

CHESAPEAKE BAY ASAP

ASSESSMENT OF PROBATION MONITORING TEAM SUPERVISION ON OFFENDER OUTCOME

REPORT

SUBMITTED TO CHESAPEAKE BAY ASAP
APRIL 28, 2008

BY

MARIE VANNOSTRAND, PH.D.



LUMINOSITY, INC. ♦ ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA
WWW.LUMINOSITY-SOLUTIONS.COM

ASSESSMENT OF PROBATION MONITORING TEAM SUPERVISION ON OFFENDER OUTCOME

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Data Analysis Results - All Classifications.....	2
<i>Referrals</i>	2
<i>Referral Type</i>	2
<i>Referring Locality</i>	2
<i>BAC</i>	3
Offender Characteristics.....	3
<i>Sex, Race/Ethnicity, Age</i>	3
<i>Education</i>	4
<i>Occupation</i>	4
<i>Number of DUI Convictions</i>	4
Offender and Program Performance.....	5
<i>Classification</i>	5
<i>Referral and Intake</i>	5
<i>Supervision Outcome</i>	6
Data Analysis Results - Treatment Classification.....	7
<i>BAC</i>	7
<i>Length of Time to Intake</i>	7
<i>Unemployment</i>	7
<i>Team Supervision</i>	8
<i>Summary</i>	8

INTRODUCTION

This report contains the results of an assessment of a new supervision strategy implemented by Chesapeake Bay Alcohol Safety Action Program (CBASAP). The information contained in this report is intended to assist in the continued successful administration of the program. CBASAP was founded in 1975 and serves the cities of Virginia Beach and Norfolk, and the counties of Accomack and Northampton. CBASAP has served Virginia Beach and Norfolk since its inception. In 1993 CBASAP, formerly Tidewater ASAP, merged with Eastern Shore ASAP and has since served the counties of Accomack and Northampton.

CBASAP provides a wide variety of services including, but not limited to, Standard VASAP, Abuse and Lose, Driver Improvement, Habitual Offender Evaluation, Intervention and Monitoring, and Young Offender. Offenders are referred for services primarily from Norfolk and Virginia Beach courts but are also received from Accomack and Northampton Counties, other ASAP programs through transfer, and from other states.

When an offender appears for an intake and the intake is completed, they are classified into one of three levels of primary intervention services- Education, Intensive Education, or Treatment as defined by the Commission on VASAP classification guidelines. On July 1, 2005, Chesapeake Bay ASAP implemented an intensive team supervision model for high risk offenders. High risk offenders are those individuals who meet the Commission on VASAP classification guidelines for Treatment. These high risk offenders are assigned to a Probation Monitoring Team (PMT). The PMT consists of a case manager, compliance officer, and administrative staffer. The Probation Monitoring Team is supervised and assisted by a Senior Case Manager. Each high risk offender is seen (face to face) by the PMT on quarterly basis while simultaneously receiving substance abuse treatment. Prior to the implementation of the PMT approach to supervision, also known as team supervision, offenders were supervised by a single case manager. This report contains the results of an assessment completed in order to determine if team supervision provided by a PMT has an impact on offender supervision outcome.

In order to assess the impact of team supervision when compared to single case manager based supervision, an analysis of all offender cases referred for Standard VASAP, Abuse and Lose, and Young Offender supervision for the 18 months prior to and following the implementation of team supervision was completed. Included in the analysis were 4,231 cases referred with an intake completed between January 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005 and 3,446 cases referred with an intake completed between July 1, 2005 and December 31, 2006. It should be noted that only cases supervised in the Virginia Beach office were included in the analysis, therefore, cases supervised on the Eastern Shore (551) as well as those transferred to another ASAP or out of state (682) were omitted from the analysis. In addition, cases with an unknown classification (627) and those with a status of active, hold, or unknown (155) were also omitted from the analysis.

DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS - ALL CLASSIFICATIONS

The results of the analysis contained below were conducted on 7,677 offenders referred to CBASAP for Standard VASAP, Abuse and Lose, and Young Offender between Jan 1, 2004 and December 31, 2006. The time frame represents 18 months pre and post implementation of “team supervision”. Only cases supervised in the Virginia Beach Office with known classifications and outcomes were included in the analysis (4,231 eighteen months pre-implementation and 3,446 eighteen months post-implementation). It should be noted that the analysis contained in this section includes offenders assigned to Education, Intensive Education, and Treatment.

REFERRALS

Referral Type

The percentage of referrals pre and post team supervision implementation were comparable for Standard VASAP while there was a decrease in the percentage of referrals for Abuse and Lose and an increase in percentage of referrals for Young Offender.

REFERRAL TYPE	PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	POST-IMPLEMENTATION
Standard VASAP	89.4%	88.6%
Abuse and Lose	6.8%	5.3%
Young Offender	3.8%	6.1%
Total	100%	100%

Referring Locality

There was no significant difference in the referral source for those offenders supervised in the Virginia Beach Office pre and post implementation of team supervision.

REFERRING LOCALITY	PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	POST-IMPLEMENTATION
Virginia Beach	67.8%	66%
Norfolk	15.4%	16.5%
Chesapeake	5.8%	5.7%
Out of State	2.2%	2.8%
Other	8.8%	9%
Total	100%	100%

BAC

For offenders who submitted to an alcohol test pre and post implementation, the average BAC was .146 percent and .148 percent respectively. The most common BAC was .14 percent. The difference in the average BAC was not statistically significant.

BAC	PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	POST-IMPLEMENTATION
Mean (average)	.146	.148
Mode (most common)	.14	.14
Median (middle)	.14	.14
Range	.03 to .34	.01 to .35

OFFENDER CHARACTERISTICS

Sex, Race/Ethnicity, Age

The distribution of offenders supervised is provided below based on sex, race, and age.

	PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	POST-IMPLEMENTATION
Sex		
Male	77.8%	77.1%
Female	22.2%	22.9%
Race		
White	74.9%	76.4%
Black	18.9%	19.5%
Hispanic	3.9%	2.2%
Other	2.3%	1.9%
Age		
Range	15 to 78	17 to 79
Average	31.79	31.61

Education

There was a statistically significant difference in the education level achieved by offenders supervised pre and post implementation of team supervision. Specifically, 10.8% of all offenders had some college education pre-implementation while only 4.2% had some college education post-implementation.

EDUCATION	PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	POST-IMPLEMENTATION
Less than 9 th Grade	1.2%	1.2%
9 th – 11 th Grade	3%	2.2%
High School or GED	85.1%	92.3%
Some College	7.3%	2.6%
College Graduate	2.6%	1.4%
Greater than College Graduate	.9%	.2%

Occupation

The breakdown of offender's occupation at the time of intake is provided below.

OCCUPATION	PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	POST-IMPLEMENTATION
Non-Professional	67.3%	71.9%
Military	15.6%	13.3%
Professional	6.3%	4.3%
Student	3.6%	3.2%
Unemployed	5.5%	6.1%
Retired/Disabled/Homemaker	1.7%	1.3%

Number of DUI Convictions

There was no statistically significant difference in the number of DUI convictions between offenders supervised pre and post supervision implementation of team supervision.

NUMBER OF DUI CONVICTIONS	PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	POST-IMPLEMENTATION
Convicted of other than DUI	4.3%	4.4%
1 st Conviction	72.3%	75%
2 nd Conviction	21.2%	18.5%
3 rd Conviction	1.9%	1.9%
4 th or Greater Conviction	0.3%	0.2%

OFFENDER AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Classification

Offenders were classified into three levels of primary intervention service (Education, Intensive Education, and Treatment) as shown in the table below. There was a statistically significant difference in the classification of offenders, specifically, almost half as many people were assigned to the lowest level of intervention (Education) 14.1% pre-implementation compared to 7.5% post-implementation. Similarly, 43.4% of the offenders were classified as needing Intensive Education post-implementation compared to only 38.3% pre-implementation. A similar number of people were classified as Treatment; 47.6% vs. 49.1% respectively.

CLASSIFICATION	PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	POST-IMPLEMENTATION
Education	14.1%	7.5%
Intensive Education	38.3%	43.4%
Treatment	47.6%	49.1%

Referral and Intake

The time lines that follow show the amount of time that elapsed between court referral and ASAP intake pre and post implementation of team supervision. There was a statistically significant difference in the amount of time that elapsed between referral and intake. Thirty-four percent of offenders had an intake completed within four weeks post-implementation compared to 22.8% pre-implementation. Nearly 75% of all referrals were seen for intake within two months post-implementation compared to only 62.5% pre-implementation.

TIME BETWEEN REFERRAL AND INTAKE	PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	POST-IMPLEMENTATION
1 Week	7.7%	8%
2 Weeks	10.9%	14.6%
3 Weeks	17.2%	21.8%
4 Weeks	22.8%	34%
5 Weeks	32.2%	47.4%
6 Weeks	41.4%	59.5%
7 Weeks	51.9%	69.2%
8 Weeks	62.5%	74.7%
9 Weeks	69.7%	78.3%
10 Weeks	74.1%	81.2%
11 Weeks	77.2%	83.6%

12 Weeks	79.8%	85.7%
13 Weeks	81.6%	87.3%
14 Weeks	83.7%	88.9%
15 Weeks	85.2%	89.8%
16 Weeks	86.7%	90.8%

Supervision Outcome

There was no statistically significant difference in outcome rates for offenders supervised pre and post implementation; 81.4% vs. 82.1% successful respectively.

CLOSURE TYPE	PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	POST-IMPLEMENTATION
Successful	81.4%	82.1%
Unsuccessful	18.6%	17.9%

There was a statistically significant difference in success rates based on the classification level determined at intake for offenders pre and post implementation. When comparing offenders pre and post implementation of team supervision, offenders had a 4.2% lower success rate if classified as Intensive Education post-implementation yet offenders classified as Treatment had a 6.1% higher success rate post-implementation.

It should be noted that team supervision only applies to offenders classified as Treatment; therefore, it is not likely that the change to team supervision for Treatment classifications impacted offenders classified as Intensive Education. The decrease in success rate in Intensive Education should be noted for future evaluations to determine if this is a trend and if so, what may be contributing to the change.

Even more importantly is the fact that the success rate for classification of Treatment increased from 72.4% to 78.5% following the implementation of team supervision. This difference was found to be statistically significant.

SERVICE TYPE	PRE-IMPLEMENTATION	POST-IMPLEMENTATION
Education	90.8%	89.1%
Intensive Education	89.1%	84.9%
Treatment	72.4%	78.5%

DATA ANALYSIS RESULTS - TREATMENT CLASSIFICATION

The analysis results provided below were conducted on the 3,712 offenders referred to CBASAP for Standard VASAP, Abuse and Lose, and Young Offender and classified as Treatment between Jan 1, 2004 and December 31, 2006. The time frame represents 18 months pre and post implementation of team supervision. Only cases supervised in the Virginia Beach Office with known classifications and outcomes were included in the analysis (2,013 eighteen months pre-implementation and 1,699 eighteen months post-implementation). Because team supervision was implemented only for those offenders classified as Treatment, the analysis was limited to those cases in order to determine whether team supervision or other factors may be associated with the observed increased success rate following the implementation of team supervision.

Binary Logistic Regression was used to identify the factors that were related to supervision outcome (program success or failure) and the relative importance of these factors. This technique identifies whether the factor is a significant predictor of supervision outcome and the likelihood an offender will fail dependent upon the specified factor. The identification of the variables that are indicators that a person is a high risk to fail is useful when determining appropriate levels of supervision or case management practices.

First, all relevant factors found to be related to supervision outcome with the exception of team supervision were examined. A logistic regression model was built using all factors found to be predictors of supervision outcome and then the factor team supervision was added (block method) to the model to determine if team supervision was a predictor of supervision outcome after considering all other identified factors. The results are discussed below.

BAC

The blood alcohol level at the time of the arrest was a statistically significant predictor of supervision outcome. The higher the BAC the less likely an offender was to complete successfully.

Length of Time to Intake

The length of time between court referral and an intake completion was a statistically significant predictor of supervision outcome. The longer the period of time between referral and intake the less likely an offender was to complete successfully.

Unemployment

Offenders who were unemployed were nearly twice and a half times more likely to be unsuccessful when compared to those who were either employed, a student, retired, disabled, or a homemaker. Note that offenders who were employed, retired, disabled, a student, or homemaker had a 76% success rate while those who were unemployed had a 58% success rate. In addition, offenders

classified for Treatment were more likely to be unemployed (3.1% Education, 4.3% Intensive Education, 7.5% Treatment).

Team Supervision

After taking into consideration the offender's BAC, length of time between referral and intake, and employment status, offenders who received team supervision were 1.3 times more likely to successfully complete the program when compared to offenders who did not receive team supervision.

Summary

There were four primary factors related to supervision outcome. The BAC, length of time between referral and intake, and employment status were all found to be statistically significant predictors of supervision outcome. After consideration of these 3 predictors of supervision outcome, offenders who received team supervision were 1.3 times more likely to be successful when compared to offenders who did not receive team supervision.