



PART OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE

Marion County Reentry Court Program Assessment

January 2005 through
September 2008

Marion County Reentry Court Program Assessment

January 2005 through September 2008



© 2009 Center for Criminal Justice Research 09-C20
334 North Senate Avenue, 3rd Floor
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-1708



Marion County Reentry Court Program Assessment January 2005 through September 2008 February 2009

09-C20

Authors
Rachel Thelin
Sr. Policy Analyst
Samuel Nunn, PhD
Director

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction.....	4
Program Background.....	4
MCRC Data.....	6
Participant Profiles.....	7
Participant Demographic Attributes.....	7
Participant Criminal History.....	9
Program Progress.....	11
Program phase duration.....	12
Drug screens.....	13
Sanctions and incentives.....	14
New Offenses.....	20
Recommendations.....	23
Conclusions.....	24



Index of Tables

Table 1: Program Stages	6
Table 2: MCRC Participant Demographic Attributes by Cohort	8
Table 3: MCRC Participants' Criminal History by Cohort	10
Table 4: MCRC Participant Sentence and Offense History by Cohort	11
Table 5: MCRC Participant Program Status by Cohort	12
Table 6: Participant Progress through Phased Benchmarks by Program Status and Cohort	13
Table 7: Number and Percentage of Drug Screens Administered by Participant Program Duration and Cohort	15
Table 8: Number and Percentage of Positive Drug Screens by Participant Program Duration and Cohort	16
Table 9: Number and Percentage of Sanctions Applied and Incentives Offered, by Participant Program Duration and Cohort	17
Table 10: Number of Positive Drug Screen Results by Time in Program, Instant Offense, and Cohort	19
Table 11: Number and Percentage of Participants that Reoffended, by Program Status, Duration in the Program, and Cohort	21
Table 12: Number and Percentage of Participants that Re-offend, by First New Offense, Program Duration, and Cohort	22



Executive Summary

The Marion County Reentry Court (MCRC or the Court) was established in 2005 as an effort to provide a comprehensive approach to prisoner reentry, consisting of intensive criminal justice supervision accompanied by substance abuse treatment and an array of multi-faceted support services. In the fall of 2007, MCRC contracted with the Center for Criminal Justice Research (CCJR) to conduct a baseline program assessment and in particular, to compare participant profiles between the initial two years of the program and roughly the last year during Judge José Salinas's tenure and associated Court program modifications.

The MCRC program's primary purpose is to provide access to intensive services that assist those reentering to break the cycle of drug addiction and crime. Overall objectives include reducing the risk of paroled individuals relapsing, reoffending, and reentering the criminal justice system. MCRC participants are closely monitored and required to undergo regular, random drug screening as ordered by the Court.

In order to conduct the baseline assessment, CCJR required participant-level information including demographic indicators, criminal history, program intervention, results, and new offense data. MCRC provided CCJR with two datasets for analysis: 1) an extract from the Court's *Informer* database, and 2) an additional spreadsheet with participants' prior and new offenses. Data from both sources encompassed demographic information, criminal history as well as relevant program information. CCJR merged the two sets of data according to unique client identifiers assigned by the Court. The merge resulted in 451 records containing valid data for analysis. Both datasets required significant cleaning and preparation for analysis.

One objective of the program assessment was comparison of program participants' profile and results according to two cohorts, corresponding to the period before Judge Salinas's tenure and following his appointment. The first cohort is comprised of participants in the program from January 2005 through September 2007.¹ The second cohort is composed of participants from October 2007 through September 2008. Of the total 451 participant records determined to contain valid data for analysis, the first cohort includes 347 total participants and the second group, 104 records.

Broadly, the assessment includes a program participant profile (by cohort) that covered analysis of demographic variables, criminal history, participant instant offenses, prior convictions, length of sentence, time served, and conditions of release (probation or parole). Research efforts also involved examination of participant progress through phased benchmarks, analysis of drug screens administered and positive results, sanctions administered and incentives offered by the Court, as well as new offense data.

Before summarizing the findings, it should be emphasized that there were several serious issues associated with the data base used by the Court to monitor participants. To build an assessment database, data on Court participants were taken from *Informer*, criminal history transcribed from participants' case files, JUSTIS², and merged. Both sets of data required significant cleaning for analysis. Several fields and values in the *Informer* extract were either not defined well or not populated and therefore invalid. Sometimes, termination end dates between the *Informer* extract and the additional offense spreadsheet provided by the Court did not match. In some cases, date inaccuracies could be corrected. However, it was often not possible to determine valid dates, which prevented analysis of some program elements. Another data weakness was that several *Informer* fields associated with demographic variables were updated after individuals entered the program. For instance, participant education and employment attributes may have changed following program entry, and when updated it would appear that those attributes were in place

¹ While the MCRC was established in 2005, two participants in the dataset provided have entry dates of December 2004.

² JUSTIS is an Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department system that integrates criminal history data.



upon program entry. Until these data issues are corrected, it will be very difficult for the MCRC to develop a comprehensive participant baseline profile capable of accurately measuring change in these areas during and following program participation.

Thus, within the limitations of the databases provided for analysis, the following points provide a summary of the key statistical findings:

1. There were few demographic differences between the participants of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2. More than three-quarters of participants were Black, and about 20 percent were White. By far, participants are male (90 percent). The predominant age category at time of entry was 25 to 34 years old. Cohort 2 included a higher percentage of single participants. Educational levels were approximately the same. Cohort 2 had a slightly higher proportion of unemployed participants.
2. Cohort 2 admitted a slightly higher proportion of participants with drug-related instant offenses (82 percent of Cohort 2) in comparison to Cohort 1 (73 percent).
3. In comparison to those in Cohort 1, participants in Cohort 2 had received slightly longer sentences for their instant offenses, and had served a longer portion of those sentences before entry into the MCRC.
4. For the period examined in this analysis, Cohort 2 participants had much smaller proportions that had terminated or withdrawn than had Cohort 1, although over a longer program duration this difference might disappear.
5. From a reporting perspective, a few crucial variables were not fully reported in the databases provided for analysis. Regarding program duration (i.e., length of time in program phases), dates of entry into and out of phases for many participants were missing, so finding valid effects of program duration was largely impossible. In addition, a substantial proportion of cases in the database showed no drug tests administered (in both cohorts),
6. Although unable to gauge the effects of program duration, there did appear to be a few significant differences in critical performance metrics. Controlling for their instant offense and whether they had been drug tested, Cohort 2 participants seemed to be experiencing higher percentages of zero positive drug screens than was the case in Cohort 1.
7. The overall rate of reoffending for Cohort 1 was 48 percent. At the time of this analysis, the rate of reoffending for Cohort 2 was 24 percent. Most of those in either Cohort who reoffended were terminated or withdrew from the program.

This baseline assessment resulted in a number of key observations and recommendations, summarized as follows:

1. CCJR recommends that MCRC continue to work toward an overall more consistent and reliable means of data collection.
2. CCJR suggests that the *Informer* database be modified to allow for updates to key participant demographic variables that do not change original data provided at program entry.
3. CCJR recommends that MCRC consider systematically collecting additional data points, including dates of re-arrest, information regarding prior substance use (frequency and substance of choice), re-incarceration, technical violations, drug relapse following program completion, as well as specific treatment programs and other services offered to participants.



In summary, due to a number of issues regarding the quality and reliability of data provided to CCJR, a comprehensive analysis of program components and participant progress that would result in definitive conclusions about program operation, trends, and outcomes was not feasible. Some preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the baseline assessment. In keeping with a mission of providing intensive criminal justice supervision, the Salinas Court does appear to apply sanctions and offer incentives more intensely than the previous court did. The analysis also suggests that a key program component—drug screening—has become more streamlined and consistent.



Introduction

According to the Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC), over 5,000 prisoners were released to Marion County in 2007. IDOC projects that the number of ex-offenders released to the county will rise from 4,700 in 2008 to more than 5,200 in 2011. Upon release, offenders face significant challenges to reintegration into their communities and pursuing law-abiding, productive lives. Many are re-arrested and returned to jail or prison. The Marion County Reentry Court (MCRC or the Court) was established in 2005 as an effort to provide a comprehensive approach to prisoner reentry, consisting of intensive criminal justice supervision accompanied by substance abuse treatment and an array of multi-faceted support services. MCRC contracted with the Center for Criminal Justice Research (CCJR) to conduct a baseline program assessment and in particular, to compare participant profiles between the initial two years of the program and roughly the last year during Judge Salinas's tenure during which substantive changes to the Court program were implemented.

Program Background

Eligibility for the MCRC program is based on release through the Community Transition Program (CTP) and parole or probations programs. Additionally, preference is given to offenders with substance abuse and addictions issues. The program's primary purpose is to provide access to intense services that assist those reentering to break the cycle of drug addiction and crime. Overall objectives include reducing the risk of paroled individuals relapsing, reoffending, and reentering the criminal justice system. Key elements of the MCRC program include assessment and planning, active oversight, management of support services, and application of sanctions and incentives. In addition to substance abuse treatment services, ex-offenders are able to access resources that assist them with securing housing and employment. MCRC participants are monitored and required to undergo regular, random drug screening as ordered by the Court.

MCRC clients enter the program from the IDOC CTP and upon recommendation from parole liaisons. The MCRC has a three-tiered identification process. Initially, the parole/CTP officer identifies a potential client as an appropriate fit for the program. MCRC personnel conduct a systematic review of the potential participant's pre-sentence investigation, for substance abuse and addiction issues. The Court also reviews the offender's reentry accountability plan (RAP) and other pertinent records from IDOC. This investigation covers substance abuse history and acknowledgement, treatment completion while in prison, failed intervention attempts, as well as reports regarding substance abuse and behavior during incarceration. A stringent requirement of the reentry program is a primary substance abuse problem. Once the Court is satisfied that the potential client meets the overall criteria, the Court submits an acceptance or denial letter summarizing reasons for either action and recommendations for treatment if accepted. Prior to Judge Salinas's tenure, parolees were given the option to participate. Currently, if a parolee is identified for the program, participation is mandatory. While the majority of MCRC clients are on parole, ex-offenders on probation may also be referred to the program. Offenders who have a history of sexual offenses or violent crimes are ineligible for participation.

Since Judge Salinas's appointment to the Court, a number of other overall changes have been implemented. These include expanded community networks for outpatient substance abuse treatment, gender specific options, increased employment, and halfway housing services. Drug testing procedures have become more streamlined and automated to improve efficiency and consistency. Finally, as described above, a more thorough screening process for best-suited participants has been added.



As outlined in Table 1, the program is divided into three phases and requires a minimum of 12-months participation. Clients are required to complete each phase and attain specific benchmarks before transitioning to the next phase.

Table 1: Program Stages

Phase	Minimum duration	Court appearances	Group counseling	Drug screens	Employment	Housing
Phase I	90 days	Weekly	Two sessions per week	Two per week		
Phase II	90 days	Bi-weekly	Two sessions per week	Two per week	Must be employed 37.5 hours/week	Living outside work release
Phase III	90 days or until one year completion from start date	Once a month	One session per week	One per week	Must be employed 37.5 hours/week	Living outside work release

A basic premise of the program is that Court responses to participants' actions should be swift and immediate. Program incentives include good, fair, or poor group designations. Those in the good group receive praise from the Judge, applause, gift certificates, drug screen vouchers, and bus passes. Participants in the fair or poor group must remain in court while the Judge recognizes the "good" group. The designation is given to individuals who need either reminders, strong encouragement from the Court to become compliant, or are facing sanctions as a result of non-compliance. Sanctions for not adhering to program requirements can include a "slap on the wrist" when the Judge reprimands a participant during a Court appearance. In addition, the first positive, missed, or diluted drug screen might incur a few hours of community service work; the second time could result in two nights in jail; and the third infraction might lead to a minimum of three nights stay in jail.

MCRC Data

In order to conduct the baseline assessment, CCJR required participant-level information including demographic indicators, criminal history, program intervention, results, and new offense data. MCRC provided CCJR with two datasets for analysis: 1) an extract from the Court's *Informer* database, and 2) an additional spreadsheet with participants' prior and new offenses. Data from the *Informer* system included demographic variables, such as age, race/ethnicity, marital status, educational attainment, employment status, and number of children. These data also included instant offense and conviction information, program status, number of drug screens administered and results, beginning and end dates for each phase, and number of incentives and sanctions administered. The data provided to CCJR did not include prior drug use information related to substance of choice or frequency, nor specific treatment or other services offered to participants.

Prior offense information was transcribed by Court staff from participants' paper case files. Court staff acquired new offense information from the Marion County JUSTIS (Justice Information System) database. The prior and new offense data included participant sentences, projected time served, prior and new offenses, and convictions. CCJR merged the two sets of data according to unique client identifiers assigned by the Court. The merge resulted in 451 records containing valid data for analysis.

Both sets of data required significant cleaning in preparation for analysis. A number of fields and values in the *Informer* extract were not clearly defined or a majority of cells in a field were not populated and therefore invalid. Additionally, often termination/phase end dates between the *Informer* extract and the additional offense spreadsheet provided by the Court did not match. In some cases, date inaccuracies were

obvious typos that could be corrected by CCJR staff, however, it was often not possible to determine valid dates which prevented comprehensive analysis of some program elements. An additional weakness of the data provided to CCJR was that a number of key Informer fields associated with demographic variables were updated following program entry. For instance, individual participant education and employment attributes may have changed following program entry. As such, it is not possible to develop a comprehensive participant baseline profile and measure change in these areas during and following program participation.

Participant Profiles

One objective of the program assessment was comparison of program participants' profile and results according to two cohorts, corresponding to the period before Judge Salinas's tenure and following his appointment. The first cohort is comprised of participants in the program from January 2005 through September 2007. The second cohort is composed of participants from October 2007 through September 2008. Of the total 451 participant records determined to contain valid data for analysis, the first cohort includes 347 total participants and the second group, 104 records.

Participant Demographic Attributes

Table 2 presents MCRC participant demographics for the two cohorts outlined above. Over three-quarters of participants in both cohorts were African American and one-fifth were Caucasian. The overwhelming majority of participants were male, roughly 90 percent in each group. The number of female participants increased slightly between the two cohorts, from 10 to just over 11 percent. (MCRC personnel also indicated that increased female participation is a current program goal.) The average age of participants at program entry in Cohort 1 was 33.4 years, which is mirrored by the 33.5 years mean age of Cohort 2 participants. Age distribution between the two groups was also quite similar. The largest segments fell within the 25 to 34 age range—46 percent in Cohort 1 and 39 percent in Cohort 2—followed by 26 percent and 29 percent, respectively, in the 35 to 44 age bracket. The majority of participants in both groups were single. However, the percentage of participants in this category increased in the second Cohort, from 67 percent to 80 percent. The mean number of children per participant was 2.0 in Cohort 1 and 1.7 in Cohort 2.

The proportion of participants that had a high school degree/GED or less than a high school education remained fairly stable over the course of the two periods. One-half of Cohort 1 clients completed high school or a GED and 36 percent had less than a high school degree. In Cohort 2, 52 percent graduated from high school or had a GED and 33 percent had less than a high school education. Roughly 14 percent in each group pursued some college education. The percentage of clients that were employed declined from 48 percent with the first group to 37 percent among those in the second cluster. (This may be attributed to more stringent employment requirements.)

Table 2: MCRC Participant Demographic Attributes by Cohort

	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
Race/Ethnicity	Count	%	Count	%
African American/Black	228	77.3	75	78.9
Caucasian/White	60	20.3	19	20.0
Hispanic	5	1.7	1	1.1
Other	2	0.7	0	0.0
<i>Subtotal</i>	295	100	95	100
Unknown	52		9	
Total participants	347		104	
Gender	Count	%	Count	%
Male	271	90.0	86	88.7
Female	30	10.0	11	11.3
<i>Subtotal</i>	301	100	97	100
Unknown	46		7	
Total participants	347		104	
Age	Count	%	Count	%
20 to 24	50	15.8	18	17.3
25 to 34	146	46.1	40	38.5
35 to 44	83	26.2	30	28.8
45 and older	38	12.0	16	15.4
<i>Subtotal</i>	317	100	104	100
Unknown	30		0	
Total participants	347		104	
Marital status	Count	%	Count	%
Single	194	66.9	72	80.0
Married/Living as married	47	16.2	8	8.9
Divorced/Separated	46	15.9	10	11.1
Widower	3	1.0	0	0.0
<i>Subtotal</i>	290	100	90	100
Unknown	57		14	
Total participants	347		104	
Educational attainment	Count	%	Count	%
Less than high school	103	35.6	27	32.9
High school/GED	143	49.5	43	52.4
Some college/'s degree	40	13.8	12	14.6
Bachelor's degree	3	1.0	0	0.0
<i>Subtotal</i>	289	100	82	100
Unknown	58		22	
Total participants	347		104	
Employment status	Count	%	Count	%
Employed	34	47.9	30	37.0
Unemployed	36	50.7	49	60.5
Other	1	1.4	2	2.5
<i>Subtotal</i>	71	100	81	100
Unknown	276		23	
Total participants	347		104	
Children				
Mean number of children per participant		2.0		1.7

Source: Marion County Reentry Court *Informer* Database

Notes: Percentage totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

"Unknown" refers to records that include invalid or missing data for the variables analyzed

Participant Criminal History

The data provided to CCJR included participant instant offense, prior convictions, sentence, time served, and whether participants were released on parole or probation. As shown in Table 3, the vast majority of participants in both program cohorts had instant offenses associated with drug dealing (42 percent in the first group and 59 percent in the second cohort) or possession (31 percent and 23 percent, respectively). With regard to convictions, most participants in both groups had B felonies (43 and 44 percent). The percentage of those with A felonies increased from 12 percent in the first group to 19 percent in the second. Table 3 also illustrates that a greater share of Cohort 2 were parolees (85 percent) than in Cohort 1 (65 percent). The average sentence was slightly higher among clients in Cohort 2 (8 years), compared to 6 years for the first cohort (see Table 4). The mean time served also was somewhat higher for later MCRC clients—4 years versus 3 years. Despite the differences in sentencing, Cohort 1 participants had a slightly higher average number of prior offenses (5) than clients in the second cluster (4).

Table 3: MCRC Participants' Criminal History by Cohort

	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
Instant offense	Count	%	Count	%
Drug dealing	146	42.1	61	58.7
Drug possession	108	31.1	24	23.1
Burglary/Robbery	38	11.0	9	8.7
Traffic violation	13	3.7	1	1.0
Larceny	12	3.5	3	2.9
Fraud/Forgery/Counterfeiting	10	2.9	3	2.9
Weapons violation	8	2.3	1	1.0
DUI	5	1.4	0	0.0
Battery	4	1.2	2	1.9
Other	3	0.9	0	0.0
Total participants	347	100	104	100
Convictions	Count	%	Count	%
A Felony	38	11.7	19	18.8
B Felony	140	43.2	44	43.6
C Felony	116	35.8	34	33.7
D Felony	30	9.3	4	4.0
<i>Subtotal</i>	324	100	101	100
Unknown	23		3	
Total participants	347		104	
Type of release	Count	%	Count	%
Parole	225	64.8	88	84.6
Probation	122	35.2	16	15.4
Total participants	347	100	104	100

Source: Marion County Reentry Court *Informer* Database. Criminal history transcribed from participant files.

Notes: Percentage totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

"Unknown" refers to records that include invalid or missing data for the variables analyzed.

Table 4: MCRC Participant Sentence and Offense History by Cohort

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Mean length of sentence	6 years	8 years
Mean length of time served	3 years	4 years
Mean number of prior offenses	5	4
N	345	89
Unknown	2	15
Total participants	347	104

Source: Marion County Reentry Court *Informer* Database. Criminal history transcribed from participant files.

Notes: Sentencing data transcribed from participant files were provided to CCJR in the form of complete years, e.g., 10 years. Projected time served data, however, were supplied in years, months, and days. In order to calculate the average time served, CCJR researchers converted these data to total number of days and rounded up to number of years. Percentage totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

Program Progress

Table 5 provides an overview of program status among participants in both cohorts. Program participants who have not yet graduated or been terminated are defined as *active*. *Graduates* have successfully completed the three phases of the MCRC program described earlier. The most common reasons for *termination* are absconding from Court (failing to appear which results in a warrant). Clients that are on *warrant* status for longer than 45 days are automatically terminated. Absconding from the IDOC CTP work release facility or acquiring new charges also may constitute grounds for termination. Individuals may be *ineligible* if they have a mental health condition (such as schizophrenia), sexual deviance case (rape, molestation, etc.) in their criminal history, or if they are on a split sentence (meaning their sentence has them placed on both parole and probation). Prior to Judge Salinas's appointment, parolees were given the option to participate. Some may have *withdrawn* or *declined* to participate. Currently, if a parolee is identified for the program, participation is mandatory. While the majority of MCRC clients are on parole, offenders on probation may also be referred to the program.

Close to 30 percent of participants in the first group graduated from the program. Just over one-third of clients were terminated. Among participants in the second cohort, 55 percent are currently active, 20 percent have been terminated, and 15 percent were deemed ineligible. Due to the lesser duration of Cohort 2, direct comparisons with Cohort 1 should be made with caution; however, at this point it appears that in comparison to the earlier participants, Cohort 2 has a considerably smaller rate of terminations and withdrawals.

Table 5: MCRC Participant Program Status by Cohort

	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Count	%	Count	%
Active	12	3.5	57	54.8
Graduate	100	28.9	0	0.0
Terminated	126	36.4	21	20.2
Withdrew/Declined	58	16.8	7	6.7
Ineligible	44	12.7	16	15.4
Warrant	6	1.7	3	2.9
<i>Subtotal</i>	346	100	104	100
Unknown	1		0	
Total Participants	347		104	

Source: Marion County Reentry Court *Informer* Database.

Notes: Percentage totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

"Unknown" refers to records that include invalid or missing data for the variables analyzed.

Program phase duration

Numerous dates in the MCRC datasets provided to CCJR were unreliable and often did not correspond to program status listed. Often, participant program entry and exit/termination dates between the *Informer* database extract and the additional offense spreadsheet provided by the Court did not match. (The additional spreadsheet did not include specific phase beginning and end dates, only program entry and exit dates.) Based upon input from MCRC staff, it was concluded that program entry and termination/exit dates in the additional spreadsheet were more reliable than those in the *Informer* database. Date inaccuracies in the *Informer* database that were obvious typos could be amended by CCJR staff. However, it was often not possible to determine valid beginning and end dates for each phase, which prevented a comprehensive analysis of program elements. For the analysis of progress through the Court's three phases, CCJR staff created a file that included what appeared to be valid phase beginning and end dates, as well as records with corrected date typos. This file incorporated program exit dates from the additional spreadsheet provided by MCRC. This allowed researchers to calculate the number of days per phase per participant. While the quality of data entry appears to have improved under the Salinas Court, the assessment of participant progress involving phase 1, 2, or 3 dates for Cohort 2 is still hampered by the fact that phase 1 beginning and end dates as well as phase 2 beginning dates were provided at a time when data entry was not as reliable.

Table 6 illustrates participant progress through each phase, measured by mean number of days and according to program status. As noted earlier, a significant portion of termination and phase end dates in the data supplied by the Court to CCJR were considered invalid or missing. Therefore, the average number of days for phase completion was calculated based on those cases with valid program duration dates. The mean number of days for phase I completion among active participants was higher among Cohort 1 participants (167days) than for those in the second cluster (132 days). The average time for Phase II completion among active clients in first group was 94 days and might be increasing, with an average of 115 days for the current group. Comparison between graduate groups category is not yet possible, given that all Cohort 2 participants are either active or have been terminated from the program. While the total number of participants terminated from the Salinas court is still small, it does appear that these individuals spend less time in the program—79 average days in phase 1 compared to 131 for the first group.

Table 6: Participant Progress through Phased Benchmarks by Program Status and Cohort

Participant status and program phase	Cohort 1				Cohort 2			
	Mean number of days	Count	Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data	Total participants	Mean number of days	Count	Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data	Total participants
Active								
Phase 1	167	11	1	12	132	28	29	57
Phase 2	94	8	4	12	115	7	50	57
Phase 3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Graduates								
Phase 1	114	91	9	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Phase 2	108	98	2	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Phase 3	191	96	4	100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Terminated/withdrew/ineligible/warranted								
Phase 1	131	64	171	235	79	7	40	47
Phase 2	145	43	192	235	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Phase 3	221	9	226	235	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: Marion County Reentry Court *Informer* Database. Additional program entry and exit data transcribed from participant case files.

Notes: Percentage totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

Drug screens

MCRC participation requirements include regular drug screens. Table 7 and 8 show the number of drug tests administered and positive results according to participant time in the program. While the small number of valid cases in Cohort 2 limits the degree to which comparisons can be made between the groups, the analysis offers a baseline for future assessment. It appears that a substantial majority (59 percent) of Cohort 1 participants were either not tested or the administration of drug screens was not recorded. Additionally, program duration data associated with more than one-half of Cohort 1 cases and two-thirds of Cohort 2 cases were invalid or missing. The percentage of participants that received larger numbers of drug tests would be expected to increase over time. This appears to be generally true for participants in Cohort 1. For Cohort 2, nearly all participants that have been in the program for 3 to 6 months (95 percent) and all those with 6 months to 1 year in, have been tested for drugs 20 or more times. Setting aside the categorization of participants into program duration categories, there has been a significant increase from Cohort 1 to Cohort 2 in the proportion of MCRC participants that received one or more drug tests during their tenure. For example, only 20 percent of Cohort 2 were reported as having no administered drug tests.

Interpretation of drug screen result data is complicated by the problem of missing program duration times as well as recognition that participants that had *no* drug tests administered should be eliminated from analysis of positive results. Considering all participants in each cohort, regardless of program duration, Cohort 1 reported 43 percent (61 out of 142) of those who had drug tests were negative, whereas Cohort 2 reported 76 percent (63 out of 83) of those with tests were negative. Considering individuals for whom program duration was reported, a few comparisons can be made. The percentage of positive drug screen results among both Cohort 1 and 2 participants appears to increase around the time of 6 months of participation. The percentage of Cohort 1 participants with 3 or more positive drug screens increased from 13 percent (3 to 6 months) to 30 percent among those in the program for 6 months to 1 year and over 1 year. Other than among participants in the program 3 months or less, the proportion of those with zero

positive screens remained constant at roughly 30 percent. Among Cohort 2 participants, only 5 percent in the program for 3 to 6 months and none of those in for 6 months to 1 year had 3 or more positive drug screens.

Sanctions and incentives

The data provided to CCJR also included the number of sanctions applied and incentives offered to program participants. (A description of sanctions and incentives is covered earlier under program background.) Again, the problem of not having complete program duration data for both Cohorts creates barriers to good analysis. As with data regarding drug screens administered, it appears that a substantial majority of participants in both groups were neither sanctioned nor offered incentives, or records of such actions were not maintained accurately. As shown in Table 9, nearly eighty percent (277 out of 347) of participants in the first group and 63 percent (65 out of 104) of Cohort 2 cases were not sanctioned. Incentives also appear to have been only utilized to a small degree. Eighty-five percent (296 out of 347) of those in Cohort 1 and nearly three-quarters (76 out of 104) of participants in Cohort 2 received no incentives. Overall, based on an analysis that considered which participants were sanctioned or received incentives (not shown in Table 9), 76 percent (264 out 347 cases) of Cohort 1 participants received neither sanctions nor incentives, or these actions were not recorded in the database. In comparison, it appears that the Salinas Court may be using sanctions and incentives a little more with participants. Fifty-six percent (58 out of 104 cases) of those in Cohort 2 were neither sanctioned nor offered incentives. The difference may also be a result of better record-keeping with the second group.

Table 7: Number and Percentage of Drug Screens Administered by Participant Program Duration and Cohort

Number of drug tests administered	Cohort 1											Cohort 2										
	Up to 3 months		3 to 6 months		6 months to 1 year		Over 1 year		Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total Participants	Up to 3 months		3 to 6 months		6 months to 1 year		Over 1 year		Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total participants
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
0	4	40.0	6	28.6	14	22.6	30	41.1	151	83.4	205	2	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	19	27.5	21
1 - 5	2	20.0	3	14.3	6	9.7	7	9.6	14	7.7	32	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	25	36.2	26
6 - 10	1	10.0	0	0.0	6	9.7	0	0.0	3	1.7	10	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	10	14.5	11
11 - 20	1	10.0	2	9.5	4	6.5	2	2.7	5	2.8	14	1	20.0	1	5.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	9	13.0	11
More than 20	2	20.0	10	47.6	32	51.6	34	46.6	8	4.4	86	0	0.0	19	95.0	10	100	n/a	n/a	6	8.7	35
Total participants	10	100	21	100	62	100	73	100	181	100	347	5	100	20	100	10	100	n/a	n/a	69	100	104

Source: Marion County Reentry Court *Informer* Database. Additional program entry and exit data transcribed from participant case files.

Notes: Percentage totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

Table 8: Number and Percentage of Positive Drug Screens by Participant Program Duration and Cohort

Number of positive drug tests	Cohort 1							Cohort 2						
	Up to 3 months	3 to 6 months	6 months to 1 year	Over 1 year	Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total participants	Up to 3 months	3 to 6 months	6 months to 1 year	Over 1 year	Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total participants
	Count %	Count %	Count %	Count %	Count %	Count %		Count %	Count %	Count %	Count %	Count %	Count %	
0	4 66.7	5 33.3	14 29.2	13 30.2	25 83.3		61	2 66.7	15 75.0	5 50.0	n/a n/a	41 82.0		63
1-2	2 33.3	8 53.3	20 41.7	17 39.5	3 10.0		50	1 33.3	4 20.0	5 50.0	n/a n/a	9 18.0		19
3 or more	0 0.0	2 13.3	14 29.2	13 30.2	2 6.7		31	0 0.0	1 5.0	0 0.0	n/a n/a	0 0.0		1
Total number of participants to whom drug tests were administered	6 100	15 100	48 100	43 100	30 100		142	3 100	20 100	10 100	n/a n/a	50 100		83
Total number of participants to whom drug tests were not administered	4	6	14	30	151		205	2	0	0	n/a n/a	19		21
Total Participants	10	21	62	73	181		347	5	20	10	n/a n/a	69		104

Source: Marion County Reentry Court *Informer* Database. Additional program entry and exit data transcribed from participant case files.

Notes: Percentage totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

Table 9: Number and Percentage of Sanctions Applied and Incentives Offered, by Participant Program Duration and Cohort

	Cohort 1											Cohort 2											
Number of sanctions applied	Up to 3 months		3 to 6 months		6 months to 1 year		Over 1 year		Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total participants		Up to 3 months		3 to 6 months		6 months to 1 year		Over 1 year		Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total participants
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		
0	7	70.0	12	57.1	35	56.5	54	74.0	169	93.4	277		5	100	7	35.0	1	10.0	n/a	n/a	52	75.4	65
1 - 5	1	10.0	8	38.1	18	29.0	15	20.5	6	3.3	48		0	0.0	10	50.0	6	60.0	n/a	n/a	14	20.3	30
6 - 10	2	20.0	1	4.8	9	14.5	4	5.5	6	3.3	22		0	0.0	3	15.0	3	30.0	n/a	n/a	3	4.3	9
Total participants	10	100	21	100	62	100	73	100	181	100	347		5	100	20	100	10	100	n/a	n/a	69	100	104

Number of incentives offered	Up to 3 months		3 to 6 months		6 months to 1 year		Over 1 year		Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total participants		Up to 3 months		3 to 6 months		6 months to 1 year		Over 1 year		Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total participants
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		
0	8	80	14	66.7	44	71.0	52	71.2	178	98.3	296		5	100	5	25.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	66	95.7	76
1 - 5	1	10	7	33.3	18	29.0	21	28.8	3	1.7	50		0	0.0	15	75.0	10	100	n/a	n/a	3	4.3	28
6 - 10	1	10	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0	0.0	0
Total participants	10	100	21	100	62	100	73	100	181	100	347		5	100	20	100	10	100	n/a	n/a	69	100	104

Source: Marion County Reentry Court *Informer* Database. Additional program entry and exit data transcribed from participant case files.

Notes: Percentage totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

Table 10 illustrates positive drug screens by instant offense and participant program duration. Given that the majority of Court participants have drug-related instant offenses, all other offenses were collapsed into one category—"Other." As with Tables 6 to 9, the overall number of participants with valid records for time in the program is quite small, so finding reliable differences across time in program categories is difficult. Also, as previously mentioned, the majority (59 percent) of participants in Cohort 1 and one-fifth of those in Cohort 2 either were not screened for drug use or records of these tests were not maintained. Accordingly, if time in program is ignored and participants without reported drug tests are excluded, a few comparisons are nonetheless possible. It appears that the percentage of participants who were drug tested and returned zero positive drug screens differs significantly between Cohort 1 and Cohort 2. For example, considering participants whose instant offense was drug dealing, the overall rate of zero positive drug screens in Cohort 1 was 44 percent (31 out of 70 tested), while the percentage of Cohort 2 participants (drug dealing) that had zero positive screens was 81 percent (43 of 53). A similar pattern held for those participants with drug possession offenses (37 percent with no positive screens in Cohort 1 versus 59 percent in Cohort 2) and other offenses (47 percent in Cohort 1 versus 77 percent in Cohort 2). Therefore, although these data are limited due to the absence of valid program duration variables and non-reported drug tests, they do suggest that Cohort 2 participants are reflecting a lower rate of positive screens.

Table 10: Number of Positive Drug Screen Results by Time in Program, Instant Offense, and Cohort

	Cohort 1											Cohort 2										
Positive drug screens	Up to 3 months		3 to 6 months		6 months to 1 year		Over 1 year		Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total participants	Up to 3 months		3 to 6 months		6 months to 1 year		Over 1 year		Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total participants
Drug dealing	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
0	3	100	4	63.6	6	42.3	6	52.8	12	95.7	31	2	100	9	81.8	3	60.0	n/a	n/a	29	82.9	43
1 - 2	0	0.0	3	27.3	9	34.6	10	27.8	2	2.9	24	0	0.0	1	9.1	2	40.0	n/a	n/a	6	17.1	9
3 or more	0	0.0	1	9.1	6	23.1	7	19.4	1	1.4	15	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0	0.0	1
Subtotal	3	100	8	100	21	100	23	100	15	100	70	2	100	11	100	5	100	n/a	n/a	35	100	53
Drug possession	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	25.0	6	42.9	5	83.3	15	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	33.3	n/a	n/a	5	62.5	10
1 - 2	1	100	2	66.7	8	50.0	5	35.7	0	0.0	16	1	100	1	20.0	2	66.7	n/a	n/a	3	37.5	7
3 or more	0	0.0	1	33.3	4	25.0	3	21.4	1	16.7	9	0	0.0		0.0		0	n/a	n/a		0	
Subtotal	1	100	3	100	16	100	14	100	6	100	40	1	100	5	100	3	100	n/a	n/a	8	100	17
Other offenses*	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
0	1	50.0	1	25.0	4	36.4	1	16.7	8	88.9	15	0	0.0	2	50	1	50.0	n/a	n/a	7	100	10
1 - 2	1	50.0	3	75.0	3	27.3	2	33.3	1	11.1	10	0	0.0	2	50	1	50.0	n/a	n/a	0	0.0	3
3 or more	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	36.4	3	50.0	0	0.0	7	0	0.0	0	0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0	0.0	0
Subtotal	2	100	4	100	11	100	6	100	9	100	32	0	0.0	4	100	2	100	n/a	n/a	7	100	13
Total number of participants to whom drug tests were not administered	4		6		14		30		151		205	2		0		0		n/a	n/a	19		21
Total participants	10		21		62		73		181		347	5		20		10		n/a	n/a	69		104

Source: Marion County Reentry Court *Informer* Database. Additional program entry and exit data transcribed from participant case files.

Notes: Percentage totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

*Other offenses" include non-drug related offenses: burglary/robbery, traffic violations, larceny, fraud/forgery/counterfeiting, weapons violations, DUIs, and battery.

New Offenses

New offense data provided to CCJR by MCRC included participant charges involved and convictions. The datasets did not include information regarding re-incarceration, technical violations, or drug relapse following MCRC program completion. With regards to time to first offense, arrest dates were not provided; only Court dates corresponding to when charges were dismissed or disposed were supplied. Given inconsistent program entry/exit dates in the Informer data and supplemental information, analysis regarding time to conviction could not be completed.

As shown in Table 11, setting aside the effects of time in the program, 48 percent of all program participants in Cohort 1 re-offended.³ While Cohort 2 clients have been out of prison for shorter periods of time than those in the first group, one-quarter have re-offended. It is not surprising that among both groups, the majority of re-offenders are terminated from the program. In Cohort 1, 60 percent of terminated participants had re-offended, and 36 percent of terminated individuals in Cohort 2 had new offenses. Overall, the analysis demonstrates that the degree to which all participants re-offend increases over time. Of particular interest is the rate of nearly one-third of Cohort 1 graduates that re-offended after 1 year in the program.

Table 12 provides participant re-offense data by type and program duration. Re-offense rates for drug-related crimes are comparatively low for both groups: 4 and 3 percent for drug possession among participants in Cohort 1 and 2 respectively, and 2 percent for dealing among both groups. The overall rate of re-offense fell among Cohort 1 participants during the 6 month to 1 year (45 percent) and over 1 year (33 percent) periods. Approximately 20 to 30 percent of Cohort 2 participants during the three program timeframes re-offended. Traffic violations represent the most common type of re-offense for both groups (12 and 11 percent) and also increased over time.

³ MCRC data provided to CCJR included dates regarding when participants' new offenses were disposed or dismissed. The data did not include arrest dates.

Table 11: Number and Percentage of Participants that Reoffended, by Program Status, Duration in the Program, and Cohort

Cohort 1																		
	Up to 3 months			3 to 6 months			6 months to 1 year			Over 1 year			Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data			Total		
Participant status	Count	%	Total participants	Count	%	Total participants	Count	%	Total participants	Count	%	Total participants	Count	%	Total participants	Count	%	Total participants
Active	0	0.0	2	0	0.0	2	1	20.0	5	0	0.0	2	1	100.0	1	2	16.7	12
Graduate				1	50.0	2	6	20.7	29	19	31.7	60	0	0.0	9	26	26.0	100
Terminated/withdrew/ineligible/warranted	2	25.0	8	12	70.6	17	21	75.0	28	5	45.5	11	100	58.5	171	140	59.6	235
Total participants	2	20.0	10	13	61.9	21.0	28	45.2	62	24	32.9	73	101	55.8	181	168	48.4	347
Cohort 2																		
	Up to 3 months			3 to 6 months			6 months to 1 year			Over 1 year			Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data			Total		
Participant status	Count	%	Total participants	Count	%	Total participants	Count	%	Total participants	Count	%	Total participants	Count	%	Total participants	Count	%	Total participants
Active	0	0.0	1	2	11.8	17	3	30.0	10	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	6.3	16	6	13.6	44
Graduate	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Terminated/withdrew/ineligible/warranted	1	25.0	4	2	66.7	3	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	16	45.7	35	16	35.6	45
Total Participants	1	20.0	5	4	20.0	20.0	3	30.0	10	n/a	n/a	n/a	17	33.3	51	22	24.7	89*

Source: Marion County Reentry Court *Informer* Database. Additional program entry and exit data transcribed from participant case files.

Notes: *For Cohort 2, among active participants, 13 did not have new offense information included in the dataset nor did 2 ineligible participants. Thus the total number of participants is 89 versus 104 in other tables.

Percentage totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

Table 12: Number and Percentage of Participants that Re-offend, by First New Offense, Program Duration, and Cohort

	Cohort 1													Cohort 2											
Offense	Up to 3 months		3 to 6 months		6 months to 1 year		Over 1 year		Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total participants			Up to 3 months		3 to 6 months		6 months to 1 year		Over 1 year		Number of cases with invalid or missing program duration data		Total participants	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Traffic violation	0	0.0	2	9.5	9	14.5	15	20.5	16	8.8	42	12.1		1	20.0	3	15.0	3	30.0	n/a	n/a	3	5.6	10	11.2
Other	2	20.0	8	38.1	7	11.3	2	2.7	44	24.3	63	18.2		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	2	3.7	2	2.2
Drug possession	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.6	3	4.1	10	5.5	14	4.0		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	3	5.6	3	3.4
Battery	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.8	1	1.4	9	5.0	13	3.7		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0	0.0	0	0.0
Larceny	0	0.0	1	4.8	3	4.8	0	0.0	5	2.8	9	2.6		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0	0.0	0	0.0
Drug dealing	0	0.0	1	4.8	1	1.6	0	0.0	5	2.8	7	2.0		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	2	3.7	2	2.2
Weapons violation	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.8	1	1.4	2	1.1	6	1.7		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	1	1.9	1	1.1
DUI	0	0.0	1	4.8	0	0.0	1	1.4	3	1.7	5	1.4		0	0.0	1	5.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	1	1.9	2	2.2
Fraud/Forgery/Counterfeiting	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	4	2.2	5	1.4		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	0	0.0	0	0.0
Burglary/ Robbery	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.6	0	0.0	3	1.7	4	1.2		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	n/a	n/a	2	3.7	2	2.2
No new offense reported	8	80.0	8	38.1	34	54.8	49	67.1	80	44.2	179	51.6		4	80.0	16	80.0	7	70.0	n/a	n/a	40	74.1	67	75.3
Total participants	10	100	21	100	62	100	73	100	181	100	347	100		5	100	20	100	10	100	n/a	n/a	54	100	89*	100

Source: Marion County Reentry Court *Informer* Database. Additional program entry and exit data transcribed from participant case files.

Notes: *For Cohort 2, among active participants, 13 did not have new offense information included in the dataset nor did 2 ineligible participants. Thus the total number of participants is 89 versus 104 in other tables.

Percentage totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.

Recommendations

This baseline assessment has resulted in a number of key observations and recommendations, primarily related to MCRC's data collection process that could contribute to overall program improvement.

CCJR recommends that MCRC continue to work toward an overall more consistent and reliable means of data collection

A number of fields and values in the *Informer* extract provided to CCJR were not clearly defined (e.g., literacy). Additionally, a majority of cells in numerous fields were not populated (e.g., homeless, prior substance abuse offense, and prior supervision violations, prior attempted treatments) and if they were, included invalid data and therefore a large percentage of "unknown" variables that significantly hampered the analysis. Specifically improving the quality and reliability of dates of participant progression through the three program phases could greatly enhance the Court's ability to evaluate success.

CCJR suggests that the *Informer* database is modified to allow for updates to key participant demographic variables that do not change original data provided at program entry

Another weakness of the data provided to CCJR was that a number of key *Informer* fields associated with demographic variables were updated following program entry. Such updates would cover educational attainment, employment status, and housing—factors considered key to successful reentry—as well as dates associated with each event.

CCJR recommends that MCRC consider collecting additional data points

MCRC provided CCJR with new offense data, but did not include dates of re-arrest. The latter would be crucial to any future analysis of recidivism among program participants. CCJR also suggests that MCRC consider ensuring the collection of data related to prior substance use (frequency, substance of choice), information regarding re-incarceration, technical violations, drug relapse following program completion, as well as specific treatment programs and/or other services offered to participants.

Conclusions

Due to various issues regarding the quality and reliability of data provided to CCJR, a comprehensive analysis of program components and participant progress that would result in definitive conclusions about program operation, trends, and outcomes was not feasible. Some preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the baseline assessment. While it may simply be a factor of better-recording keeping, it appears that the Salinas Court is applying sanctions and offering incentives more intensely to participants, than the previous court did. This would certainly contribute to fulfilling the reentry court mission of providing intensive criminal justice supervision. The analysis also bears out anecdotal reports from MCRC staff that a key program component and assessment tool—drug testing—has become more streamlined and thus more consistent and efficient.

|



INDIANA UNIVERSITY PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE

334 North Senate Avenue, Suite 300 | Indianapolis, IN 46204 | Phone 317.261.3000 | Fax 317.261.3050 | www.criminaljustice.iupui.edu



**SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND
ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS**

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
IUPUI