


Roundtable Discussion: Policy Implications of Findings from the Multi-site Evaluation of SVORI

International Reentry Association
March 20, 2007



Today's Topics

- Brief review of SVORI
- Implementation: What did we learn from the the SVORI Program Directors (PDs) about the SVORI programs?
- Service Delivery: What did the offenders tell us about service & treatment needs? Services & treatment receipt?
- Impact: What did the offenders tell us about outcomes?




The Genesis of SVORI

- More than 650,000 of the 2 million+ people incarcerated are released each year (450,000 to parole)
- Within 3 years of release:
 - 2/3rds will be rearrested
 - More than half will be returned to prison
- SVORI as a Federal Response
 - Collaborative Federal effort to improve reentry outcomes in the areas of criminal justice, employment, education, health and housing
 - Funded by Education, HHS, HUD, DOJ, and DOL





SVORI Logic Model





Program Implementation


- 69 grantees operating 89 programs *Note: youthful offender programs classified with adult programs unless the program is a juvenile/youthful offender combination.*
- These 89 SVORI programs
 - Target adult & juvenile populations
 - Incorporate partnerships among state and local agencies to provide comprehensive services to prisoners returning to the community
 - Are locally designed to meet local needs and organizational capabilities





Serious and
Violent
Offender Multi-
site Evaluation


SVORI Programs





The SVORI Multi-site Evaluation

- GOAL: “...determine whether the selected programs have accomplished the overall goal of the Reentry Initiative—increasing public safety by reducing recidivism among the populations served by the program—and determine the relative costs and benefits of the program.”
- Evaluation Components
 - **Implementation Assessment:** document implementation of SVORI, including targeted populations, program elements, and agencies (*PD surveys*)
 - **Impact Evaluation:** determine the extent to which SVORI improves access to services and employment and health outcomes, and reduces criminal behavior of returning criminals (*Offender surveys*)
 - **Economic Evaluation:** determine whether SVORI is cost effective (*subset of impact sites*)




Implementation Assessment

- Three rounds of surveys conducted with SVORI Program Directors
 - 2004 survey results were used in the *National Portrait of SVORI*, the Multi-site Evaluation's preliminary assessment of all 69 sites
 - 2005 and 2006 survey results were and are being used to produce short reports on specific topics, *Reentry Research in Action: Findings from the Field*
 - Results from all surveys provide information on the individual programs on www.svori-evaluation.org



Impact Evaluation

- Goal is to determine the extent to which SVORI
 - improves access to appropriate, comprehensive, integrated services
 - improves employment, health, & personal functioning of returning prisoners
 - reduces criminal activity
- Longitudinal study of more than 2,500 adult & juvenile offenders in 14 states (16 programs)
- Data from four waves of CAPI interviews (drug testing at 3 & 15 months)
- Agency data (DOC, DJJ, P&P, FBI & ESC)



Impact Evaluation Sites

- Northeast (2 states)
 - Maine
 - Pennsylvania
- South (5 states)
 - Florida (juvenile only)
 - Maryland
 - Missouri
 - Oklahoma
 - South Carolina (adult & juvenile)
- Midwest (4 states)
 - Kansas (adult & juvenile)
 - Indiana
 - Iowa
 - Ohio
- West (3 states)
 - Colorado (juvenile only)
 - Nevada
 - Washington

***Adult only unless noted**



Impact Evaluation Outcome Measures

- Self Sufficiency & Quality of Life
 - Employment
 - Housing
 - Family (including contacts, stability & child custody/support)
 - Community Involvement
- Health
 - Substance Use (sobriety & relapse prevention)
 - Physical Health
 - Mental Health
- Reduced Criminality
 - Supervision Compliance
 - Reoffending
 - Rearrest
 - Reconviction
 - Reincarceration
- Agency-level impact: Systems Change
 - Agency cooperation
 - Sustainability




Cost-Benefit Study

- Juvenile Programs
 - Florida
 - South Carolina
- Adult Programs
 - Iowa
 - Maryland
 - Ohio
 - Pennsylvania
 - South Carolina

SVORI Implementation: Program Status, Enrollment, and Services


Results from the
Project Director Surveys
(2005 & 2006)






Program Status*

- 90% of Project Directors for adult programs described their programs as having become fully operational
- Most became operational in 2003






Program Status*


- Program Director
 - Most adult programs (96%) still had a SVORI program director as of March 2006
 - Over half of the programs have experienced PD turnover
- Grant End Dates
 - 80% applied for a no-cost extension for the original SVORI grant
 - Just over half of the adult programs (n=29) have passed their end dates
 - 13 programs have end dates in 2007 (latest is 6/2007)

**From 2006 PD survey; adult programs only*




Enrollment: PDs said*

- Programs established eligibility criteria
 - Most (58%) accept all offenders that meet criteria
 - Of those that don't, the most frequent reasons for rejecting an eligible offender include insufficient capacity (38%) and the likelihood of the offender not being released by the parole board (33%)
- Most (79%) programs receive referrals from facility/classification staff (84%) or self-referrals from prisoners (68%)
- Most (80%) programs are voluntary
 - Few eligible participants decline participation
 - Those who decline participation don't think they need the services or that SVORI requires too much oversight
 - **From 2005 PD survey; all programs*



Enrollment*


- 34 adult programs (68%) are still enrolling new participants
 - 23 plan to continue enrolling indefinitely
 - 11 plan to continue until a specific end date



- Of the 16 programs no longer enrolling new participants, most stopped in 2005 or early 2006


*From 2006 PD survey, adult programs only

www.svori-evaluation.org




Enrollment*


- All 51 adult programs have enrolled at least 1 participant
- Most adult programs (n=28) have enrolled 150 participants or less



*From 2006 PD survey, adult programs only




Enrollment*




Enrollment*


Serious and Violent Offender Multi-site Evaluation




Enrollment Barriers




*From 2005 PD survey; all programs



Primary Focus of Adult & Juvenile SVORI Programs



From 2005 survey; all programs



Serious and
Violent
Offender Multi-
site Evaluation


Many Programs & Services Are Offered

- Risk assessment
- Needs assessment
- Treatment/release plan development
- Legal assistance
- Assistance obtaining identification
- Assistance obtaining benefits
- Financial support/emergency assistance
- Peer support groups
- 1-on-1 mentoring
- Housing placements/referrals
- Transportation (post-release only)
- Comprehensive drug treatment programs
- AA/NA
- Counseling sessions
- Mental health services
- Anger management/violence counseling
- Medical services
- Dental services
- Education/GED/tutoring/literacy
- Vocational training
- Employment referrals/job placement
- Resume & interviewing skills development
- Work release program
- Cognitive skills development/behavior program.
- Life skills training
- Domestic violence services
- Parenting skills development
- Family reunification
- Family counseling
- Formal post-release supervision (post only)







Adults: Most Common Pre-release Services






Adults: Most Common Post-release Services






Juveniles: Most Common Pre-release Services




From 2005 survey; all programs



Juveniles: Most Common Post-release Services




From 2005 survey; all programs



Service Coordination*


Service Coordination Approach	% of programs
Case Management	
Pre-release case management provided	92%
More likely for SVORI than comparison	66%
Post-release case management provided	94%
More likely for SVORI than comparison	71%
Program uses Continuity of Care Model	77%
Same case manager used for pre- and post-release (SVORI)	40%
Same supervision officer used for pre- and post-release (SVORI)	35%
Representative from post-release agency begins working with offender while they are incarcerated	83%
More likely to happen for SVORI than comparison	71%

*From 2005 PD survey, all programs



Service Coordination*

Service Coordination Approach (cont'd)	% of programs
Program uses Wrap-Around Approach	79%
Community Accountability Panels/Boards Used	37%
Used only with SVORI participants pre-release	14%
Used only with SVORI participants post-release	17%
Offender-Specific Reentry Teams Used	71%
Used only with SVORI participants pre-release	48%
Used only with SVORI participants post-release	54%
Program uses One-Stop Shop	64%




Sustainability*

- The majority of adult program PD's (82%) reported other reentry initiatives are underway in their state
- The majority of adult program PD's (94%) plan to continue at least some elements of SVORI program once SVORI funds are no longer available
 - Of these, 77% are planning to expand their SVORI program




Sustainability*

SVORI Elements PDs Plan to Retain




**From 2006 PD survey; adult programs only*




Sustainability

Ways PDs Plan to Expand SVORI Program




**From 2006 PD survey; adult programs only*




Sustainability*

Number 1 Factor Required to Take Reentry Programming "To Scale" in PDs State



**From 2006 PD survey; adult programs only*



Implementation Conclusions


- Most programs were designed to fill service gaps (or expand an existing program)
- Most programs are small & have enrolled fewer people than originally projected
- Programs are targeted geographically (pre- and post-release) but do not focus on a specific phase, offender need type, or specific service type
- Primary programmatic focus for adult programs is employment/vocational services
- Overall, SVORI participants are more likely to receive more programs/services than comparable non-participants
- Most programs will be continuing at least some parts of their SVORI programs



What They Needed & What They Got: Is Service Matching Enhanced through SVORI?

Results from the Offender Interviews





Needs-Services Matching Background

- One of SVORI's main functions is to encourage the use of needs assessments to develop tailored reentry plans
- These plans specify the types of services that specific offenders need (avoid the 'kitchen sink' syndrome)
- We examined the extent to which SVORI improves the provision of tailored services
 - Self-report service needs at baseline (just prior to release)
 - Self-report service receipt at 3 months (from release until interview)
 - N = 984 (those who had completed interviews at both baseline and 3 months)



Serious and
Violent
Offender Multi-
site Evaluation

Service Delivery

1. Risk assessment
2. Needs assessment
3. Treatment/release plan development
4. Legal assistance
5. Assistance obtaining identification
6. Assistance obtaining benefits
7. Financial support/emergency assistance
8. Peer support groups
9. 1-on-1 mentoring
10. Housing placements/referrals
11. Transportation (post-release only)
12. Comprehensive drug treatment programs
13. AA/NA
14. Counseling sessions
15. Mental health services
16. Anger management/violence counseling
17. Medical services
18. Dental services
19. Education/GED/tutoring/literacy
20. Vocational training
21. Employment referrals/job placement
22. Resume & interviewing skills development
23. Work release program
24. Cognitive skills development/behavior pgm.
25. Life skills training
26. Domestic violence services
27. Parenting skills development
28. Family reunification
29. Family counseling
30. Formal post-release supervision (post only)





Service Needs & Receipt Bundles

- **Coordination & Supervision (received only):** needs assessment, case management, worked with anyone to reintegrate, supervision
- **Transition Services:** legal assistance, financial assistance, public benefits assistance, healthcare insurance, mentoring, assistance obtaining documents, finding place to live, transportation, getting drivers license, clothing/food
- **Health Services:** tx for physical, MH, AOD, abuse groups, anger management programs
- **Employment/Education/Skills Building Services:** assistance finding job, educ. services, money management, gen. lifeskills, assistance w/ personal relationships, changing criminal thinking
- **Family Services:** DV support group, batterer intervention
- **Child Services:** getting child support, assistance modifying child support debt, custody, parenting class, assistance finding child care (for the ~ 600 cases with children < 18 years)



Service Matching (Adult Male Self Report)

- **Calculation:** For each service, we coded whether each offender said they needed assistance/service and then received the assistance/service
- We identified unmet need: 1=Unmet need (Higher is worse)


Unmet Need		
Baseline Need	3-M Receipt	
	Yes	No
Yes	0	1
No	0	0

- The match score (for each bundle) represents the average proportion of unmet need for SVORI and non-SVORI offenders
- Range is from '0' (no unmet need) to '1' (complete unmet need)



Unmet Need for Service Bundles


(Higher indicates more unmet need)



*p<.05; **p<.01



Service Bundle Items Unmet Need




*p<.05; **p<.01



Service Bundle Items Unmet Need

Employment/Educ./Skills-Building Services



***p<.001



So... What Did the Rs Tell Us About Needs & Services?

- In general, those not in SVORI have more unmet need than SVORI participants, regardless of service bundle
- Nonetheless, the overall level of service provision is dismayingly low
- Bundle scores will be used in multivariate analyses
- Are beginning to examine potential reasons for low service provision




Impact: Is SVORI Working?



Thinking about Impact Overview

- Taking a first look:
 - Who are the SVORI and Comparison offenders?
 - How are they doing 3 months after release?
- Taking a broader view: Dozens of needs, smorgasbord of services & scores of outcomes




Characteristics of Adult Male Respondents

Variable*	SVORI	Non-SVORI
Age @ interview	28.76	29.17
White*	0.32	0.37
Black*	0.56	0.49
Hispanic	0.04	0.04
Other race	0.08	0.10
Married	0.08	0.10
Married/steady relationship	0.38	0.40
Children < 18	0.60	0.62
HS grad/GED	0.62	0.60
Ever had job*	0.89	0.92
Job 6 months pre- prison*	0.64	0.67
Hourly wage	10.95	10.09

*p-value < .05

Source: Baseline interviews: N = 1858




Characteristics of Adult Male Respondents

Variable*	SVORI	Non-SVORI
Family w/ AOD problems	72%	73%
Family convicted crime	78%	78%
Friends w/AOD problems	82%	83%
Friends convicted crime	84%	84%
Friends incarcerated	81%	82%
Alcohol use, 30 days prior to incarceration	68%	66%
Used drugs, 30 days prior to incarceration	66%	69%
AOD treatment, 30 days prior to incarceration	42%	41%




Characteristics of Adult Male Respondents


Conviction Offense (self report)




Number Priors



Juvenile Detention




Time Served at Baseline




*p-value < .05

Source: Baseline interviews: N = 1858




Taking a First Look: Adult Males 3 M Post Release

- Only 1% homeless; most are living with relatives although about ¼ report living in own place
- In contrast to baseline findings (re: pre-incarceration), few report currently living with people using AOD or who have committed illegal acts
- SVORI subjects more likely than non-SVORI to respond positively to questions about reentry programming
- Nearly ¾'s have worked since release



Taking a First Look: More on Employment

Variable	SVORI	Non-SVORI
Employed since release	76%	73%
Employed @ time interview	64%	59%
Hours/week worked (mean)	39.2	38.2
Hourly salary (mean)	\$9.57	\$9.33
Permanent job?	68%	68%
Formal pay?*	84%	75%
Benefits?*	47%	39%
Health insurance?	36%	29%
Paid leave?	35%	33%




Taking a First Look: Substance Use (Self-Report)

Variable	SVORI	Non-SVORI
Alcohol use since release?	54%	58%
Any drugs since release?	26%	30%
Used marijuana since release?	20%	24%
Used cocaine since release?	6%	7%
Used drugs past 30 days?	19%	23%




Taking a Broader View

- As we've seen
 - SVORI programs potentially address a **very broad range of needs**
 - Individual programs provide up to **28 pre-release** and **30 post-release** categories of services
 - Offenders may be receiving assistance across these **58 service categories**




Taking a Broader View


- As a result, we have **more than 100 potential outcome measures** at the individual level
 - Community involvement
 - Employment
 - Family Contact/Stability
 - Health/Mental Health
 - Housing
 - Recidivism
 - Substance Use
 - Supervision Compliance



SVORI better than Non-SVORI?


t-tests for 116 SVORI Outcomes
(positive if SVORI average 'better' than non-SVORI average)





Impact Evaluation: Next Steps

- Complete data collection (May 2007)
- Acquire administrative data from sites
- Continue to assess service delivery, including refining bundles and studying treatment-needs matching
- Begin to analyze 9- and 15-month data
- Develop multivariate models for outcomes, including models that will accommodate our quasi-experimental design and multiple sites



SVORI Implications for Policy Implementation Results

- What should be ***retained***?
 - Service coordination
 - Partnerships
- Why was there ***low enrollment***? What does this mean for reentry?
 - Stringent eligibility criteria
 - MIS failures
- How to take 'SVORI' ***to scale***?
 - PDs reported need to integrate into SOP
 - Expand eligibility criteria, geographic coverage
 - Other than funding, what is necessary?
- Implications of ***low service availability***?




Serious and
Violent
Offender Multi-
site Evaluation

SVORI Implications for Policy Early Impact Results

- How to avoid the 'Martinson' syndrome?
 - Think about multiplicity of outcomes and trends
 - View SVORI as one element in change scenario rather than single intervention to be tested






Serious and
Violent
Offender Multi-
site Evaluation

www.svori-evaluation.org



www.svori-evaluation.org



Topics for Discussion

- How would you define 'Reentry' ?
- Is there a core set of reentry components that you feel are important to maintain? What are they? How will they be maintained (\$\$, policies, staffing)?
- What do you think is necessary to 'go to scale' (i.e. expand state-wide)? Do you think that targeting/enrollment would be an issue (SVORI programs had difficulties with low enrollments)?
- Are there unintended consequences, either for offenders or for system, of the focus on reentry? (e.g. for offenders, perhaps more scrutiny during the immediate post-release phase increases returns to prison; for the system, perhaps needed resources are getting diverted to reentry)?



Topics for Discussion

- What are the “lessons learned” by the community and institutional partners on forging and then maintaining productive, multi-year collaborations supportive of reentry?
- From where you sit, what is the "climate" re. reentry ?
 - Internal to the DOC? The post-supervision agency?
 - External to the CJ system in other service agencies?
 - Political climate in your state? In the Federal government?
- What do you see as the biggest barriers to maintaining 'reentry' in your state? What will prevent change or impede the ability to sustain the systems or programming changes made to date?