

4/3/85

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
RICHMOND  
1984**

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by  
Virginia Criminal Justice Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary . . . . .	1 - iv
<b>NCJRS</b>	
I. Introduction/Papis Projects . . . . .	1
OAR-PAPIS . . . . .	NOV 14 1984 2
Virginia CARES Post-Release <b>ACQUISITIONS</b> . . . . .	5
Virginia CARES Pre-Release . . . . .	9
General Conclusions and Recommendations Services . . . . .	10
II. Analysis of Virginia CARES Impact on Recidivism . . . . .	15
Characteristics of Virginia CARES Participants . . . . .	16
Virginia CARES Recidivism Data . . . . .	18
Characteristics of Comparison Group . . . . .	25
Comparison Group Recidivism . . . . .	28
Comparative Analysis . . . . .	34
Conclusions . . . . .	39
III. Appendices . . . . .	40

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1982 Virginia General Assembly budgeted \$500,000 for the 82-84 biennium to provide pre- and post-release services to offenders who were being released from Virginia jails and state correctional institutions. The funds were provided to assist ex-offenders in their transition between incarceration and returning to society in order to reduce the recidivism of program participants. Two organizations were awarded funds, Offender Aid and Restoration, Inc. (OAR) and Virginia Community Re-Entry System (VIRGINIA CARES). VIRGINIA OAR was chosen to provide services to the jail prisoners being released in the metropolitan Richmond. VIRGINIA CARES was chosen to provide services to felons released from state institutions in four VIRGINIA CARES' sites--Fairfax, Norfolk, Richmond and Roanoke.

The services provided to the clients in each program include pre- and post-release services which prepare them for release and provide services, such as counseling, referral for services, and employment assistance in the community.

The present evaluation was completed by the Department of Criminal Justice Services with assistance in obtaining data from both the Department of Corrections and the Virginia State Police. The evaluation consists of two major components. The first component provides a general description of both the OAR program and the VIRGINIA CARES program. Information is also provided on the number of clients and the types of services provided during the initial year of funding and an identification of any problems encountered. Data for this component were provided by the programs.

During the first year of funding, OAR of Richmond interviewed 877 misdemeanants and 313 felons and informed them of their services. A total of 1,732 services was requested. Thirty Pre-release Orientation Groups were held with 103 individuals completing the sessions. Forty-four (44) Family Life Groups were held with 30 individuals completing the sessions. The major problem OAR experienced was gaining access to and getting requests from the inmates in the Chesterfield jail. Both Richmond and Henrico jail staff appear to have been very cooperative.

During the first year of funding VIRGINIA CARES provided post-release services to 515 ex-offenders, exceeding their objective by 115. The majority of the ex-offenders receiving services were black (69.7%) and male (92.8%). The majority (72%) were on parole. The district probation and parole officers were the most frequent source of referrals to VIRGINIA CARES (45.4%). The overall percentage of successful employment placements was approximately 20.5%.

Additional funds provided to VIRGINIA CARES also enabled them to provide pre-release services during a six-month period. During this time 287 offenders were enrolled in the pre-release groups. Of this number, 238 completed the sessions. However, only 52 were actually released.

A number of issues in the VIRGINIA CARES program was apparent and centered around the need for greater cooperation between the Department of Corrections and VIRGINIA CARES, the definition of the targeted clients, the provision of unique services and the development of a client management system. Recommendations are included in the report.

The second major component of the report deals with VIRGINIA CARES' impact on recidivism. This is accomplished by comparing 177 VIRGINIA CARES' clients who were paroled during July 1, 1981 through December 1982 with a randomly selected group of 201 offenders paroled to the localities served by VIRGINIA CARES during the same time period. The data were provided by the Department of Corrections. The majority of both groups were black and males with a very similar median age (VIRGINIA CARES, 27.9 years and the comparison group 27.1 years). The majority of both groups were not married and had a similar educational background. Approximately half of each group had been paroled after serving time for a property offense. The majority of both groups had no prior commitments. Approximately half of both groups had no prior felony convictions.

Four measures of recidivism were analyzed. The first measure was any rearrest following parole. Approximately thirty percent (29.9%) of the VIRGINIA CARES clients were rearrested for either a felony or a misdemeanor while 38.8% of the comparison group were rearrested. This difference in recidivism rates is not statistically significant and may have occurred through chance. However, the difference may indicate a trend. The second measure of recidivism is defined as a felony rearrest. Approximately twenty percent (20.3%) of the VIRGINIA CARES clients were rearrested on felony charges while approximately twenty-eight percent (27.9%) of the comparison group were rearrested. Again this measure of recidivism is not statistically significant.

The third measure of recidivism used is any new conviction after parole. Approximately twelve percent (11.9%) of VIRGINIA CARES clients had a new conviction while 25.9% of the comparison group had a new conviction. This relationship is statistically significant indicating that the program participants have a lower recidivism rate than the comparison group.

The final measure of recidivism is a new felony conviction. Only 3.4% of the program participants had new felony convictions while 11.9% of the comparison group had new felony convictions. Again, this relationship is statistically significant indicating that the program participants do have a lower recidivism rate when defined as a new felony conviction.

The lack of statistically significant relationships in the measures of recidivism based on rearrest suggest some need for further study. One would assume that if the actual program services had an impact on recidivism that all four measures would clearly show this. However, this is not the case. There may be some intervening variables which account for the differential recidivism rates as measured by reconviction. For example, VIRGINIA CARES' clients may have better access to legal representation, or VIRGINIA CARES' staff may intervene on behalf of their clients. Income has been shown to

affect the type of legal representation retained and this has been shown to affect the court disposition. Income and the type of legal council were not variables in the present study. Thus, without further study, it is impossible to conclude unequivocally that VIRGINIA CARES' clients have lower recidivism rates than those not exposed to the program.

At first glance, it would appear that VIRGINIA CARES does indeed have an impact on recidivism defined as a reconviction. However, this conclusion must be tempered by the knowledge from the multivariate analysis findings presented in the report. These findings indicate that knowledge of whether a parolee is in VIRGINIA CARES or in the comparison group, plus knowledge of other theoretical relevant variables, does not increase the ability to predict their success or failure in terms of recidivism.

The conclusions in the report should be considered with some qualifications. The most important perhaps is that a longer follow-up period is suggested. The longer follow-up period would increase the number of cases in the analysis and would provide an increased confidence in the results of the recidivism study.

#### FOUR MEASURES OF RECIDIVISM

<u>Type</u>	<u>VA. CARES GROUP</u>	<u>CONTROL GROUP</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
Rearrest Following Parole	29.9%	38.8%	Not statistically significant
Felony Rearrest	20.3%	27.9%	Not statistically significant
New Convictions After Parole	11.9%	25.9%	Statistically significant
New Felony Convictions	3.4%	11.9%	Statistically significant

## Introduction

Many ex-prisoners find difficulty in re-adjusting to society upon release. Their expectations concerning their release may be unrealistic and they may find that much change has taken place while they were incarcerated. In addition the family support system may no longer be intact and many of the same problems, such as lack of education and job skills, that may have helped to precipitate their earlier involvement in crime may still exist. Without preparation for their release and without supportive follow-up services the ex-prisoner may find a source of support on the street and may turn again to crime.

The 1982 Virginia General Assembly budgeted \$500,000 for the 82-84 biennium to provide Pre and Post release services (PAPIS) to offenders who have been incarcerated in Virginia jails and state institutions. These funds were provided to assist ex-offenders in their transition between incarceration and returning to society in order to reduce the recidivism of program participants.

The Department of Criminal Justice Services was named by the Assembly to administer and supervise the contracting of PAPIS. The Department issued requests for proposals in May, 1982. Eight (8) proposals were received and two proposals were chosen for funding. The projects are the Virginia Community Action Re-Entry System (Virginia CARES) and the Offender Aid and Restoration of Richmond, Inc. (OAR). Virginia CARES was selected to provide services to felons released from state institutions because of their past experience in service provision to the targeted clients and their use of an existing network of four of the twenty-eight community action agencies which had provided similar services under previous funding initiatives. OAR was chosen to provide services to the jail prisoners being released in the metropolitan Richmond area which also includes Chesterfield and Henrico Counties. The Richmond site for jail inmates was selected because of the large number of inmates serving sentences in the three localities. In addition OAR

of Richmond, Inc. had experience in providing services to ex-offenders and their families. The targeted clients for Va. CARES services are felons released from state institutions, therefore there is no overlap in services provided by Virginia CARES at the Richmond site and OAR of Richmond.

## OAR-PAPIS

On July 1, 1982 OAR of Richmond was awarded \$75,000 for the first year of the biennium to provide pre and post - release services to jail inmates in Richmond, Henrico and Chesterfield.

The Richmond OAR-PAPIS contract fully funds three positions. The positions are Program Supervisor, Jail Services Coordinator and Office Manager. In addition twenty percent (20%) of the OAR Director's salary is paid by PAPIS funds. Volunteers are also utilized for some client services. A breakdown of the total OAR-PAPIS budget for the initial year of funding from July 1, 1982 thru June 30, 1983 is provided in Appendix A.

During the FY 82-83 a total of 877 misdemeanants and 313 felons were interviewed in the jail and informed of the services of the OAR program. Of the total (1190) interviewed the following services were requested:

<u>Service Requests</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Pre-release Orientation	202	11.7
Family Life Groups	111	6.4
One to one Volunteers	61	3.5
Information	496	28.6
Job Assistance	110	6.4
Housing Assistance	84	4.8
Agency Referral	88	5.1
Client Services	443	25.6
Clothing	49	2.8
Substance Abuse	88	5.1
	1732	100%

Two major components of the pre-release or in-jail services are Pre-release Orientation Groups and Family Life Groups. The Pre-Release Orientation covers such areas as parole obligations and services, job finding and retention, family and personal expectations, community resources, consumer education, housing and the use of drugs and alcohol. One-hundred and three (103) individuals completed the pre-release orientation. The Family Life Groups are held in the jail for the inmates and groups are held in the community for the families. The Family Life Group covers such areas as self-worth, communication, decision-making, budgeting, alcohol and drugs and sexual relations. Ninety (90) individuals participated in the Family Life Groups with thirty (30) individuals completing the group sessions.

During the year the following in-jail services were provided:

In Jail Services Provided

Pre-release Orientation	groups	30
	individuals participated	148
	individuals completed	103
Family Life Groups	groups	44
	individuals participated	90
	individuals completed	30
	one to one volunteers	29
	Information	377
	Job Assistance	75
	Housing Assistance	53
	Agency Referral	52
	Client Services	305
	(Includes Post Release)	
	Clothing	37
	Substance Abuse	138

During the initial in-jail interview one hundred-six (106) inmates requested post-release services during the year. Sixty-seven (67) actually contacted OAR following release. Approximately twenty-four percent (16) of these ex-prisoners requesting job assistance with OAR of Richmond were successfully placed. The following additional referrals were made in the post-release program:

Referrals for Services

Housing	8
Substance Abuse	24
Mental Health	3
Public Health	4
Public Assistance	13
Other	8

Unfortunately, the OAR program has experienced some problems in gaining access to and getting requests from the inmates in the Chesterfield jail. The Richmond and Henrico jail staff appear to have been very cooperative with the OAR staff. Had the cooperation in the Chesterfield Jail been better, the total number of offenders served would have been larger.

# Virginia CARES Post Release

Virginia CARES, Inc. was originally funded for \$175,000 for the first year of the biennium to provide post-release services to ex-prisoners returning to the Fairfax, Norfolk, Richmond and Roanoke areas. Specially trained transition specialists operating within Community Action Programs in the four localities provide job counseling, employment assistance, referral for housing and other supportive rehabilitative services to released ex-offenders. The projected number of released offenders to be served during the contract period was 400. However Virginia CARES exceeded this by 115 for a total of 515 ex-offenders. The majority of the ex-offenders receiving services were black (69.7%) and male (92.8%). Table 1 and Table 2 depict the race and sex of participants in each locality.

TABLE 1

Race of Virginia CARES Clients by Locality				
	Fairfax	Norfolk	Richmond	Roanoke
White	53.5%	11.6%	8.4%	53.8%
Black	43.7%	88.4%	91.6%	44.9%
Other	2.8%	0 %	0 %	1.3%
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
	(71)	(155)	(131)	(158)

TABLE 2

Sex of Virginia CARES Clients by Locality				
	Fairfax	Norfolk	Richmond	Roanoke
Male	95.8%	91%	92.4%	93.7%
Female	4.2%	9%	7.6%	6.3%
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
	(71)	(155)	(131)	(158)

According to Virginia CARES records, the majority of all their entering clients were on parole (72%). Approximately twenty-eight percent of the total number of the clients served during the contract year were either on probation, suspended sentence or had completed a short sentence and were discharged. Table 3 depicts the current status of ex-offenders who were served in each locality during the contract year.

TABLE 3

Ex-offender Status by Locality				
	Fairfax	Norfolk	Richmond	Roanoke
Incarcerated	0%	0%	0%	0.6%
Parole	66.2%	63.9%	83.2%	73.4%
Probation	23.9%	27.7%	6.1%	10.8%
Suspended Sentence	9.9%	8.4%	10.7%	15.2%
	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Virginia CARES records indicate that the District Probation and Parole offices were the most frequent source of referral to Virginia CARES (45.4%). Table 4 depicts the source of referral for Virginia CARES clients in each of the PAPIS funded locations.

TABLE 4				
Source of Referral by Locality				
	Fairfax	Norfolk	Richmond	Roanoke
Pre-Release	11.3%	5.8%	3.1%	3.8%
Probation/ Parole	53.5%	68.4%	34.4%	28.4%
Walk-in Friend or Client	5.6%	10.3%	28.2%	13.3%
Drug Treatment	0 %	2.6%	.7%	0 %
Other	29.6%	12.9%	33.6%	54.4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(71)	(155)	(131)	(158)

Under the PAPIS contract Virginia CARES provided five services to ex-offenders. These services included counseling, referral to temporary housing, general referrals to jobs and other rehabilitative/assistance services and an employment assistance program. Table 5 depicts the number of clients receiving the first four more general services in each locality and Table 6 depicts the number of clients enrolled in the Employment Assistance program and the rate of successful placement.

TABLE 5				
Number of Clients Receiving Contract Services				
	Fairfax	Norfolk	Richmond	Roanoke
Counseling	30	154	131	76
Referral to Temporary Housing	5	9	12	38
Job Referrals	31	31	0	90
Referral to Other Rehab./Assistance Services	9	59	87	122

TABLE 6				
Number of Clients Receiving Employment Assistance				
	Fairfax	Norfolk	Richmond	Roanoke
Number Seeking Employment	71	139	123	154
Number Employed	28	18	36	18
Approximate Average Hourly Wage	\$4.44	\$3.50	\$3.93	\$6.98 *
Number Provided Training/Education	0	3	7	16

\* This number is somewhat inflated by one individual with a starting salary of over \$13.00.



The overall percentage of successful employment placements is approximately 20.5 percent. The rate varies from 39.4 percent successful in Fairfax to 11.7 percent successful in Roanoke.

#### Virginia Cares Pre-release

Beginning in January, 1983 Virginia CARES was awarded an additional \$75,000 through Criminal Justice Services from the Department of Corrections budget to provide pre-release services to offenders in institutions around the four Papis post-release sites. These sites were chosen because the Virginia CARES structure was already in place to accomplish this and with the post-release sites in place, released offenders could be provided transition through the follow-up services of the post-release program therefore gaining maximum benefit of the Virginia CARES Services. During the six month period from January 1, 1983 thru June 30, 1983, 287 offenders were enrolled for pre-release orientation sessions which cover such topics as parole regulations, finding a job, family relations, budgeting, etc. The majority of the enrollees were male (93.7%) and black (59.2%). Of the total number, 238 completed the sessions. This exceeds the projected number of one hundred-fifty (150). However, only 52 were actually released and only 33 were released to a locality which has post-release services.

The budget presented in Appendix B summarizes the costs associated with the Virginia CARES pre-release and post-release program. The average cost per client for Virginia CARES post-release services was \$ 340.00 during the first Papis contract year. The average cost for client in the Virginia CARES Pre-release Program was \$ 315.00 during the six months of project operations for those completing the program. However if the cost per client is calculated on those clients who received the pre-release services and were then released during the contract period, the cost per client increases dramatically to \$1,442.00.

#### General Conclusions and Recommendations Regarding Services

During the first year of Papis funding OAR of Richmond and Virginia CARES have provided much needed services to jail and state institution inmates. Both programs have exceeded the projected number of clients for the year. Both programs have also encountered some problems. OAR has encountered problems with accessing clients in the Chesterfield Jail. Both the Henrico and Richmond Jail staff appear to cooperate well with OAR staff. However the Pre-release groups and the Family Life groups have experienced some problems with inmates being released before completing the program. Adjustments in the length of pre-release sessions have helped to alleviate this problem. The Family-Life Groups in the community for ex-inmates and their families have experienced some problems attracting participants. Initially the Family Life Curriculum was developed for use with the male offenders which required changes to make it relevant to the female offender. OAR has also been instrumental in developing groups within the jails to deal with substance abuse.

According to Virginia CARES records, the majority of the clients receiving post-release services indicate that they are on parole. However, from reviewing Virginia CARES records, it is apparent that a number were paroled for some time before contacting Virginia CARES for assistance. Also a number of Virginia CARES clients are on probation and may have never been incarcerated. These clients along with clients who serve short jail sentences or who have suspended sentences may indeed be in need of services however, they should not be the targeted group and should not be served to the detriment of state felons released from jails and state institutions. If Virginia CARES is to maximize its service potential and

have the greatest impact on recidivism, then an offender should obtain post-release services immediately upon release. The primary focus of the program should be on the transition period between incarceration and positive reinvolvement in the outside world.

For this to be accomplished, a number of problems need to be resolved. First of all a very positive cooperative relationship between Virginia CARES and the Probation and Parole officers must be developed. At present the percentage of all referrals coming from Probation and Parole officers is only about 45.4%. In Richmond and Roanoke the percentage is even smaller (34.4% and 28.5% respectively). The total number of clients served in Fairfax is low, however Probation and Parole referred 53.5% of the clients. Interviews with Probation and Parole officers in the four localities revealed some problem areas that need to be addressed. All the officers interviewed indicated that they frequently refer parolees to Virginia CARES for emergency services particularly food and housing. Each indicated that Virginia CARES had useful contacts and funds (not PAPIS) to provide emergency short term help. Employment assistance was another frequent reason for referral.

Two of the officers interviewed expressed concern over the quality of services provided by Virginia CARES. One mentioned the large amount of paperwork and the lack of time for services while another indicated that their office was still assessing the quality of service. Another indicated that there were no unique services provided, just a duplication of probation and parole services. One indicated that since probation and parole officers are using the same community resources then why refer to a third party. A probation and parole officer explained that the small number of referrals to

Virginia CARES reflected the fact that the locality had many other services available. One Chief Probation and Parole officer expressed concern over a lack of emphasis on developing the ex-offenders' self-sufficiency. The respondents generally noted Virginia CARES enthusiasm in providing services to ex-offenders.

The Virginia CARES services most often mentioned as reasons for the initial referral were emergency housing and food which is not funded by PAPIS. July 1, 1983 Department of Corrections funds were made available to three of the four probation and parole offices in PAPIS locations to allow for the purchase of emergency housing and food. Under the current program structure this will probably further decrease the probation and parole referrals to Virginia CARES.

In order to resolve these problems a number of changes may be required. First of all clients entering the Virginia CARES program have available to them a number of services including short term emergency services and more long term services such as Employment Assistance and Counseling. The level of involvement with Virginia CARES varies from a simple referral to long term counseling and employment assistance. The program should be restructured in such a way as to enable the program to easily identify clients who received long term intensive treatment and those who received short term emergency referral. The new case management system developed with the assistance of Criminal Justice Services may alleviate this problem. At present Virginia CARES counts as equal a client who receives single or multiple referrals for emergency services and a client who has had extensive counseling and assistance in job placement and self sufficiency.

The lack of distinction between the long term and short term client makes an analysis of program success problematic. Although the provision of short term referral services is a valuable service to the clients, the present program structure makes a definition of program success and termination difficult. To deal with this the short term information and referral only clients should be maintained separately and each case should be considered closed when the referral is made and followed-up. Counseling and Employment Assistance should also be separate identifiable components. Each should have objectives and a treatment/action plan developed with the client. At present a treatment plan is not developed. Having a treatment plan that can be shared with the Probation and Parole officer could be a benefit to the relationship with Probation and Parole but also prove beneficial to the client.

In addition, the formal referral process from Probation and Parole to Virginia CARES should be maintained and further developed. A Probation and Parole officer should refer a client to Virginia CARES for an identified specific service. Progress reports should be regularly made to the officer and frequent contacts between Virginia CARES and the Parole Officer should be maintained so that assistance to the client is seen as a cooperative and not an adversary effort.

Further development and promotion of special services such as the Employment Assistance Program and the Counseling Program which are viewed as unique to Virginia CARES is very important since many of the other services provided are similar to parole services. Having more recognizable special services available at Virginia CARES would be likely to increase the number of referrals from Probation and Parole.

Another related problem that needs to be addressed is the referral to pre-release services in the institution. At present a large number of individuals who are referred to Virginia CARES for pre-release services are not released soon after completion of the program, or the client may be released to a site without post-release services. Given that pre-release and post-release services are not systematically available to all statewide it is important to insure that only individuals whose release is imminent be referred for services. In addition preference at this point in time should be given to offenders who will return to localities with post-release services. Again this requires the cooperation between Virginia CARES and the Department of Corrections.

#### ANALYSIS OF VIRGINIA CARES' IMPACT ON RECIDIVISM

In order to determine Virginia CARES' impact on recidivism an analysis of Virginia CARES' clients who were paroled from state correctional institutions during the time period from July, 1981 thru December, 1982 was undertaken. This time period was chosen versus the time period covered by PAPIS funding because of the need for a longer follow-up period. Clients being released on parole were chosen instead of all clients because newly released state felons are the targeted client group. By focusing on this group it will be possible to make comparisons to parolees who were released during the same time period but were not involved in Virginia CARES. The data available on both parolees in Virginia CARES and non-Virginia CARES parolees makes possible a determination of how the two groups differ in terms of demographics, and prior criminal records as well as recidivism.

In order to complete the report, Criminal Justice Services requested that the Department of Corrections provide information on inmates released on parole to the four PAPIS sites released on parole during the time period of July 1, 1981 thru December 31, 1982. As a result of the request the Department of Corrections produced a printout containing a total of 2,030 parolees. The printout was taken to the Virginia CARES office in Roanoke where all Virginia CARES clients on the printout were identified. The following table shows the total number of parolees by location during this time period and the number of parolees that became Virginia CARES clients.

#### NUMBER OF PAROLEES AND VIRGINIA CARES CLIENTS

	<u>Fairfax</u>	<u>Norfolk</u>	<u>Richmond</u>	<u>Roanoke</u>
Total Paroled	395	433	862	340
Number of Virginia CARES clients	15 (3.8%)	55 (12.7%)	47 (5.5%)	60 (17.6%)

#### Characteristics of Virginia CARES Participants

A total of one hundred seventy-seven (177) parolees during this time period became clients of Virginia CARES. The majority of the clients were black (73.4%) and male (93.8%). Over half (77.7%) were single while (22.3%) were married.

Approximately one-third (34%) of the clients had an eighth grade education or less according to the Department of Corrections records. Approximately 53.7% of the clients had completed some high school while 8.6% had completed high school or received a GED. Less than four percent (3.7%) had completed some college. The vast majority (87.7%) were not high school graduates.

The age of Virginia CARES clients ranged from 18 to 65 years old. The median age was approximately 27.9 years.

The following table depicts the types of offenses that Virginia CARES clients had been serving time for prior to their release:

# VIRGINIA CARES CLIENTS' OFFENSES FOR COMMITMENT

## PRIOR TO PAROLE

<u>Offense</u>	<u>Percent of Clients</u>
Homicide	9.2%
Kidnapping	1.7%
Rape/Sexual Assault	5.8%
Robbery	18.2%
Assault	1.2%
Arson	1.7%
Burglary	28.8%
Larceny	12.6%
Vehicle Theft	2.9%
Forgery	2.3%
Fraud	1.2%
Stolen Property	.6%
Drugs	7.3%
Weapons	1.2%
Others	5.7%
TOTAL	100%

Approximately forty-eight percent (48%) of the clients were serving sentences for property crimes and approximately forty-one percent (41%) were serving sentences for crimes against persons. The remainder (10.8%) were serving sentences for drug convictions (7.3%) and other miscellaneous offenses.

Almost half (48.9%) of Virginia CARES clients had been convicted of felonies prior to the offense for which they were paroled. The numbers of prior felony offense convictions were from zero to eight. The following table depicts the number of prior felony offense convictions of Virginia CARES clients'.

## Virginia CARES Clients

### Prior Felony Offense Convictions

<u>No Prior Felony Convictions</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3 or more</u>
51.2%	22%	17.1%	9.8%
(84)	(36)	(28)	(16)

Most (72%) of the Virginia CARES clients had not been committed to the Department of Corrections prior to the most recent incarceration for which they were being paroled. Approximately eighteen percent (18%) had one prior commitment while almost 10% had multiple commitments.

## Virginia CARES Recidivism Data

The Virginia State Police assisted in determining the recidivism of Virginia CARES clients by providing updated criminal records for each client. From this information four measures of recidivism which vary according to the level of contact in the criminal justice system were developed. The first two measures of recidivism used in the analysis are any rearrest and a felony rearrest. Rearrest is a common measure of recidivism (Levin 1971, Waller 1974). The measurement of recidivism by rearrests has been criticized by many as being more of a measure of law enforcement response than criminal activity.

This is perhaps more true in lower level crimes for which law enforcement agencies periodically conduct mass arrests for specific categories of offenses such as drunk in public and prostitution. However there is little reason to assume that the criminal justice system would respond differently to Virginia CARES participants and non participants. Any error in measurement should have an equal effect on both groups. Another criticism of defining rearrest as recidivism relates to the concept of the assumption of guilt before a conviction.

The final two measures of recidivism are any reconviction and a felony reconviction. Again while reconviction is frequently used as a measure of recidivism (Glaser 1964, Greenberg 1975), using reconviction is also problematic. A lengthy follow-up period is usually required in order to have a large enough group of failures for analysis. In addition using reconviction of any offense does not address the seriousness of the offense. If however the interest in reconvictions is linked to an interest in reincarceration then a conviction for either a misdemeanor or a felony could result in a recommitment. For example, in FY 81-82, 717 paroles revoked for new felony and misdemeanor offenses. This total included a number of revocations for low level misdemeanor offenses such as drunk in public, disturbing the peace and damaging property.

In addition to the four recidivism measures previously mentioned, data on the current status of the Virginia CARES participants was collected from the Department of Corrections. From this data it is possible to determine the Virginia CARES clients' current confinement or parole status.

Measure #1: New Arrest

Of the one hundred seventy-seven program participants fifty-three (53) were arrested following their release on parole. The new arrests represented charges on 80 felony and 51 misdemeanor offenses. If the criterion of rearrest is used to define recidivism then approximately thirty percent (29.9%) of Virginia CARES clients were recidivist. Blacks had a somewhat higher percentage of rearrests than whites (32.3% compared to 23.4% rearrested) and the unmarried were also more likely to be rearrested than the married (31.2% and 22.2% respectively). As the following table depicts high school graduates and greater had a slightly lower percentage of rearrests (20%):

	Rearrests Following Release By Educations		
	8th Grade or Less	Some High School	High School Grad. +
Rearrested	29.1%	29.9%	20%
Not arrested	70.9%	70.1%	80%
	100%	100%	100%
	(55)	(87)	(20)

As much research has previously documented, those who have been convicted of prior property offenses were more likely to be rearrested. The other crimes "category", which includes drug related offenses had the lowest percentage of rearrests (16.7%). The following table confirms this relationship.

#### Rearrests After Release By Type of Prior Conviction

	Crimes Against Persons	Property Crimes	Other Crimes
Rearrested	22.9%	38.2%	16.7%
Not Arrested	77.1%	61.8%	83.3%
	100%	100%	100%
	(70)	(89)	(18)

Age appears to have been a significant variable in rearrest. Approximately 41% of the 18 to 27 year olds and only 18.4% of the 28 year olds and older were rearrested. Approximately 38% of the clients with prior felony convictions were rearrested, while 27% of the clients without prior felony convictions were rearrested.

#### Measure #2: New Felony Arrest

If recidivism is defined by a new felony arrest then thirty-six (36) of Virginia CARES clients were recidivists or 20.3%. Blacks, unmarried, those convicted of property offenses, those under the age of 28 and those with prior felony convictions were more likely to be arrested for a felony following their parole. The number of felony rearrests by educational level did not vary significantly.

#### Measure #3: New Conviction

Twenty-one (21) Virginia CARES clients were convicted for either a new felony or a new misdemeanor offense following their parole. Using this as a measure of recidivism produces a recidivism rate of 11.9%. The number of reconvictions for blacks and whites was very similar (11.5% and 12.8% respectively).

The percentage of new convictions for the married and unmarried group was also very similar (11.1% and 12.0% respectively). Approximately 10% of the clients completing some high school and the clients completing high school or higher were convicted, while 15% of the clients with eighth grade or less education were convicted of a new offense. Again, clients having a prior personal property conviction were more likely to be convicted of a new offense just as those under 28 years old were more likely to be reconvicted. Clients with a prior felony conviction had a higher new conviction rate than those without a felony conviction before the offense for which they were on parole (16.3% compared to 9.5%).

#### Measure #4: New Felony Conviction

According to Virginia State Police records only six (6) of the one hundred seventy-seven Virginia CARES clients were reconvicted of a felony. This produces a failure or recidivism rate of approximately 3.4%. Further statistical analysis of the recidivism is limited because of the small number of cases. The judicial process that ends in a conviction is sometimes lengthy and thus limits the actual number of convictions in a short follow-up period.

The short follow-up period ranging from six to approximately twenty-four months in the present study is problematic and limits the conclusions that can be reached based on the data. This is particularly true for the felony reconviction data. With the overall small number of individuals being reconvicted of a felony it is difficult to analyze and control for other variables that may effect recidivism. In addition, the short follow-up time does not allow an analysis of the potential long term treatment effect of a program like Virginia CARES. With a longer follow-up period an initial

difference between the Virginia CARES group and the comparison group's recidivism may disappear or the difference may become more evident. With these types of problems in mind the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973) has recommended a minimum of three years of follow-up in recidivism studies. This is supported by Waldo and Griswold (1979) after reviewing various issues in the measurement of recidivism.

#### Current Status of Virginia CARES Participants

If recidivism is considered to be a return commitment then a new conviction of a felony while on parole would generally lead to a return to an institution. However using a new conviction as a determinant of recidivism masks the actual number of return commitments due to technical parole violations and alleged felony offenses that are not convicted. To obtain a more comprehensive view of return commitments as a measure of recidivism the Department of Corrections provided data on the current status of all the inmates who were paroled during the time period of interest. The following table depicts the current status (June 1983) of the Virginia CARES client group:

Current Department of Corrections  
Status of Virginia CARES

On Parole	Fugitive From Parole	Currently* Incarcerated	Successfully Released from Parole	Deceased
96	6	11	63	1

\* These individuals had a current status that implied an in-house classification such as transferred to isolation, returned from parole, returned to general population etc.

Eleven of the Virginia CARES clients were classified as a part of the institutional population. If this is used as a recidivism measure then the rate is approximately 6.2%. Generally as the recidivism measure used penetrates the criminal justice system further the number of recidivists decreases. In this case using the actual returns to the institution increased the rate of recidivism because the technical parole violators were included.

It is also possible that a parolee may have been returned and been discharged or paroled again prior to the date when the current status was determined. Since the maximum follow-up period is under two years this probably did not occur in many cases. Six clients were listed as fugitives from parole and depending upon the definition of recidivism could have been classified as failures.

Overall the recidivism rate for Virginia CARES' clients ranges from approximately 30% with recidivism defined as a new arrest to 3.4% for a new felony conviction. The clients who most frequently became recidivists were generally the young, the black, the unmarried, those who had prior felony convictions and those who had been paroled after being convicted of a property crime. Education did not appear to be as important a part in determining recidivism.



### Comparison Group Analysis

The comparison group consists of two hundred and one (201) offenders paroled during the same time period as the VIRGINIA CARES clients--July 1, 1981 through December 30, 1982. The group was systematically selected with a random start from the Department of Corrections printout previously referenced. The comparison group did not obtain the services of the VIRGINIA CARES. The following table shows the total number of parolees, the total number that became VIRGINIA CARES clients, and the number from each locality in the comparison group.

<u>Number of Parolees, VIRGINIA CARES Clients, Comparison Group</u>				
	<u>Fairfax</u>	<u>Norfolk</u>	<u>Richmond</u>	<u>Roanoke</u>
Total Paroled	395	433	862	340
VIRGINIA CARES	15	55	47	60
Comparison Group	20	66	53	62

### Characteristics of the Comparison Group Participants

The majority of the comparison group were black (57.2%) and male (93.5%). The majority (83%) were single, while approximately seventeen percent (17%) were married.

Approximately forty percent (39.5%) had an eighth grade education or less according to Department of Corrections records. Approximately forty-one percent (40.7%) had completed some high school while 19.8% had completed high school or beyond. The vast majority (80.2%) were not high school graduates.

The age of the comparison group ranged from 17 to 71 years old. The median age was approximately 27.1 years.

The following table depicts the types of offenses for which the comparison group participants had been serving time prior to their release: —

<u>COMPARISON GROUPS' OFFENSES FOR COMMITMENT PRIOR TO PAROLE</u>	
<u>OFFENSE</u>	<u>PERCENT OF GROUP</u>
HOMICIDE	3.5 %
SEXUAL ASSAULT	1.5 %
ROBBERY	19.5 %
ASSAULT	2.0 %
ARSON	.5 %
BURGLARY	27.5 %
LARCENY	12.5 %
VEHICLE THEFT/TAMPERING	1.0 %
FORGERY	4.0 %
FRAUD	2.0 %
STOLEN PROPERTY	1.5 %
DRUGS	14.0 %
OTHER SEXUAL OFFENSES	1.0 %
WEAPONS	1.5 %
OTHERS	8.0 %

Fifty percent (50%) of the clients were serving sentences for property crimes and twenty-eight percent (28%) were serving sentences for crimes against persons. The remainder (22%) included drug convictions (14%) and other miscellaneous offenses.

Approximately half (50.3%) of the comparison group had been convicted of a felony prior to the offense for which they were paroled. The following table

depicts the number of prior felony offense convictions of the comparison group.

COMPARISON GROUP PRIOR FELONY OFFENSE CONVICTIONS			
NO PRIOR CONVICTION	ONE	TWO	THREE +
49.7%	22.3%	10.9%	17.1%
(96)	(43)	(21)	(33)

Most (70.1%) of the comparison group had not been committed to the Department of Corrections prior to the most recent incarceration for which they were being paroled.

When the characteristics of the non-VIRGINIA CARES comparison group are compared with the VIRGINIA CARES group, similarity in the two is apparent. In both the VIRGINIA CARES and the comparison group, the majority of the parolees were black males. However, the VIRGINIA CARES group has a slightly higher percentage of blacks than the comparison group--73.4% versus 57.2%. The majority in both groups were single.

The groups were similar in educational level with the majority of each having less than a high school diploma or GED. Approximately a third of each had eighth grade or less of education--VIRGINIA CARES 34%; Comparison Group 39.5%.

The age ranges for both groups were very similar with the median age for VIRGINIA CARES clients being 27.9 years and the median age for the comparison group being 27.1 years.

Approximately fifty percent of both groups had been serving time for a property offense at the time of parole. However, a higher percentage of VIRGINIA CARES clients had been serving sentences for crimes against persons prior to release (41% versus 28%). The comparison group had a higher percentage of drug offenders (14%) than VIRGINIA CARES (7.3%).

Approximately half of both the VIRGINIA CARES group and the comparison group had been convicted of prior felonies. The same approximate percentage in each group had been convicted of one, and the approximate same percentage had been convicted of two or more. However, if separate statistics are provided for two and three or more convictions, the comparison group was more likely to have three or more convictions (17.1% versus 9.8%). The majority of both the VIRGINIA CARES clients (72%) and the comparison group (70.1%) had not been incarcerated prior to the incarceration for which they were being paroled.

#### The Comparison Group's Recidivism

Data on four measures of recidivism were provided by the State Police on the comparison group. The first two measures of recidivism used in the analysis are any rearrest and a felony rearrest. The second two measures are any reconviction and any felony reconviction. These are the same measures used in the analysis of VIRGINIA CARES clients' recidivism and provide for a comparison of the two groups with the same qualifications addressed earlier.

### Measure No. 1: New Arrest

Of the two hundred and one (201) comparison group participants, seventy-eight (78) were arrested following their release on parole. The new arrests represented charges on 132 felony offenses and 106 misdemeanor offenses. If the criterion of any rearrest is used as the measure of recidivism, then approximately thirty-nine percent (38.8%) of the comparison group were recidivists. Blacks had a somewhat higher percentage of rearrests than whites (40.9% compared to 35.3%) and the unmarried were somewhat more likely to be rearrested than the married (40.4% and 33.3% respectively). Educational level did not appear to be a factor in rearrest in the comparison group.

Comparison group parolees who had been previously incarcerated on a property offense were more likely to be rearrested. The following table confirms this relationship.

COMPARISON GROUP REARRESTS AFTER RELEASE BY TYPE OF PRIOR CONVICTION			
	CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS	PROPERTY CRIMES	OTHER CRIMES
Rearrested	28.6%	48%	31.8%
Not Arrested	<u>71.4%</u>	<u>52%</u>	<u>68.2%</u>
	100 %	100 %	100 %
	(56)	(100)	(44)

Age did not appear to be a significant variable in rearrest. Approximately forty-one percent (40.5%) of the 18-through-27-year-olds were rearrested

while approximately thirty-seven (36.7%) of the 28-year-olds and older were rearrested.

### Measure No. 2: New Felony Arrest

If recidivism is defined by a new felony arrest, then approximately twenty-eight percent (27.9%) of the comparison group were recidivists. Neither race, marital status, education, age or prior commitments appeared to affect the likelihood of being rearrested for a felony. However, those with a prior commitment for a property offense were more likely to have a felony rearrest. The following table depicts this relationship:

FELONY REARRESTS	COMPARISON GROUP BY TYPE OF PRIOR CONVICTION		
	CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS	PROPERTY CRIMES	OTHER CRIMES
Rearrested	19.6%	37%	18.2%
Not Arrested	<u>80.4%</u>	<u>63%</u>	<u>81.8%</u>
	100 %	100 %	100 %
	(56)	(100)	(44)

In addition, those with prior felony convictions were more likely to be arrested for a felony following their parole.

### Measure No. 3: New Conviction

Fifty-two (52) of the comparison group were convicted for either a new felony or a new misdemeanor offense following their parole. Using this as a

measure of recidivism produces a recidivism rate of 25.9%. Blacks were only slightly more likely to have a new conviction than whites (29.6% and 21.2% respectively).

The unmarried were slightly more likely to have a new conviction (28.1% compared to 20.0%). Approximately twenty-six percent (25.8%) of those with eighth grade or less education were convicted, while 20.6% of those with some high school were convicted and 24.2% of those completing high school or more were convicted. Again in the comparison group, participants having a prior personal property conviction were more likely to be convicted of a new offense. Those in the 18-to-27-year-old group were only slightly more likely to have a new conviction than the 28-year-old-and-older group (27.9% compared to 23.3%). The reconviction of comparison group members having a prior felony conviction was basically similar to those with no prior felony conviction (27.8% compared to 26%). Comparison group members with prior Department of Corrections commitments were somewhat more likely to have a new conviction following their parole (34% compared to 24.1%).

#### Measure No. 4: New Felony Conviction

According to Virginia State Police records, twenty-four (24) of the comparison group had a new conviction for a felony. Using this as a measure of recidivism produces a recidivism rate of 11.9%. The younger, unmarries with less education who previously were committed to the Department of Corrections for a property offense were somewhat more likely to be convicted for a new felony following their parole. Race did not appear to be a factor with 11.8% of the whites having a new felony conviction and 12.2% of the blacks

having a new felony conviction.

The same concerns and recommendations regarding the measurement of recidivism addressed earlier in the discussion of the VIRGINIA CARES clients applies equally to the comparison group analysis.

#### Current Status of the Comparison Group Participants

The Department of Corrections provided data on the current status of all inmates who were paroled during the time period of interest. The following table depicts the current status (June, 1983) of the comparison group.

CURRENT DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS STATUS OF COMPARISON GROUP				
ON PAROLE	FUGITIVE FROM PAROLE	CURRENTLY * INCARCERATED	SUCCESSFULLY RELEASED FROM PAROLE	DECEASED
78	10	26	84	3

\* These individuals had a current status that implied in-house classification, such as transferred to isolation, returned from parole, returned to general population, etc.

Twenty-six of the comparison group were classified as a part of the institutional population. If this is used as a recidivism measure, then the rate is approximately 12.9%. Ten of the comparison group were classified as fugitives from parole and, depending upon the definition of recidivism, could be classified as failures.

Overall the recidivism rate for the comparison group ranges from approximately 40% for any new arrests to 11.9% for a new felony conviction. The following table summarizes the overall similar characteristics of the comparison group.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND PRIOR RECORD CHARACTERISTICS			
VIRGINIA CARES		COMPARISON GROUP	
SEX		SEX	
Male	93.8%	Male	93.5%
Female	6.2%	Female	6.5%
RACE		RACE	
White	26.6%	White	42.3%
Black	73.4%	Black	57.2%
Other	0.0%	Other	.5%
MEDIAN AGE	27.9 Yrs.	MEDIAN AGE	27.1 Yrs.
MARITAL STATUS		MARITAL STATUS	
Not married	77.6%	Not Married	83%
Married	22.4%	Married	17%
EDUCATION		EDUCATION	
8th Grade/less	34%	8th grade/less	39.5%
Some High School	53.7%	Some High School	40.7%
High School grad and greater	12.3%	High School grad and greater	19.8%
PRIOR OFFENSE FOR INCARCERATION		PRIOR OFFENSE FOR INCARCERATION	
Personal Crime	39.5%	Personal Crime	28.0%
Property Crime	50.3%	Property Crime	50.0%
Other Crime	10.2%	Other Crime	22.0%
PRIOR COMMITMENTS		PRIOR COMMITMENTS	
None	72.0%	None	72.7%
One or more	28.0%	One or more	27.3%
PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS		PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS	
None	51.2%	None	49.7%
One	22.0%	One	29.5%
Two or more	26.8%	Two or more	20.7%

### The Recidivism Rates of VIRGINIA CARES and The Comparison Group

The following tables depict the statistical comparison of the recidivism rates of VIRGINIA CARES clients and the comparison group on the four measures of recidivism.

RECIDIVISM AS ANY REARREST BY GROUP			
	NO REARREST	REARREST	
Comparison Group	61.2%	38.8%	(100%) 201
VIRGINIA CARES	70.1%	29.9%	(100%) 177
	TOTAL		378

$X^2 = 2.885$  with 1 degree of freedom

Level of statistical significance  $> .05$

The level of statistical significance is not within the accepted .05 level of significance indicating that the difference in the recidivism rates may have occurred through chance. The apparent difference in the actual recidivism rate may indicate a trend. However, the difference is not statistically significant.

RECIDIVISM AS A FELONY REARREST BY GROUP			
	NO REARREST	REARREST	
Comparison Group	72.1%	27.9%	(100%) 201
VIRGINIA CARES	79.7%	20.3%	(100%) 177
	TOTAL		378

$X^2 = 2.49758$  with 1 degree of freedom

Level of statistical significance  $> .05$

Again, the level of statistical significance is not within the .05 level of significance indicating that the difference in the recidivism rates may have occurred through chance. While the apparent difference in the actual recidivism rate may indicate a trend, the difference is not statistically significant.

RECIDIVISM AS A NEW CONVICTION BY GROUP			
	NO NEW CONVICTION	NEW CONVICTION	(100%)
Comparison Group	74.1%	25.9%	201
VIRGINIA CARES	88.1%	11.9%	177
	TOTAL		378

$X^2 = 10.9672$  with 1 degree of freedom

Level of statistical significance  $\leq .05$

The level of statistical significance is within the .05 level indicating that there is a statistically significant difference in the recidivism rates of VIRGINIA CARES and the comparison group. In this bivariate analysis, VIRGINIA CARES has an impact on recidivism as measured by reconviction and the apparent differences in recidivism did not occur by chance.

RECIDIVISM AS A NEW FELONY CONVICTION BY GROUP			
	NO NEW CONVICTION	NEW CONVICTION	(100%)
Comparison Group	88.1%	11.9%	201
VIRGINIA CARES	96.6%	3.4%	177
	TOTAL		378

$X^2 = 8.28372$  with 1 degree of freedom

Level of statistical significance  $\leq .05$

The level of statistical significance is within the .05 level indicating that there is a statistically significant difference in the recidivism rate of VIRGINIA CARES and the comparison group. This supports that VIRGINIA CARES has an impact on recidivism as measured by a felony reconviction and that the apparent difference in recidivism did not likely occur by chance.

SUMMARY		
RECIDIVISM RATES BY TYPE AND GROUP		
	VIRGINIA CARES	COMPARISON GROUP
ANY NEW ARREST	29.9%	38.8%
NEW FELONY ARREST	20.3%	27.9%
ANY NEW CONVICTION	11.9%	25.9% *
NEW FELONY CONVICTION	3.4%	11.9% *
CURRENTLY CONFINED	6.2%	12.9%
* Statistically significant at the .05 level		

The lack of a consistent statistically significant relationship between group membership and recidivism suggests a need for further study. Since both VIRGINIA CARES and the comparison group may be experiencing similar rearrest rates (i.e., not statistically significant), there may be some intervening variable which accounts for the statistically significant differential rates in new convictions. For example, one hypothesis to be examined may be that VIRGINIA CARES' clients may have access to better legal representation, or VIRGINIA CARES' staff may intervene on their behalf, thus affecting the case disposition. Information on income was not available in the present study. However, income has been shown to have a direct effect on the type of legal representation retained. In addition, previous studies have shown that there is a relationship between type of legal representation and the court disposition. Thus, without a further study elaborating this issue, it is not possible to conclude unequivocally that VIRGINIA CARES' clients behave any differently from those offenders who are not exposed to this program.

In addition to the bivariate analysis previously discussed, two multivariate analyses were completed. These involved multiple regression analysis and discriminant function analysis. The relationships found in the bivariate analysis were sustained in the multivariate analyses. However, the regression analysis also indicated that knowledge of relevant variables, such as an offender's age, race, marital status, education, prior commitments, felony convictions, and group membership, does not guarantee a large increase in predicting which offenders will and will not recidivate. At best, only nine percent (9%) of the variation in recidivism behavior could be explained by these factors.

Discriminant function analysis was also completed. In discriminant function analysis the purpose is to determine the impact of theoretically relevant variables in predicting success/failure or, in this case, recidivism. One assumes that there is a 50/50 probability of successfully predicting recidivism or lack of recidivism, given no other information. Discriminant function analysis provides predictive efficiency information when theoretically relevant variables related to the criterion variable (recidivism) in the study are known. The following relevant variables were used in this analysis:

Race

Age

Marital Status

Education

Offense

Prior Felony Convictions

Group Membership (VIRGINIA CARES/Comparison)

When these variables were used in the analysis, only a small improvement over a prediction based on chance occurred in determining whether someone would be a recidivist. The following table depicts the percent of successes/failures correctly predicted when using these variables and the amount of improvement over the chance prediction without knowing any of the relevant data. In addition, the table also shows the percent correctly predicted when the expected numbers of successes and failures are adjusted to the actual percentages of success/failure occurrences and also the percentage of improvement when the previously mentioned relevant variables are known.

CORRECT PREDICTIONS OF RECIDIVISM				
RECIDIVISM MEASURE	PERCENT CORRECTLY PREDICTED (GIVEN 50/50 PROBABILITY)	PERCENTAGE POINT IMPROVEMENT OVER 50/50 PROBABILITY	PERCENT CORRECTLY PREDICTED (GIVEN ADJUSTED PROBABILITIES)*	PERCENTAGE POINT IMPROVEMENT OVER ADJUSTED PROBABILITIES
REARREST	62.96%	+ 12.96%	65.66%	+ 1.01
FELONY REARREST	63.97%	+ 13.97%	76.09%	+ 0.67
RECONVICTION	61.28%	+ 11.28%	80.41%	+ 0.34
FELONY RECONVICTION	61.26%	+ 11.26%	90.91%	+ 0.00

\*Probabilities were adjusted in accordance with the frequency distribution of successes/failures obtained for each of the recidivism measures; for example, since 35% of all offenders were rearrested, the probabilities were adjusted from 50/50 to 65/35.

Although there is a difference in recidivism rates for the comparison group and VIRGINIA CARES, the discriminant function analysis shows that knowing group membership and other relevant variables does not dramatically improve the ability to predict whether an offender will become a recidivist.

The conclusions in the report should be considered with some qualifications. The most important perhaps is that a longer follow-up period is suggested. The longer follow-up period would increase the number of cases in the analysis and would provide increased confidence in the results. In addition, collecting other relevant data such as employment status, income level, and the type of legal representation in court for recidivists may also prove helpful in understanding VIRGINIA CARES' effect on recidivism.

APPENDICES



## APPENDIX A

OAR-PAPIS BUDGET  
July 1, 1982 thru June 30, 1983Salaries

OAR DIRECTOR at 20%	\$ 5,161.00
Supervisor	\$15,000.00
Jail Service Coordinator	\$12,500.00
Office Manager	\$10,500.00

<u>Fringe Benefits</u>	\$ 4,392.00
------------------------	-------------

<u>Employer Taxes</u>	\$ 3,448.00
-----------------------	-------------

\$51,001.00

<u>Travel</u>	\$ 1,915.00
---------------	-------------

\$ 1,915.00

Other Support Services Costs

Telephone	\$ 2,000
Postage	\$ 1,000
Rental Outside Printing	\$ 5,000
Outside Printing	\$ 1,000

\$ 9,000

Other Costs

Audit	\$ 2,000.00
Bookkeeping	\$ 2,623.00
Consultant Services	\$ 1,500.00
Professional Liability Insurance	\$ 950.00
Office Equipment	\$ 3,030.00
Repair/Maintenance of Equipment	\$ 500.00
Miscellaneous	\$ 500.00

\$11,103.00

TOTAL BUDGET \$74,993.00

## APPENDIX B

VIRGINIA CARES BUDGET  
Post Release (July 1, 1982 thru June 30, 1983)SALARIES

ANNUAL '82-'83

Executive Director	\$21,000	\$18,694
Business/Volunteer Coordinator	\$19,350	\$16,884
Senior Transition Specialist/Coordinator	\$16,500	\$14,416
Intake Referral/Data Management Specialist	\$10,450	\$ 9,260
Secretary/Bookkeeper	\$ 9,500	\$ 3,850
Fairfax Transition Specialist (F-cap)	\$13,000	\$13,000
	\$13,576	\$13,576
	\$10,510	\$10,510
	\$ 9,500	\$ 9,350

\$109,540

FRINGE

\$21,768

\$131,308

TRAVEL @20¢ per mile/\$75 per diem

\$ 14,902

\$14,902

SUPPLIES

\$ 3,492

\$ 3,492

OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES COSTS

Membership, Fees, Dues, etc.	\$ 950
Copying	\$2,135
Printing	\$ 26
Telephone	\$7,224
Postage	\$1,315
Rent	\$4,367
Computer Services for Case Management	\$1,097

\$17,111

EQUIPMENT

Typewriter Service Contract

\$ 94  
\$ 94OTHER COSTS

Audit

\$3,118

General Insurance

\$1,391

Computer Services for DCJS Reporting

\$1,094

\$ 5,603

CONTRACTED SERVICES

Computer Services

\$1,140

General Insurance and Bonding

\$1,350

\$ 2,490

Total Budget\$175,000Pre-Release (January 1, 1983 thru June 30, 1983)SALARIESANNUALJan. - June '83

2 Fairfax Pre-release Trainers

\$20,800

\$10,400

1 Richmond Pre-release Trainer

\$12,054

\$ 5,386

1 Richmond Pre-release Trainer

\$11,719

\$ 4,808

2 Norfolk Pre-release Trainers

\$19,038

\$ 9,519

2 Roanoke Pre-release Trainers

\$22,820

\$11,410

1 Clerk/Typist (Roanoke)

\$ 8,320

\$ 1,088

\$42,611

FRINGE

\$ 8,191

50,802

TRAVEL

@20¢ per mile/\$75 per diem

\$ 7,990

\$7,990

SUPPLIES

Participants/Office Supplies and Materials

\$ 1,936

\$1,936

OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES COSTS

Membership, Fees, Dues, etc.

\$ 460

Copy Costs

\$ 474

Printing

\$ 400

Phone

\$ 2,790

Postage

\$ 277

Rent

\$ 2,795

\$7,196

OTHER COSTS

Audit

\$ 518

General Insurance and Bonding

\$ 50

Supervisory Differential

\$ 1,147

Administrative Costs

\$ 5,361

\$7,076

TOTAL BUDGET\$75,000

# REFERENCES

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

Greenberg, D.F. The Incapacitative Effects of Imprisonment: Some Estimates. Law and Society Review 9:541-580. 1975

Levin, M.A. Policy Evaluation and Recidivism Law and Society Review. 6:17-46. 1971

Waldo, G.P. and David Griswold. Issues in the Measurement of Recidivism. In Lee Sechrest, et.al. eds., The Rehabilitation of Criminal Offenders: Problems and Prospects. Washington, National Academy of Sciences, 1979

**END**