sex offenders, in general, over time.
- Explanation 1: A demographic artifact:
 - Sex offenders were more likely to be white, have a higher level of educational attainment, and to be older.
 - Each of these effects were independently associated with the risk to recidivate.
 - But controlling for these effects did not change the relationship between sex offender status and recidivism.
 - Little evidence in favor of this explanation.
- Explanation 2: A difference in treatment:

- Individual effects have roughly the same relationship here as for the full sample.
- Those sex offenders who completed sex offender treatment had lower rates of recidivism than non-sex offenders.
- Caveat is that only 13% of sex offenders completed treatment before release, so Sex offender treatment was negatively associated with general recidivism.
- Explanation 3: A difference in supervision:
 - Sex offenders had a higher risk to be reincarcerated than did non-sex offenders
 - But if we focus on reincarceration for JUST revocations without a new offense... Sex offenders had a higher risk to be reincarcerated than did non-sex offenders, specifically for no new sentence revocations.
 - See that again when we look at the revocations after release:
 - Sex offenders had a higher risk to be reincarcerated than did non-sex offenders, specifically for no new sentence revocations.
 - Being revoked was associated with a reduced risk to recidivate.
 - Sex offender risk to recidivate decreased when revocation was added to model.
 - There is some evidence in favor of this explanation.
- Additional Tests:
 - Being revoked at some point after release:
 - People who are revoked for a technical have a lower risk to recidivate than those who do not- effect side has definitely changed.
 - Generation affects, rearrest, and a variety of other – didn't change the overall trend.
- Conclusion:
 - There was very little evidence in favor of demographic relationships playing an intervening role.
 - However, these independent effects were systematically different between the two groups, which should not be disregarded.
 - There was evidence that sex offender treatment reduced recidivism, but very few sex offenders actually completed treatment prior to release.
 - Future studies should take what works from sex offender treatment, and apply it to other programs, and obviously, expand sex offender treatment.
 - Evidence that revocation played an important role in driving the relationship
 - Though what it was about revocation was not tested
 - Revocation was a proxy for differences in community supervision, and should not be taken as a direct effect.

Discussion

- Question: So you only looked at those that had treatment through 2013?
 - Answer: Yes, because limited to just the data we had which was from 2010-2013.
- Question: What types of programming do you have?
 - Answer: Sex Offender Treatment, Cognitive Behavioral Treatment, Substance Abuse Disorder, and Anger Management and Domestic Violence – and they are encouraged to participate but are not required to participate, also education/vocational programming. Earned release program that are statutorily created programs- those are things that people are encouraged to take as an incentive to take- generally have eligibility requirements.

- Question: What percentage completed treatment?
 - Answer: A little over 13% (Didn't look at community programming, only programming while in the facility)

Plenary: Research in Corrections Practices – Pracademic Research: Engaging Corrections Practitioners in Research through Innovation and Experimentation

Bret Bucklen, Pennsylvania Department of Corrections

- The Pennsylvania DOC has three goals to meet in the next 4 years: Population reduction, recidivism reduction and in-prison violence reduction.
 - Evidence based practices (EBPs) and academic research models are typically the “go-to” strategies for meeting these types of goals. Due to concerns with these strategies, PA DOC has looked into other options.
- There are complimentary ways of looking at evidence in state corrections and EBPs are not the only way. Some of the concerns PA DOC had with EBPs include:
 - Claiming something is evidence based makes it harder to counter it. Unless you follow up with the data, you might be using a tool solely because it is labeled evidence based.
 - Other methods are being overlooked because they are not labeled as evidence based.
 - EBPs are only as good as the quality in evidence behind them.
 - More evidence or studies does not mean it is the best evidence, quality over quantity is best.
 - Lower quality studies tend to over exaggerate the impact or effectiveness of a programs.
 - Only focusing on EBPs crowds out innovation.
- Concerns with the Academic Research Model:
 - Evaluations tend to be too slow.
 - Example: You identify program, find a research partner, work together and apply for a grant. If you receive the grant, there are then agreements to work out. By the time this is done – people might not care anymore about the original question.
 - It is expensive.
 - It is monopolized by academics and executives with little feedback from on the ground practitioners (especially line staff).
- The faults in EBPs and Academic Research Model led the PA DOC to figure out what it means to be a learning organization with total employee involvement. They began researching the pracademic model.
 - Pracademic key take away: Anyone can be a part of the scientific process of generating and testing an idea, irrespective of background, training, or job title.
- How to implement this pracademic strategy with staff?
 - PA DOC developed the I.D.E.A. (Innovate, Develop, Experiment, Adapt) model:
 - Key tool here is a “suggestion box” but with more structure, that is actually taken seriously and translated into learning.
 - It has helped get ideas to improve practices from staff.
 - Empowers staff and makes them feel like they have a say in the organization.

- All staff can submit, and all suggestions are followed up on, permitting that they are legal, ethical and not cost prohibitive.
 - The process for submitting an idea is an anonymous online form. A committee meets weekly to check the forms to determine which suggestions are worth pursuing.
 - What is included in the form:
 - Describe what you hope your idea will accomplish.
 - Suggest where your idea should be tested first.
 - Describe any challenges you may foresee with your idea.
 - Contact information - optional
 - The suggestions are then broken down into three categories that they already had in place for improvements. The categories are labeled:
 - BetaGov (external partner): improve outcomes
 - Lean (internal): improve processes
 - GoTIME (internal): save money
- Examples of staff ideas that worked:
 - More color friendly sheets improved inmate conduct. They used green bed linens instead of their usual blue and say positive outcomes.
 - Increased Pat Searches, which resulted in lower misconducts, lower contraband finds and there was no difference in grievances.
 - This is one of the “harsher” ideas that worked. Staff were worried that only “lenient” initiatives would be expected but they were open to all types
 - Putting up motivational posters for inmates and staff.
- Examples of ideas with mixed results (produced unclear results):
 - Playing soothing sounds in restrictive housing unit.
 - Introducing aroma therapy.
 - Using video games as an incentive.
- Examples of ideas that did not work:
 - Having fish tanks in the facilities.
 - Introducing a suicide prevention training for staff.
 - Providing vitamin D supplements for inmates and staff.
 - Having inmates participate in art therapy sessions.
- PA DOC has taken a few strategies to systemize this practice and brand it so it carries on in the department.
 - They created a podcast called Pracademically Speaking.
 - Each episode focuses around a topic, features an interview with an expert, and features an interview with a PA DOC “pracademic”.
 - There is now a staff innovations award at their annual employee awards ceremony.
 - A Facebook page was created for staff to debate and share ideas.
 - A steering committee for IDEA initiatives was put in place.
- Challenges to this pracademic strategy.
 - People propose ideas but don’t want to do the work.
 - Takes a lot of manage it, not everything lends itself to this type of testing because of time

- Recidivism does not lend itself well to this internal practice.

Discussion

- Question: Have you ever heard of Canada giving reduced time for completing a GED or other courses?
 - Answer: That would have to be built into sentencing statute and could not be implemented by this model.

Plenary: Research in Corrections Practices – Idaho Prison Compstat Reporting

Janeena White, Idaho Department of Correction

- Idaho Department of Correction (IDOC) currently has one of the highest incarceration rates in the country. They are now a Justice Reinvestment state and this has led to the development of new goals and strategies to implement positive changes. This is implemented through a program called Compstat and some of the ideas include:
 - Evaluating all programs in prisons and the community using a program checklist (Correctional Program Checklist - CPC). The metrics are then used to help probation and parole officers.
 - Training on motivational interviewing.
 - Keeping caseloads lower for probation and parole officers.
 - Reserving prison beds for more violent offenders and focus on community programs for nonviolent, low risk offenders.
 - Providing judges with more information on recidivism based on risk.
 - Tracking recidivism reduction and evaluated both positive and negative outcomes.
 - Creating more reentry centers.
 - Increasing research and policies.
 - Providing more data metrics on probation and parole as well as providing legislative reports.
- Outcomes after becoming a Justice Reinvestment state.
 - There has been a continuation in population growth, mainly driven by parole violations and drug offenses.
 - More data is being collected.
 - There has been an increase in spending on treatment in the community.
 - CPC assessments indicate most programs are effective to highly effective.
 - There has been an increase in absconding.
 - There has been an Increase in drug sentencing.
 - They started to do more substance abuse testing in the community.
 - Greater attention to data and evidence based practices is being given.
 - Policy makers and leadership are asking right question about progress and changes they can make. This has been key in keeping the motivation to reach their goals.
- How do we keep policy makers and leadership involved?
 - Produce results of data collection being done in a timely fashion. If you wait too long the data may not be of interest anymore.
 - Simplify the data and create better visualizations.
 - A data visualization training helped them with presenting their data and keeping staff and leadership interested.
 - Follow up with leadership to see if a report you are working on is really what they need.

- Always dig deeper if you are not finding the right answer.
- Why is IDOC's population not decreasing?
 - Surveying of absconders has resulted in the feedback that their access to and relationship with parole officers needs improvement.
 - Surveying of staff has resulted in the feedback that they feel like they don't have enough time to work on their caseloads.
 - Main expectation of JRI means a lot more is expected of them. There is more data to collect and enter.
 - Working on hiring Probation/Parole Specialists to help staff with the higher expectations.
 - They haven't had sentencing reform.
- What can IDOC do differently?
 - They can implement Betagov trials.
 - Have more pre and post surveying of inmates in facilities.
 - Trying the principles of normality method.
 - Meaning to normalize the prison environment with things like plants, murals, couches, an enhanced environment.
 - Incentive tiers like video games and dog training programs.

Breakout Session #1: Impact of Technical Revocations on Recidivism for More Serious Crime

Gerald Gaes, Corrections Consultant

- Parole outcomes:
 - Offenders can enter community supervision, complete their terms successfully, and exit supervision.
 - Offenders can enter community supervision, commit a minor crime or a violation of the terms governing community supervision, and parole is revoked, returning the offender to prison with no new conviction.
 - Offenders can enter community supervision, commit a serious crime, and return to prison with a new conviction.
 - We emphasize the difference between serious crimes, which are a major policy concern, and minor crimes or technical violations which are much less egregious.
- Policy issue:
 - Revocations for minor crimes and technical violations incapacitate offenders thereby preventing new crimes for more serious offenses.
 - How much does the use of revocations prevent serious crimes from occurring?
 - As important as this question is, we are not aware of any previous research to address this question.
- Prison Return Ambiguities:
 - Sometimes supervision terminations are ambiguous.
 - The parole outcomes discussed before may not be known at the time of re-admission to prison.
 - These outcomes may vary extremely between jurisdictions.

- We have looked at this problem across many states and found evidence that not all states have sufficient information at the time of admission to distinguish revocation returns and new court commitment returns.
- In research on this problem, some scholars have acquired additional data to sort out these dispositions.
 - We have developed five to seven databases to assist in sorting out any issues and researching the problem.
- This will vary by state, so researchers tried to resolve this issue by choosing an alternative definition.
 - Many researchers are in need of a generic approach, contradictory to the variation across states. Using a generic approach with such variation complicates the process.
- One resolution to this ambiguity:
 - Alternative Definitions:
 - A minor crime is one that results in a prison readmission of less than one year.
 - A serious crime is one that results in a prison readmission of one year or more.
 - Justification:
 - We compared the data using the minor/major crime distinction to the parole release codes and the prison admission codes, finding they are consistent with each other.
 - Alternative interpretation:
 - Our analysis is an evaluation of the incapacitative effect of a minor offense return on the occurrence of a return for a serious offense.
- Data come from NCRP – a state with a large parole population:
 - The analysis comprises parole terms that end with:
 - Censoring (we cannot observe the outcome beyond some point in time) because of the end of data collection.
 - Censoring because supervision ends successfully.
 - Event A occurs when the offender returns to prison for a minor crime/technical violation.
 - Event B occurs when the offender returns to prison for a serious crime.
 - The research uses 12 years of release/return data.
- Analysis method: Competing events survival model:
 - Simple survival model: inferential program
 - In the simple survival model, we estimate the distribution of time until an offender returns to prison. Nothing interrupts the “process” of recidivism except the length of the supervision period.
 - In a competing events model, two (or more) events “compete” to occur first. If A (a minor crime) occurs first, we do not observe B. If B (a serious crime) occurs first, we do not observe A.
 - The competing events model allows us to estimate:
 - The rate offenders would return to prison for serious crimes given that the parole process operates the way it operates, that is, given that A does interrupt B?
 - The rate offenders return to prison if the parole process did not revoke offenders for minor matters?
 - The difference is the treatment effect – the reduction in serious crimes by imprisoning for minor crimes/violations.

- Technical Research Explanations:
 - Our competing events models are Weibull/normal mixtures.
 - The competing events are dependent; the mixture is the bivariate standard normal distribution with correlation ρ .
 - ρ is the correlation in the distribution of the error terms for the two events.
 - If ρ is 0, this implies no relationship between the unmeasured variables that predict minor and major crimes.
 - If ρ is 1, this implies a perfect relationship.
 - ρ is certainly not 0: unmeasured factors that predict a minor crime will predict a major crime.
 - ρ is unlikely to be 1: there are probably subtle factors that determine whether a minor or serious crime will occur.
 - ρ is not identified. We do not know the value of ρ because we never observe minor and major crimes simultaneously.
 - To overcome this problem, we use a bounding solution that allows ρ to take on different values, $\{0, 0.5, 1\}$.
 - We use a Bayesian logic to estimate standard errors. Bill and I developed this estimator for an article that is forthcoming in a special issue of *Evaluation Review*

- Simulating event outcomes :
 - Every observation has an estimated time-to-event for both a minor and major return.
 - We simulate the returns when a minor crime return interrupts the serious criminal return from occurring.
 - We simulate the returns when a minor crime return cannot interrupt a major crime return.
 - The simulation cycles through events into the future – 5, 10, and 15 years – using an algorithm that has the following features:
 - An individual's is returned unless the person desists.
 - If returned, the length of time in prison is estimated for minor and major returns.
 - The person serves a simulated time in prison based on time served for a minor/major event.
 - Then a subsequent release and return is simulated unless the person desists.
 - We update the person's age and criminal history each cycle of the event and this effects the estimation of a return for either a minor or major offense.
 - We run this simulation under different values of ρ providing bounded results.

- Conclusions:
 - Regardless of the value of ρ , returns for a minor crime/technical violation prevented a large number of more serious crimes from occurring.
 - ρ is unlikely to be 0 which is the assumption of most analysts who use competing risks survival models in criminal justice.
 - If we had used this typical assumption, the impact of returns for less serious crimes/violations would have been lower by as much as 30%.
 - We presume the impact of technical violation/minor crime returns will be different for different states, so the results we presented here may only apply to this state.

- Limitations:
 - We assume that the end of supervision is an independent censoring event, but maybe it is not.
 - The lack of covariates – having the state's risk release score would be an important addition.
 - Our best evidence to date is that these definitions yield the same results.

Discussion

- Question: Research like that is usually done with parole data; there isn't much about probation. Is there some work to be done to focus less on parole and more on probation?
 - Answer: The same method could be applied to probation by looking at time from being assigned to probation and look at revocations.
- Question: When you did your modeling, for 5-10-15 years, were you able to compare back to database to see if modeling held out?
 - Answer: We have a number of modeling checks. In terms of initial estimation, we started with Kaplan-Myer result. The Kovi and Boggs simulation is another check used.
- Question: Is it possible to use the findings to suggest that even though many prisoners are coming back with technical violations and policies are preventing future crimes from happening?
 - Answer: Only in this state; revocation policy may be different in different jurisdiction. Anyone interpreting the results should be careful with overgeneralizing.

Breakout Session #1: The Technicalities of Technical Violations

Clarissa Dias and Maria Stephenson, Georgia Department of Community Supervision

- Background Information for Georgia (GA):
 - Supervision officers have a little over 100-person caseload.
 - GA has about 100,000 people on parole and probation.
 - In the United States, 45% of 1.5 million people in community corrections return to prison due to tech violations.
 - In each state tech violations are defined differently. This complicates reporting and drawing inferences from nationwide data.
- What are Technical Violations?
 - In GA technical violations are not a criminal offense.
 - Violations of supervision condition(s) are imposed by the court or the parole board.
 - Technical violations do not usually result in a new arrest.
- Examples of Tech Violations:
 - Examples of technical violations include:
 - Failure to report
 - Failure to pay supervision fees or restitution
 - Positive drug screen
 - Curfew violation
 - Changing residence without permission
 - Technical violations increase prison populations and contribute to overcrowding.
 - The current research separated technical violations between prison and alternative to incarceration (community supervision).
- Community Supervision Revocations:
 - The Department of Community Supervision (DCS) on average has a total of 1900 revocations.

- DCS records data on separate types of revocations, including: new charges, technical violations and special conditions.
- Important Considerations:
 - Talking about probationers; judge could be looking at something in the totality of the system, and decided on something else other than the violation itself
- Opportunities had for graduated sanctions:
 - A state should ensure a clear statewide definition of “revocation”, to promote statewide consistency.
 - State laws should limit which violations are sanctioned by incarceration, and if possible, to keep those who violate in the community.
 - Graduated sanctions or alternative sentencing should be available.
 - The use of a graduated sanctions matrix reduces discretion and not increase emotional decisions.
 - Probation options management:
 - Helps internally.
 - Historically conversation has shifted from prison entry; previously the importance of measuring technical violations

Discussion

- Question: Is probation data used for felonies or for misdemeanors?
 - Answer: All probation data is for felonies.
- Question: Depending on severity of violation does the sanction of assigned doesn't have to go through chain of supervision; do supervisors have to sign off or can agents sign off?
 - Answer: Yes, supervisor has to sign off if person is going back to parole board. This is done for any violation.
- Question: In parole, it is somewhat common to have someone in supervision to be arrested. This person is technically violated but often not prosecuted. What happens when someone gets arrested?
 - Answer: In GA, this [an arrest] would be considered a technical violation.
- Question: Do you distinguish people who get technical violation with those who have been arrested?
 - Answer: Yes, it is captured in the raw data, but in presentation they are grouped together.
- Question: How are resources allocated for alternatives to detention?

Answer: DCS collaborates with the GA Department of Corrections and also partners with other agencies. Because DCS is in the middle of community and facility so have double the resources.

Breakout Session #1: Development and Validation of New Classification Assessment: The MN Severe and Frequent Estimate for Discipline (MnSafeD)

Grant Duwe, Minnesota Department of Corrections

- Misconduct is the outcome we are trying to predict with classification assessments.

- One of the main reasons why we want to assess for risk for misconduct is because research has shown when we use an actuarial assessment it can most effectively predict misconduct.
- Paul Meehl wrote a book about clinical judgement vs statistical/mechanical judgement (how does our gut judgment do vs an algorithm).
 - Clinical judgement does better at predicting than professional judgement.
 - Why does actuarial judgement outperform? Cognitive bias – we have thoughts/feelings about what someone will do in the future.
- Kahneman and Tversky: Their work focused on why humans make decisions that aren't always rational, and the reason decisions aren't always rational is because of the cognitive bias that we all have.
 - When we are making risk assessment decisions, it makes sense for someone who is in prison for sex offender treatment to admit to additional offenses– because of this admission, we think we need to increase that person's risk, yet the empirical evidence shows that just because there are additional offenses this does not increase their risk to commit it again.
- Research on use of “expert” judgment (done in multiple fields) – we should rely on statistical predictions:
 - We see this in corrections in the place where we use professional judgement to outweigh statistical judgement. Agencies are using professional judgement to override a risk assessment.
 - The two research studies (Wormith et al. (2012) and McCafferty (2017)) showed that overrides do not lead to better risk decisions than statistical.
- Prior Research on Risk Assessment Customization:
 - One of the other assumptions is that it is better to customize the risk assessment to the population you are going to use it on, but there isn't much research to address this issue.
 - What we do see on the Level of Services (LS) family of tools is the predictive performance has been tested on multiple populations and works, but that does not mean it will work on your particular population (misconception about the LS tools).
- Comparison of the performance of the MnSOST-3 and Static- 99 on the Minnesota population:
 - Found that the MnSOST-3 outperformed the Static-99.
 - The MnSOST-3 was developed specifically for the MN sex offender population.
 - It is important to make sure you test your risk assessment to be sure that it is validated on your population.
- Impact of Using an Automated Scoring Method:
 - With a manually scored assessment, scoring the assessment could take from 30-60 minutes per assessment.
 - The automated assessment is done automatically in a matter of seconds/minutes.
 - MnSTARR was manual, but the MnSTARR 2.0 was automated in 2016.
- What are the impacts of fully automating the assessment?
 - Automation eliminates inter-rater disagreement and increases reliability and better predictive performance.

- Automation eliminates a layer of potential error from the risk assessment process because how people score the assessment manually pulls down the predictive performance of the tool.
- 2 years after automating the MnSTARR 2.0, MN has increased to 68,000 assessments per a year (about 50,000 increase from how many assessments were conducted previously).
 - No matter how many days they are in prison (1 day, etc.) EVERYONE gets an assessment because it is automated.
- Bias in Risk Assessment:
 - A lot of confusion and misunderstanding around risk assessments is that risk assessments are used a lot of different ways across the system from sentencing decisions to pretrial to probations to prisoners to Classification (MN) to helping make parole decisions.
 - There is a difference between high stakes decisions (e.g. whether someone is released to the community or confined) vs. lower stakes (e.g. level of supervision, decisions for programming).
 - It is important to validate the assessment for bias.
- Minnesota DOC Current Classification System:
 - MnDOC classification assessment was manually by staff and uses a simple, summative weighing scheme (Burgess method).
 - There are some inmates that don't get the assessment, if released as a probation they don't get reassessed if go back for violation, etc. unless they are back for a new felony.
- MnSafeD
 - The MnSafeD is fully automated.
 - The MnSafeD predicts "severe and frequent misconduct":
 - The assessment is done at intake and then an assessment is done every 6 months thereafter.
 - MN uses the MnSafeD to make custody level decisions.
 - Two tools were developed --one for males and one for females, so they are gender specific.
 - Used multiple metrics to evaluate predictive performance.
- MnSafeD predicts "severe and frequent misconduct":
 - Defined "severe and frequent misconduct" as multiple discipline convictions and/or violent/assaultive misconduct within a six-month period.
 - About 1/3 of the population has at least 1 misconduct.
 - Career criminal literature shows a small number of individuals that are responsible for a large amount of the crime/misconduct within the prison.
 - There is a lot of overlap between what predicts recidivism and what predicts misconduct.
 - Governor and DOC Leaders wanted an assessment like MnSTARR but for classification. They took the items from MnSTARR 2.0 and put them in the same predictive models with a different outcome, and the results showed that it was predictive for misconduct as well.
- Predicted outcome- severe and frequent misconduct:
 - Criminal history measures:
 - the type of crime
 - severity of the offense
 - whether a person specialized in certain offenses
 - type of offense
 - prison admission type
 - suicidal tendencies

- demographic characteristics
 - gang affiliation, and
 - also looked at if anyone had been in prison previously
 - Looked at their behavior data: To what extent did they perform in programming vs. unauthorized idle status (not being in programming) vs. to what extent involved in misconduct.
 - We see that there are quite a few people that are not in prison for more than 6 months, so they wouldn't get the reassessment.
 - As they went through every additional 6 months (at least 42 months or more)- couldn't determine predictive models beyond 42 months because the numbers were so small (this was true for both males and females).
- How accurate are they identifying?
 - Predictive Performance results for Females:
 - Current Classification – all AUC values were in the 60s
 - MnSafeD were in the 70s for the initial assessment, in the 80s for the 6month reassessment, in the 90s for the 12 and 18 month reassessments, and the overall average was in the 80s.
 - Predictive Performance results for Males:
 - Similar results to the females
 - Current classification – all AUC values were in the 60s
 - Initial assessment was in the 70s
 - 6 month assessment all the way to the 42 month reassessments were in the 80s
 - Overall average was .84
 - Why we see that it gets better is because the assessments can capture that misconduct earlier on- the things that they did in that 1st 6 months are powerful predictors of what they will do for months 6-12
- To gather the information needed to complete this assessment, there are certain things that get entered into the offender management information system from the interactions with an offender during intake.
- MnSafeD will replace the current classification assessment. The MnDOC IT department is currently working on implementing the MnSafeD.
- There is a tendency to back-load programming closer to time of release.
 - The MnSafeD will help with improving institutional safety, and thus will help with more than just custody level placement.
 - By front loading programming:
 - At least for those at high-risk of severe frequent misconduct (SFM)
 - Deliver programming to those at high risk of SFM shortly after intake/beginning of confinement
 - (Example: immediately prioritize those at highest risk of SFM (top 5 percent) for an intervention (e.g., cognitive-behavioral therapy) at the beginning of confinement)
 - Front-loading programming may not only reduce misconduct but also increase dosage. By having a greater dosage, this in turn has better recidivism outcomes.

- MN may not work well for all other institutions, but there may be things to consider in terms of automation of your classifications/assessments, etc.
- The study will be coming out in early 2020 in The Prison Journal.

Discussion

- Question: Is this only used in your prisons?
 - Answer: Yes, only used in prison (designed, developed and validation on the MN prison population).
- Question: Before this was automated process were you doing reassessment every 6 months?
 - Answer: Yes.
- Question: Quantifiably, how many staff hours are saved by switching to an automated system?
 - Answer: Because this is still in IT development, we haven't been able to actually quantify the number of staff hours.
- Question: Are there quality control checks in place?
 - Answer: Yes, there is a good line of communication with the court state system to ensure the information being used to generate the assessment is accurate.
- Question: Could you run AUCs periodically to determine if the MnSafeD is hitting the benchmarks?
 - Answer: With the 6 month increments – Yes, but if longer times between reassessment then you should wait for the 3 year validation cycle.
- Question: How often do you go back to the drawing board?
 - Answer: This is the 1st iteration of the MnSafeD, but for the MnSTOT-3 we are now on the MnSTOT-4. MnSTOT-4 was just implemented this past July. The MnSTOT-3 started being used in 2012 and in 2017 had the MnSTOT-4 ready to go, but it took IT about 2 years to get it ready for use.
- Question: Did you test for mental health? Do you have mental health indicators that are considered not just for recidivism?
 - Answer: For the MnSTARR, but also for MnSafeD, there were about 100 items considered, but suicidal tendencies were more consistently predictive.
- Question: What has the process been for officer when their person is at 6months?
 - Answer: That process is still being worked out.
- Question: Do you look at out of state criminal history for the MnSTARR 2.0?
 - Answer: Yes, because there is a state repository (COMS) where there is staff that enters out of state criminal history and that gets fed into the MnSTARR 2.0.

Breakout Session #1: NCRP for Newcomers

Tom Rich and Michael Shively, Abt Associates

- National Prisoner Survey (NPS)
 - NPS is similar to NCRP: NPS is aggregate data, NCRP is broken down by individual.
 - NPS the source of the overall state and federal prison population graphs/data that are well known by now.
 - BJS prisoners report comes out each year: this also relies on the NPS.
 - So important it is as accurate as possible.
 - People enter the info on a website. Every facility has their own login and password. Those using the website start it and then complete it later if needed
 - Advice for completing NPS:
 - Look carefully at what the question is asking about. “Custody” might be defined differently in the survey than by the facility, for example. Go by what the definition is in the survey/exactly what the question is asking for. Some questions ask for total state pop including private prisons, and some don’t.
 - Admissions and release questions are only for offenders with sentences greater than 1 year.
 - Since it’s always the same questions, built and reuses a chunk of code each year to get the data quickly.
 - Make sure you train other people on how to do it. So if the main person entering data leaves, there is someone else there who knows the process.
 - Read definitions clearly, and reach out to Abt if you need to.
 - Figure out the right time to do it (for example, do snapshot at the very end of the year so don’t have to recreate it). Don’t wait until the last minute.
 - People use Crystal, Sequel, and Oracle to pull data. KS getting ready to switch to Power BI. Depending on your system, can set up a schedule for when to run things.
- NCRP is essentially a collection of files:
 - A – Prison admissions
 - B – Prison releases
 - D – One record for each offender at the end of the year
 - E – PCCS admissions (PCCS – Post Confinement Community Supervision)
 - F – PCCS releases
 - There are lots of overlap between these files.
 - People counted in multiple files (possible for one person to be in all five files in one year.)
 - What do these terms mean?
 - All of the definitions and details are in the NCRP manual.
 - Pay attention to how NCRP defines their terms – may be different from how your state does (even basic things like “prison”).
 - If a person is on PCCS and revoked back to prison, they count both in files F (PCCS release) and A (prison admission).
 - Manual lays out what should be included in each part.
 - What is in each of the files?
 - Key variable groups:
 - Identifying information, offender characteristics, sentence characteristics, admissions information, and release information.

- People can either code data as NCRP does, or tell Abt how the data is coded and they will match it up.
 - A lot of this data is confidential.
 - It is illegal for Abt, BJS, or any other contractors to use the data except for research or statistical purposes.
 - Take the confidentiality of this data very seriously.
- Tips from users:
 - Creating code for each section is helpful. So most of that work is upfront – they don't change the variables being asked for frequently.
 - Check code before running and/or look over the data before submitting to make sure it looks correct.
 - Call Abt if you have any questions. They are there to help you out.
 - If you can't do all the files at once, that's okay. Submit whatever you can, that's still better than nothing.
 - If people in your agency don't see the importance of it, point to some of the reports that have come out using the NCRP data. Show that can benefit from the analysis.
 - Can submit in many different file types.
- What states participate?
 - Usually get about 48 each year.
 - All 50 states have submitted over the last 5 years, it's just that every year there are a few states that are late or have a problem and can't submit until later.
 - When first started only got data from about 30, so it's much better now.
- Abt's primary role is to answer questions:
 - Every state is different.
 - Abt's job is to try to reconcile differences and get it into standardized format. So can look different in the end than what you submitted.
 - If you have any questions, reach out to Abt and then can talk things through/give advice.
- Using NCRP data;
 - What form is it available in?
 - When Abt came on, charge was to make the data more usable.
 - They combined annual files into a single term record file on the National Archive.
 - "Term" = prison term (single stay in prison by a single person) or PCCS term (single community supervision stay by a single person).
 - Each individual has an ID, so can track if they come back to prison or PCCS over time.
 - Abt is happy to share your prison term records with you. Just let them know
 - Won't provide your term records to any other state, as has confidential info in it.
 - The current file has 15 million records. It gets bigger each year.
 - Data and research products:
 - A couple years ago, Abt added offender's last known address; then add in the term records their census tract.
 - Abt is working on an online tool that allows you to analyze NPS and NCRP data at once.
 - Abt wants to offer back useful analysis in thanks for sharing data.

Discussion

- Question: When is the deadline for submitting data?

- Answer: Abt prefers to get NCRP data by March 31, but know that isn't always possible. If states can't get it by March, then they should get it to Abt over the summer.

Breakout Session #2: The Path to Removing Restrictive Housing in Delaware –

Philisa Weidlein-Crist and Miranda Mal, Delaware Department of Correction

- Delaware is a unified system with prisons and jails in the same facilities. There are 8 Restrictive Housing units among 4 prisons.
- There are positives and negatives to this unified system. Mainly, implementing policies is easier but operations are harder.
 - Ex. when there is only one restrictive housing unit, all inmates are treated as maximum security, regardless of their behaviors.
- Their process for collecting and storing information is outdated.
 - They have an older information management system; data is being pulled from ORAS.
 - All information is stored in an excel workbook and everything about the facilities is tracked there, including housing, inmate prior history and receipts for food.
- What prompted the motivation for change in DE's restrictive housing practices?
 - Three major events in 2015 shaped the national conversation around restrictive housing and contributed to the DE focus.
 - The Kalief Browder case out of Rikers Island.
 - President Obama's U.S. DOJ report on solitary confinement and RH.
 - ACA report in partnership with Liman Center at Yale Law School.
- A lawsuit was filed against DE for their restrictive housing practices.
 - DE had just finished doing JRI. Restrictive housing did not come up and it was not on their recommendation list. Still, they were not surprised about the lawsuit because of the national conversation.
 - Lawsuit happened on the heels of Browder case in the NY. A young man was held in restrictive housing for 2-3 years and committed suicide.
 - Delaware made the decision to settle the lawsuit, they knew they could do better.
- They used the standard 23 and 1 definition of restrictive housing.
 - 1 hour of rec time, including yard and shower time.
 - Disciplinary detention could be 90 days or more. There was no limit and it was based on the Warden's discretion.
 - They used indoor recreation yards, unfortunately resembling and referred to as cages, despite efforts to discourage that description.
- What did Delaware change to address the lawsuit?
 - It is important to note nothing in the settlement seemed unreasonable. Based on the changes they made, they have eliminated restrictive housing according to the industry definition.
 - Restrictive housing now stay cannot exceed 15 days. This is below the national limit of 30 days.

- If an extension is necessary, the inmate needs a break from the consecutive stay. This has to go through several levels of approval, including the warden, commissioner and BOP.
 - Anyone with a SMI will not be placed for any amount of time unless they present an immediate danger.
 - They reduced the use of alternative meals plans (AMPS). Restrictive housing inmates cannot be given AMPS or “the loaf” as a punishment. AMPS can only be used to manage behavior that threatens the safety and security of the institution and a form must be filled out to document this.
 - They implemented treatment chairs and equipment for dangerous offenders receiving treatment.
 - Female inmates must have access to menstrual products.
 - Wardens must issue report to Bureau Chief to justify any RH placement in excess of 6 months.
 - Showers, meals and appointments no longer count as unstructured recreational time.
 - Inmates in restrictive housing receive structured therapeutic hours.
- How has data collection changed as a result of the lawsuit?
 - Collecting more data has been required by the lawsuit. When they first started tracking it was all done on paper, but they are improving their strategies with an IT contractor.
 - Types of data they began collecting:
 - Demographic information
 - Security levels
 - Mental health security codes
 - DOC required to conduct a mental health evaluation/assessment within 24 hours of admission into restrictive housing (must be a Qualified Mental Health Professional and must occur in confidential setting)
 - Codes can change at any time
 - Previously, one sheet of paper per day was used to track information on each inmate in restrictive housing. Now information is completed in a computerized offender management system called DACS.
- Compliance reporting has been increased since the lawsuit.
 - DOC Submits two reports to CLASI every month.
 - There is a statistical report with demographic and discipline detention data.
 - There is an audit report that details individuals out of cell activity reports and can provide more data if requested (age, housing unit, date they are in, date they moved, notes/comments).
- There were changes in disciplinary sanctions as a result of the lawsuit.
 - Now, before a disciplinary sanction can be imposed, Delaware must complete a form with BOP that designates if a mental health issue is contributing to misconduct. This must include input from a mental health professional but they do not make recommendations about restrictive housing.
 - Inmates must receive 5 hours of unstructured recreational time while in disciplinary detention.
 - DOC shall not release inmates directly to the street from restrictive housing. They must be put into another unit first.
- What is the proof that there has been positive change for the inmates as well as the facilities?
 - There was a decrease in class-1 disciplinary incidences as well as grievances.

- Did DE DOC improve their restrictive housing practices?
 - They technically no longer have restrictive housing. It is now called designated housing units. They are still required to monitor restrictive housing data because of the lawsuit and someone will always have a pulse on this because they don't want to revert back to using restrictive housing as discipline.
- Ideas for your jurisdiction:
 - Determine which climate indicators would be meaningful for your staff **with** your staff.
 - Their chief of planning was at all of our lawsuit meetings and that was extremely helpful.
 - Clearly communicate to your security staff and behavioral health teams which metrics you want to see changed.
 - Monitor your data monthly and frequently update field staff on progress.

Discussion

- Question: Maryland does not don't have indications in their system if someone is seriously mental ill. How did you get there and how did you get to a level of differentiations on mentally ill (MI) and seriously mentally ill (SMI)?
 - Answer: Security operations are what really took the lead on working with medical contractors to iron out which conditions are MI or SMI.
 - Answer: Their DACS system does talk somewhat to their medical contractor's record system.
- Question: For your indications of mental health, you mentioned the designation could change at any time. Can you link it in history?
 - Answer: Designations do not have a history but they are working on it.
 - Answer: The medical contractor can see the previous designations.
- Question: There was some resistance from security staff, can you elaborate? NY is going through similar process
 - The chief of planning and was there for all discussion, lot of pushback on taking away ability to sanction someone that got violent with them
 - Some officers claimed that these restrictive housing edits attributed to death of a guard.
 - We can't discipline, no tools, no restrictive housing, inmates have more rights than guards.
 - They finally just called all the higher end officers in and sat them down and explained what was really happening.
 - Started measuring class 1s to show that violence didn't change because of reduction of RH.
- Question: How was this communicated to them – newsletters, rewarding behaviors they wanted to see, town halls with commissioner, talking face to face to security.

Breakout Session #2: Results from Survey on Research Capacity within Local Jails and State Departments of Correction

Tama Celi, Virginia Department of Corrections and Dr. Hefang Lin, Department of Orange County Corrections, Florida

- We were interested in how departments use numbers and research and the difference between departments of corrections and local or regional jails
 - We just wanted to establish a baseline at this point
 - This work came out of the ACA Research Council and is ACA sponsored. It took place in 2017
 - Our methodology was survey
- ACA Research council came up with the question
 - ASCA sent out the survey to the state DOCs—we received 32 response
 - An email with the survey went to 859 jails— only 43 responses were received
 - Mostly southern jails
 - ADP was 1430
- Of the state DOCs that responded
 - Texas was biggest
 - RI was smallest
- 69% of jails often used data to make decisions
- How would you rate the level of importance for research and statistics within your organization
 - Jail – 95% important or above
 - Prisons – all important or greater
- Existence of research staff
 - Jails - 37% had a full-time staff person, 56% had no research staff. Average of 2.44 research staff
 - Prison – All departments but North Dakota had research staff. 5.5 was the average number. Maximum 16
- What are biggest challenges your department encounters when collecting data
 - Jail - Lack of staff
 - Prisons – 1) Lack of staff 2)lack of funds
- Data quality challenges
 - Insufficient rules,
 - Validity concerns
- Location of research units
 - Jail- Other, mostly (Population management, Criminal Records, Supervised by Detention Chief), within office of director
 - Prison - 1/3rd within office of director; 1/3rd within administration; IT and then programs
- Responsibilities of statisticians, research, analysts or related positions
 - Jail - Gather, summarize, analyze statistics; Evaluate information from various sources to prepare reports
 - Prison - Data mining and collection; analysis 90% evidence based decision making
- Responsibilities Related to Requests
 - Jail - Reviewing proposals, reviewing external requests
 - Prisons –FOIA, Review internal review board requests, External research review
 - Program fidelity and recidivism
 - Program evaluation and recidivism studies
- Planning
 - Prisons - flow of offenders, strategies for efficiencies and effectiveness, 95% of states have internal research review processes, funding is mostly from department budget

- Grants
- Grants and funding for research
 - Reentry, SA, MH
 - Jail – State, Federal, Other
- Contributing materials to the website
 - Research unit contribute to website - 90% of state DOCs contribute; 40% of jails contribute
 - What statistical reports
 - Jail – ADP, Budget projections
 - Prisons – ADP, Budget projection
- Incident reports
 - 70% states use them for research and analysis
- Jails
 - Data driven management, Research capacity is less
- Importance of research
 - Vital to making decisions; Program evaluation, best practice; for research, a lot of jobs to support for the operation side

Discussion

- Have you done any specific population studies?
 - Virginia –Trends, Geriatric offenders, Female offenders, Overdoses and drug tests, Restrictive housing
 - Orange County (jail) Population trends, mental health, homelessness
- What was methodology to make sure it gets sent out to the right person
 - Sent it to ASCA and asked that they send it to research staff
 - How it works in Virginia is that Tama gets the emails that go to the director. That way it is one less thing that the director needs to worry about.
 - ASCA also sends out survey results to everyone on the list.
- South Carolina - probation and parole, we're looking at mental health, DV
- What kind of forecasting and impact analysis are you doing? How does that work in your department?
 - Virginia –multi-agency process, legislative impact analysis, we receive 300 requests in a legislative session
 - Orange County -master plan, do a forecast by many characteristics, what kind of impact specific policy changes have
 - Washington -programming custody projections, use of the dynamic risk and need tool.
 - Nebraska - 5 people in research area, internal and external requests from media, research director is doing legislative impact. Looking at mental health, restrictive housing eligibility for the mental health population.
- What kind of surveys do you do? How do you do extra data collection
 - Virginia: staff environment survey, topical surveys. For data collection, we use survey monkey and nontraditional sorts of data collection.

- Orange county (jail): For surveys, we are benchmarking per day cost. We have a use of force survey and also a women's leadership survey. For data collection we are using database software.
- Missouri: We use survey monkey with wufoo. We've done surveys to get feedback on parole board hearings
- Oregon: We used to do inmate surveys. We would do paper and then scan. We got more responses doing it that way than electronic.
- Nebraska: We do a disabilities/ADA survey. HR does their staff research.
 - Virginia has talked about this but HR makes people more nervous. We decided not to do it at the location level, to preserve anonymity
- What about performance measures? What is your role with those?
 - VA: We produce our operations efficiency measures, which is a 100+ page report. We also produce dashboards for all of the unit heads/chiefs/wardens. These include operations efficiency measures, so that they're not blindsided. Reports are made monthly. The data is connected on the back end and can drill down to the offender level. Through this, the quality of the data has improved tremendously. They can use it to correct their own data problems and issues. It's a 10 year old project where we recently decided to go through IT. It is working better with big gains.
 - OC: We produce a primary indicators report. It tells how we did this month. Chief and Major or Captain is aware of what categories we're looking at. We provide a long list of indicators at the to county level
 - WA: Performance measures gets split off as it's own thing. It gets packaged and presented to the department leaders. We're in the midst of transitioning to Tableau
 - Idaho: We have a new offender management system. It's been a 3 year project. We're working on getting consistency across data. When the system changed, communication didn't come down to the right level.
 - Nebraska: Our experience with building a new data system was that researchers were brought into data system at the very end. They asked line staff what they needed but not research staff. It was disappointing.
- Do you do work with program evaluation and program outcomes? What?
 - VA: We're doing EBP program fidelity and quality assurance. It feeds into a database to collection on a systematic level. We have a unit devoted to outcome evaluations. We took staff and gave it to them as a full time job. We are doing a recidivism analysis. We're trying to answering why people come back. We have mental health folks, a lot of them are staying in jails when they go out to the community. We've been trying to inform policy makers and tell them what the issues are.
 - Orange county: We're doing evaluations looking at program success rate and recidivism rate.
 - Nebraska: We're doing lean six sigma. The research division could do evaluations and pull the outcome data. It is pretty common for a leader to go and ask for input. Our new programs administrator is very big on data and EBP.
- Do you do internal evaluation? Q about doing internal evaluation
 - VA: We moved staff to create that unit.
 - There can be push back because of the closeness to the subject.

- But internal evaluation has less of a learning curve. They already know the system and the data.
- Sometimes if someone's getting a contract, they might feel pressure of giving bad results because that's someone they know.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 20TH

Breakout Session #3: Source and Use of Firearms Involved in Crimes, Survey of Prison Inmates 2016, and Time Served in State Prison, 2016

Danielle Kaebler, BJS

- About the Survey of Prison Inmates (SPI) dataset:
 - It's a cross-sectional survey of US prison population, looking at a sample of state and federal prisoners.
 - BJS has conducted this survey periodically.
 - It contains lots of information that we don't get anywhere else, so it is a valuable data set.
 - Topics covered include: demographics, criminal history (include use of firearms, which is important for this topic) socio-economic status, health/health care, prison rule violation, and prison programs and work assignments.

- "Source and Use of Firearms" report:
 - "Source and Use of Firearms" is a report recently released from BJS that describes possession of a firearm during the crime for which they are in prison, and details about how the firearm was used and where it was obtained. This report uses SPI data.
 - Some takeaways from the report:
 - 21% of state and federal prisoners possessed or carried a firearm when they committed the offense for which they are currently serving time.
 - Most of those were handguns.
 - Within that 21%: 46% discharged the firearm during the offense and 27% of those times a victim was killed.
 - Many more people in *state* prison discharged a firearm during the offense/killed a victim when compared to those in *federal* prison.
 - Source of the firearms was primarily illegal.
 - Positive that 56% of them were obtained illegally, but that number could be higher.
 - Dataset not yet available online, but BJS hopes to release it soon.
 - Ton more information in the full report so please check that out.
 - Available at bjs.gov

- "Time Served in State Prison" report:
 - About the NCRP dataset:
 - NCRP has been administered by BJS since 1983, and the data is submitted by states.
 - Key data elements include: ID numbers (so can link to other data sets and track people across time), also offender characteristics and offense characteristics.
 - About the report:
 - This report looked at releases from prison in 2016.
 - The report examined offenders on their first release with a sentence of at least 1 year, and contained data from 37 states.
 - Findings:
 - The average time served by state prisoners released in 2016 was 2.6 years; the median was 1.3 years.
 - Persons serving less than 1 year represented 40% of fire releases in 2016.

- (People *sentenced* to less than one year were not included in this analysis: this data point is *time served*).
- On average, state prisoners serving time for property, drug, or public-order offenses served less than 2 years before initial release.
- Violent offenses made up almost 30% of releases, drug offenses made up almost 25%.
- There can be narratives that people who are incarcerated are incarcerated for decades, but this data shows lots of people releasing after just a few years.
 - That has important implications for reentry/release.
- The full report can be viewed at bjs.gov.

Discussion

- Question: For firearm survey, did you go back to check if what people were saying was true?
 - Answer: No. It's a self-reported sample of the inmates. Didn't have the identifiers to go back and verify. SPI doesn't look at criminal background (aside from the offense). Not sure what kind of validation they did for that, but don't think they did.
- Question: Are there questions in SPI to identify sentence length?
 - Answer: Yes. They are still incarcerated so don't know time served, but do know sentence length.
- Question: Do you know how many people completed programs?
 - Answer: No, we have the survey data that they self-reported but didn't go back to check if they had actually been completed.

Breakout Session #3: Parole Recovery Opportunity (PRO) Supervision

Gina Papagiorgakis, Massachusetts Parole Board

- PRO Structure
 - PRO is an enhanced type of supervision.
 - It is a 3-year project undertaken with UMass-Boston as the primary research partner
 - Intended for parolees seeking substance abuse treatment.
- PRO Supervision
 - PRO provides substances abuse resources to family members in the form of referrals to Learn to Cope, which provides Narcan training, substance abuse treatment support, and other resources.
 - There are three phases to supervision with decreasing levels of intensity, reaching the lowest level within 6 months at a minimum.
 - Non-relapse is only one success metric and POs are given a lot of discretion. Returns to custody are generally limited to cases where a supervisee is deemed to be a danger to themselves or others, which means many parolees are able to stay in the community following a relapse.
 - Medication-assisted treatment (MAT) is mandatory for supervisees and becomes a parole condition when they begin PRO supervision.
- PRO Eligibility
 - Limited to high risk offenders with a history of opioid use in participating offices.

- While there has been discussion of expanding the program to low/medium risk parolees, this was rejected because the high intensity of supervision would increase the probability of technical violations.
 - Offenders can opt in to PRO at release. They are informed of the option by both transitional staff and the parole board.
 - People already on parole can be required to enter PRO as a graduated sanction following a relapse.
- Program Outcomes
 - 80 participants, mostly white men serving sentences <2.5 years, with a prior period of incarceration.
 - 42 participants have had a relapse, four of which required Narcan administration.
 - 33 people have been successfully discharged and 30 have returned to custody. Average return to custody time is 37 days.
- Evaluation
 - The program has improved communication between UMass and the Parole Board regarding performance measures.
 - It turned out that it was very difficult to transition data from their case management system into a format useful for research, so data collection ended up becoming a supplementary task for PRO officers.
- Recruitment
 - Sometimes the Parole Board requires supervisees to stay in sober houses, which can be expensive. This was dissuading potential participants, so PRO was given a grant extension allowing PRO to pay for the first 3 months at a sober house.
 - There is a bureaucratic barrier to sober house access as well: many sober houses are not approved vendors by the state of Massachusetts.
 - Recruitment has been difficult. It is unclear whether this is because people don't want to participate in the program or if they just aren't hearing about it.
 - Some people were avoiding the program due to the requirement for medication-assisted treatment. The drug used for this treatment, Vivitrol, has a bad reputation for side effects in many communities.
- Evaluation
 - Participants expressed a desire for participation in support groups other than AA/NA to be counted towards mandated support group attendance.
 - Time management challenges for parolees was a consistent theme: parole offices are generally only open during business hours, leading parolees to miss work and risk their employment.
 - Parolees generally preferred PRO to traditional parole due to greater resources access.

Discussion

- Question: Are mentors/sponsors part PRO?
 - Answer: No, but it is included in pre-release substance abuse programs. It's been tough to implement and enforce outside of correctional institutions.
- Question: There is a lot of money available federally for medication assisted treatment.

- Answer: Unfortunately, this funding can only be used to administer vivitrol. Methadone and Suboxone have become contraband in most institutions.
- Answer: One Massachusetts institution has a successful program that includes suboxone and methadone assisted treatment programs, but it has run into DEA compliance issues.
- Answer: Different drug assisted treatment programs add another layer of complication to reentry, as people need access to the same medication post-release.
- Question: Has LSCMI been useful for building case management plans?
 - Answer: Different programs use different aspects of LSCMI, and parole case plans don't rely heavily on the results. Parole uses COMPASS and the DOC uses ORAS. Case management and treatment plans are generally decided by the parole board, which has a lot of discretion.

Breakout Session #3: The New On-Line NCRP data analysis tool: A Preview

Tom Rich, Abt Associates

- NCRP data analysis tool is not publicly available yet. Organizations are needed to pilot test this.
 - There will be a sign up sheet at the end of the session for organizations interested in being pilot testers.
- What data analysis tools are currently available: CSAT
 - There is a tool for parole, prisoners, and probation. Each is tied to annual NPS survey.
 - The only subpopulations available in the NPS survey are males and females, therefore those are the only subcategories in the current CSAT tool.
 - NCRP data has been added into the CSAT tool and there are new ways to look at populations.
 - New data includes age, race, age at admission, education level, type of admission, etc.
- The new CSAT tool includes:
 - Map Query which has data from all 50 states. You can compare states over different years with this tool.
 - There are three types of advanced query: annual counts, offender characteristics and national characteristics.
 - Annual counts contain only the NPS data.
 - Offender characteristics has the NCRP data added in.
 - National characteristics is NCRP data rolled up into national picture.

Discussion

**presenter asked audience what would be helpful for their organizations/agencies*

- It would be helpful to have graphs right off the bat without exporting the data into excel and creating them.
- If you could toggle back and forth between totals and percentage, that would be helpful.
- It would be interesting to have state characteristics that you could check. For example, which states have JRI, determinate sentencing, unified systems, etc.

- Question: Could you extend it to include probation and parole service?
 - Answer: A different contractor does those surveys so they currently cannot include that information.
- It would be useful to be able to look at partial maps and to compare states similar in population size.
- Question: Can you show time served?
 - Answer: It might be difficult to do this with revocations and it would only be fair with new court commitments. This would be another layer of complexity not available with current resources but Abt will look into it.
- Question: Could this include sentencing?
 - Answer: No, as that is not in the NPS but you could look at changes in admissions.

Breakout Session #4: National Institute of Justice Correction's Portfolio and new Corrections Strategic Research Plan

Eric Martin, National Institute of Justice

- There is a dedicated NIJ Journal on Corrections issues that was not created by NIJ but is now housed with NIJ.
- Not all work of NIJ is evaluation work. NIJ also works on projects that are:
 - Qualitative,
 - Cross-sectional Research, and
 - Efficacy Trials in Engineering
- The NIJ Director now serves as the Chief Evaluation Officer for DOJ.
- NIJ hosts the Crime Solutions website. The Crime Solutions (crimesolutions.gov) website is a:
 - Repository of evaluation evidence and a one-stop-shop of evidence on programs
 - There are 500 programs in the repository, and all the programs on the site are not just NIJ funded programs.
 - There are 136 programs in corrections and reentry.
 - Able to use the Crime Solutions website to adopt programs and determine the best programming for the agency/department/etc. to use. When you click on a program, it provides the following information:
 - An overview of the program
 - Logic models of how to implement
 - The evaluation of the program, and other information to assist in determining the best program for the agency.
- Corrections Related Research at NIJ:
 - NIJ has a number of research fellowship opportunities, for example:
 - The Graduate research fellowship program, which is the longest solicitation.
 - There has been a shift at NIJ and trying to “cross pollinate” teams, and doing more topical programs:

- Safety health and wellness: does research for everyone touched by the CJ system (LEO, Incarcerated people, Probation, Parole, etc. what are your issues).
 - Artificial Intelligence tools and Use in corrections: looks at all the ways to benefit from them.
- Research and You (Q&A of the Audience):
 - NIJ: Do you use research to inform practice?
 - Research is good to confirm what we are doing
 - NIJ: Do you have time to actually look for research or engage in research coming out?
 - Some people to try to, but don't have much time to
 - NIJ: Where do you go to get research findings?
 - BJS
 - APPA, ACA
 - Many people commented that it is hard to get Journals that you can't get freely
 - Eric said that issue comes up a lot (one thing to do is try emailing the author for a cop.y)
 - NIJ offers a 10 page summary report of the research (for their articles).
 - People can also put a request through NIC at www.nicic.gov to get free access to the subscriptions that NIJ has access to.
 - Sometimes universities will partner with you, but if you don't have a grant structure then that relationship doesn't really happen/it is hard to have that relationship.
 - NIJ: We cover the big cities well because they have the data, but much of our CJ work goes on at the rural cities/towns/counties level and tribal, and there isn't much research being done on that level.
 - NIJ: How big of a priority are research results to your work?
 - After meetings like ICRN they ask each other/work with each other because there is a wealth of information between all the other agencies, but then those connections fizzle out by the next meeting, and there is also a lot of turnover.
 - Research value ebbs and flows with leadership.
 - Provide data to a lot of researchers but it takes so long to get published, and they don't follow up at the end of doing the analysis of the states' data to double check that everything is correct and interpreted correctly. Often times they may have misinterpreted the findings because they don't really understand the agency/department's policies but the agency/department doesn't know until it is already published sometimes years later.
 - Beta.gov bridges the gap between practitioner and researcher so the practitioners don't get "burned".
 - Better educate correctional administrators:
 - Push for communication around data and collecting automated data sets.
 - Trying to integrate into one data set for multiple counties around the same area to see how valuable, and it was valuable but it was really hard to do it because of how many MOUs that needed to get.
- NIJ Investment in Corrections and Reentry Research:
 - Initiated 22 Corrections Research Projects in the last 2 years with about \$20 million in research dollars
 - Projects include topics on:
 - Development of AI algorithms to assist Community Supervision.
 - Medication-Assisted Treatment for Opioid Addiction- In the Vermont system
 - Risk-Needs-Responsivity Program Evaluations.

- Tool developed to have RNR enhance and do the forced multiplier while in the community.
 - Alternative Young Adult Housing Programs:
 - South Carolina to evaluate a new young adult housing programs- CT developed program.
 - Young adults are mentored by people doing life sentences; Their daily schedules are meant to mirror real life schedules including, educational programming, volunteer based aspects of their day.
 - The program was evaluated in CT but now doing a full scale replication.
 - Evaluation of Body-Worn Cameras in Jails:
 - Jail correctional officers wearing body worn cameras- see if applicable in a jail setting.
 - Doing the research to show how much it costs and full scale of what they are getting into.
 - Correction Officer (COs) Occupational Prestige:
 - Working with NORC in Sheriff offices to look at occupational prestige
 - COs have the lowest occupational prestige- i.e. “I have pride that I am a CO”
- Notable Ongoing Projects:
 - Correctional Officer Suicide in Massachusetts
 - Restrictive Housing:
 - Inmate and Officer Well-Being
 - Offender Misconduct
 - Step-Down Programs
 - Contraband and Mitigation Techniques
 - Impact of Parental Incarceration on Children- Bowling Green is using data to look at the waves of data for where a kid was at pre-incarceration of their parent vs. now that the parent is incarcerated.
- Recent Findings:
 - Kiosk Supervision Effectiveness for low-risk offenders:
 - 2 states (not named), and looked at 3 types of reporting:
 - Regular supervision vs kiosk
 - Kiosk vs tele-reporting
 - Kiosk did as good or better than having a meeting during regular supervision
 - Tele-reporting did better than reporting for the Kiosk
 - Home visits can reduce recidivism
 - State had a budget crunch where they had to stop doing home visits, they reduced them and noticed it didn’t change the reduction in recidivism.
 - Asked NIJ if there was research on home visits and there wasn’t so NIJ wrote a solicitation to study this.
 - Abt conducted a National survey and partnered with APPA and produced a data infographic.
 - Looked at impact of home visits in Ohio -- supervisees had recidivism reductions except for low risk people.
 - In Minnesota, they saw reductions across the board.
 - ARS in Georgia: seeing the person at a home visit extended the survival time of an offender before an infraction.

- The POs are able to develop a relationship with the offender, but aren't necessarily doing RNR; however, it is working- results showed that POs don't necessarily have to engage in programming every single time they are with the offender
- Implementing new initiatives can be difficult: states used in the study were not named.
 - Adopted EBP programming and they used buzz words to talk about the job differently but it didn't have any effect.
 - The study showed that training alone is insufficient and inadequate to implement new programs.
- Vera is looking at if jails can systematically address inmate self-harm- found 4 jails were able to set up the review processes, but if contracted out there is more difficulty getting them to the table.

Discussion

- Question: Overall, for research in general, NIJ is looking to see how research can be done quicker, and is there any way to do it in a week/month/year
 - Answer: NIJ has Centers of Excellence in different areas, right now there are 3, one is on Forensics and Corrections Technologies. These centers do long term research, but also do quick turnaround research as a result of events. They are looking into how to get researchers on the ground as things happen rapidly (e.g "critical response teams").
- Question: How do you recruit places like Association of State Correctional Administrators (ASCA), Pew, etc. for these initiatives? And is there a way to streamline reporting because states keep getting questionnaires with the same/similar questions?
 - Answer: There are lots of places that get funding through NIJ specifically but it's also complicated because there are places such as the National Science Foundation and Arnold Ventures that are not government funding, and so those surveys are not generated through NIJ or the same places. However, with the federal awards there is a need for OMB clearance (for most awards/grants) for sending out the surveys.

Breakout Session #4: Hate Crimes and Sex Offenders: Exploring the NCRP's Unique Capabilities for Research on Rare and Specialized Crime Types

Michael Shively and Christopher Cutler, Abt Associates

- The National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP) dataset is national, and it allows us to look at some specific populations/unique research questions that would not be able to look at just using data from one state.
 - This talk will be presenting two examples of this: one on female sex offenders, and the other on hate crimes.
- A little bit about the NCRP dataset:
 - Data is requested from 50 Departments of Corrections (DOCs).
 - Data team at Abt cleans and verifies it, so at the end they have a national dataset with variables that can be compared across states.
 - They are also able to track people over time, and over multiple DOC or community supervision stays.
 - This is great for recidivism analysis as it allows tracking the same person over time.

- As NCRP is a large national dataset, it can be used to look at very specific/small populations.
 - Two of those: female sex offenders and hate crimes.
- Female sex offenders:
 - Sex offenders as a whole have been studied a lot.
 - However, most released sex offenders are male. When reading about sex offenders, it's usually about the behavior of male sex offenders.
 - Without separating out females, we don't know about their behavior, but that is hard to do, because they are such a small part of a state's population.
 - By using NCRP to look nationally, can now study female sex offenders.
 - Research questions:
 - How prevalent are female sex offenders? Does this vary over time/states?
 - What are the characteristics of female sex offenders? How does that compare to male sex offenders?
 - Do released female sex offenders return to prison less often than male sex offenders?
 - Methodology:
 - Researchers defined recidivism as return to prison within the same state.
 - Limited sample to those who were released following a new court commitment (so, not people returning to prison from community supervision).
 - Defining sex offenses:
 - States have different definitions of the same term, or use different terms to mean the same thing.
 - When combining NCRP data, Abt makes an effort to make things consistent across states so can compare between states.
 - Sample:
 - Only included people whose primary offense was a sex offense.
 - Data from 19 state sample with data from 2000 – 2017.
 - Findings on their research questions:
 - How prevalent are female sex offenders?
 - 293 released, 1,692 incarcerated nationwide.
 - The proportion that female sex offenders account for has increased in 2000.
 - Lots of variation between states in the proportion of total pop that is female sex offenders.
 - What are the characteristics of female sex offenders?
 - Of releases, females more likely to have been convicted of sexual assault or statutory rape, males more likely to have been convicted of rape.
 - No real difference in the likelihood that they had a secondary offense.
 - But of those with a secondary offense, males more likely to have other sex offense as secondary offense and female more likely to have a public order charge as secondary offense.
 - Some difference in mean sentencing length by gender: male in general have longer sentences.
 - Same trend when looking at time served, but a bigger difference: males more likely to serve a long sentence than women.
 - When looking at average age upon admission: males are generally older
 - Race/ethnicity: females more likely to be white than nonwhite, males about 50% white/50% nonwhite.

- Do released female sex offenders return to prison less often than male sex offenders?
 - Calculated recidivism at 1, 2, and 3 years post release.
 - Males more likely to return to custody than females.
 - But that's only true for some offenses: especially rape and sexual assault.
 - But there is lots of variation in recidivism across states.
 - So if using a report that talks about recidivism in one state, that isn't translatable to another state.
 - Conclusion:
 - Female sex offenders account for small proportion of all sex offenders and offenders, but that has proportion has increased over time.
 - Female sex offenders received shorter sentences than men and are more likely to serve less time than males with similar offenses.
 - Females more likely to be white.
 - Females less likely to return to prison within 3 years than males.
 - Tools used in one state might not work the same in another – lots of variation among female sex offenders in each state.
- Hate or bias motivated offenders:
 - Lots of research on hate and bias motivated crime.
 - But, not a lot of research on what is going on in corrections with hate crimes. Don't know much about what that population look like.
 - This is surprising because a lot of the argument for separating out that sentence is that those offenders are different and should be handled differently/should receive more severe punishments.
 - But there is no research on whether the average sentence for hate crime is more than a similar non-hate crime offense.
 - There is some data available on hate crimes:
 - Since 1990, hate crimes have been captured by many federal justice data collections. We also know about reports to and arrests by police.
 - But nearly complete absence of data on research on correctional sanctions for hate crimes. Just three studies, but they were pretty specific/had small samples.
 - So, Abt decided to use NCRP data across multiple states/years to look at this.
 - Can hate crimes be identified by NCRP?
 - No specific code in NCRP for hate crimes, so they dug into state laws to identify hate crimes.
 - By doing this, found 2,685 cases they were confident were hate/bias crimes.
 - Most were for arson or destruction of property, but also person crimes.
 - However, more than one third of the cases they found were from 1 state. 2 states accounted for 50% of the cases.
 - So it's not representative across states.
 - Because of that, will be pretty broad picture when talking about results.
 - Research question: Is the central intent of hate crime laws being realized – i.e. are they being punished more severely?
 - When looking at differences in sentence length, found there is not really a difference between sentence lengths of those convicted of hate crimes vs non hate crimes.
 - Slightly more people convicted of hate crimes sentenced to more than 5 years, but not by much.

- Same with time served: not much difference in time served when comparing those with hate crime vs non hate crimes.
 - Would be great to dig more into this data with states to find out more information and widen the sample.
 - From what this research found, there isn't a big difference in sentence length or time served between hate and non-hate crimes.
- These two studies are examples of the types of research that can be done on rare crime types using the NCRP.
 - NCRP allows for assembling large and cross-state samples.
 - NCRP is publicly available (limited data available for free, or can go through IRB to get the non-identified data) so can use it to do your own studies/research.

Discussion

- Question: Regarding the data on the differences between recidivism of male vs female sex offenders, is that comparable to the difference in recidivism for male vs female offenders generally?
 - Answer: Didn't look at that. But that would be a good next step. Another good next step: currently don't have data on who the victims of female sex offenses are, but would be interested in looking into that
- Question: On the table on male vs female sexual offenders by offense type, there was a column on forcible sodomy. How do you define/report that?
 - Answer: That's a legacy code from the early datasets. Unless state law says "sodomy," usually classify the offense as rape because that is now defined by rape in FBI code. So for forcible sodomy have really small sample size.
- Question: For recidivism, that includes violations not just new offense?
 - Answer: Yes, any return to state prison system
 - Follow-up Question: so only returns to state facilities? Not County?
 - Answer: Correct. Exception is for unified states where have both prison and jail info. It's whatever we have in the dataset from the state. Currently just looking within the same state, but with the new work on identifiers could start to look across states as well. That would be a next step
 - Follow-up Question: In MA, if someone has a violation for not registering as sex offender they are sent to a local facility. So that wouldn't be included here?
 - Correct. States vary on how they handle things like that, but for this study just looked at return to state custody. But an area for further research could be differing definitions of recidivism
 - True there is a lot we are missing in this study. But if we are clear on how we are defining, it still has value. If we are just doing comparatively, it's still helpful to see difference between states, genders, or over time
 - Because of the work Abt did comparing different state statutes, can use NCRP to compare your state recidivism/other things to other states

A Review of Educational Strategies and their Impacts

Tama Celi and Yan Jin, Virginia Department of Corrections

- Correctional Education programs
 - These program focus on helping offenders successfully re-enter the community.
 - Programs aim to increase skills, including academic, workplace readiness, technical, and employability.
 - Programs are offered to all eligible offenders and eligibility is determined by various factors.
 - These factors include prior possession of HS/Special Education diploma; HSE/GED credential; length of stay; and release-related situations (work-release and pre-release).
 - Programs require participation in academic programs for those offenders without a verified HS diploma or high school equivalent (HSE/GED) credential.

- Adult Basic Education Program (ABE)
 - The purpose of ABE is to provide instruction with the goal of improving basic and specific skills necessary to function adequately in society.
 - Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE)
 - The test is aligned to the national College and Career Readiness Standards and measures and assesses student achievement levels in reading, math, and language arts.
 - This is often the first step in determining the educational path of students and also aids in determining eligibility for GED and CTE programs.
 - After initial assessment, students are re-tested throughout their incarceration to determine gains.
 - TABE Battery Average: average of the reading and math tests and used as the measure of student achievement in this study.
 - Education Functioning Levels are determined via TABE scale scores.
 - TABE Initial Participation (required, as of 2007)
 - Exceptions in participation include the following: Has High School (HS)/Special Education Diploma; Has GED/HSE Credential or partial completers; English as a Second Language (ESL)/On Detainer; Social Security Eligible; <1 year in DOC; In Hospital.

- General Education Development Program (GED)
 - The purpose of this program is to provide individuals who have not graduated from high school the opportunity to demonstrate attainment of necessary skills and earn a high school equivalency (HSE) credential.
 - A Research Synthesis (Passarell, 2013) shows that attainment of a GED while incarcerated has a positive impact on recidivism rates, resulting in increased employment, advanced training, and higher education opportunities.
 - GED Tests
 - Test versions (2002, 2014)
 - Test version from 2002 examine skills, such as reading, writing, science, social studies, and math.
 - Test version from 2014 examine proficiencies in language, science, social studies, math; informed by Webb’s Depth of Knowledge, Common Core State Standards, and College and Career Readiness Standards; and are computer-based.

- Career and technical Education Programs (CTE)
 - The purpose of this program is to provide students with courses that emphasize cultivating career information, technical skills, industry-based certification and licensing.
 - Outcomes of this program demonstrate evidence of improved employability and workplace readiness.

- Courses are diverse (40 types, with ~107 courses offered) and include options such as automotive Repair, Food Services, Pipefitting, Painting, CAD, Carpentry, Masonry, Optical, Horticulture and many others.
 - Courses are offered statewide and current capacity is 2,873 students.
 - Prerequisites vary depending on the CTE course and sometimes include the following: minimum TABE scores; GED/HSE; HS diploma; sufficient time left in sentence to complete course (or a substantial component).
 - Challenges may include students being transferred prior to class completion; limitations of space and resources; qualified instructors; and competing programming needs.
- Virginia Career Readiness Certificate (CRC) Program
 - The Career Readiness Certificate (CRC®) – provides documented evidence that offenders possess the necessary skills for successful employment.
 - The CRC serves an alternative program for offenders who are not qualify for GED testing.
 - The purpose of this program is to increase an individual’s job behavior and potential success in the workplace.
 - Virginia CRC program consists of three WorkKey assessments in work-related skills: applied math; reading for information; and locating information.
 - CRC Credentials Awarded:
 - CRC proficiency levels correspond to skill requirements of profiled jobs specified at the state level.
 - **Bronze** – at least 16% of profiled jobs
 - **Silver** – at least 67% of profiled jobs
 - **Gold** – at least 93% of profiled jobs
 - Eligibility Qualifications for CRC Program (OP 601.4) include the following:
 - Offenders must be within one year of release
 - Offenders must meet a certain academic level requirement:
 - Minimum of an 8th grade equivalency on TABE for reading and mathematics; or
 - Earned a verifiable HSE or GED; or
 - Successfully completed one or more college course with a grade of C or better; or
 - Transitioned from Virginia-specific to National CRC in 2018
- Program Outcomes
 - Correctional Education students vary greatly in Adult Basic Education (ABE) Functioning Levels.
 - 65.6% of those students with initial ABE Levels of less than VI (n=1,599) showed improvement.
 - Even small levels of improvement can increase an individual’s ability to function in society.
 - GED Readiness criteria may not be met for those individuals with DOC LOS less than 3 years, especially if initial ABE Levels are low.
 - 63.2% of the FY2013 SR Releases from DOC facilities (n = 7,009) served less than 3 years prior to release.
 - For non-GED completers, gains in TABE Battery Average scores give an idea of the improvements these students have made in their time with the Agency.
 - GED Passing is critical in preparing students for CTE Coursework or Advanced Educational opportunities.
 - Correctional Education programs had larger completion or pass rates for individuals with DOC Length of Stays (LOS) 3+ years.
 - CTE Course completion and the resulting industry based certification seem to be strong factors in reducing recidivism.

- In the FY2013 SR Releases, 25% (1,740) participated in the CRC Program.
 - 94% of participants received either a Bronze, Silver, or Gold certificate.
 - Only 6% did not earn a certificate
- Recidivism rate decreased as the CRC level increased.
- The CRC Program is an opportunity for offenders to increase their employability upon release.
- The CRC serves an effective and alternative program for offenders who are not qualify for GED testing.
- The CRC Program, along with other educational programs, should continue to be evaluated to monitor effects on recidivism.
- All Adult Education students have the opportunity to improve, so this may be impacting the GED Pass study versus comparison group outcomes.
- There is no way to isolate non-education, since all offenders with need have an education participation requirement.

Discussion

- Question: Are instructors' licensed and certified teachers?
 - Answer: Yes, for all CTE programs. The teachers for programs have the same certifications as teachers in other educational settings.
- Question: Are certifications (e.g. vocational certifications) on the inside the same as the outside?
 - Answer: Yes.
- Question: Is there a waitlist
 - Answer: Yes. Sometimes a person's release date may determine when they get into the program.

Ongoing BJS Activities and Closeout

Ann Carson, Acting Corrections Unit Chief, BJS

- Hiring
 - BJS is currently seeking four new statisticians and a unit chief.
- Publications
 - Prison Facility Census is currently in the field
 - It has been shortened for community corrections facilities.
 - There is a separate survey going out to private facilities.
 - Information regarding survey access and deadlines was provided.
- Mortality in Correctional Institutions (MCI)
 - State DOCs are not required to complete the MCI survey, but BJS is required to *ask them* to complete it.
 - BJS has overhauled its arrest-related deaths data and now utilizes web-scrapers to scan the media, confirming deaths with arresting agencies.
 - Quarterly MCI surveys will now be administered by BJA, BJS will only ask for information yearly. The survey web tool will be available year round.

- The change from BJS to BJA administration is legally motivated: BJS data cannot be used for enforcement programs, but Byrne-Jag funding can be reduced for failing to submit data. There will be a 3-month overlap where both agencies are collecting the data.
 - The BJA survey asks for less information on location, but does require DOCs to report time of death and cause of death. If autopsy results are unavailable this should be entered as “TBD.”
 - BJS has matched MCI data to the CDC’s death certificate data. They are planning on using this to research which drugs lead to overdose deaths in custody.
- Survey of Prison Inmates (SPI)
 - SPI data publication is in progress and will (hopefully) be made available to researchers by the end of 2019, subject to IRB approval,
 - There are six data briefs in the publication process that utilize this data.
 - Abt is developing a web tool for SPI analysis that will be available to the general public.
 - Abt is also crosswalking 2019 questions to previous years and will provide guidance on which responses can be tracked over time.
- Census of Jail Facilities
 - Currently in the field, deadline is 9/30/19. Data will become available by Summer 2020.
 - There is a focus on opioid-related questions.
- Survey of Inmates in Local Jails (SILJ)
 - Most recent release was in 2002, the next survey is planned for 2022.
 - The US Census Bureau will survey 10-12 thousand respondents.
 - The survey will include new questions on opioids and fees and fines.
- Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA)
 - At least one jail and prison in each state will be required to complete the survey.
 - The US Census Bureau will collect responses. Sample size currently unknown, but last survey included 80,000 respondents.
- Community Corrections
 - BJS intends to begin differentiating between misdemeanors and felonies in community corrections surveys. They intend to release a web tool in the next six months that will facilitate reporting.
 - There is discussion of extending the NCRP to probation agencies, but this is difficult.
 - The Urban Institute is currently examining the viability of getting probation data from individual courts.
- First Step Act
 - There have been changes to Bureau of Prisons reporting due to the FSA, which will be detailed in a report this year. There will be new data about pregnancy shackling.

Discussion

- Question: Is there a change in who is required to do MCI reporting? Changes in the reporting structure may require DOCs to maintain internal data on deaths in custody, which can be requested through FOIA requests.

- Answer: This will vary state to state. MCI data is frequently requested through FOIAs though these requests are usually rejected. BJA is not planning on publishing anything using the data.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A – Meeting Contact List

**7th Annual ICRN/NCRP Data Providers Meeting
September 19th – September 20th, 2019
St. Louis, MO**

Participants and Contact Information

State Representatives and Employees

Zachary Baumgart

Lead Research Analyst
Wisconsin Department of Corrections
3099 East Washington Avenue
PO Box 7925
Madison, WI 53707
(608) 240-5806
Zachary.Baumgart@wisconsin.gov

Drew Bigham

Agency Data Auditor
Nebraska Department of Correctional Services
801 W Prospector Place
Lincoln, NE 68522
(402) 479-5639
drew.bigham@nebraska.gov

Kristofer Bucklen

Director of Planning, Research, and Statistics
Pennsylvania Department of Corrections
1920 Technology Parkway
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050
(717) 728-4055
kbucklen@pa.gov

Tama Celi

Chief of Research
Virginia Department of Corrections
6900 Atmore Drive
Richmond, VA 23261-6963
(804) 887-8249

tama.celi@vadoc.virginia.gov

Tiffanye Compton

Research & Planning Administrator
Arkansas Department of Correction
6814 Princeton Pike
PO Box 8707
Pine Bluff, AR 71611
(870) 267-6335
tiffanye.compton@arkansas.gov

Peter Coulson

Research Analyst Senior
Idaho Department of Correction
1299 N, Orchard, Suite 110
Boise, ID 83706
(208) 658-2162
pcoulson@idoc.idaho.gov

Elizabeth Dehlbom

Interim Director
Washington State Department of Corrections
PO BOX 41100
Mail Stop 41100
Olympia, WA 98504-1100
(360) 725-8515
ejdehlbom@doc1.wa.gov

Clarissa Dias

Senior Research Analyst
Department of Community Supervision
2 Martin Luther King, Jr. SE East Tower
Atlanta, GA 30334
(470) 767-6159
clarissa.dias@dcs.ga.gov

Ken Dimoff

Statistician Specialist
Michigan Department of Corrections
Office of Research & Planning
Grandview Plaza Building
206 E. Michigan Avenue
Lansing, MI 48933
(517) 402-2920
DimoffK@michigan.gov

Michael Dolny

Research Manager
Arizona Department of Corrections
1645 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 542-7109
mdolny@azcorrections.gov

Grant Duwe

Research Director
Minnesota Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55108
(651) 361-7377
grant.duwe@state.mn.us

Anne Dwyer

Research Analyst
Kansas Department of Corrections
714 SW Jackson Street, Suite 300
Topeka, KS 66603
(785) 296-0913
LuAnne.Dwyer@ks.gov

Kim Edson

EBP Manager
South Dakota Department of Corrections
3200 East HWY 34
Pierre, SD 57501
(605) 773-3478
kim.edson@state.sd.us

Bob Flaherty

Chief of Data Analysis
Pennsylvania Department of Corrections
Bureau-Planning, Research, & Statistics
1920 Technology Parkway
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050
(717) 728-4056
rflaherty@pa.gov

Jana Friedman

Operations & Management Consultant
Florida Department of Corrections
501 South Calhoun Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2500
(850) 717-3432
Jana.Friedman@fdc.myflorida.com

Aaron Garner

Executive Director, Data Analytics
Indiana Department of Correction
Indiana Government Center South Indiana
302 W. Washington, E327
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 232-1757
AGarner@idoc.IN.gov

Joel Gilbert

Data and CQI Manager
State of Maine Department of Corrections
State House Station 111
Augusta, ME 04330-0111
(207) 215-3045
Joel.Gilbert@maine.gov

Angelina Guarino

Executive Director, Office of Data Development
Maryland Department of Public Safety and
Correctional Services
300 E Joppa Rd, 10th floor
Towson, MD 21286
(410) 339-5936
angelina.guarino1@maryland.gov

Ethan Harris

Statistics Instructor
Casper College
125 College Drive
Casper, WY 82601
(307) 268-2560
Ethan.harris@caspercollege.edu

Mark Harris

Research Manager
Wyoming Department of Corrections
305 SW Wyoming Boulevard
Mills, WY 82604
(307) 2261 x236
mark.harris@wyo.gov

Sabrina Haugebrook

Research Scientist
New Jersey Department of Corrections
PO Box 863
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 292-4036 x5290
Sabrina.Haugebrook@doc.nj.gov

Sierra Haynes

Data Architect
Montana Department of Corrections
5 S Last Chance Gulch
Helena, MT 59601
(406) 444-0127
Shaynes@mt.gov

Juan Jimenez

IT Business Systems Analyst (Research)
Nebraska Department of Correctional Services
PO Box #94661
Lincoln, NE 68509-4661
(402) 479-5662
juan.jimenez@nebraska.gov

Yan Jin

Evaluation Unit Manager
Virginia Department of Corrections
6900 Atmore Drive
Richmond, VA 23261-6963
(804) 887-7877
yan.jin@vadoc.virginia.gov

Beth Klingensmith

Senior Data Analyst
Colorado Department of Corrections
1250 Academy Park Loop
Colorado Springs, CO 80910
(719) 226-4376
beth.klingensmith@state.co.us

Rhiana Kohl

Executive Director Strategic Planning and
Research
Massachusetts Department of Correction
965 Elm Street
PO Box 9125
Concord, MA 01742
(978) 405-6675
Rhiana.Kohl@doc.state.ma.us

Brian Kowalski

Social Science Research Specialist
Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and
Correction
4545 Fisher Road, Suite D
Columbus, OH 43228
(614) 752-1277
Brian.Kowalski@odrc.state.oh.us

Mary Lansing

Associate Research Analyst
State of Connecticut Department of Correction
24 Wolcott Hill Road, Suite 146
Wethersfield, CT 06109
(860) 692-7641
Mary.Lansing@ct.gov

Hefang Lin

Research Statistician
Orange County Corrections Department
PO Box 4970
Orlando, FL 32802
(407) 836-0309
Hefang.Lin@ocfl.net

Alejandra Livingston

Economist III
Nevada Department of Corrections
5500 Snyder Avenue
PO Box 7011
Carson City, NV 89702
(775) 887-3357
alivingston@doc.nv.gov

Miranda Mal

RNR Planner
Delaware Department of Correction
Planning, Research, & Reentry Unit
245 McKee Road
Dover, DE 19904
(302) 857-5343
miranda.mal@delaware.gov

Audrey McAfee

Deputy Administrator for Technology and
Program Services
Mississippi Department of Corrections
633 N. State Street
Jackson, MS 39202
(601) 359-5636
AMcAfee@mdoc.state.ms.us

LaTonya Moore

Operations Specialist-Data Unit
Alabama Board of Pardons and Parole
1255 Madison Avenue
PO Box 302405
Montgomery, AL 36107
(334) 530-5148
latonya.moore@paroles.alabama.gov

Jeff Mustard

Administrative assistant to the Deputy Director
of Prisons
Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and
Correction
4545 Fisher Road, Suite D
Columbus, OH 43228
(614) 728-3997
Jeffery.Mustard@odrc.state.oh.us

Janice Neiman

Program Coordinator
Massachusetts Parole Board
12 Mercer Road
Natick, MA 01760
(508) 650-4544
janice.neiman@state.ma.us

Gina Papagiorgakis

Director of Research and Planning
Massachusetts Parole Board
12 Mercer Road
Natick, MA 01760
(508) 650-4540
gina.papagiorgakis@mass.gov

Stacy Philippus

Business Support Analyst
Georgia Department of Corrections
300 Patrol Road
Forsyth, GA 31029
(478) 342-2046
stacy.philippus@gdc.ga.gov

Gina Raney-Eatherly

Administrator, Research & Office of
Government Efficiencies
Oregon Department of Corrections
2575 Center Street NE
Salem, OR 97301
(503) 945-9998
Gina.Raney-Eatherly@doc.state.or.us

Deborah Richmond

Criminal Justice Specialist
West Virginia Division of Corrections &
Rehabilitation
1509 Greenbrier Street
Charleston, WV 25311
(304) 2036 x53410
Debbie.D.Richmond@wv.gov

Becki Schulz

Business Analyst
North Dakota Department of Corrections and
Rehabilitation
3100 Railroad Avenue
Bismarck, ND 58501
(701) 328-6769
bjschulz@nd.gov

Rosie Shingles

Administrative Analyst II
Alabama Department of Corrections
Alabama Criminal Justice Center
Research & Planning Division
301 South Ripley Street
Montgomery, AL 36130-1501
(334) 353-9541
Rosie.Shingles@doc.alabama.gov

Sharon Shipinski

Manager, Planning & Research
Illinois Department of Corrections
1301 Concordia Court
Springfield, IL 62794
(217) 2200 x6550
sharon.shipinski@illinois.gov

Maria Stephenson

Research Development Manager
Department of Community Supervision
2 MLK JR Drive SE
Atlanta, GA 31220
(478) 973-5046
maria.stephenson@dcs.ga.gov

Monica Weeber

Administrative Services Director
Vermont Department of Corrections
280 State Drive
Waterbury, VT 05671
(802) 598-4122
monica.weeber@vermont.gov

Philisa Weidlein-Crist

Planner in Planning, Research, and Reentry Unit
Delaware Department of Correction
245 McKee Road
Dover, DE 19904
(302) 857-5345
Philisa.Weidlein-Crist@delaware.gov

LaQuenta Weldon

Research & Statistics Analyst
South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole
and Pardon Services
2221 Devine Street, Suite 606
Columbia, SC 29250
(803) 734-4057
LaQuenta.Weldon@ppp.sc.gov

Janeena White

Evaluation and Compliance Supervisor
Idaho Department of Correction
1299 N Orchard
Suite 110
Boise, ID 83642
(208) 658-2130
jawwhite@idoc.idaho.gov

Victoria Wilson

Principal Research Analyst
Idaho Department of Correction
1299 N Orchard, Suite 110
Boise, ID 83706
(208) 658-2147
Vwilson@idoc.idaho.gov

Minzhe Wu

Director of Evaluation and Analysis
Oklahoma Department of Corrections
2901 North Classen Boulevard
Oklahoma City, OK 73106
(405) 962-6142
minzhe.wu@doc.ok.gov
Abt Associates Inc.

Walter Campbell

Associate/Scientist
Abt Associates Inc.
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 520-2347
Walter_Campbell@abtassoc.com

Chris Cutler

Associate
Abt Associates Inc.
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 520-2441
Christopher_Cutler@abtassoc.com

Gerry Gaes

Consultant
Abt Associates Inc.
1874 Cabrini Court
Crofton, MD 21114
(410) 721-8086
ggaes@comcast.net

Ryan Kling

Principal Associate
Abt Associates Inc.
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 349-2460

Ryan_Kling@abtassoc.com

Melissa Nadel

Abt Associates Inc.
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 520-3005
Melissa_Nadel@abtassoc.com

Tom Rich

Senior Associate
Abt Associates Inc.
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 349-2753
tom_rich@abtassoc.com

Michael Shively

Senior Associate
Abt Associates Inc.
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
(617) 520-3562
Michael_Shively@abtassoc.com

Bureau of Justice Statistics

Guy Burnett

Senior Advisor
Bureau of Justice Statistics
Guy.Burnett@ojp.usdoj.gov

Elizabeth Ann Carson

Acting Chief, Corrections Statistics Unit
Bureau of Justice Statistics
810 7th Street NW
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 616-3496
Elizabeth.Carson@usdoj.gov

Danielle Kaeble

Statistician
Bureau of Justice Statistics
810 7th Street NW
Washington, DC 20531
(202) 305-2017
Danielle.Kaeble@usdoj.gov
National Institute of Justice

Eric Martin

Social Science Research Analyst
National Institute of Justice
810 7th Street NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 598-7260
Eric.D.Martin@ojp.usdoj.gov

National Institute of Corrections

Shaina Vanek

Acting Director
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street NW
Washington, DC 20534
(202) 514-4202
svanek@bop.gov

Crime and Justice Institute at CRJ

Gina Abbondandolo

Administrative Coordinator
Crime and Justice Institute
355 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02169
(617) 482-2520
gabbondandolo@crj.org

Noah Atchison

Data and Policy Specialist
Crime and Justice Institute
355 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02116
(612) 481-8995
natchison@crj.org

Michael Kane

Senior Project Director
Crime and Justice Institute
355 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02116
(202) 549-3178
mkane@crj.org

Leila Khelifaoui

Policy Analyst II
Crime and Justice Institute
355 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02116
(617) 455-8495
lkhelifaoui@crj.org

Ashley Melanchook

Policy Analyst II
Crime and Justice Institute
355 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02116
(617) 879-8473
amelanchook@crj.org

Abby Strait

Policy Specialist
Crime and Justice Institute
355 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02116
(608) 334-5977
astrait@crj.org

APPENDIX B – Meeting Agenda

**SEVENTH ANNUAL INSTITUTIONAL CORRECTIONS RESEARCH NETWORK (ICRN)/
NATIONAL CORRECTIONS REPORTING PROGRAM (NCRP) DATA PROVIDERS MEETING**
AGENDA

September 19th 8:30am-5:00pm and September 20th 8:30am-1:00pm

Robert A. Young (RAY) Federal Building in St. Louis, Missouri

Wednesday September 18th

3:00pm - 10:00pm *Registration*

Thursday September 19th

7:45am - 8:00am *Bus transfers to RAY federal building*

8:15am - 8:30am *Gather in Auditorium*

8:30am - 8:45am *Welcome and Introductions*

- Shaina Vanek, Acting Director, National Institute of Corrections (NIC)
- Danielle Kaeble, Statistician, Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and Ann Carson, Acting Corrections Unit Chief, BJS
- Tom Rich, Senior Associate, Abt Associates
- Michael Kane, Senior Associate, Crime and Justice Institute (CJI) at CRJ

8:45am - 9:45am Keynote speaker – Anne Precythe, Director, Missouri Department of Corrections

9:45am - 10:30am BJS and CES Initiatives –

- Research studies using NCRP and CES data – Ryan Kling, Abt Associates
- Current and Future Plans – Danielle Kaeble, BJS

10:30am - 10:45am *Break*

10:45am - 12:00pm Plenary – Exploring Recidivism

- Conditions of Confinement on Recidivism
Brian Kowalski, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
- Using Prison Days and Total Costs as an Alternative to Return to Prison Measures – Mark Harris, Wyoming Department of Corrections and Ethan Harris, Casper College
- Recidivism of Sex Offenders
Zach Baumgart, Wisconsin Department of Corrections

| | |
|------------------|--|
| 12:00pm - 1:00pm | <i>Lunch (on your own in the cafeteria, 1st Floor)</i> |
| 1:00pm - 2:25pm | Plenary – Research in Corrections Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pracademic Research: Engaging Corrections Practitioners in Research through Innovation and Experimentation Bret Bucklen & Robert Flaherty, Pennsylvania Department of Corrections • Idaho Prison Compstat Reporting Janeena White, Idaho Department of Correction |
| 2:25pm - 2:45pm | <i>Break</i> |

Breakout rooms:

1st Floor Cafeteria Conference Room (room 1)

6th Floor Conference Room (room 6.208)

7th Floor Conference Room (room 7.207)

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2:45pm - 3:45pm | Breakout Session #1 |
| 1st Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of Technical Revocations on Recidivism for More Serious Crime Gerald Gaes, Corrections Consultant • The Technicalities of Technical Violations Clarissa Dias and Maria Stephenson, Georgia Department of Community Supervision |
| 6th Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and Validation of New Classification Assessment: The MN Severe and Frequent Estimate for Discipline (MnSafeD) Grant Duwe, Minnesota Department of Corrections |
| 7th Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCRP for Newcomers—Tom Rich and Michael Shively, Abt Associates |
| 3:45pm - 4:00pm | <i>Break</i> |
| 4:00pm - 5:00pm | Breakout Session #2 |
| 1st Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Path to Removing Restrictive Housing in Delaware – Philisa Weidlein-Crist and Miranda Mal, Delaware Department of Correction |
| 6th Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location, Location, Location: What the NCRP tells us about where prisoners serve their sentence, where they’re from, and where they reoffend — Walter Campbell and Melissa Nadel, Abt Associates |
| 7th Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results from Survey on Research Capacity within Local Jails and State Departments of Correction—Tama Celi, Virginia Department of Corrections and Dr. Hefang Lin, Department of Orange County Corrections, Florida |
| 5:00pm - 5:15pm | <i>Bus transfers to Hotel</i> |
| 7:00pm - 9:00pm | <i>Informal gathering in Hyatt Regency Hotel bar/lobby</i> |

Friday September 20th

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 7:45am - 8:00am | <i>Bus transfers to RAY federal building</i> |
| 8:30am - 9:30am | Breakout Session #3 |
| 1st Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• BJS Recent Releases—<i>Source and Use of Firearms Involved in Crimes: Survey of Prison Inmates 2016 and Time Served in State Prison, 2016</i> — Danielle Kaebler, BJS |
| 6th Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parole Recovery Opportunity (PRO) Supervision— Gina Papagiorgakis, Massachusetts Parole Board |
| 7th Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The New On-Line NCRP data analysis tool: A Preview— Tom Rich, Abt Associates |
| 9:30am - 9:45am | <i>Break</i> |
| 9:45am - 10:45am | Breakout Session #4 |
| 1st Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• National Institute of Justice Correction’s Portfolio and new Corrections Strategic Research Plan— Eric Martin, National Institute of Justice |
| 6th Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hate Crimes and Sex Offenders: Exploring the NCRP’s Unique Capabilities for Research on Rare and Specialized Crime Types Michael Shively and Christopher Cutler, Abt Associates |
| 7th Floor | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A Review of Educational Strategies and their Impacts Tama Celi and Yan Jin, Virginia Department of Corrections |
| 10:45am - 11:00am | <i>Break, return to Auditorium</i> |
| 11:00am - 12:15pm | Ongoing BJS Activities and Closeout |
| 12:30pm - 1:45pm | <i>Bus transfers to hotel or airport</i> |