

### Preliminary Outcome Results, Post-Prison Education Program

**Subjects:** Released from prison or entered program before July 31, 2008, allowing for one-year of follow-up and two months of adjudication time: 24 clients, 62 controls who applied for the program but could not be served due to high demand.

- The standard measure for recidivism outcomes is three years, with a year of adjudication time.
- Results of previous studies indicate that 60% of felony recidivists (according to the 3-year standard) do so by the end of 1 year, and 75% of "any offense" recidivists do so by the end of one year.
- Data supplied by WSIPP for this study suggest that the vast majority of adjudications occur within two months of the offense date.

**Methods.** Client identifiers were retrieved by DOC staff and provided to WSIPP. Demographic data, infraction records, and incarceration dates were supplied by DOC. Criminal history and recidivism data were provided by WSIPP.

<b>Results.</b>	One year <i>felony</i> recidivism:	0 out of 24 clients 8 out of 62 controls
	One year <i>any new offense</i> (misdemeanor or felony)	0 out of 24 clients 16 out of 62 controls
	Numbers of offenses (controls)	11 felonies, 12 misdemeanors

The .05 standard of statistical significance--the odds that the results are due to chance--was met for *any recidivism*, not quite for *new felony*. This measure is greatly affected by low numbers because comparison would look different if, by chance, there had been just a few felony recidivists among the clients.

The results of previous studies were used to calculate "risk scores" that reflect the likelihood of felony recidivism, based on well-established predictors: number of previous felonies, misdemeanors, and drug offenses; age at release; sex; felony versatility; and race. The two groups are roughly equivalent by this measure. Updated data on infractions from DOC will make a slight difference to the results.

These results are very preliminary, and the numbers are quite low. Information provided by the clients and other studies will be used to assess whether these results, though preliminary, may reasonably be attributed to the effects of the program. In the evaluation of the Dangerous Mentally Ill Offender Program, the first evaluation also showed a promising trend with limited numbers, and with each subsequent evaluation and refinement in method the trend (and the difference in benefits over costs) was strengthened.