

INFORMATION PAPER FOR THE EXECUTIVE STAFF

DATE: November 15, 1996

SUBMITTED BY: Miles D. Harer and Jody Klein-Saffran
Research Analysts
Office of Research and Evaluation

THRU: Thomas R. Kane, Assistant Director
Information, Policy, and Public Affairs Division

SUBJECT: Lewisburg ICC Evaluation

Introduction: Attached is a report which provides post-release information on inmates involved in the Lewisburg ICC program and a control group of inmates eligible for the ICC program but who did not participate in the program.

Evaluation of Post-Release Success for the First 4 Classes
Graduating from the Lewisburg Intensive Confinement Center

November 15, 1996

O Evaluation results for the first four classes graduating from the Lewisburg Intensive Confinement Center (ICC) demonstrate that placement in the ICC achieves the same post-release success rate as does placement in a conventional prison. Lewisburg ICC graduates who were transferred from the general prison population into the program were rearrested at a 13.0 percent rate during the first two years in the community (See Figure 1), while Lewisburg ICC graduates who entered the program directly from the court were rearrested at a 13.9 percent rate. Rates for these two groups are not statistically different from the 13.8 percent adjusted rate for a group of similar program eligible inmates, who did not participate in the ICC program and instead completed their full prison term.

O As of May 1996, ICC graduates with a 30 month or less sentence are eligible for reduction in their prison sentence. Sentence reductions allowed range from a 3 month reduction for persons with a 12-16 month sentence to a 6 month reduction for persons with a sentence of 26-30 months. As shown in Table 2, the estimated incarceration cost saving for an ICC inmate with a one year and a day sentence is \$ 2,519.66 when compared to a non-

ICC minimum security inmate with a one year and a day sentence. For an ICC inmate with a 30 month sentence, the incarceration cost saving is \$ 9,330.58 when compared to a non-ICC minimum security inmate with a 30 month sentence.¹ Note, however, that inmates with sentences between 30 and 60 months and who constitute the bulk of transfers into the ICC program are not eligible for a sentence reduction.

O In addition to possible cost savings associated with the shorter period of confinement for current ICC participants, the program also has the benefit of returning very low risk offenders sooner to their families and to their jobs, presumably reducing public assistance costs to inmates' families and allowing these former offenders to become taxpayers once more. Furthermore, earlier release contributes to inmate family stability, which criminological research shows to be a key element in reducing juvenile delinquency and crime among future generations.

O Background measures used to assess differences in recidivism risk between the ICC participant groups and the Control Group were chosen from prior recidivism studies of Federal prisoners, conducted both by the BOP Office of Research and Evaluation and

¹ Because of current unused minimum security bed space, the actual marginal daily cost per inmate for a minimum security bed may be substantially lower than the full cost used here of \$42.22, and this could dramatically alter cost savings estimates.

by the United States Parole Commission. These risk measures, listed in Table 1, are: the United States Parole Commission's Salient Factor Score (see Attachment A. for the form used to calculate the Salient Factor Score); age at release to supervision; stable employment during at least six months in the two years prior to the current imprisonment; marital status; alcohol abuse (note in Attachment A, that heroin abuse is a component of the Salient Factor Score); prison misconduct; and planning, while still in prison, for employment upon release to a halfway house or to supervision in the community. Race (percent black) and ethnicity (percent Hispanic) are reported, in Table 1, for comparison purposes only.

O Comparisons of background characteristics for the two ICC participant groups, ICC Dropouts (persons who entered the ICC program but for whatever reason did not complete it), and the Control Group show the following statistically significant differences (see Table 1): The ICC Prison Transfer Group had significantly higher Salient Factor Scores and were more likely to have made pre-release employment plans than the Control Group. Both of these differences suggest that the ICC Prison Transfer Group had lower risk of rearrest when compared to the control group.

The ICC Direct Court Admissions were significantly more likely to have stable pre-prison employment, less prison

misconduct, and to have made pre-release employment plans than the Control Group. All three differences suggest that the Direct Court Admission group was at a lower risk of rearrest than the control group.

ICC dropouts had significantly lower (i.e., poorer) Salient Factor Scores; were younger; were less likely to be married; were more involved in prison misconduct; and were less likely to have made pre-release employment plans than the control group.

Therefore, based on these differences, the ICC dropouts were at a much greater risk of rearrest than the control group.

Furthermore, from the risk profiles shown in Table 2, the ICC dropouts were also at higher risk of rearrest than the two other ICC participant groups.

O Results from the complete (multivariate) analysis of recidivism during release to the community (not shown here, but reported in the full evaluation report) show that for inmates studied as part of this evaluation, those with high Salient Factor Scores, who were older, and who had made pre-release employment plans were significantly less likely to be rearrested than inmates with low Salient Factor Scores, who were younger, and who did not make pre-release employment plans.

O As already noted, both the ICC prison transfer and ICC direct court commitment groups demonstrated a significantly

greater reliance on pre-release employment planning than did the control group. (See Table 1). That is, they were more likely to have arranged for employment prior to release to a halfway house than inmates in a conventional prison camp. Analysis shows that such planning had a significant and dramatic effect in reducing recidivism for both program participants and control group members, when compared to those in either group not making such plans. While differences between the control group and ICC groups in the percent making pre-release employment plans may be due at least in part to ICC program emphasis on such planning, the mean differences may also reflect a larger number of more effective social and community contacts and resources available to those referred to the ICC program compared to those who are not referred. These contacts and resources may reflect a family/community support network in place prior to incarceration that appreciably aids in post-release adjustment beyond that provided by obtaining and maintaining employment alone.

O As noted above, background characteristics of the ICC Dropouts indicate that they will be rearrested at a higher rate than either the control group or the two groups of ICC graduates. The rearrest rate for ICC dropouts was 33.3 percent (See Figure 1), which is a substantially higher rearrest rate than for either program graduates or control group members. Since this is a group of inmates who did not complete the ICC program, this

finding suggests that, besides providing intensified or accelerated correctional programming, the ICC serves to screen eligible, but more recidivistic, inmates who are unable to benefit from the program and places them back into the general prison population to serve their full prison term. However, because of the small number of program dropouts in this study (N=27), any conclusive statement about a screening effect would be premature.

O It should be noted that the 13 percent rearrest rate over 2 years for Lewisburg ICC graduates is substantially lower than that for graduates of similar programs run by many State correctional systems, as reported by Mackenzie and Souryal in their 1994, National Institute of Justice final report, "Multisite Evaluation of Shock Incarceration." For example, 37.3% of graduates from a Louisiana program were rearrested in the 2 years following release; 56.5 percent of Florida graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; 49.5 percent of New York program graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; 40.4 percent of South Carolina graduates were rearrested during the first year in the community; and 51.7 percent of Texas program graduates were rearrested during the first 2 years in the community. Differences in rearrest rates between graduates from these State run programs and graduates of the Lewisburg ICC are most likely due in large

part to the younger age of State program participants when compared to Lewisburg ICC participants.

O While the evaluation of the Lewisburg ICC was able to assess the effect of the overall program on post-release outcome, it was not possible to assess the effectiveness of individual program components because they continued to be developed through 1995 (see attached chronology). In light of these changes, a work group was assembled by the Correctional Programs Division, including representatives of ICC staff, researchers, and Regional and Central Office administrators to review various program components. Now that ICC program components have matured and stabilized, this work group will develop a set of performance measures for monitoring the contribution each component makes to a set of outcomes including, but not limited to, post-release rearrest. For example, improvements in academic skills might be monitored by testing at admission, intermittently during participation, and at program completion.

O Given the ICC's demonstrated success regarding low rearrest rates, consideration might be given to expanding opportunities for transferring eligible inmates from other facilities into the program, especially if referrals from court do not fully utilize the additional bed space capacity provided by the new ICC at Lompoc. Also, since inmates with a sentence of 60 months or

less, with no history of violence, and no serious prison misconduct are eligible for ICC placement within 24 months of release, case managers might consider informing potentially eligible inmates at time of admission to prison about the ICC program and the prospects of serving much of their sentence in a halfway house or on home confinement rather than in a prison facility. Such early notification might provide an incentive toward good behavior among this group of new admissions.

Currently, inmates with sentences of greater than 30 months are not eligible for a sentence reduction if they successfully complete the ICC, but may be released to a halfway house earlier than comparable minimum security inmates who do not participate in the ICC. As of October 26, 1996 there were 3,095 male inmates (3,043 minimum security and 52 low security) who meet minimum eligibility requirements for placement into the ICC and an additional 368 male inmates (355 minimum security and 13 low security) who will become eligible as they move toward 24 months remaining to serve on their sentences, barring any prison misconduct. Among female inmates there were 751 (747 minimum security and 4 low security) who meet minimum eligibility requirements for placement into the ICC and an additional 32 female inmates (31 minimum security and 1 low security) who will become eligible as they move toward 24 months remaining to serve on their sentences, barring any prison misconduct. In sum, on October 26, there were 3,846 inmates minimally eligible for

immediate placement into the ICC and an additional 400 inmates who will be potentially eligible in the future, for a total of 4,246.

O Both persons admitted to the ICC directly from the court and those transferred from the prison population pass through multiple review stages during which their appropriateness for the program and their recidivism risk, especially for violent offending, are assessed. For those entering the ICC directly from the court, these are: 1) the initial judicial review and recommendation; 2) the formal program eligibility requirements; 3) the informal review by the ICC staff and administrator prior to actual admission; 4) the rigors of the program itself (see the above discussion regarding program dropouts); 5) the period of observation during halfway house stay; 6) for some, the surveillance during home confinement; and 7) the final period of surveillance during supervised release. Persons transferred to the ICC from the general prison population are subject to the same review and assessment with the addition of a period in prison when their behavior and appropriateness for the program can be observed and assessed by Bureau of Prisons staff.

O We should highlight the importance of screening ICC participants both for personal characteristics seen as benefiting from ICC programming and for likelihood of recidivating,

especially for crimes of violence. In this regard, both formal and informal eligibility requirements and conditions for remaining in the ICC program should be continually reviewed regarding their capability to predict positive returns from program participation and post-release success.

Table 1. Means or Percentages for Analysis Variables
(Standard Deviations in Parentheses).

Variables	ICC Prison Transfer Group N=100	ICC Direct Court Admissions N=43	Control Group N=143	ICC Dropouts N=27
Salient Factor Score	8.630** (1.186)	8.477 (1.651)	8.098 (1.804)	7.259* (2.194)
Age at Release to Community+	29.200 (4.634)	28.907 (4.155)	28.391 (4.155)	26.704* (5.172)
Percent with Stable Pre- Prison Employment	84.000 (0.368)	95.349* (0.213)	87.413 (0.333)	77.777 (0.423)
Percent Married	22.000 (0.416)	30.233 (0.213)	23.776 (0.427)	7.407** (0.269)
Percent Who Abused Alcohol Prior to Prison	33.000 (0.473)	27.907 (0.454)	39.161 (0.490)	40.741 (0.501)
Percent Black	30.000 (0.461)	16.279 (0.373)	24.476 (0.431)	33.333 (0.480)
Percent Hispanic	24.000 (0.429)	9.302 (0.294)	25.175 (0.435)	11.111* (0.320)
Prison Misconduct+	0.310 (0.631)	0.070** (0.258)	0.224 (0.549)	0.888** (1.368)
Percent Making Pre-Release Employment Plans	79.000* (0.409)	83.721** (0.374)	69.231 (0.463)	40.741** (0.501)

* Significantly different from Control group at .10 level.

** Significantly different from Control group at .05 level

+ Difference of means tests were conducted on the natural log of this variable.

Table 2: Incarceration Costs for an ICC Participant with a Sentence of One Year and One Day and a Participant with a Sentence of 30 Months Compared to Conventional Incarceration Costs for Inmates with Similar Sentences

Incarceration Length Calculation for One Year Plus One Day Sentence

	ICC Inmate 1 Year Plus 1 Day Sentence Days	Non-ICC Inmate 1 Year Plus 1 Day Sentence Days
Length of Sentence	366	366
ICC Reduction	-90	0
Good Time Reduction	-55	-55
Total Time To Serve	221	311

Estimate Imprisonment Cost for One Year Plus One Day Sentence

	ICC Inmate			Non-ICC Inmate		
	<u>Days</u>	<u>Full Cost/Day</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Full Cost/Day</u>	<u>Total</u>
ICC	180	\$47.39	\$8,530.00			
Minimum Security Institution				221	42.22	9,330.62
Community Corrections Center	30*	43.52	1,305.60	60*	43.52	2,611.20
Home Confinement	11*	21.76	239.36	30*	21.76	652.80
Total	221	\$10,074.96		311		\$12,594.62

Estimated total cost savings per ICC inmate using full cost/day = \$2,519.66

*Estimate length of stay

Table 2 continued: Incarceration Costs for an ICC Participant with a Sentence of One Year and One Day and a Participant with a Sentence of 30 Months Compared to Conventional Incarceration Costs for Inmates with Similar Sentences

Incarceration Length Calculation for a 30 Month Sentence

	ICC Inmate 30 Month Sentence Days	Non-ICC Inmate 30 Month Sentence Days
Length of Sentence	912	912
ICC Reduction	-180	0
Good Time Reduction	-135	-135
Total Time To Serve	597	777

Estimate Imprisonment Cost for a 30 Month Sentence

	ICC Inmate Full			Non-ICC Inmate Full		
	<u>Days</u>	<u>Cost/Day</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Days</u>	<u>Cost/Day</u>	<u>Total</u>
ICC	180	\$47.39	\$8,530.00			
Minimum Security Institution				539	\$42.22	\$22,756.58
Community Corrections Center	200*	43.52	8,704.00	154*	43.52	6,702.08
Home Confinement	217*	21.76	4,721.92	84*	21.76	1,827.84
Total	597		\$21,955.92	777		\$31,286.50

Estimated total cost savings per ICC inmate using full cost/day = \$9,330.58

*All length of stays are medians.

Chronology for ICC

July 16,1990 - Proposal submitted to executive staff on operation of ICC, Lewisburg.

November 19,1990 - ICC activated began to accept participants.

November 20, 1990 - Operations Memorandum (174-90) established procedures of the implementation of the Federal Intensive Confinement Center (ICC) on the site of the former Federal Prison Camp at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. Eligibility criteria established in this Ops Memo consist of the following requirements:

- *serving a sentence of more than 12, but not more than 30 months.
- *serving their first period of incarceration or have a minor history of prior incarcerations.
- *minimum security
- *35 years of age or less
- *without medical restrictions
- *volunteers

January 28,1991 - The first training cycle began consisting of 42 ICC inmates accepted to Team 1 (Alpha).

April 19,1991 - Operations Memorandum (82-91) this will serve to notify institutions that they may, until further notice, continue to refer eligible inmates to the ICC.

May-June, 1991 - Scheduling changes at the ICC went into effect. Evening study for GED students was cut out.

July 1991 - Exit Interviews Team 1 (Alpha) Summary available.

August 1991 - Drug counselor Mr. Davis was in a contract position and his contract ended. His contract was unable to be renewed. Mr. Davis was liked by staff and well as by ICC inmates. His leaving the ICC initially caused a big change to the drug counselor/educator component of the ICC program.

Fitness Book provided to inmates as part of the fitness program.

Exit Interviews Team 2 (Bravo) Summary available.

September 1991 - Work day hours change to 7 hours per day and programming in the evening. This left less time for educational programming.

October 1991 - Exit interviews Team 3 (Charlie) summary Available.

Greater emphasis on work component as opposed to educational and vocational opportunities. Many inmates found the ICC becoming too much of a work camp and the educational aspects of the program in particular were being neglected.

December 1991 - Operation Memorandum (285-91) establishes a procedural change in ICC inmates who are transferred from other institutions to the ICC. This change states that ICC referrals will be limited to a total sentence of 60 months or less. These inmates shall be transferred to the ICC not earlier than 24 months prior to a projected release date with the optimum time for placement at 18-20 months.

January 1992 - Exit Interviews Team 4 (Delta) Summary Available. Chaplain still a part time position.
Warden Patrick Koehane leaves USP, Lewisburg.

March-April 1992 - Many scheduling changes were taking place. No drug treatment specialist.

May 1992 - David Chapman Administrator of ICC announced he will be leaving the ICC. Assistant Administrator Willie Jusino will be acting Administrator until the new administrator arrives.

June 1992 - Paul Horner newly appointed ICC Administrator arrives at the ICC.

September 1992 - Scheduling and programming changes. Programming will be during the day. Increased hours of programming. Interviews conducted with ICC inmates indicate that some of the content of the life skills course is too elementary and there needs to be more depth to the course. Inmates indicate that the problem may lie with shorter class periods.

November 1992 - Drug Treatment specialist added to staff compliment. Formal DAP program begins.

March 1993 - Added Community Outreach Program as part of Red Ribbon Campaign-Inmates and staff visit local schools and talk to students about drug and alcohol abuse.

May 1993 - Alcoholics Anonymous begins weekly at ICC. Inmates feel the need for more one-to-one counseling. They felt rushed in and out of the counselors office.

July 1993 - Narcotics Anonymous begins weekly at ICC.

January 1994 - Added "Employability" curriculum to education program. Inmates are assisted with resume writing, job searches and interview skills.

June 1994 - Expanded "Release Readiness" program to include volunteers from local community.
Changes in wellness coordinator.

January 1995 - Added "Parenting Skills" program and incorporated program with local juvenile treatment center (approximately 15 inmates per team used as pilot program).

February 1995 - Begin admitting 100% direct court commitments and no transfer inmates.

June 1995 - ICC staffing reduced by 13 positions:

- 1-Case Manager
- 1-Wellness Fitness Coordinator
- 1-Assistant Food Services Administrator
- 1-Recreation Specialist
- 1-Teacher
- 2-Team Leaders
- 6-Correctional Officers

July 1995 - Begin Community Projects with ICC inmates (cleaning parks, setting up for parades, etc.)

July 1995 - Faith Lutze contract researcher completes her project.

August 1995 - ICC receives accreditation by ACA as first boot camp in BOP to be accredited and first facility to receive 100% compliance on both mandatory and non-mandatory standards.

September 1995 - Added "Victim Awareness" program to make inmates aware of the impact of crime and victimization.

October 1995 - ICC Chaplain transferred-position not filled.

January 1996 - Added "Welding Vocational Training" as part of the educational curriculum.

April 1996 - Constructed green house and expanded horticultural and farm operation.

May 1996 - Program Statement 5390.9 becomes effective. Allows for an additional 6 month sentence reduction in some cases.

August 1996 - Added "Masonry Vocational Training" as part of educational curriculum.

August 1996 - Parenting program expanded to include all ICC inmates.

SALIENT FACTOR SCORE (SFS 81)

Item A: PRIOR CONVICTIONS/ADJUDICATIONS (ADULT OR JUVENILE)..... * *
)
 None = 3
 One = 2
 Two or Three ... = 1
 Four or More ... = 0

Item B: PRIOR COMMITMENT(S) OF MORE THAN THIRTY DAYS..... * *
 (ADULT OR JUVENILE))
 None = 2
 One or Two..... = 1
 Three or More... = 0

Item C: AGE AT CURRENT OFFENSE/PRIOR COMMITMENTS..... * *
)
 Age at commencement of current offense
 26 years of age or more = 2
 20-25 years of age = 1
 19 years of age or less = 0
 ***Exception: If five or more prior commitments of more than
 thirty days (adult or juvenile), place an "X" here _____
 and score this item = 0

Item D: RECENT COMMITMENT FREE PERIOD (THREE YEARS) * *
)
 No prior commitment of more than thirty days (adult or
 juvenile) or released to the community from last such
 commitment at least three years prior to the commence-
 ment of the current offense = 1
 Otherwise = 0

Attachment A Continued.

Item E: PROBATION/PAROLE/CONFINEMENT/ESCAPE STATUS VIOLATOR.....*) *
THIS TIME)

Neither on probation, parole, confinement, or escape
status at the time of the current offense; nor com-
mitted as a probation, parole, confinement, or escape
status violator this time = 1

Otherwise..... = 0

Item F: HEROIN/OPIATE DEPENDENCE.....*) *
)

No history of heroin/opiate dependence... = 1

Otherwise..... = 0

TOTAL SCORE.....*) *
)

Note: For purposes of the Salient Factor Score, an instance of criminal
behavior resulting in a judicial determination of guilt or and admission
of guilt before a judicial body shall be treated as a conviction, even if
a conviction is formally entered.