An Evaluation of the Minnesota Comprehensive Offender Reentry Plan (MCORP): Phase 1 Report

February 2010

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Table of Contents

TABLES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2008, the Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC), in collaboration with Hennepin, Ramsey, and Dodge/Fillmore/Olmsted (DFO) counties, implemented the Minnesota Comprehensive Offender Reentry Plan (MCORP) pilot project, an offender reentry initiative serving offenders released to the five counties. In an effort to lower recidivism, MCORP was designed to increase offender access to critical reentry services in the community such as employment, housing, educational and vocational programming, chemical dependency (CD) treatment, income support, and community support programming (i.e., mentoring, restorative justice circles, and faith-based support). Using the core components of evidence-based practices, MCORP attempted to enhance service delivery by emphasizing increased collaboration between institutional caseworkers and supervision agents to provide planning, support, and direction for offenders to address their strengths and needs in both the institution and the community. In pursuit of increasing offender access to community services and programming, MCORP supervision agents had smaller caseload sizes and began initiating contact with the offenders on their caseloads while the offenders were still incarcerated.

To evaluate whether the MCORP pilot project (hereafter referred to as MCORP) was effective in reducing recidivism, the DOC and the five pilot counties implemented a randomized experimental design, which is widely considered to be the most rigorous research design used in program evaluations. During 2008, eligible offenders were randomly assigned to either the experimental (MCORP) or control (regular) groups. Data were collected on the offenders from both groups that measured their experiences prior to imprisonment, during their incarceration, and after their release from prison.

Using the data that were collected, this evaluation attempted to address three main questions. First, did MCORP reduce recidivism? Second, did MCORP increase offender access to community services and programming? And, third, to what extent did these services have an impact on recidivism? To answer these questions, the results from the evaluation are provided below.

Results

Did MCORP reduce recidivism?

- The results indicate that participation in MCORP significantly reduced reoffending.

  - MCORP lowered the risk of rearrest for a new offense by 37 percent.

  - MCORP decreased the risk of reconviction for a new crime by 43 percent.

  - MCORP reduced the risk of reincarceration for a new felony offense by 57 percent.

- MCORP did not have a statistically significant impact on supervision revocations for technical violations.

Why did MCORP reduce recidivism?

- MCORP expanded systems of social support for offenders and increased their access to employment, housing, and community programming and services.

  - MCORP increased the chances that an offender found employment within the first six months after release by 91 percent.

  - MCORP offenders were 80 percent less likely to be homeless than the offenders in the control group.

  - MCORP offenders were about 17 times more likely than offenders in the control group to report having any source of social support.

  - MCORP offenders were more than four times more likely to participate in mentoring, restorative justice circles, or faith-based programming in the community.

  - MCORP offenders were about three times more likely than the control group to participate in educational programming in the community.

  - MCORP offenders were nearly 2.5 times more likely than the control group to receive income support.

- MCORP did not have a statistically significant effect on housing location, access to vocational training, or participation in community-based CD treatment.

What impact did community services and programming have on recidivism?

- Social support had a statistically significant effect on three measures of recidivism (reconviction, reincarceration for a new felony offense, and any return to prison).
    - Reduced recidivism was associated with broader systems of social support; that is, the risk of recidivism decreased as the number of social support sources identified by offenders increased.
- Employment had statistically significant effects on three recidivism measures (rearrest, revocation, and any return to prison).
    - Employment reduced the risk of rearrest by 51 percent.
    - Employment decreased the risk of revocation for a technical violation by 75 percent.
    - Employment lowered the risk of returning to prison for any reason by 69 percent.
- A combination of mentoring, restorative justice circles, and faith-based programming had a statistically significant impact on two measures of recidivism.
    - It reduced the risk of rearrest for a new felony offense by 68 percent.
    - It lowered the risk of reconvictions by 51 percent.
    - None of the types of community support programming had a significant independent effect on recidivism.
- Participation in both prison- and community-based CD treatment significantly lowered the risk of rearrest, reducing it by 62 percent.
- Participation in vocational programming in the community significantly lowered the risk of returning to prison.
- Income support significantly reduced the risk of revocation for a technical violation and returning to prison for any reason.
- None of the other types of community programming and services had a statistically significant effect on the five measures of recidivism.

Other Notable Findings

- The crime rate of the community in which offenders were living was a significant predictor of revocations for technical violations. Offenders living in high-crime areas were more likely to return to prison for a technical violation.

- Compared to DFO, offenders released to supervision in Hennepin and Ramsey counties were significantly less likely to return to prison, especially for a technical violation.

- Multiple residences were related with a significantly increased risk of revocation.

Conclusions

The results presented here suggest that MCORP is a promising model for offender reentry. Although it did not have a statistically significant effect on revocations for technical violations, MCORP significantly reduced reoffending by increasing offender employment, expanding offender social support systems, and facilitating access to services and programming in the community. Despite MCORP's success in significantly lowering recidivism, the results suggest there is room for improvement. For example, providing a continuum of CD treatment from the institution to the community produced much better recidivism outcomes, but only 11 percent of the offenders participated in both prison- and community-based treatment. In addition, involvement in mentoring, restorative justice circles, and faith-based programming was effective in reducing reoffending, but only six percent of the offenders participated in all three types of community support programming. Participation in vocational training was associated with a decreased risk of reincarceration, yet less than 10 percent participated in this type of programming in the community.

In general, the evidence suggests that offender reentry practices can be even more successful if access can be further increased to the following areas:

- Additional opportunities for offenders without a degree to obtain their GED, as having a GED or high school degree tripled an offender's chances of finding post-release employment.

- Greater availability of training opportunities in both prison and the community to acquire or improve vocational skills.

- For offenders unable to earn a GED or find steady employment, supervision agents should focus efforts on helping them identify potential sources of income support in the community.

- Because housing location can affect an offender's chances of success in the community, institutional caseworkers and supervision agents should concentrate efforts, when possible, on locating housing opportunities in communities where there is greater availability of informal support networks and community resources.

- Increasing the extent to which a continuum of CD treatment is provided from the institution to the community.

- Increasing the extent to which offenders have a continuum of social support from prison to the community by promoting increased visitation within the facilities by friends and relatives; strengthening or reestablishing ties with families; and greater involvement in mentoring, restorative justice programming, and faith-based services.

Efforts to evaluate the MCORP model will continue, as Phase 2 was initiated in October 2008. Because Phase 2 will operate over a longer period of time than Phase 1, it will adhere more closely to the original MCORP model by assigning offenders to the project shortly after their admission to prison. Therefore, in addition to increasing the overall sample size for MCORP, Phase 2 will provide valuable comparative data to help identify whether there are benefits to be derived from starting the reentry process at an earlier point during an offender's confinement. Future research on MCORP will also contain cost-benefit analyses to help determine the most cost-effective model for offender reentry.

INTRODUCTION

The state and federal prison population has skyrocketed over the last several decades, more than quadrupling in size. Despite increased penalties for many crimes—particularly for drug and sex offenses—since the 1980s, the vast majority of offenders get released from prison. As the number of released prisoners has grown, so, too, has concern over the issue of offender reentry. Much of this concern is driven by the relatively low success rates of released prisoners who transition from the institution to the community. In a Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) study of more than 272,000 offenders from 15 states who were released from prison in 1994, Langan and Levin (2002) found that roughly two-thirds had been rearrested for a new offense within three years, a finding that has become one of the most frequently cited statistics within the offender reentry literature.

The relatively high rate at which released prisoners recidivate has generally been linked to a number of factors. Research has shown, for example, that prisoners are often undereducated, have little or no prior work history, lack vocational skills, have lengthy histories of substance abuse, are more likely to suffer from mental illness, and are disproportionately more likely to be minorities (Petersilia, 2003). Although the majority of state and federal prisons offer some programming opportunities to address the educational, vocational, and chemical dependency issues often faced by offenders, research suggests that most prisoners do not participate in programming while incarcerated (Lynch and Sabol, 2001). Therefore, when offenders get released from prison, they often leave with the same needs and deficits with which they arrived. Moreover, because a criminal record presents a major barrier in finding a job and a place to live, released offenders often experience a great deal of difficulty in securing steady employment and suitable housing (Bushway and Reuter, 2002; Pager, 2003). Given these obstacles, some have concluded it is hardly surprising that recidivism rates are so high (Kubrin and Stewart, 2006).

In an effort to promote public safety by facilitating the successful reintegration of offenders into Minnesota communities, the Minnesota Comprehensive Offender Reentry

Plan (MCORP) pilot project was implemented in 2008. Based on the premise that offender reentry begins as soon as offenders are admitted to prison, MCORP emphasizes increased collaboration between institutional caseworkers and supervision agents to provide planning, support, and direction for offenders to address their strengths and needs in both the institution and the community. MCORP was developed on the notion that increased collaboration will enhance delivery of services by increasing the extent to which offenders access employment, suitable housing, and programming in the community. Enhanced service delivery will, in turn, purportedly lead to a reduction in recidivism.

Present Evaluation

To evaluate the effectiveness of the MCORP model, the DOC and the five pilot counties used a randomized experimental design, which is generally considered to be the most rigorous design for program evaluations. Prior to their release from prison, eligible offenders were randomly assigned to either the treatment group (i.e., they participated in MCORP) or the control group (i.e., they received regular services in both the institution and community) from January-September 2008. Offenders from the MCORP and control groups were released from state prison facilities to communities in the five pilot counties from February-December 2008. By the end of 2008, a total of 175 MCORP offenders and 94 control group offenders had been released from prison.

In assessing the effectiveness of MCORP, this evaluation attempted to address three main questions. First, did MCORP reduce offender recidivism? Second, did MCORP increase offender access to critical reentry services such as employment, housing, vocational training, treatment, and faith-based programming? Third, in an effort to identify the reasons why MCORP was effective or not, what impact did specific types of community programming and services have on recidivism? To answer these questions, data were collected on the 269 offenders (175 in the MCORP group and 94 in the control group) that included information on what happened with offenders prior to their admission to prison, during their imprisonment, and during the first six months following their release

from prison. Recidivism data were collected on the 269 offenders through the end of October 2009, resulting in an average follow-up period of 16 months.

In the next section, the offender reentry literature is briefly reviewed, followed by a more detailed description of MCORP. After discussing the data and methods used for this evaluation, the results from the statistical analyses are presented. This report concludes by exploring the implications of the results and offering recommendations for enhancing offender reentry practices in Minnesota.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Although the fact that nearly all offenders make the transition from prison to the community is not new, the focus placed on offender reentry by academic and applied researchers is relatively recent. Prior to this decade, only a handful of studies dealt explicitly with the issue of offender reentry. Since 2000, however, there has been a sharp increase in the amount of scholarship devoted to this topic.

Prisoner reentry generally encompasses efforts to promote the successful reintegration of offenders in the communities to which they return. At a minimum, offender reentry consists of programming that focuses on the transition from prison to the community or, more narrowly, on connecting the delivery of treatment in both the institution and the community to provide a continuity of care (Seiter and Kadela, 2003). Yet, others such as Petersilia (2003) have defined prisoner reentry more broadly by stating that it consists of "…all activities and programming conducted to prepare ex-convicts to return safely to the community and to live as law abiding citizens." Regardless of differences in how offender reentry is defined, existing research has, considering the deficits and needs often observed among prisoners, focused on determining the efficacy of programming related to education, employment, chemical health, housing, and social support.

Educational Programming

Prior research has generally found that prison-based educational programming lowers recidivism rates and increases the chances of post-release employment. For example, studies of prisoners in Oklahoma (Holley and Brewster, 1998); New York (Nuttall, Hollmen, and Staley, 2003); and New Jersey (Zgoba, Haugebrook, and Jenkins, 2008) found that offenders who earned their GED in prison were less likely to recidivate after release from prison than offenders who did not have a degree at the time they left prison. In addition, a study of Texas inmates found that educational achievement in prison produced an 11 percent reduction in recidivism (Fabelo, 2002), whereas an evaluation of more than 3,000 offenders from Maryland, Ohio, and Minnesota reported that offenders who were involved in educational programming had lower recidivism rates than those who were not (Steurer, Smith, and Tracy, 2001). But not every existing study of educational programming has found that it reduces recidivism. For example, the evaluations by Adams and colleagues (1994) and Vito and Tewksbury (1999) reported that it had little impact on reoffending. Both studies did find, however, that educational programming increased academic achievement. Overall, in a meta-analysis of correctional programming evaluations, Wilson and colleagues (2000) found that adult basic education/GED programming reduced recidivism by 18 percent and that postsecondary educational programming lowered it by 26 percent.

Employment and Vocational Training Programs

Much of the initial research examining the effects of work on crime generally found that employment and vocational training had little impact on recidivism (Soothill, 1974; Berk, Lenihan, and Rossi, 1980; Rossi, Berk, and Lenihan, 1980). More recent studies have shown, however, that employment and vocational training programs can mitigate the risk of reoffending. For example, in their evaluations of the Post Release Employment Program (PREP), a vocational apprenticeship program for federal prisoners, Saylor and Gaes (1992, 1997) found that participants had fewer misconduct reports, higher rates of employment, and lower rearrest rates. Moreover, in an evaluation of the Opportunity to Succeed (OPTS) program, Rossman and Roman (2003) reported that the program increased post-release employment for offenders. The increase in employment was, in

turn, associated with reductions in drug dealing, violent crime, and property crime. Examining the National Supported Work Demonstration Project, Uggen (2000) found that employment was effective in reducing rearrest rates for offenders over the age of 26. Most recently, in an evaluation of an offender reentry program in Ohio, Listwan (2009) reported that offenders who obtained employment following their release from prison were significantly less likely to fail the program. Finally, in their meta-analysis of correctional program evaluations, Wilson and colleagues (2000) estimated that participation in vocational training and correctional work/industries decreased recidivism by 22 and 20 percent, respectively.

Chemical Health/Treatment

Existing research has evaluated prison-based drug treatment programs for federal prisoners (Pelissier et al., 2001) as well as for state prisoners in California (Prendergast, Hall, Wexler, Melnick, and Cao, 2004; Wexler, Melnick, Lowe, and Peters, 1999); Delaware (Inciardi, Martin, Butzin, Hooper, and Harrison, 1997; Inciardi, Martin, and Butzin, 2004); New York (Wexler, Falkin, and Lipton, 1990); Oregon (Field, 1985); Pennsylvania (Welsh, 2007); Texas (Knight, Simpson, Chatham, and Camacho, 1997; Knight, Simpson, and Hiller, 1999) and; most recently, Minnesota (Duwe, 2010). In general, the findings from these studies suggest that prison-based treatment can be effective in reducing recidivism and relapse. For example, the evaluation of prison-based treatment in Minnesota found that it lowered recidivism from 17-25 percent (Duwe, 2010). The most promising outcome results have been found for offenders who complete prison-based treatment programs, especially those who participate in post-release aftercare (Inciardi, Martin, and Butzin, 2004; Mitchell et al., 2007; Pearson and Lipton, 1999). Moreover, several studies have found that treatment effectiveness is related to the length of time an individual remains in treatment, but only up to a point (Duwe, 2010; Wexler, Falkin, and Lipton, 1990). In the most recent meta-analysis of the incarceration-based drug treatment literature, Mitchell, Wilson, and MacKenzie (2007) found that treatment significantly decreased subsequent criminal offending and drug use in their review of 66 evaluations.

Housing/Neighborhood

In their research on housing in New York City, Metraux and Culhane (2004) found that there was an association between homelessness and incarceration. In addition, when released prisoners did not have stable housing arrangements, they were more likely to return to prison. When offenders get released from prison, most go to a small number of neighborhoods in urban areas (Lynch and Sabol, 2001). These urban areas, moreover, are often marked by high levels of social and economic disadvantage (Visher et al., 2004). Researchers have suggested that high rates of incarceration and reentry may further destabilize these communities (Clear, Rose, and Ryder, 2001).

Offenders returning to unsafe neighborhoods lacking in social capital are not only less likely to be employed but are also at a greater risk of recidivism (Visher and Farrell, 2005). Indeed, Kubrin and Stewart (2006) found that higher rates of recidivism were associated with neighborhoods that were more disadvantaged (i.e., lower median family income and higher percentage of residents on public assistance, below the poverty level, and unemployed). They also reported that the risk of recidivism was higher for offenders living in neighborhoods where relative inequality was greater. In their 2008 study, Mears and colleagues found that resource deprivation (median family income, percent of female-headed households, percent unemployed, percent poverty, and percent receiving public assistance) significantly increased violent recidivism. Finally, in their study of parole in California, Grattet, Petersilia, and Lin (2008) observed that concentrated neighborhood disadvantage (percent of households in poverty, percent of adults unemployed, median household income, percent of children living with unmarried parents, and percent of residents who are black) significantly increased the risk of absconding but was unrelated to other types of parole violations.

Social Support

Major theories of crime have generally noted the importance of social support as a buffer against criminal offending. Social control theory assumes, for example, that crime is less likely to occur when individuals establish a bond to conventional society (Hirschi, 1969). This theory assumes, moreover, that the social bond is strengthened when individuals

have a stake in conformity, are involved in conventional activities like work or school, and have strong social support attachments. General strain theory, meanwhile, posits that sources of social support reduce the likelihood of crime by decreasing opportunities to experience strain (Agnew, 2006). Further, labeling theory suggests that social ties can protect against the harmful effects that the acceptance of a deviant label can have on future offending by providing offenders with social networks that promote a more positive sense of personal identity (Maruna, 2001). Finally, life-course theory argues that social support can help offenders desist from offending by serving as a critical aid in the transition from prison to society (Maruna and Toch, 2005).

Despite ample theoretical justification for the beneficial impact of social ties on offending, relatively few studies have recently examined the relationship between social support and recidivism in the context of offender reentry. Nevertheless, the findings from existing research generally support the view that social support can act as a buffer against future criminal activity. Although Adams and Fischer (1976) found that prison visitation had no effect on recidivism, other studies have shown that various measures of social support are associated with a decreased likelihood of reoffending (Glaser, 1964; Hairston, 1988; LeClair, 1978; Ohlin, 1951). Moreover, in a recent study on Florida prisoners, Bales and Mears (2008), reported that prison visitation was significantly associated with reduced recidivism. That is, visited inmates were, compared to non-visited inmates, 31 percent less likely to reoffend. In addition, the odds of recidivism were significantly lower for offenders who were visited more recently and more often.

Previous Offender Reentry Evaluations

As interest has grown in the concept of offender reentry, so have efforts to implement programs that focus on helping offenders successfully transition from prison to the community. In general, these programs concentrate on improving reentry by enhancing the delivery of services and programming in one or more areas. Of the extant offender reentry program evaluations, most have been either process evaluations, which examine the implementation of a program, or outcome evaluations, which measure whether a program has an impact on outcomes such as recidivism. Only a few studies, however,

have included both process and outcome evaluations (Sample and Spohn, 2008) or used a randomized experimental design (Smith and Suttle, 2008).

The findings from most prior process evaluations suggest that the implementation of offender reentry programs has generally been consistent with how they were designed (Haas, Hamilton, and Hanley, 2007; Holl, Kolovich, Grady, and Coffey, 2009; Knollenberg and Martin, 2008; LaVigne, Lawrence, Kachnowski, Naser, and Schaffer, 2002; Lindquist, Hardison, and Lattimore, 2003; Lutze, Bouffard, and Falconer, 2009; Sample and Spohn, 2008). Yet, because only one evaluation has measured the provision of services to a comparison group of non-participants (Winterfield, Lattimore, Steffey, Brumbaugh, and Lindquist, 2006), it is difficult to conclude whether reentry programs in general have actually enhanced the delivery of programming. In their multi-site evaluation of programs funded under SVORI, Winterfield and colleagues (2006) found that a greater proportion of offenders participating in offender reentry programs received services relating to transition, family, health, employment, education, and skills development.

Thus far, outcome evaluations have produced mixed results as to whether offender reentry programs can reduce recidivism. For example, the findings from evaluations of reentry programs in California (Zhang, Roberts, and Callanan, 2006); Massachusetts (Braga, Piehl, and Hureau, 2009); New York (Jacobs and Western, 2007); and Nebraska (Sample and Spohn, 2008) suggested that they decreased the risk of recidivism. In contrast, the results from evaluations of reentry programs in Indiana (McGarrell, Hipple, and Banks, 2003); New York (Wilson and Davis, 2006; McDonald, Dyous, and Carlson, 2008); and Pennsylvania (Smith and Suttle, 2008) indicated that none of these programs produced a reduction in reoffending. Reasons offered for the inability of these reentry programs to lower recidivism included program design problems (Smith and Suttle, 2008; Wilson and Davis, 2006); low dosage or short program duration (McGarrell et al., 2003; Smith and Suttle, 2008; Wilson and Davis, 2006); lack of administrative oversight (Smith and Suttle, 2008); poor program implementation (Wilson and Davis, 2006); and the absence of a community aftercare component (Wilson and Davis, 2006).

Summary

The evidence from existing research indicates that programming addressing offender needs related to education, vocational skills, employment, chemical health, housing, and social support can produce more successful transitions from prison to the community. Moreover, the findings from prior evaluations suggest that offender reentry programs are capable of providing more services and reducing the extent to which offenders recidivate. None of the existing evaluations, however, has connected program delivery to recidivism outcomes. It is therefore unclear whether the recidivism reductions achieved by some reentry programs were due, in fact, to an enhanced delivery of services. Nor is it clear whether certain types of programming are more effective than others in lowering recidivism. In their study of SVORI programs, Winterfield and colleagues (2006) argued that evaluators of offender reentry programs need to measure program delivery for both treatment and comparison subjects in order to ascertain whether a program is actually providing more services to offenders. Yet, to gain a better understanding as to why a program is effective or not, it is also necessary to connect the delivery of programming to outcomes such as recidivism. Using a randomized experimental design, this study builds on prior offender reentry evaluations by assessing not only the effects of MCORP on service delivery and recidivism but also the extent to which these services had an impact on recidivism.

MCORP PILOT PROJECT: A DESCRIPTION

Reducing the extent to which offenders recidivate is the overarching goal of MCORP. Because increasing offender access to programming in both the institution and community is considered critical to achieving this goal, MCORP focused on enhancing the delivery of services by forging a more collaborative relationship between institutional caseworkers and supervision agents in the community. More specifically, the core programmatic theme of this project was the development of dynamic case planning and case management that provided continuity between the offender's confinement and return to the community. In addition, institutional caseworkers and supervision agents applied

14

evidence-based strategies to engage offenders in the case management process by integrating motivational interviewing and SMART (Small, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Timely) planning strategies with the use of the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) risk and needs assessment tool.

After offenders were assigned to participate in MCORP, institutional caseworkers established a transition accountability plan (TAP), which was based on the model developed by the National Institute of Corrections under the Transition from Prison to the Community initiative. In particular, caseworkers reviewed available file information, administered the LSI-R, and interviewed offenders to determine their motivation related to interventions targeted to their needs and risk. Further, caseworkers developed SMART plans (specific goals and strategies within the TAP) that provided a guide for what offenders would need to accomplish while in the institution. To promote a greater continuity of case planning and management between the institution and the community, the caseworker included the assigned agent in the case planning process as early as possible during an offender's confinement. Due to the additional case planning required by the TAP model, the caseload sizes for caseworkers involved with MCORP were expected to be about half (35-40) that of regular caseloads (80-90). As noted later, however, there was no decrease in caseload sizes for institutional caseworkers.

Agents who provide standard supervision (as opposed to intensive supervised release) generally have a caseload size of approximately 75-80 offenders at a given time. Moreover, supervision agents seldom have any contact with the offenders on their caseloads until the offenders get released from prison. But in an effort to increase collaboration, enhance service delivery, and foster a more seamless transition for offenders from prison to the community, MCORP supervision agents had smaller caseload sizes and began initiating contact with the offenders on their caseloads while the offenders were still incarcerated ("inreach"). The caseload sizes for MCORP agents were approximately 35-40 offenders at a given time, about half the caseload size of regular supervision agents. The reduced caseload sizes for MCORP agents were considered necessary because these agents would need more time per offender in order to provide an

improved delivery of services. In addition to using the LSI-R to offer an updated assessment of an offender's strengths and needs, MCORP agents met with offenders several times in the institution prior to their release from prison. The inreach efforts were also considered important in helping MCORP agents connect the offenders with critical resources in the community when they left the institution. In particular, MCORP agents focused on helping offenders access services related to employment, vocational training, education, housing, chemical health, mentoring, faith-based programming, and income support.

DATA AND METHODS

A randomized experimental design was used to evaluate whether MCORP had an impact on recidivism. If offenders met the eligibility criteria, they were randomly assigned—by DOC research staff—to either the experimental (MCORP) or control (regular) groups at least 60 days prior to their scheduled release date. More specifically, those in the experimental group were assigned to MCORP institutional caseworkers and supervision agents who worked together to provide planning, support, and direction for offenders in an effort to address their strengths and needs, both in the institution and in the community. Those assigned to the control group, on the other hand, were exposed to regular case management and supervision practices. Because offenders did not have a choice as to whether they wanted to be involved in MCORP, participation was compulsory. At the time of assignment, the following four criteria were used to determine eligibility: 1) have a commit from one of the five pilot counties; 2) be incarcerated at one of the seven participating institutions (Shakopee, Lino Lakes, Stillwater, Rush City, Red Wing, Moose Lake, and St. Cloud); 3) have at least six months of community supervision remaining on their sentence; and 4) not have a requirement to register as a predatory offender.

In addition to these requirements, there were four additional eligibility criteria: 1) be released from prison to one of the five counties; 2) not participate in one of the DOC's early release programs such as the Challenge Incarceration Program (i.e., the adult boot camp) or work release; 3) be released to regular supervised release rather than intensive

supervised release (ISR); and 4) not have any detainers, warrants, or holds that would jeopardize participation in the project. Whether offenders met these four criteria was seldom known until after assignments were made. For example, the decision to place an offender on ISR was often made shortly before release. As such, incarcerated offenders assigned to either the MCORP or control group were removed from the project once it was later determined that they did not meet all of the eligibility criteria.

Eligible offenders were assigned to the MCORP and control groups on a bi-monthly basis between January and September of 2008. As noted above, one of the concepts of MCORP involved the use of reduced agent caseloads. Instead of a caseload of 80 or more offenders, the goal for MCORP supervision agents was a caseload size of approximately 35 offenders. During the planning and development phase of MCORP, analyses of DOC data revealed that there would be an insufficient number of eligible offenders released from prison to the pilot counties to support an equal assignment of offenders into the experimental and control groups. Accordingly, for every three offenders who met the initial eligibility criteria, two were randomly assigned to MCORP and one to the control group.

During the nine-month period from January-September 2008, 630 offenders determined to be initially eligible were randomly assigned to the MCORP and control groups. Due to the unequal assignment of offenders to the two groups, 409 (65 percent) were assigned to MCORP and 221 (35 percent) were assigned to the control group. However, of the 630 selected offenders, 361 (57 percent) were determined to be ineligible prior to their release from prison. The three most common reasons for exclusion were that offenders were placed on ISR, offenders were selected for an early release program (primarily work release), or offenders were released to supervision in a non-MCORP county. The attrition rate (57 percent) was the same for both groups, however, as 234 (57 percent) of the 409 MCORP offenders and 127 (57 percent) of the 221 control group offenders were excluded prior to their release from prison. Overall, the final sample consisted of 269 offenders, with 175 in the MCORP group and 94 in the control group.

Although the MCORP model conceptualized reentry as a process that begins as soon as an offender is admitted to prison, the reality is that many offenders were assigned to MCORP several months prior to their release, often after they had already served most of their sentence. The main reason why the implementation did not correspond with the design of the program, at least in this respect, was due to the short period of time in which the project had to be initiated. The Minnesota Legislature appropriated $1.9 million to implement MCORP over the FY 2008-2009 biennium (i.e., July 1, 2007-June 30, 2009). Because time was required to design and develop MCORP, the program was not implemented until January 2008, which left 18 months to operate the program. Due to the brief time frame for program operation, some of the first offenders assigned to MCORP had little more than a month remaining to serve prior to release. It was necessary to initially select offenders who did not have much time remaining to serve in order to generate adequate caseload sizes for the supervision agents in the pilot counties. Following this ramp-up period at the beginning of the project during the early months of 2008, offenders selected for MCORP (and the control group) from March-September 2008 generally had more time in the institution prior to their release to the community, especially those who were released toward the end of 2008. Even so, the vast majority of MCORP participants had already served a substantial portion of their prison term prior to being selected for MCORP. Given the brevity of MCORP participation in the institution for most offenders, it was anticipated that any effects MCORP might have on program delivery would be observed strictly in the community.

Another area where the implementation of the pilot project did not correspond with the initial design concerned the caseload sizes for caseworkers in the institution. Because developing a TAP for an offender involves a greater amount of work for caseworkers in comparison to regular case planning, the goal for caseworkers involved with MCORP was to cut their caseload sizes in half. This goal was never realized, however, as caseload sizes for caseworkers involved with MCORP stayed between 80 and 90. As a result, a continuous improvement process was conducted to help prioritize work for MCORP caseworkers. Nevertheless, this evaluation did not directly assess how well case plans were developed for MCORP participants, although the lack of a reduction in

18

caseload sizes for institutional caseworkers may have had an adverse impact on the quality of case planning.

In September 2008, DOC administration decided to continue MCORP for another biennium (FY 2010-2011). The FY 2008-2009 biennium is referred to as Phase 1, whereas the FY 2010-2011 period is referred to as Phase 2. At 11 months (February-December 2008), the release window for Phase 1 participants was relatively brief. In contrast, the release window for Phase 2 is considerably longer. Offender selection for Phase 2 began in October 2008. With the first offenders being released from prison in April 2009, the release window is 21 months (April 2009-December 2010). Due to the longer release window, it is possible to select more offenders for MCORP participation as soon as they enter prison. Accordingly, Phase 2 for MCORP will adhere more closely to the MCORP model than Phase 1 did.

Data Collection

Data collection efforts focused on what happened with offenders prior to their imprisonment, during their incarceration, and after their release from prison. Aside from demographic data, the pre-incarceration data consisted of information regarding educational level at the time of admission to prison, sentencing county, type of offense, type of admission to prison, and prior criminal history (e.g., number of prior supervision failures and number of prior felony convictions). Criminal history data were obtained from the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA), whereas the other data were derived from the Correctional Operations Management System (COMS), the prison database maintained by the DOC. Initially, the research design called for the collection of pre-incarceration employment and housing data, mainly from pre-sentence Investigation (PSI) reports. However, due to missing employment and housing data in the PSI reports on a relatively large number of offenders, this information was not included in the analyses. The institutional data focused on discipline, participation in programming such as education and CD treatment, LSI-R score, and length of stay in prison. All of the institutional data were obtained from COMS.

Although DOC research staff collected all pre-release data (i.e., what happened with offenders before and during their incarceration), supervision agents from the five counties were responsible for all of the post-release data except for information pertaining to recidivism. Information on whether offenders were rearrested and reconvicted was obtained from the BCA, whereas reincarceration data were collected from COMS. Supervision agents collected information on employment, housing, income support, vocational training, educational programming, community-based CD treatment, community support programming, debts, and social support.

After offenders had been in the community for at least 150 days, DOC research staff sent monthly lists of offenders on whom data needed to be gathered to the pilot counties. Supervision agents then collected, entered, and electronically submitted information on the offenders they supervised to DOC research staff. Despite multiple attempts to follow up with agents, there were 20 offenders (7 percent of the total sample) whose sentences expired (i.e., they were discharged from supervision) before post-release data could be collected. Of the 20 offenders, 15 (75 percent) were assigned to the control group. The larger proportion of control group offenders with missing post-release data is likely attributable to the fact that non-MCORP agents were not as invested in, or as familiar with, the project as MCORP agents. Moreover, to protect the integrity of the research design, neither institutional caseworkers nor supervision agents from the five pilot counties were aware that offenders had been assigned to the control group until the post-release data collection lists were distributed to the pilot counties. Thus, in some instances, shielding the identity of offenders as members of the control group may have hindered data collection efforts. Nevertheless, post-release data were collected on 249 (93 percent) of the 269 offenders. All of the post-release data measure the period of time between an offender's release from prison and the time of data entry. The average time between release from prison and data entry was six months.

Dependent Variables

Recidivism, which was the main dependent variable in this study, was defined as: 1) a rearrest, 2) a reconviction, 3) a new offense reincarceration, 4) a revocation for a

technical violation, and 5) any reincarceration, whether for a new offense or a technical violation. It is important to emphasize that the first three recidivism variables strictly measure new criminal offenses. In contrast, technical violation revocations (the fourth measure) represent a broader measure of rule-breaking behavior. Offenders may have their supervision revoked for violating the conditions of their supervised release. Because these violations can include activity that may not be criminal in nature, technical violation revocations do not necessarily measure reoffending. Meanwhile, given that any reincarcerations (the fifth measure) examine whether offenders return to prison for either a technical violation or a new felony-level sentence, this variable provides a measure of both criminal and non-criminal behavior.

Recidivism data were collected on offenders through October 31, 2009. Considering that offenders from both the MCORP and control groups were released from prison at some point during the February-December 2008 period, the follow-up time for the offenders examined in this study ranged from 10-21 months with an average of 16 months. In using BCA and COMS data to track recidivism, the main limitation with using these data is that they measure only arrests, convictions, or incarcerations that took place in Minnesota. Because neither source includes arrests, convictions, or incarcerations that occurred in other states, the findings presented later likely underestimate the true recidivism rates for the offenders examined here.

In the recidivism analyses for the three variables (rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration) that strictly measured reoffending, it was necessary to deduct from their total follow-up periods the amount of time offenders spent in prison due to supervised release revocations in order to accurately calculate how long they were actually at risk to reoffend. Failure to deduct time spent in prison as a supervised release violator would artificially increase the length of the at-risk periods for these offender. Therefore, to accurately measure an offender's "street time," the amount of time that an offender spent in prison as a supervised release violator was subtracted from his/her follow-up period, but only if it preceded a rearrest, reconviction, reincarceration for a new offense, or if the offender did not experience any of these three types of recidivism events.

Independent Variables

Because the primary goal of this evaluation involves assessing the impact of MCORP on recidivism, participation in MCORP is the principal variable of interest. Offenders who participated in MCORP were given a value of "1," whereas those in the control group were assigned a value of "0." The statistical analyses also included independent variables either known or hypothesized to have an impact on recidivism. The following lists the pre- and post-release variables and describes how they were created:

Pre-Release Variables

Offender Sex: dichotomized as male (1) or female (0).

Offender Race: dichotomized as minority (1) or white (0).

Age at Release: the age of the offender in years at the time of release based on the date of birth and release date.

County: three dichotomous dummy variables were created to measure the county or geographic area where offenders were released and supervised. The three variables were Hennepin, which includes Minneapolis (1 = Hennepin, 0 = Ramsey or DFO); Ramsey, which includes St. Paul (1 = Ramsey, 0 = Hennepin or DFO); and Dodge/Fillmore/Olmsted (DFO), which covers the Rochester area (1 = DFO, 0 = Hennepin or Ramsey). DFO serves as the reference in the statistical analyses.

Prior Supervision Failures: the number of prior revocations while under correctional supervision (probation or supervised release).

Prior Felony Convictions: the number of prior felony convictions, excluding the conviction(s) that resulted in the offender's incarceration.

LSI-R Score: the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) is a risk assessment tool designed to predict an offender's risk of recidivism. In general, the higher an offender's LSI-R score, the greater the risk of recidivism. The total score, which ranges from a low of 0 to a high of 54, was used from the most recent LSI-R administered in prison before an offender was released.

Offense Type: five dichotomous dummy variables were created to quantify offense type; i.e., the offense on which an offender's release date was based. The five variables

were person offense (1 = person offense, 0 = non-person offense); property offense (1 = property offense, 0 = non-property offense); drug offense (1 = drug offense, 0 = non-drug offense); felony driving while intoxicated (DWI) offense (1 = DWI offense, 0 = non-DWI offense); and other offense (1 = other offense, 0 = non-other offense). The other offense variable serves as the reference in the statistical analyses.

Admission Type: three dichotomous dummy variables were created to measure prison admission type. The three variables were new commitment (1 = new commitment, 0 = probation or release violator); probation violator (1 = probation violator, 0 = new commitment or release violator); and release violator (1= release violator, 0 = new commitment or probation violator). Release violator serves are the reference in the statistical analyses.

Length of Stay (LOS): the number of months between prison admission and release dates.

Institutional Discipline: the number of discipline convictions received during the term of imprisonment for which the offender was released.

Institutional Education: data were collected on education level at the time of admission to prison, whether offenders earned a general equivalency diploma (GED) or high school degree (HSD) while incarcerated, and the education level at the time of release from prison. The three education variables were GED/HSD at intake (GED or HSD = 1, less than GED or HSD = 0); earned a GED or HSD while incarcerated (GED or HSD = 1, did not earn a GED or HSD = 0); and GED/HSD at release (GED or HSD = 1, less than GED or HSD = 0).

CD Treatment: to examine the effects of providing a continuum of treatment from the institution to the community, four dichotomous dummy variables were created to measure whether offenders participated in CD treatment in the institution and/or the community. The four variables were participation in treatment in both prison and the community (prison and community treatment = 1, other = 0); treatment in prison but no treatment in the community (prison-only treatment = 1, other = 0); treatment in the community but no treatment in prison (1 = community-only treatment, 0 = other); and no treatment (1 = no treatment in either prison or the

23

community, 0 = treatment). The data on prison-based treatment were obtained from COMS, whereas supervision agents entered information on whether offenders participated in community-based treatment. The no treatment variable serves as the reference in the statistical analyses.

Post-Release Variables

Employment: this variable measures whether offenders obtained employment at any time following their release from prison, with employment as (1) and unemployment as (0).

Community Support Programming: this variable measures whether offenders participated in mentoring, restorative justice circles of support, or faith-based programming within the first six months following their release from prison. Three separate variables were created (mentoring, restorative justice circles, and faith-based programming) in which offenders who participated in this programming received a value of "1," whereas those who did not received a value of "0." In the recidivism analyses presented later, a binary variable was created that assigned a value of "1" to offenders who participated in all three types of community support programming and a value of "0" to those who did not.

Community Educational Programming: offenders who were enrolled and/or participating in educational courses in the community were given a value of "1," whereas those who were not received a value of "0."

Vocational Training: offenders who participated in a vocational training program in the community were assigned a value of "1," while those who did not were given a value of "0."

Committed Relationship: this variable, which measured whether offenders were involved in a committed relationship (e.g., married, engaged, etc.), was dichotomized as committed (1) or single (0).

Multiple Residences: a proxy of housing stability, this variable measured the number of residences offenders had within the first six months after release. Offenders with more than one residence were given a value of "1," whereas those with one residence were assigned a value of "0."

Living Alone: supervision agents collected information on the individuals with whom offenders lived during the first six months (i.e., spouse/significant other, children, relatives, friends, etc.). In the statistical analyses, this variable was dichotomized as either (1) living alone or (0) living with others.

Homeless: measuring whether offenders were homeless at any time during the first six months, this variable was dichotomized as either (1) homeless or (0) not homeless.

Social Support: when supervision agents collected information from offenders, they asked the offenders to identify those whom they felt had supported them while in the community. Categories of social support included family, friends, significant other, co-workers, faith community, neighbors, social service professionals, and other clients/offenders.

Income Support: this variable, which measures whether offenders received income support, was dichotomized as receiving support (1) or not receiving support (0). Income support included both informal (i.e., family, friends, significant other, etc.) and formal (Supplemental Security Income, General Assistance, Medical Assistance, General Residential Housing Assistance, etc.) types of financial assistance.

Debts: this variable was dichotomized as either having non-criminal debts (e.g., consumer, child support, medical, etc.) (1) or not having non-criminal debts (0).

Crime Debts: this variable was dichotomized as either having debts (1) related to criminal activity (e.g., restitution, fines, etc.) or not having crime-related debts (0).

Community Crime Rate: because supervision agents collected address information on where offenders lived following their release from prison, city and state crime data from 2008 were used to calculate the crime rates (per 1,000 residents) of the communities in which offenders lived. For offenders living in Minneapolis, neighborhood crime data were obtained from: http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/police/crime-statistics/codefor/2008/2008-12-31-Yearly_Neighborhood_Crime_Reports.PDF. For offenders living in St. Paul, crime data were obtained from the St. Paul Police Department 2008 Crime

Report. For offenders not living in Minneapolis or St. Paul, community crime

data were obtained from the Minnesota Crime Information 2008 Report.

Supervised Release Revocations (SRRs): the number of times during an offender's

sentence that s/he returned to prison as a supervised release violator. This

variable was used as a control only for the three recidivism variables that

exclusively measured reoffending.

Analysis

Although randomly assigning offenders to either the MCORP or control groups increased

the chances that the two groups would be equivalent, there were, as shown below, several

statistically significant differences between the two groups. To statistically control for

these differences, it was necessary to use multivariate statistical models to estimate the

impact of MCORP on service delivery as well as recidivism.

Most of the community services and programming variables were dichotomous measures.

Because multivariate logistic regression is the most appropriate model for dependent

variables with binary outcomes, it was used to estimate the impact of MCORP on the

delivery of services. There were several variables, however, that were not dichotomous

measures. Rather, because community crime rate and amount of social support

approximated ratio-level measures, ordinary least squares regression was used to estimate

the impact of MCORP on these variables.

In analyzing recidivism, survival analysis models are preferable in that they utilize time-

dependent data, which are important in determining not only whether offenders

recidivated but also how long it took them to either reoffend or "survive" in the

community without committing a new offense. Survival analyses are designed to handle

censored observations and varying lengths of time until a terminal event. Given that a

number of the offenders studied here never experienced a recidivism event and that the

lengths of at-risk periods varied among offenders, survival analysis is ideally suited to

examine the effects of MCORP on recidivism. To statistically control for the observed

differences between offenders in the MCORP and control groups, Cox regression, a multivariate survival analysis model, was used to analyze the data.

RESULTS

The results presented in Table 1 compare the 175 MCORP offenders with the 94 offenders in the control group. Offenders in the two groups are, to a large degree, similar to the extent that statistically significant differences were found for only four of the characteristics shown in Table 1 (the t test p values for these four characteristics, which are below .05, have been bolded in the table). Although the randomized assignment process increases the chances of equivalence between the experimental and control groups, it does not guarantee it. Indeed, MCORP offenders were significantly more likely to be male, older, have more prior felony convictions, and have fewer discipline convictions while incarcerated.

As noted earlier, post-release data were not collected on 7 percent of the 269 offenders prior to the expiration of their sentences. Of the 20 offenders without post-release data, 5 were MCORP and the remaining 15 had been assigned to the control group. Still, post-release data are available on 97 percent of the MCORP offenders (170) and 84 percent of the offenders from the control group (79). The results shown in Table 2 compare the extent to which the 249 offenders in the MCORP and control groups accessed programming and services in the community.

Within the first six months after release from prison, 55 percent of MCORP offenders found employment compared to 39 percent of those in the control group, an increase of 41 percent. In addition, MCORP offenders were less likely to be homeless following release from prison, as 5 percent did not have housing compared to 9 percent of the control group. Of those who did find housing, MCORP offenders were more likely to rent apartments and live in residences they owned, whereas control group offenders were more likely to reside in a single-family dwelling that they did not own.

27

Table 1. Pre-Release Comparison of MCORP and Control Group Offenders

Characteristics	MCORP	Control	t test p Value
Male	93.1%	84.0%	**0.018**
Minority	68.6%	73.4%	0.410
Age at Release (years)	36.9	32.6	**0.000**
County			
Hennepin	58.9%	58.5%	0.956
Ramsey	32.6%	30.9%	0.774
DFO	8.6%	10.6%	0.579
Prior Criminal History			
Supervision failures	1.77	1.48	0.202
Felony convictions	4.39	3.09	**0.008**
LSI-R Score	25.50	26.73	0.190
Offense Type			
Person	17.1%	21.3%	0.408
Property	31.4%	30.9%	0.923
Drug	22.3%	24.5%	0.687
DWI	16.6%	12.8%	0.410
Other	12.6%	10.6%	0.642
Admission Type			
New commitment	50.9%	43.6%	0.259
Probation violator	21.7%	21.3%	0.934
Release violator	27.4%	35.1%	0.192
Length of Stay (months)	18.2	15.2	0.094
Institutional Discipline	2.73	4.48	**0.044**
Education			
GED/HSD at intake	61.1%	59.6%	0.803
GED/HSD earned in prison	23.4%	16.0%	0.151
GED/HSD at release	84.5%	75.6%	0.070
Entered CD Treatment	39.4%	34.0%	0.386
N	175	94	

During the first six months following release from prison, MCORP offenders were more likely to live in more than one residence. The residences in which they lived, however, were not necessarily located in better areas compared to the control group. For example, the average crime rate (per 1,000 residents) of the communities in which MCORP offenders lived was 74.94, whereas it was 66.61 for the control group. In other words, MCORP offenders lived in areas where there were, on average, 8 more crimes reported to police per 1,000 residents.

Offenders from the two groups were similar, for the most part, regarding the persons with whom they lived. MCORP offenders were much more likely to live with others who were also involved in programming in the community. In addition, MCORP offenders were somewhat less likely to live with their parents.

Most of the offenders from both groups reported that they were single, although MCORP offenders were more likely to indicate that they were involved in a committed relationship (35 percent) in comparison to the control group (24 percent). Very few offenders from either group, however, were likely to identify their significant other as a source of support. Instead, most were likely to cite friends and family members as part of their support system. MCORP offenders were much more likely than those in the control group to identify friends and social service professionals as sources of support. Although the post-release data collection instrument did not contain "supervision agent" as a possible response category, anecdotal evidence suggests that offenders who cited social service professionals as a source of support often included agents within this category. The data also show that more than one-fifth of the control group offenders reported having no support compared to four percent of the MCORP offenders. In general, MCORP offenders tended to report having a wider system of support. For example, they cited, on average, support from more than two different areas of social support compared to 1.5 for the control group.

A little more than half of the MCORP offenders received income support compared to 30 percent of the control group. Moreover, MCORP offenders were more likely than the control group to report having debts, including those related to criminal activity. Further, MCORP offenders were, in general, more likely to access programming in the community. In particular, given that nearly half (48%) of the MCORP offenders participated in mentoring, restorative justice circles, or faith-based programming, they were about 2.5 times more likely to be involved in community support programming than the control group (20%). In addition, MCORP offenders (20%) were nearly three times as likely as control group offenders (8%) to participate in educational programming in the community. A slightly higher percentage of MCORP offenders (25%) than control group

Table 2. Post-Release Comparison of MCORP and Control Group Offenders

Characteristics	MCORP	Control	t test p Value
Employment	55.3%	39.2%	**0.018**
Housing			
Homeless	5.3%	8.9%	0.287
Halfway house	19.4%	15.2%	0.422
Apartment (Renter)	37.1%	25.3%	0.068
Single family dwelling (Owner)	10.0%	3.8%	0.094
Single family dwelling (Occupant)	45.3%	59.5%	**0.037**
Other	4.7%	5.1%	0.903
Multiple Residences	54.1%	35.4%	**0.006**
Housing Location			
Community crime rate (per 1,000)	74.94	66.61	0.580
Living Arrangement			
Significant other	25.3%	22.8%	0.670
Children	7.6%	7.6%	0.989
Parents	21.8%	31.6%	0.094
Other relatives	24.7%	20.3%	0.441
Friend(s)	17.6%	17.7%	0.989
Clients/roommates	24.7%	11.4%	**0.015**
Alone	14.1%	12.7%	0.756
Committed Relationship	34.7%	24.1%	0.092
Social Support			
Family	74.1%	63.3%	0.081
Significant other	2.4%	1.3%	0.571
Friends	54.1%	39.2%	**0.029**
Co-workers	12.4%	10.1%	0.612
Faith community	17.1%	12.7%	0.376
Neighbors/community	8.2%	2.5%	0.088
Social service professionals	39.4%	17.7%	**0.001**
Fellow clients/roommates	1.2%	0.0%	0.335
None identified	3.5%	21.5%	**0.000**
Number of Social Support Categories	2.09	1.47	**0.000**
Income Support	53.5%	30.4%	**0.001**
Post-Release Debts	42.4%	22.8%	**0.003**
Post-Release Criminal Debts	58.2%	35.4%	**0.001**
Community Support Programming	47.1%	17.7%	**0.000**
Mentoring	25.9%	10.1%	**0.004**
Restorative justice circles	29.4%	5.1%	**0.000**
Faith-based	20.0%	8.9%	**0.027**
CD Treatment (community)	25.3%	20.3%	0.386
Educational Training	20.0%	8.9%	**0.027**
Vocational Training	10.6%	7.6%	0.458
Formal Restructure	23.5%	26.6%	0.604
N	170	79	

offenders (20%) participated in CD treatment in the community. There was little difference in the extent to which each group accessed vocational training (11% MCORP vs. 8% control group). Offenders from the control group had a slightly higher formal restructure rate (27%) than the MCORP group (23%).

Impact of MCORP on Community Services and Programming

The data presented in Table 2 compared the two groups in the extent to which they accessed programming and services in the community. This comparison, however, did not control for observed differences between offenders in the MCORP and control groups. Recall, for example, that MCORP offenders were significantly more likely to be male, older, have more prior felony convictions, and have fewer discipline convictions in prison. To control for these differences, multivariate logistic regression models were estimated in which specific types of community programming and services were the dependent variables. The independent variables were participation in MCORP along with the control variables shown in Table 1.

The results presented in Table 3 reveal that, after holding all other variables constant, participating in MCORP increased an offender's odds of securing post-release employment by 91 percent. Not surprisingly, having a GED or high school diploma at the time of release more than tripled an offender's chances of finding employment. Compared to person offenders, drug and DWI offenders were significantly less likely to find post-release employment.

Table 3. Logistic Regression Model for Employment

Predictors	B	SE	Odds Ratio
MCORP	0.649	0.314	1.914*
Male	0.590	0.570	1.805
Minority	-0.537	0.359	0.584
Age at Release (years)	0.009	0.020	1.009
Hennepin	-0.532	0.671	0.587
Ramsey	-0.429	0.687	0.651
Prior Supervision Failures	-0.148	0.118	0.862
Prior Felony Convictions	-0.050	0.060	0.951
LSI-R Score	-0.023	0.022	0.977
Property	-0.881	0.474	0.414
Drug	-1.072	0.480	0.342*
DWI	-1.354	0.556	0.258*
Other	-0.622	0.537	0.537
New Commitment	-0.440	0.468	0.644
Probation Violator	-0.647	0.465	0.524
Length of Stay (months)	0.018	0.014	1.018
Institutional Discipline	-0.023	0.027	0.977
GED/HSD at release	1.185	0.435	3.272**
Entered CD Treatment	0.015	0.364	1.015
Constant	0.519	1.321	1.681
N	249		
Log-likelihood	295.424		
Nagelkerke R^2	0.242		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

The results from Table 4 reveal that, after controlling for other factors, MCORP offenders were nearly five times more likely to secure housing. Put another way, MCORP significantly decreased the chances of homelessness by 80 percent. Moreover, the chances of locating housing were significantly greater for younger offenders. In contrast, the odds of homelessness were significantly higher for older offenders. A one-year decrease in age increased the chances of finding housing by 9 percent. LSI-R score was also a statistically significant predictor of securing housing. A one-unit decrease in the LSI-R score improved one's chances of finding a residence by 10 percent. The results also show that the likelihood of obtaining housing was significantly greater for offenders who had longer lengths of stay in prison and those with fewer institutional disciplinary convictions. A one-month increase in an offender's length of stay increased

his or her chances of finding housing by 16 percent, whereas one discipline conviction reduced the likelihood of locating a residence by 16 percent.

Table 4. Logistic Regression Model for Housing

Predictors	B	SE	Odds Ratio
MCORP	1.600	0.816	4.954*
Male	-2.999	1.486	0.050
Minority	-0.250	0.855	0.779
Age at Release (years)	-0.097	0.046	0.908*
Hennepin	-16.511	9300.507	0.000
Ramsey	-17.180	9300.506	0.000
Prior Supervision Failures	-0.279	0.197	0.757
Prior Felony Convictions	0.110	0.123	1.117
LSI-R Score	-0.102	0.051	0.902*
Property	-1.386	1.057	0.250
Drug	-0.477	1.088	0.621
DWI	-0.511	1.366	0.600
Other	17.571	5978.132	4.275E7
New Commitment	-2.127	1.118	0.119
Probation Violator	-1.481	1.054	0.227
Length of Stay (months)	0.151	0.061	1.163*
Institutional Discipline	-0.170	0.053	0.844**
GED/HSD at release	-0.588	0.898	0.556
Entered CD Treatment	-1.028	0.900	0.358
Constant	29.554	9300.507	6.841E12
N	249		
Log-likelihood	77.489		
Nagelkerke R^2	0.403		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

The findings presented in Table 5 show that MCORP did not have a statistically significant effect on the location where offenders lived; that is, the crime rates of the communities in which they lived were not significantly different from those for the offenders in the control group. The results showed that there was only one factor that was significantly associated with community crime rate. Older offenders were significantly more likely to live in communities with higher crime rates. Although not statistically significant at the standard .05 level, there were three other factors that were marginally significant (i.e., $p > .05$ but $< .10$). In particular, offenders were more likely

to live in high-crime communities when they were released to Hennepin County, had prior supervision failures, and had less than a GED or high school degree at the time of release.

Table 5. OLS Regression Model for Housing Location

Predictors	B	SE	b
MCORP	-0.005	15.059	-1.256
Male	0.082	25.416	31.102
Minority	0.040	16.944	9.954
Age at Release (years)	0.164	0.916	1.909*
Hennepin	0.246	31.081	55.344
Ramsey	0.076	31.777	17.577
Prior Supervision Failures	0.158	5.177	9.735
Prior Felony Convictions	0.012	2.686	0.325
LSI-R Score	0.100	1.059	1.523
Property	0.004	22.020	0.899
Drug	-0.048	22.374	-12.542
DWI	-0.060	26.328	-17.748
Other	0.027	25.115	9.043
New Commitment	-0.158	22.427	-34.682
Probation Violator	-0.048	21.750	-12.791
Length of Stay (months)	0.130	0.660	1.028
Institutional Discipline	-0.049	1.259	-0.874
GED/HSD at release	-0.117	18.818	-33.128
Entered CD Treatment	-0.028	17.142	-6.415
Constant		60.973	-87.894
N	249		
Adjusted R^2	0.094		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

The results in Table 6 show that participation in MCORP reduced the odds of not having any social support by 94 percent. The chances of reporting no social support were significantly greater for property offenders and offenders with more prior supervision failures. The odds of reporting no social support were significantly less, however, for offenders with prior felony convictions.

Table 6. Logistic Regression Model for Social Support

Predictors	B	SE	Odds Ratio
MCORP	-2.824	0.726	0.059**
Male	0.154	1.043	1.166
Minority	0.885	0.736	2.422
Age at Release (years)	0.013	0.037	1.014
Hennepin	17.404	9168.499	3.618E7
Ramsey	19.144	9168.499	2.061E8
Prior Supervision Failures	0.658	0.200	1.931**
Prior Felony Convictions	-0.324	0.156	0.723*
LSI-R Score	-0.003	0.041	.997
Property	2.138	1.062	8.482
Drug	1.281	1.056	3.600
DWI	0.947	1.335	2.578
Other	0.007	1.432	1.007
New Commitment	1.390	0.877	4.016
Probation Violator	1.465	0.853	4.326
Length of Stay (months)	-0.017	0.030	.983
Institutional Discipline	-0.004	0.046	.996
GED/HSD at release	1.119	0.779	3.062
Entered CD Treatment	-0.915	0.859	.401
Constant	-23.096	9168.500	.000
N	249		
Log-likelihood	288.937		
Nagelkerke R^2	0.207		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

Controlling for other factors, MCORP increased an offender's odds of participating in mentoring, restorative justice circles, or faith-based programming by 318 percent (see Table 7). The only factor that significantly affected the odds of participation was participation in prison-based CD treatment, which increased the chances by 146 percent.

Table 7. Logistic Regression Model for Community Support Programming

Predictors	B	SE	Odds Ratio
MCORP	1.431	0.358	4.184**
Male	-0.295	0.547	0.744
Minority	0.177	0.359	1.193
Age at Release (years)	0.009	0.020	1.009
Hennepin	0.124	0.662	1.133
Ramsey	0.373	0.682	1.452
Prior Supervision Failures	0.009	0.106	1.009
Prior Felony Convictions	0.001	0.055	1.001
LSI-R Score	-0.003	0.023	0.997
Property	0.142	0.482	1.153
Drug	-0.556	0.490	0.573
DWI	0.155	0.545	1.167
Other	0.143	0.529	1.154
New Commitment	0.076	0.492	1.079
Probation Violator	0.469	0.467	1.599
Length of Stay (months)	-0.005	0.015	0.995
Institutional Discipline	-0.038	0.034	0.962
GED/HSD at release	-0.119	0.415	0.888
Entered CD Treatment	0.901	0.363	2.463*
Constant	-2.050	1.313	0.129
N	249		
Log-likelihood	288.937		
Nagelkerke R^2	0.207		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

The results from Table 8 show that MCORP significantly increased the extent to which offenders accessed mentoring and restorative justice circles in the community. Compared to the control group, MCORP offenders were 3.1 times more likely to be involved in mentoring and 9.1 times more likely to participate in restorative justice circles. MCORP did not have a statistically significant effect, however, on faith-based programming. The findings further show that participation in prison-based CD treatment significantly increased an offender's chances of involvement in all three types of community support. Moreover, compared to person offenders, those incarcerated for drug crimes were significantly less likely to participate in mentoring and faith-based programming, whereas DWI offenders were significantly less likely to be involved in mentoring.

Finally, minority offenders were significantly less likely to participate in faith-based programming in the community.

Table 8. Logistic Regression Models for Type of Community Support Programming

	Mentoring		Circles		Faith-Based	
	Odds Ratio	SE	Odds Ratio	SE	Odds Ratio	SE
MCORP	3.111**	0.443	9.096**	0.568	2.129	0.491
Male	0.852	0.658	1.417	0.705	0.858	0.639
Minority	1.146	0.423	1.885	0.445	0.377*	0.456
Age at Release (years)	1.016	0.023	0.995	0.023	1.050	0.027
Hennepin	1.267	0.876	4.099	1.140	0.348	0.856
Ramsey	1.887	0.887	5.062	1.162	0.422	0.879
Prior Supervision Failures	1.001	0.132	1.047	0.119	1.055	0.137
Prior Felony Convictions	0.942	0.070	0.948	0.068	1.035	0.069
LSI-R Score	0.993	0.027	1.033	0.028	1.019	0.031
Property	0.779	0.545	2.937	0.602	0.742	0.655
Drug	0.302*	0.580	1.010	0.601	0.127*	0.827
DWI	0.279*	0.624	1.910	0.660	0.358	0.676
Other	0.922	0.576	1.519	0.667	1.572	0.680
New Commitment	1.491	0.606	0.820	0.588	0.710	0.697
Probation Violator	2.670	0.559	1.744	0.533	1.082	0.620
Length of Stay (months)	0.989	0.019	0.984	0.019	0.975	0.024
Institutional Discipline	0.984	0.040	0.980	0.042	1.017	0.045
GED/HSD at release	1.337	0.512	1.341	0.504	1.132	0.574
Entered CD Treatment	3.394*	0.420	2.472*	0.428	2.844*	0.493
Constant	0.045	1.575	0.001	1.896	0.072	1.719
N	249		249		249	
Log-likelihood	216.136		222.469		180.790	
Nagelkerke R^2	0.251		0.192		0.262	

MCORP did not have a statistically significant effect on whether offenders participated in CD treatment in the community (see Table 9). The odds of entering community-based CD treatment, however, were more than four times greater for drug offenders. Moreover, the chances of participating in CD treatment in the community were nearly three times greater for offenders who participated in prison-based CD treatment. Finally, males were 78 percent less likely than females to enter community-based CD treatment.

Table 9. Logistic Regression Model for Community-Based CD Treatment

Predictors	B	SE	Odds Ratio
MCORP	0.380	0.372	1.463
Male	-1.467	0.548	0.231**
Minority	-0.496	0.395	0.609
Age at Release (years)	-0.026	0.023	0.974
Hennepin	0.645	0.743	1.907
Ramsey	0.180	0.764	1.197
Prior Supervision Failures	0.132	0.113	1.141
Prior Felony Convictions	-0.005	0.062	0.995
LSI-R Score	0.021	0.026	1.021
Property	1.056	0.615	2.875
Drug	1.431	0.607	4.181*
DWI	0.887	0.669	2.428
Other	0.524	0.726	1.688
New Commitment	0.067	0.547	1.070
Probation Violator	-0.043	0.505	0.958
Length of Stay (months)	0.008	0.016	1.008
Institutional Discipline	-0.001	0.030	0.999
GED/HSD at release	-0.220	0.447	0.802
Entered CD Treatment	1.091	0.406	2.978**
Constant	-1.411	1.489	0.244
N	249		
Log-likelihood	241.948		
Nagelkerke R^2	0.174		

** p < .01
* p < .05

MCORP offenders were, compared to the control group, 226 percent more likely to participate in educational programming in the community. The only other factor that had a statistically significant effect was the release location. Compared to offenders released to supervision in DFO counties, offenders from Ramsey county were 85 percent less likely to participate in educational programming in the community.

Table 10. Logistic Regression Model for Educational Programming

Predictors	B	SE	Odds Ratio
MCORP	1.180	0.492	3.256*
Male	0.157	0.733	1.170
Minority	0.742	0.512	2.100
Age at Release (years)	-0.018	0.026	0.982
Hennepin	-1.183	0.742	0.306
Ramsey	-1.901	0.809	0.149*
Prior Supervision Failures	0.053	0.145	1.055
Prior Felony Convictions	-0.100	0.085	0.905
LSI-R Score	0.021	0.030	1.021
Property	0.378	0.613	1.459
Drug	-0.446	0.628	0.640
DWI	0.499	0.677	1.647
Other	-0.412	0.769	0.662
New Commitment	0.331	0.676	1.392
Probation Violator	0.920	0.588	2.509
Length of Stay (months)	-0.044	0.024	0.957
Institutional Discipline	0.029	0.038	1.029
GED/HSD at release	0.324	0.537	1.382
Entered CD Treatment	0.925	0.477	2.522
Constant	-2.043	1.651	0.130
N	249		
Log-likelihood	188.633		
Nagelkerke R^2	0.217		

** p < .01
*   p < .05

MCORP did not have a statistically significant effect on vocational training (see Table 11). In fact, none of the predictors in the model had a statistically significant effect.

Table 11. Logistic Regression Model for Vocational Training

Predictors	B	SE	Odds Ratio
MCORP	0.477	0.564	1.612
Male	0.477	1.205	1.610
Minority	1.938	1.072	6.944
Age at Release (years)	0.006	0.032	1.006
Hennepin	0.319	1.180	1.375
Ramsey	0.416	1.210	1.516
Prior Supervision Failures	-0.146	0.195	0.864
Prior Felony Convictions	-0.049	0.100	0.953
LSI-R Score	0.011	0.035	1.012
Property	0.163	0.714	1.177
Drug	-0.391	0.687	0.676
DWI	-18.852	5955.516	0.000
Other	-0.062	0.763	0.940
New Commitment	-1.115	0.786	0.328
Probation Violator	-0.245	0.735	0.782
Length of Stay (months)	0.022	0.021	1.022
Institutional Discipline	-0.166	0.091	0.847
GED/HSD at release	-0.169	0.619	0.844
Entered CD Treatment	-0.206	0.583	0.814
Constant	-4.151	2.293	0.016
N	249		
Log-likelihood	129.591		
Nagelkerke R^2	0.229		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

.

Offenders participating in MCORP were, compared to the control group, 224 percent more likely to receive income support, holding all other factors constant. In addition, male offenders were 86 percent less likely than females to receive income support. Further, compared to offenders released to supervision in DFO counties, offenders released to supervision in Hennepin and Ramsey counties were both more than six times more likely to receive income support in the community.

Table 12. Logistic Regression Model for Income Support

Predictors	B	SE	Odds Ratio
MCORP	1.176	0.333	3.242**
Male	-1.956	0.658	0.141**
Minority	-0.153	0.356	0.858
Age at Release (years)	0.020	0.019	1.020
Hennepin	1.975	0.838	7.203*
Ramsey	1.749	0.852	5.751*
Prior Supervision Failures	-0.100	0.110	0.905
Prior Felony Convictions	0.097	0.061	1.102
LSI-R Score	0.005	0.022	1.005
Property	-0.186	0.455	0.830
Drug	-0.500	0.468	0.606
DWI	-0.169	0.549	0.845
Other	-0.025	0.515	0.975
New Commitment	-0.469	0.469	0.626
Probation Violator	-0.519	0.462	0.595
Length of Stay (months)	0.007	0.014	1.007
Institutional Discipline	-0.013	0.027	0.987
GED/HSD at release	-0.455	0.409	0.634
Entered CD Treatment	-0.227	0.360	0.797
Constant	-1.016	1.405	0.362
N	249		
Log-likelihood	296.532		
Nagelkerke R^2	0.231		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

Summary

In comparison to the control group, offenders participating in MCORP had significantly greater access to community programming and reentry services. The results from the multivariate statistical analyses showed that MCORP did not have a significant effect on the extent to which offenders accessed community-based CD treatment or vocational training. Nor did it have an impact on the quality of the communities where offenders were able to find housing. The findings indicated, however, that MCORP significantly increased the extent to which offenders were able to obtain employment, find housing, receive income and social support, and participate in community support and educational programming in the community.

But did the increased access to these services have an impact on recidivism? And, if so, which types of community programming were responsible for reduced recidivism? The next section attempts to address these questions by examining whether MCORP had an effect on recidivism.

Impact of MCORP on Recidivism

As shown Table 13, MCORP offenders had lower recidivism rates than the control group for all five measures. By the end of the follow-up period (October 31, 2009), 55 percent of the MCORP offenders had been rearrested for a new offense compared to 66 percent of the control group. MCORP's rearrest rate was, therefore, 17 percent lower than that of the control group. At 29 percent, MCORP's reconviction rate was 23 percent lower than the control group's rate of 37 percent. The new offense reincarceration rate for MCORP (11%) was 32 percent lower than it was for the control group (16%). At 27 percent, the technical revocation rate for the MCORP group was just three percent lower than it was for the control group (28%). Finally, 37 percent of the MCORP offenders returned to prison for any reason by the end of the follow-up period compared to 40 percent for the control group, a decrease of nine percent.

Table 13. Recidivism Comparison of MCORP and Control Group Offenders

Recidivism Measures	MCORP	Control	Percentage Difference
Rearrest	54.9%	66.0%	-16.8%
Reconviction	28.6%	37.2%	-23.1%
Reincarceration for a new offense	10.9%	16.0%	-31.9%
Revocation for technical violation	26.9%	27.7%	-2.9%
Any return to prison	36.6%	40.4%	-9.4%
N	175	94	

The analyses presented later examine not only whether offenders recidivated by the end of the follow-up period but also how long it took them to reoffend or how long they were able to "survive" in the community without reoffending. As shown in Table 14, MCORP generally performed better than the control group. For example, in all but one of the recidivism measures (reincarceration), it took the MCORP offenders longer, on average, to recidivate. Similarly, in all but one of the recidivism measures (rearrest), MCORP offenders survived, on average, for longer periods in the community without a recidivism event. Overall, the total number of survival days in the community was, on average, longer for the MCORP group for all five measures of recidivism. For example, MCORP offenders survived, on average, 43 more days for rearrest, 35 more days for reconviction, 22 more days for reincarceration, 19 more days for revocation, and 32 more days for return to prison.

The findings shown in Tables 13 and 14 are reflected, to some extent, in the results from the Cox regression models presented in Tables 15-19. As noted earlier, Cox regression looks not only at whether offenders recidivate, but also how long they spent in the community either before, or without, a recidivism event. Moreover, recall earlier that, despite the randomized assignment to either the MCORP or control groups, there were several statistically significant differences between the offenders in these two groups. Because Cox regression is a multivariate statistical model, it is able to statistically control for these observed differences. Therefore, Cox regression provides an estimate (the hazard ratio) of the extent to which MCORP offenders survived in the community without a recidivism event relative to the control group, controlling for the impact of the other predictors in the model on recidivism.

Table 14. Average Number of Days at Risk for Recidivism in the Community

	MCORP		Control	
Rearrest	Average Days	N	Average Days	N
Days at risk prior to rearrest	208.2	96	175.7	62
Days at risk without a rearrest	440.3	79	451.3	32
Total average	313.0	175	269.5	94
Reconviction				
Days at risk prior to reconviction	249.4	50	213.8	59
Days at risk without a reconviction	463.1	125	458.4	35
Total average	402.0	175	367.3	94
New Offense Reincarceration				
Days at risk prior to reincarceration	211.4	19	225.2	15
Days at risk without a reincarceration	466.3	156	452.8	79
Total average	438.6	175	416.5	94
Technical Violation Revocation				
Days at risk prior to revocation	204.3	47	155.0	26
Days at risk without a revocation	499.9	128	495.8	68
Total average	420.5	175	401.6	94
Any Reincarceration				
Days at risk prior to prison return	205.3	64	173.8	38
Days at risk without a prison return	497.7	111	483.8	56
Total average	390.8	175	358.5	94

The results in Table 15 suggest that, compared to the control group, participation in MCORP lowered the hazard ratio for rearrest by 37 percent, controlling for the effects of the other predictors in the model. That is, MCORP offenders were rearrested less often and more slowly than the offenders in the control group; as a result, MCORP offenders survived longer in the community without rearrest for a new offense. The results also reveal that the risk of rearrest was significantly greater for male offenders, younger offenders, those with prior supervision failures, and offenders with institutional discipline convictions.

Table 15. Cox Regression Model: Impact of MCORP on Time to First Rearrest

Variables	B	SE	Hazard Ratio
MCORP	-0.464	0.175	0.629**
Male	1.414	0.376	4.110**
Minority	0.084	0.206	1.087
Age at Release (years)	-0.024	0.012	0.976*
Prior Supervision Failures	0.179	0.067	1.196**
Prior Felony Convictions	0.020	0.036	1.020
Hennepin	-0.048	0.329	0.953
Ramsey	0.074	0.334	1.077
LSI-R Score	0.022	0.012	1.022
Property	0.181	0.247	1.199
Drug	-0.204	0.259	0.816
DWI	0.268	0.337	1.308
Other	0.464	0.304	1.591
New Commitment	-0.081	0.266	0.922
Probation Violator	-0.132	0.266	0.876
Length of Stay (months)	-0.017	0.009	0.983
Institutional Discipline	0.046	0.013	1.047**
GED/HSD earned in prison	0.409	0.226	1.506
Entered CD Treatment	-0.320	0.219	0.726
N	269		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

The results in Table 16 show that, controlling for other factors, MCORP reduced the hazard ratio for reconviction by 43 percent. The only other covariate that had a statistically significant impact was gender; more specifically, compared to females, the risk of reconviction was nearly five times greater for males.

Table 16. Cox Regression Model: Impact of MCORP on Time to First Reconviction

Variables	B	SE	Hazard Ratio
MCORP	-0.563	0.239	0.569*
Male	1.575	0.562	4.833**
Minority	0.011	0.268	1.011
Age at Release (years)	-0.007	0.016	0.993
Prior Supervision Failures	0.147	0.081	1.158
Prior Felony Convictions	0.049	0.045	1.050
Hennepin	-0.226	0.464	0.797
Ramsey	-0.137	0.470	0.872
LSI-R Score	0.030	0.017	1.030
Property	0.177	0.336	1.193
Drug	-0.387	0.376	0.679
DWI	0.189	0.487	1.208
Other	0.069	0.433	1.071
New Commitment	-0.109	0.352	0.897
Probation Violator	-0.071	0.363	0.932
Length of Stay (months)	-0.015	0.013	0.985
Institutional Discipline	0.008	0.020	1.008
GED/HSD earned in prison	0.195	0.293	1.215
Entered CD Treatment	-0.503	0.301	0.605
N	269		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

Table 17. Cox Regression Model: Impact of MCORP on
Time to First New Offense Reincarceration

Variables	B	SE	Hazard Ratio
MCORP	-0.843	0.416	0.430*
Male	2.358	1.098	10.567*
Minority	0.193	0.432	1.212
Age at Release (years)	0.009	0.026	1.009
Prior Supervision Failures	0.316	0.119	1.371**
Prior Felony Convictions	-0.066	0.069	0.936
Hennepin	-0.098	0.802	0.906
Ramsey	0.340	0.805	1.406
LSI-R Score	0.086	0.028	1.090**
Property	1.422	0.611	4.143*
Drug	-0.548	0.803	0.578
DWI	1.617	0.870	5.037
Other	0.587	0.836	1.799
New Commitment	0.414	0.550	1.512
Probation Violator	-0.135	0.635	0.874
Length of Stay (months)	-0.005	0.022	0.995
Institutional Discipline	0.021	0.028	1.021
GED/HSD earned in prison	0.154	0.443	1.167
Entered CD Treatment	-0.881	0.532	0.414
N	269		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

The results in Table 17 reveal that, controlling for other factors, MCORP decreased the hazard ratio for reincarceration by 57 percent. The risk of reincarceration was significantly greater, however, for male offenders, property offenders, and those with prior supervision failures. Further, a one-unit increase in an offender's LSI-R score was associated with a nine percent increase in the hazard ratio for reincarceration; in other words, offender's with higher LSI-R scores were reincarcerated more quickly and more often.

**Table 18. Cox Regression Model: Impact of MCORP on
Time to First Technical Violation Revocation**

Variables	B	SE	Hazard Ratio
MCORP	-0.005	0.264	0.995
Male	0.552	0.535	1.737
Minority	0.136	0.287	1.145
Age at Release (years)	-0.030	0.018	0.970
Prior Supervision Failures	0.197	0.080	1.218*
Prior Felony Convictions	0.020	0.052	1.020
Hennepin	-1.347	0.359	0.260**
Ramsey	-1.092	0.369	0.336**
LSI-R Score	0.005	0.019	1.005
Property	-0.381	0.397	0.683
Drug	-0.053	0.381	0.948
DWI	0.689	0.465	1.992
Other	-0.470	0.524	0.625
New Commitment	-0.196	0.389	0.822
Probation Violator	-0.541	0.392	0.582
Length of Stay (months)	-0.019	0.015	0.981
Institutional Discipline	0.013	0.021	1.013
GED/HSD earned in prison	0.029	0.311	1.030
Entered CD Treatment	-0.568	0.327	0.567
N	269		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

The results in Table 18 show that MCORP did not have a statistically significant impact on supervision revocations. The risk for revocation was significantly greater for offenders with prior supervision failures. It was significantly less, however, for offenders supervised in Hennepin and Ramsey counties in comparison to those supervised in DFO counties.

Table 19. Cox Regression Model: Impact of MCORP on Time to First Reincarceration

Variables	B	SE	Hazard Ratio
MCORP	-0.252	0.224	0.777
Male	1.203	0.491	3.329*
Minority	0.139	0.243	1.149
Age at Release (years)	-0.014	0.015	0.986
Prior Supervision Failures	0.276	0.069	1.318**
Prior Felony Convictions	-0.032	0.042	0.968
Hennepin	-1.383	0.331	0.251**
Ramsey	-1.032	0.336	0.356**
LSI-R Score	0.039	0.016	1.040*
Property	0.328	0.326	1.389
Drug	-0.267	0.352	0.766
DWI	0.791	0.417	2.205
Other	-0.174	0.442	0.840
New Commitment	0.033	0.326	1.034
Probation Violator	-0.399	0.337	0.671
Length of Stay (months)	-0.016	0.012	0.984
Institutional Discipline	0.022	0.017	1.022
GED/HSD earned in prison	0.109	0.262	1.116
Entered CD Treatment	-0.509	0.281	0.601
N	269		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

The results presented in Table 19 indicate that MCORP did not have a statistically significant impact on whether offenders returned to prison for any reason (technical violation or new offense). The risk of return to prison was significantly less for offenders supervised in Hennepin and Ramsey counties (relative to DFO). The risk was significantly greater, however, for males, offenders with prior supervision failures, and offenders with higher LSI-R scores.

Impact of Community Services and Programming on Recidivism

The results presented above suggest that MCORP has had a statistically significant effect on recidivism, particularly when it is defined as committing a new criminal offense (as opposed to a technical violation). As shown earlier, MCORP significantly increased the extent to which offenders were able to obtain employment, find housing, receive income and social support, and participate in community support and educational programming in the community. Which of these factors, if any, are responsible for the recidivism reduction observed among MCORP participants? This section attempts to address this question by taking a closer look at the community programming data. As noted above, data were not available for 20 of the 269 offenders; as such, the results presented below are based on the 249 offenders on whom post-release data were collected.

The results in Table 20 suggest that securing employment within the first six months of release had a statistically significant effect on rearrest, reducing the hazard ratio by 37 percent. In addition, the risk of rearrest was 67 percent lower for offenders who participated in all three types of community support programming (mentors, restorative justice circles, and faith-based programming). Further, the findings indicate that providing a continuum of CD treatment from the institution to the community significantly reduced the risk of rearrest. Indeed, the hazard ratio was 62 percent lower for offenders who participated in both prison- and community-based treatment. The findings also showed that offenders with debts related to criminal activity had a significantly increased risk of recidivism. Similar to the results presented earlier, males, younger offenders, prior supervision failures, and institutional discipline significantly increased the risk of rearrest.

Table 20. Cox Regression Model: Impact of Community Programming on Time to First Rearrest

Variables	B	SE	Hazard Ratio
Employment	-0.464	0.217	0.629*
Social Support	-0.112	0.105	0.894
Homeless	0.328	0.362	1.388
Living Alone	0.162	0.284	1.176
Multiple Residences	-0.190	0.209	0.827
Community Crime Rate	0.001	0.001	1.001
Community Support Programming	-1.112	0.516	0.329*
Vocational Training	-0.496	0.340	0.609
Educational Programming	0.160	0.265	1.174
CD Treatment			
Prison and community	-0.979	0.440	0.376*
Prison only	-0.216	0.265	0.806
Community only	-0.465	0.316	0.628
Income Support	0.037	0.201	1.038
Committed Relationship	0.019	0.209	1.020
Post-Release Debts	0.089	0.195	1.093
Criminal Debts	0.611	0.194	1.843**
Supervised Release Revocations	-0.324	0.283	0.723
Pre-Release Controls			
Male	1.313	0.421	3.716**
Minority	-0.053	0.227	0.948
Age at Release (years)	-0.027	0.013	0.973*
Prior Supervision Failures	0.165	0.075	1.179*
Prior Felony Convictions	0.030	0.038	1.031
Hennepin	-0.105	0.478	0.901
Ramsey	-0.067	0.489	0.935
LSI-R Score	0.022	0.014	1.022
Property	0.077	0.276	1.080
Drug	-0.102	0.294	0.903
DWI	0.203	0.370	1.225
Other	0.471	0.337	1.602
New Commitment	-0.217	0.284	0.805
Probation Violator	-0.554	0.299	0.575
Length of Stay (months)	-0.018	0.010	0.982
Institutional Discipline	0.056	0.017	1.058**
GED/HSD at release	0.212	0.235	1.237
N	249		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

Table 21. Cox Regression Model: Impact of Community Programming on Time to First Reconviction

Variables	B	SE	Hazard Ratio
Employment	-0.295	0.295	0.745
Social Support	-0.274	0.151	0.760*
Homeless	0.078	0.481	1.081
Living Alone	0.255	0.361	1.290
Multiple Residences	0.079	0.288	1.082
Community Crime Rate	0.000	0.001	1.000
Community Support Programming	-1.837	0.836	0.159**
Vocational Training	-0.520	0.512	0.594
Educational Programming	-0.043	0.385	0.958
CD Treatment			
Prison and community	-0.847	0.659	0.429
Prison only	0.017	0.387	1.017
Community only	-0.073	0.395	0.930
Income Support	0.170	0.271	1.186
Committed Relationship	-0.017	0.288	0.983
Post-Release Debts	0.243	0.269	1.275
Criminal Debts	0.620	0.265	1.859*
Supervised Release Revocations	-0.275	0.331	0.759
Pre-Release Controls			
Male	1.412	0.595	4.102*
Minority	0.188	0.307	1.207
Age at Release (years)	-0.016	0.018	0.984
Prior Supervision Failures	0.122	0.086	1.129
Prior Felony Convictions	0.074	0.048	1.077
Hennepin	1.042	1.055	2.836
Ramsey	0.933	1.065	2.541
LSI-R Score	0.031	0.019	1.031
Property	0.059	0.377	1.061
Drug	-0.203	0.422	0.816
DWI	0.263	0.535	1.301
Other	0.029	0.471	1.030
New Commitment	-0.158	0.373	0.854
Probation Violator	-0.516	0.405	0.597
Length of Stay (months)	-0.022	0.014	0.978
Institutional Discipline	0.026	0.027	1.027
GED/HSD at release	0.278	0.339	1.321
N	249		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

The findings for reconviction show that, once again, offenders who participated in all three types of community support programming had a significantly lower risk of recidivism (see Table 21). For example, the hazard of reconviction was 84 percent lower for offenders involved in community support programming. The results also suggest that a broader base of social support was related with a reduced risk of reconviction. That is, a one-unit increase in the number of social support areas or categories identified by offenders was associated with a 24 percent reduction in reconviction risk. Similar to the rearrest findings, criminal debts significantly increased the hazard ratio for reconviction. In addition, the results showed that the risk of reconviction was significantly greater for males.

The results in Table 22 reveal that social support also had a statistically significant impact on reincarceration, reducing the hazard by 55 percent. The only other covariate that had a statistically significant effect was LSI-R score. A one-unit increase in an offender's LSI-R score increased the risk of reincarcearation by nine percent.

As shown in Table 23, employment significantly decreased the hazard ratio for revocation by 63 percent. Offenders who received income support also had a significantly lower risk of revocation, as it lowered the hazard by 54 percent. Although the crime rate of the community where offenders were living did not have a statistically significant effect on new criminal offenses, it was significantly associated with the risk of revocation. That is, the risk of revocation was greater for offenders living in communities with higher crime rates. Residential instability also increased the risk of revocation. The more times an offender moved during the first six months, the greater the risk of revocation. The results also showed that younger age at release and prior supervision failures were associated with a greater risk of revocation, whereas offenders supervised in Hennepin and Ramsey had a significantly lower risk.

Table 22. Cox Regression Model: Impact of Community Programming on Time to First New Offense Reincarceration

Variables	B	SE	Hazard Ratio
Employment	-0.054	0.546	0.948
Social Support	-0.790	0.284	0.454**
Homeless	0.205	0.825	1.227
Living Alone	-0.914	0.815	0.401
Multiple Residences	-0.184	0.525	0.832
Community Crime Rate	0.003	0.001	1.003
Community Support Programming	-8.928	66.062	0.000
Vocational Training	-1.789	1.246	0.167
Educational Programming	-0.520	0.851	0.594
CD Treatment			
Prison and community	-0.785	1.165	0.456
Prison only	-0.595	0.781	0.552
Community only	-0.075	0.805	0.927
Income Support	0.062	0.485	1.064
Committed Relationship	-0.362	0.542	0.696
Post-Release Debts	0.578	0.508	1.783
Criminal Debts	0.941	0.495	2.563
Supervised Release Revocations	-1.016	0.617	0.362
<u>Pre-Release Controls</u>			
Male	2.064	1.242	7.874
Minority	0.656	0.585	1.926
Age at Release (years)	0.008	0.032	1.008
Prior Supervision Failures	0.140	0.127	1.151
Prior Felony Convictions	-0.042	0.084	0.959
Hennepin	8.002	74.723	2987.427
Ramsey	8.145	74.723	3444.596
LSI-R Score	0.090	0.036	1.094*
Property	0.712	0.649	2.038
Drug	-1.328	0.964	0.265
DWI	1.336	0.928	3.805
Other	-0.309	0.904	0.734
New Commitment	-0.092	0.714	0.912
Probation Violator	-1.200	0.784	0.301
Length of Stay (months)	-0.013	0.024	0.988
Institutional Discipline	0.013	0.050	1.013
GED/HSD at release	0.277	0.608	1.320
N	249		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

Table 23. Cox Regression Model: Impact of Community Programming on Time to First Technical Violation Revocation

Variables	B	SE	Hazard Ratio
Employment	-1.001	0.338	0.368**
Social Support	-0.260	0.168	0.771
Homeless	0.655	0.532	1.925
Living Alone	-0.883	0.505	0.413
Multiple Residences	0.790	0.320	2.203*
Community Crime Rate	0.003	0.001	1.003**
Community Support Programming	1.071	0.629	2.917
Vocational Training	-1.440	0.838	0.237
Educational Programming	-0.134	0.453	0.875
CD Treatment			
Prison and community	-0.171	0.549	0.843
Prison only	-0.654	0.416	0.520
Community only	0.197	0.430	1.218
Income Support	-0.773	0.313	0.462*
Committed Relationship	-0.065	0.318	0.937
Post-Release Debts	0.230	0.309	1.259
Criminal Debts	-0.017	0.319	0.983
<u>Pre-Release Controls</u>			
Male	-0.309	0.556	0.734
Minority	0.006	0.356	1.006
Age at Release (years)	-0.045	0.020	0.956*
Prior Supervision Failures	0.195	0.086	1.215*
Prior Felony Convictions	0.032	0.058	1.033
Hennepin	-2.191	0.543	0.112**
Ramsey	-1.633	0.554	0.195**
LSI-R Score	-0.022	0.022	0.979
Property	-0.635	0.477	0.530
Drug	0.119	0.478	1.126
DWI	0.346	0.535	1.414
Other	-0.458	0.570	0.633
New Commitment	-0.147	0.424	0.863
Probation Violator	-0.512	0.454	0.600
Length of Stay (months)	-0.008	0.016	0.992
Institutional Discipline	0.005	0.029	1.005
GED/HSD at release	0.052	0.375	1.053
N	249		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

**Table 24. Cox Regression Model: Impact of Community
Programming on Time to First Reincarceration**

Variables	B	SE	Hazard Ratio
Employment	-0.771	0.277	0.462**
Social Support	-0.420	0.137	0.657**
Homeless	0.575	0.428	1.777
Living Alone	-0.390	0.387	0.677
Multiple Residences	0.472	0.273	1.603
Community Crime Rate	0.002	0.001	1.002
Community Support Programming	0.225	0.577	1.253
Vocational Training	-1.375	0.743	0.253*
Educational Programming	-0.310	0.376	0.734
CD Treatment			
Prison and community	-0.143	0.472	0.867
Prison only	-0.517	0.357	0.596
Community only	0.190	0.367	1.209
Income Support	-0.487	0.255	0.615*
Committed Relationship	-0.095	0.265	0.910
Post-Release Debts	0.388	0.255	1.473
Criminal Debts	0.183	0.258	1.201
Pre-Release Controls			
Male	0.347	0.486	1.415
Minority	0.124	0.293	1.133
Age at Release (years)	-0.016	0.017	0.984
Prior Supervision Failures	0.200	0.072	1.222**
Prior Felony Convictions	-0.019	0.047	0.981
Hennepin	-1.783	0.497	0.168**
Ramsey	-1.416	0.510	0.243**
LSI-R Score	0.021	0.018	1.021
Property	0.001	0.375	1.001
Drug	-0.179	0.420	0.836
DWI	0.551	0.468	1.736
Other	-0.276	0.482	0.759
New Commitment	0.213	0.354	1.238
Probation Violator	-0.469	0.387	0.626
Length of Stay (months)	-0.017	0.013	0.984
Institutional Discipline	0.020	0.024	1.020
GED/HSD at release	-0.009	0.313	0.991
N	249		

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

The results in Table 24 show that employment and social support significantly reduced the risk of returning to prison for any reason. Employment lowered the hazard ratio by 54 percent, whereas social support reduced it by 34 percent. Vocational training had a statistically significant effect on returning to prison, as the risk of return was 75 percent lower for offender participants. Like the revocation findings, income support reduced the risk of return to prison by 39 percent. Again, compared to DFO offenders, those supervised in Hennepin and Ramsey counties had a significantly lower risk of returning to prison, whereas prior supervision failures significantly increased it.

Summary

The results suggest that employment and social support had the greatest impact on recidivism. Employment had a statistically significant effect on three (rearrest, revocation, and any return to prison) of the five measures of recidivism, while social support also had a significant impact on three of the measures (reconviction, reincarceration for a new felony offender, and any return to prison). Community support programming was effective in reducing the risk of rearrest and reconviction, but only when offenders participated in all three types of programming. Providing a continuum of CD treatment from the institution to the community was effective in reducing the risk of rearrest. Vocational training significantly reduced the risk of reincarceration, whereas income support significantly decreased the risk of revocation and returning to prison for any reason.

The results indicated that there were several community factors that significantly increased the risk of recidivism. Crime-related debts, for example, were a significant predictor of two measures (rearrest and reconviction). In addition, although the crime rate of the community where offenders lived did not have significant impact on reoffending, it was associated with a significantly greater risk of revocation. Finally, offenders who lived at more than one residence during the first six months after release from prison had a significantly greater risk of revocation.

The results were also notable with respect to which community factors did not have a significant effect on recidivism. Educational programming in the community did not have a significant effect on recidivism. Homelessness was positively associated with each measure of recidivism, but the effect was not statistically significant. Living alone and involvement in a committed relationship were not significantly associated with any of the five recidivism measures.

CONCLUSION

Notwithstanding the rigorous research design used in this evaluation, there are several limitations worth noting. First, due to the exclusionary criteria for MCORP participation, the findings reported here may not necessarily be generalizable to sex offenders, participants in early release programs, or offenders released to intensive supervision. Second, it is possible that the greater proportion of MCORP offenders involved in community programming and services may be a by-product—at least to some extent—of increased agent/offender contact and more diligent reporting by MCORP supervision agents. For example, the control group accounted for a disproportionate number of cases for whom post-release data were not reported. Third, because pre-incarceration employment data were unavailable, it is possible that the effects of MCORP on employment were due to MCORP offenders having more prior work history than offenders in the control group. Fourth, the implementation of MCORP was not consistent with its design insofar as many Phase I offenders were assigned shortly before release and the quality of case planning may have been affected by the absence of reduced caseloads for institutional caseworkers. Finally, at 269 offenders, the sample size was relatively small.

Despite these limitations, however, the results suggest that MCORP is a promising and effective model for offender reentry. Indeed, MCORP significantly reduced all three types of reoffending, lowering the risk by 37 percent for rearrest, 43 percent for reconviction, and 57 percent for reincarceration. MCORP did not have a statistically significant effect on revocations for technical violations and any return to prison.

Although it is not entirely clear why MCORP did not have an effect on these two measures, one possible explanation may be the quantity or frequency of agent/offender contact. This evaluation did not track the amount of time agents spent with offenders or the number of agent-offender contacts. Due to the smaller caseload sizes, however, it is reasonable to infer that MCORP agents had greater contact with the offenders they supervised than agents in the control group. Given that prior research on intensive supervision has shown that greater surveillance and frequency of agent/offender contacts increases the risk of revocation for a technical violation (Grattet, Petersilia, and Lin, 2008; Petersilia and Turner, 1993), one might anticipate that MCORP offenders should have had higher revocation rates. That MCORP offenders had similar rates of revocation as the control group may be attributable to a greater use of restructures—both formal and informal—for violations of supervision conditions. That is, because MCORP supervision agents were able to develop closer working relationships with the offenders they supervised due to the smaller caseload sizes and heightened focus on enhanced service delivery, they may have been less likely to pursue revocations as a sanction for supervision violations.

Why was MCORP successful in reducing reoffending? The findings from the process evaluation showed that MCORP significantly improved employment rates, decreased homelessness, broadened offender systems of social support, and increased the extent to which offenders participated in community support programming. Although none of the housing measures were significantly associated with the three types of reoffending (rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration), the results from the community programming analyses revealed that the main keys to success for MCORP were its impact on post-release employment, social support, and community support programming. Indeed, employment significantly reduced the risk of rearrest, whereas social support and community support programming each had a significant effect on two measures of reoffending.

The findings suggest that the MCORP model is more effective than previous reentry practices, but there is still room for improvement. The results showed, for example, that

some of the most effective programming and services were generally used by only a minority of the offenders. Perhaps most notably, providing offenders with a continuum of CD treatment from the institution to the community produced substantially lower reoffense rates (see Table 25). Because community-based CD treatment provides more opportunities for revocation (e.g., failing the treatment program, not following the rules of the program, etc.), those who entered CD treatment in the community—regardless of whether they had participated in prison-based treatment—had higher revocation rates. When focusing on the three reoffense measures (rearrest, reconviction, and new offense reincarceration), however, the recidivism rates for offenders who participated in either prison- or community-based treatment were slightly lower than those for the untreated offenders. But the reoffense rates for the offenders who participated in both prison- and community-based CD treatment were lower in comparison to those who were treated only in the institution or the community and were much lower than those who were untreated. Although approximately 90 percent of offenders admitted to Minnesota prisons are diagnosed as chemically dependent or abusive (Minnesota Department of Corrections, 2009), roughly half of the offenders did not enter treatment, either in prison or the community. Just as important, only 11 percent (28) of the 249 offenders were treated in both the institution and the community.

Table 25. Recidivism Rates by CD Treatment Participation

Recidivism	CD Treatment in Prison/Community	CD Treatment in Prison	CD Treatment in Community	No CD Treatment
Rearrest	28.6%	59.7%	57.1%	64.3%
Reconviction	10.7%	29.9%	35.7%	36.5%
Reincarceration	3.6%	9.0%	14.3%	16.7%
Revocation	32.1%	22.4%	35.7%	23.8%
Any Prison Return	35.7%	31.3%	50.0%	37.3%
N	28	67	28	126

Participating in mentoring, restorative justice circles, and faith-based programming was effective in reducing reoffending, but only six percent of the offenders were involved in all three types of community support programming. Involvement in vocational training was associated with a decreased risk of reincarceration, yet less than 10 percent participated in this type of programming in the community. Although MCORP increased

the extent to which offenders obtained employment, which was associated with a reduced risk of recidivism, less than half of the offenders in this study were able to find employment in the first six months after release from prison. Those who found employment, however, were often underemployed, typically working less than full-time.

Despite MCORP's success, the findings suggest that even better recidivism outcomes could be achieved by further increasing offender access to needed resources in four main areas. First, the results showed that offenders are more likely to make a successful transition from prison to the community when they can find employment, are involved in vocational programming, or are able to receive income support. To increase offenders' chances of securing employment after release, greater efforts should be made to provide GED programming for offenders without degrees and offer additional opportunities for offenders to acquire or improve vocational skills while incarcerated. For those offenders who are unable to earn a GED or find steady, full-time employment, agents should focus efforts on helping them identify potential sources of income support in the community.

Second, MCORP helped more offenders locate housing, but the results also showed that it matters where the housing is located. Finding any housing for offenders, let alone housing in neighborhoods with relatively low crime rates, is frequently a challenge. To the extent possible, however, institutional caseworkers and agents should concentrate efforts on locating housing opportunities in communities where there is greater availability of informal support networks and community resources.

Third, offenders were more likely to successfully return to the communities from which they came when a continuum of treatment was provided, although relatively few participated in both prison- and community-based treatment. To be sure, offenders are often reluctant to participate in treatment programming, but the lack of available treatment slots—both in the institution and the community—is also a major obstacle towards attaining a greater continuum of care. Expanding treatment resources in both the institution and the community would, of course, involve increased costs. Yet, the benefits produced by reduced recidivism stemming from a greater continuum of care

could well exceed the costs, resulting in a more cost-effective offender reentry model. Efforts to increase the continuum of CD treatment should also focus on establishing more collaborative relationships between state and local service providers. The current treatment delivery structure is, to some extent, fragmented because prison- and community-based treatment are administered at the state and local levels, respectively. Still, as demonstrated by this evaluation, forging partnerships between state and county agencies can be helpful in overcoming some of the structural barriers involved in the delivery of services.

Finally, social support figures prominently in helping offenders successfully reintegrate into society. Reentry efforts should therefore focus on helping offenders establish or expand systems of social support in both the institution and the community. Similar to CD treatment, providing a greater continuum of social support from prison to the community would likely yield better recidivism outcomes. Within the institution, strengthening inmate social support could include efforts to promote more frequent visitation by friends and family members, a focus on family reunification, and greater involvement in mentoring, restorative justice programming, and faith-based services. The social ties initiated or developed in prison would then be maintained in the community through continued participation in mentoring, restorative justice circles, and faith-based programming.

The evidence presented here largely supports what research has previously suggested about offender reentry—better recidivism outcomes can be achieved by increasing access to needed services and programming that have, to a large extent, been shown to be effective. Nevertheless, there still remains much to be learned about how best to optimize offender reentry. For example, although MCORP emphasized greater collaboration between institutional and community corrections personnel in order to provide a more dynamic delivery of services, additional research is needed to help identify the most effective service delivery models. Future research is also needed to further clarify the point at which offender reentry planning should begin. As noted earlier, in October 2008 the DOC and the pilot counties initiated Phase 2, which adheres

more closely with the original model (i.e., offender reentry begins at admission to prison) insofar as offenders, for the most part, are assigned shortly after they enter prison. In addition to increasing the overall sample size for MCORP, which addresses one of the aforementioned limitations of this study, Phase 2 will provide a valuable comparison as to whether there is an added benefit to starting reentry earlier during an offender's confinement. Finally, future research should also consider the costs and benefits of offender reentry programming. Although the present study did not contain a cost-benefit analysis, future efforts to evaluate MCORP will examine this issue to help determine whether it is a cost-effective offender reentry model and, if so, to what extent.

REFERENCES

Adams, K., Bennett, K.J., Flanagan, T.J., Marquart, J.W., Cuvelier, S.J., Fritsch, E., Gerber, J., Longmire, D.R., & Burton, Jr., V.S. (1994). A large-scale multidimensional test of the effect of prison education programs on offenders' behavior. *The Prison Journal* 74: 433-449.

Adams, D. & Fischer, J. (1976). The effect of prison residents' community contacts on recidivism rates. *Corrective and Social Psychiatry and Journal of Behavior Technology Methods and Therapy* 22: 21-27.

Agnew, R. (2006). General strain theory: Current status and directions for further research. Pp. 101-123 in *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminology Theo*ry, edited by F.T. Cullen, Wright, J.P., and Blevins, K.R., New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Bales, W.D. & Mears, D.P. (2008). Inmate social ties and the transition to society: Does visitation reduce recidivism? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 45: 287-321.

Berk, R., Lenihan, K.J., & Rossi, P.H. (1980). Crime and poverty: Some experimental evidence from ex-offenders. *American Sociological Review* 45: 766-786.

Braga, A.A., Piehl, A.M., Hureau, D. (2009). Controlling violent offenders released to the community: An evaluation of the Boston Reentry Initiative. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 46: 411-436.

Bushway, S. & Reuter, P. (2002). Labor markets and crime risk factors. In Sherman, L., Farrington, D., Welsh, B., & MacKenzie, D., *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention*. Rutledge Press: NY.

Clear, T.R., Rose, D.R., & Ryder, J.A. (2001). Incarceration and the community: The problem of removing and returning offenders. *Crime & Delinquency* 47: 335-351.

Duwe, G. (2010). Prison-based chemical dependency treatment in Minnesota: An outcome evaluation. *The Journal of Experimental Criminology*.

Fabelo, T. (2002). The impact of prison education on community reintegration of inmates: The Texas case. *Journal of Correctional Education* 53: 106-110.

Field, G. (1985). The Cornerstone program: A client outcome study. *Federal Probation* 48: 50-55.

Glaser, D. (1964). *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*. Indianapolis:
      Bobbs-Merrill.

Grattet, R., Petersilia, J. & Lin, J. (2008). *Parole Violations and Revocations in
      California*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Hass, S.M., Hamilton, C.A. & Hanley, D. (2007). *Preparing Prisoners for Returning
      Home: A Process Evaluation of West Virginia's Offender Reentry Initiative*.
      Charleston, WV: Mountain State Criminal Justice Research Services.

Hairston, C. (1988). Family ties during imprisonment: Do they influence future criminal
      activity? *Federal Probation* 52: 48-52.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California
      Press.

Holl, D.B., Kolovich, L., Grady, M., & Coffey, A.C. (2009). *Evaluation of the Prisoner
      Re-entry Initiative: Final Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Holley, P., & Brewster, D. (1998). An examination of the effectiveness of GED
      programs within the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. *Journal of the
      Oklahoma Criminal Justice Research Consortium*.

Inciardi, J.A., Martin, S.S., Butzin, C.A., Hooper, R.M. & Harrison, L.D. (1997). An
      effective model of prison-based treatment for drug-involved offenders. *Journal of
      Drug Issues* 27: 261-278.

Inciardi, J.A., Martin, S.S., & Butzin, C.A. (2004). Five-year outcomes of therapeutic
      community treatment of drug-involved offenders after release from prison. *Crime
      & Delinquency 50*: 88-107.

Jacobs, E. & Western, B. (2007). *Report on the Evaluation of the ComALERT Prisoner
      Reentry Program.* Available at:
      http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/soc/faculty/western/pdfs/report_1009071.pdf

Knight, K., Simpson, D.D., Chatham, L.R., & Camacho, L.M. (1997). An assessment of
      prison-based drug treatment: Texas' in-prison therapeutic community program.
      Journal of Offender Rehabilitation 24: 75-100.

Knight, K., Simpson, D. & Hiller, M. (1999). Three-year reincarceration outcomes in prison therapeutic community treatment in Texas. *The Prison Journal* 79: 337-51.

Knollenberg, L. & Martin, V.A. (2008). Community reentry following prison: A process evaluation of the Accelerated Community Entry Program. *Federal Probation* 72: 2.

Kubrin, C. & Stewart, E. (2006). Predicting who reoffends: The neglected role of neighborhood context in recidivism studies. *Criminology* 44: 165-197.

Langan, P.A., & Levin, D.J. (2002). *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

LaVigne, N., Lawrence, S., Kachnowski, V., Naser, R., & Schaffer, M. (2002). *Process Evaluation of the Pennsylvania Community Orientation and Reintegration (COR) Program*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

LeClair, D.P. (1978). Home furlough program effects on rates of recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 5: 249-258.

Listwan, S.J. (2009). Reentry for serious and violent offenders: An analysis of program attrition. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 20: 154-169.

Lutze, F.E., Bouffard, J., & Falconer, S. (2009). *Washington State's Reentry Housing Pilot Program Evaluation: Year 1 Report*. Pullman, WA: Washington State University.

Lynch, J.P. & Sabol, W.J. (2001). *Prisoner Reentry in Perspective*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Maruna, S. (2001). *Making Good: How Ex-convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Maruna, S. & Toch, H. (2005). The impact of imprisonment on the desistance process. Pp. 139-178 in *Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America*, edited by J. Travis and C. Visher. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McDonald, D., Dyous, C., & Carlson, K. (2008). *The Effectiveness of Prisoner Reentry Services as Crime Control: The Fortune Society*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

McGarrell, E.F., Hipple, N., & Banks, D. (2003). Applying Problem Solving Approaches to Issues of Inmate Re-entry: The Indianapolis Pilot Project. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Mears, D.P., Wang, X., Hay, C., & Bales, W.D. (2008). Social ecology and recidivism: Implications for prisoner reentry. *Criminology* 46: 301-340.

Metraux, S. & Culhane, D.P. (2004). Homeless shelter use and reincarceration following prison release: Assessing the risk. *Criminology & Public Policy* 3: 201-222..

Minnesota Department of Corrections (2009). *Chemical Dependency Treatment Services in Prison*. St. Paul, MN.

Mitchell, O., Wilson, D.B., & MacKenzie, D.L. (2007). Does incarceration-based drug treatment reduce recidivism? A meta-analytic synthesis of the literature. *The Journal of Experimental Criminology* 3: 353-375.

Nuttall, J., Hollmen, L., & Staley, E. (2003). The effect of earning a GED on recidivism rates. *Journal of Correctional Education* 54: 90-94.

Ohlin, L. (1951). *Selection for Parole*. New York: Russell Sage.

Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *The American Journal of Sociology* 108: 937-975.

Pearson, F.S. & Lipton, D.S. (1999). A meta-analytic review of the effectiveness of corrections-based treatments for drug abuse. *The Prison Journal* 79, 384-410.

Pellisier, B., Rhodes, W., Saylor, W., Gaes, G., Camp, S.D., Vanyur, S.D. & Wallace, S. (2001). *TRIAD drug treatment evaluation project final report of three-year outcomes*. Washington, DC: Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Evaluation and Research.

Petersilia, J. (2003). *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Petersilia, J. & Turner S. (1993). Intensive probation and parole. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research,* 17, 281-335. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Prendergast, M.L., Hall, E.A., Wexler, H.K., Melnick, G., & Cao, Y. (2004). Amity prison-based therapeutic community: 5-year outcomes. *The Prison Journal* 84: 36-60.

Rossi, P.H., Berk, R.A., & Lenihan, K.J. (1980). *Money, Work, and Crime: Experimental Evidence*. New York: Academic Press.

Rossman, S.B. & Roman, C.G. (2003). Case-managed reentry and employment: Lessons from the Opportunity to Succeed Program. *Justice Research and Policy* 5: 75-100.

Sample, L.L & Spohn, C. (2008). *Final Report for the Evaluation of Nebraska's Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Program*. Omaha: NE: University of Nebraska at Omaha, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice.

Saylor, W.G., & Gaes, G.G. (1992). The post-release employment project: Prison work has measurable effects on post-release success. *Federal Prisons Journal* 2: 33-36.

Saylor, W.G., & Gaes, G.G. (1997). Training inmates through industrial work participation and vocational apprenticeship instruction. *Corrections Management Quarterly* 1: 32-43.

Seiter, R.P. & Kadela, K.R. (2003). Prisoner reentry: What works, what does not, and what is promising. *Crime & Delinquency* 49: 360-388.

Smith, L.G. & Suttle, D.R. (2008). *Final Report: An Outcome Evaluation of the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections' Community Orientation and Reintegration Program*. Columbus, OH: International Association of Reentry.

Soothill, K. (1974). *The Prisoner's Release: A Study of the Employment of Ex-Prisoners*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Steurer, S., Smith, L, & Tracy, A. (2001). *Three State Recidivism Study*. Washington, DC: Office of Correctional Education, U.S. Department of Education.

Uggen, C. (2000). Work as a turning point in the life course of criminals: A duration model of age, employment, and recidivism. *American Sociological Review* 65: 529-546.

Visher, C. & Farrell, J. (2005). *Chicago Communities and Prisoner Reentry*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Visher, C., Kachnowski, V., LaVigne, N., & Travis, J. (2004). *Baltimore Prisoners' Experiences Returning Home*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Vito, G.F. & Tewksbury, R. (1999). Improving the educational skills of inmates: The results of an impact evaluation. *Corrections Compendium* 24: 46-51.

Welsh, W. (2007). A multisite evaluation of prison-based therapeutic community drug treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 34: 1481-1498.

Wexler, H.K., Falkin, G.P., and Lipton, D.S. (1990). Outcome evaluation of a prison therapeutic community for substance abuse treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 17: 71-92.

Wexler, H., Melnick, G., Lowe, L. & Peters, J. (1999). Three-year reincarceration outcomes for Amity in-prison therapeutic community and aftercare in California. *The Prison Journal* 79: 321-36.

Wilson, D.B., Gallagher, C.A., & MacKenzie, D.L. (2000). A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 37: 347-368.

Wilson, J.A. & Davis. R.C. (2006). Good intentions meet hard realities: An evaluation of the Project Greenlight reentry program. *Criminology & Public Policy* 5: 303-338.

Winterfield, L., Lattimore, P.K., Steffey, D.M., Brumbaugh, S., Lindquist, C. (2006). The serious and violent offender reentry initiative: Measuring the effects of service delivery. Western Criminology Review 7: 3-19.

Zgoba, K.M., Haugebrook, S., & Jenkins, K. (2008). The influence of GED obtainment on inmate release outcome. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 35: 375-387.

Zhang, S.X., Roberts, R.E.L., & Callanan, V.J. (2006). Preventing parolees from returning to prison through community-based reintegration. *Crime & Delinquency* 52: 551-571.