

# **Drug Offender Reform Act: DORA Statewide Report**

**November 1, 2010  
Updated Mini-Report**



THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

---

*Utah Criminal Justice Center*

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK  
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES  
UTAH COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE  
S.J. QUINNEY COLLEGE OF LAW



## Table of Contents

	Page
Table of Contents .....	i
Executive Summary .....	iii
Background and Review of Original 2009 Findings .....	1
Updated 2010 Results .....	4
Discussion and Conclusion .....	12
Bibliography .....	13

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**DORA Statewide Evaluation**  
**Executive Summary – Updated 2010 Report**  
**Utah Criminal Justice Center, University of Utah**  
**November 1, 2010**

**Background and Study Sample**

Statewide DORA began with the passage of Senate Bill 50 during the 2007 Utah Legislative General Session. Effective July 1, 2007, offenders convicted of a felony offense or granted parole for the first time after incarceration for a felony offense were to be screened and assessed for substance abuse treatment. This report updates outcomes for Statewide DORA probationers and parolees through June 30, 2010. The final DORA Statewide sample consisted of those offenders who were identified as DORA in Utah Department of Corrections (UDC) records (N = 1,419), had a match in Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health (DSAMH) records (N = 1,359), and had either DORA indicated treatment in DSAMH records or DSAMH treatment that overlapped with time on DORA supervision (N = 1,337; Probation = 930; Parole = 407).

**Updated 2010 Results**

The major themes of the update are:

- Treatment usage and successful completion rates have increased for both probationers and parolees
- Nearly all of the factors significantly related to successful early completion remain significantly related to successful completion with this longer follow-up period
- With longer follow-up periods and opportunities for re-offense, during-DORA and post-DORA recidivism (arrest and convictions) have increased for both probationers and parolees
- Treatment Completers, both probation and parole, did significantly better than non-completers on post-DORA criminal justice outcomes.
- The DORA statewide model did not significantly improve outcomes for parolees overall. However, for those parolees who were able to succeed in the DORA model (complete treatment), outcomes were extremely positive.

**Supervision**

- Under one-half (40.2%) of probationers and 13.5% of parolees were still under supervision at the end of the 2010 study period (July 1, 2010).
  - *74.4% probationers active 7/1/09; 50.1% parolees*

**Treatment**

- The average number of treatment admissions for the offenders was 2.4 for probationers and 1.8 for parolees.
  - *2.1 for probationers in 2009; 1.7 for parolees*
- The parolees spent an average of 233 days in treatment and the probationers spent 273 days in treatment.
  - *221 days in treatment for parolees in 2009; 227 days for probationers*
- Over 60% of both probationers (64.1%) and parolees (60.5%) completed at least one treatment admission
  - *53.2% of probationers and 54.3% of parolees in 2009*
- At the 2010 update, 6.8% of probationers and 3.2% of parolees were active in some level of treatment
  - *16.8% of the probationers and 11.1% of the parolees in 2009*

## Outcomes

- Close to 30% of both groups have successfully completed supervision
  - *In 2009 around 10% of both groups had successfully completed supervision*

<b>Supervision Outcomes</b>				
	Probation		Parole	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
Still on Supervision	74.4%	40.2%	50.1%	13.5%
Successful Completion	10.5%	29.0%	11.6%	30.5%
Prison Admission	6.3%	11.2%	37.1%	52.6%
Unsuccessful Discharge	5.1%	12.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Neutral Discharge/Died	3.5%	7.5%	1.2%	2.9%

- If only counting those who are no longer on supervision, 48.0% of probationers successfully exited (41.5% w/ at least one successful treatment discharge as well), while 35.2% of parolees have successfully exited (31.5% with treatment as well)
  - *In 2009 41.2% of exited probationers were successfully discharged (34.9% w/ successful treatment discharge); parolees = 23.2% successful supervision exit (20.2% w/ successful treatment discharge)*
- Around 15% of both groups had a new criminal conviction while they were under supervision (14.3% probationers, 15.2% parolees). The majority of the new convictions were for property, then drug crimes, with the most common level of new offense being a 3rd degree felony.
  - *8.9% probationers, 7.6% parolees had a new conviction during supervision in 2009*

## Factors Related to Successful Supervision Completion

The key factors that were related to successful supervision exit across 2009 and 2010 analyses and both probationers and parolees were:

- Lower LSI Score at Intake
- Older age at DORA start
- More days in treatment during DORA
- Utilizing less intensive treatment during DORA (e.g., outpatient instead of IOP)

The continued relationship between the intensity of treatment required by the participants and supervision exit status may suggest that those individuals do not receive the support they need in the current DORA model to achieve similar rates of success as offenders who require less intensive treatment.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

Similar to the 2009 report, we recommend that statewide DORA funding continue for those who remain in supervision and treatment to allow active DORA participants to continue and finish the program under similar conditions as those who have already exited. Additional follow-up time is also required to examine the full impact of statewide DORA on post supervision recidivism outcomes.

## **Background and Review of Original 2009 Findings**

### **DORA History**

Statewide DORA began with the passage of S.B. 50 during the 2007 Utah Legislative General Session. Effective July 1, 2007, offenders convicted of a felony offense or granted parole for the first time after incarceration for a felony offense were to be screened and assessed for substance abuse treatment, followed by treatment where appropriate.

The DORA Statewide Criteria and Process was designed by the Utah Substance Abuse Advisory Council (USAACV), following the legislative mandates. Statewide DORA offenders must meet the following criteria:

- Convicted of a felony offense on or after July 1, 2007 (cannot be pled to a misdemeanor); or granted parole for the first time on or after July 1, 2007, after incarceration for a felony offense <sup>1</sup>
- Total score on the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) must fall within the range of 16 to 35 (originally 16 to 40)
- Substance Abuse Assessment must indicate that treatment is needed

### **Key DORA Statewide Findings from 2009 Report**

The original statewide DORA Report from November 2009 that describes the foundations of DORA, study methodology, and complete process and initial outcome results can be found on the UCJC website at: <http://ucjc.law.utah.edu/>.

The 2009 Statewide Study included the following offenders as participants who met DORA statewide inclusion criteria:

- “DORA” offender in Utah Department of Corrections (UDC) records (N = 1,419) from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2009,
- had a match in Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health (DSAMH) records (N = 1,359), and
- had either DORA indicated treatment in DSAMH records or DSAMH treatment that overlapped with time on DORA supervision (N = 1,337; Probation = 930; Parole = 407).

### **Sample Characteristics**

Both probationers and parolees in statewide DORA were just over 30 years old on average, less than 25% minority, about around one-third female. At the time of their initial treatment intake, about one-quarter had a DSM-IV diagnosis, over half had a previous treatment admission, and methamphetamines were the most common drug of choice. Average years of education were under 12<sup>th</sup> grade and approximately half were

---

<sup>1</sup> Beginning July 1, 2009, parolees were no longer eligible for DORA, due to limited funding

unemployed. At the time of their DORA probation/parole intake, DORA offenders had several prior arrests (Prob Mn = 10.3, Parole Mn = 16.1). As calculated for this report, an arrest was counted as each unique charge type on a single arrest date; therefore, a drug and a property charge on the same arrest date would count as two arrests. Over half of the probationers and nearly 90% of the parolees had conviction(s) prior to the one(s) that got them into DORA. Over half (54%) of DORA probationers had a drug conviction at their DORA qualifying conviction, while 44% of parolees did. DORA probationers' average risk score at intake (LSI = 22.9) fell just within the "Moderate" risk range, while parolees' average risk score (LSI = 26.6) was considered "High."

**Table 1 – Statewide DORA Sample Characteristics**

	Probation	Parole
<b>Demographics</b>		
Average Age at Start	30.4	33.9
Percent Minority	16.7	23.1
Percent Female	30.5	31.4
Average Years Education	11.6	11.9
Percent Unemployed	45.9	48.6
<b>At Treatment Intake</b>		
Percent w/ a Prior Treatment Episode	55.0	76.7
Percent with a DSM Axis I or II Disorder	22.0	29.7
Percent w/ Methamphetamine as Primary Drug of Choice	29.4	50.4
<b>Criminal History</b>		
Average # of prior lifetime arrests	10.3	16.1
Percent with prior conviction(s) for any offense type(s)	52.5	88.0
Percent with at least one drug charge at Qualifying Conviction	53.5	43.7
Average LSI score at intake	22.9	26.6

### **Supervision**

The data from the 2009 report indicated that the DORA supervision process was implemented as planned, with approximately 90% of probationers and parolees having regular community-based contacts with their PO's, as well as meetings between PO's and treatment providers that occurred monthly on average.

### **Predictors of Early Completion**

There were four factors that were significantly related to successful exit among early completers in the 2009 report: lower risk scores at intake, older age at intake, longer time in treatment during supervision, and having less intensive treatment during DORA. Most of these factors are supported in the literature. However, the 2009 report cautioned that although lower risk offenders do have higher success rates, generally, intensive programs should be targeted toward higher risk individuals, even if they have less success than their low risk counterparts, as their decrease in recidivism due to programming is greater (Andrews & Dowden, 2006; Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, & Rooney, 2000). In the 2009



analyses, it was hypothesized that having less intensive treatment during DORA was related to successful early completion because those requiring higher levels of care would require longer follow-up times to achieve similar success.

### **Other Early Outcomes**

Other early positive outcomes that were highlighted in the 2009 report were:

- At their last treatment discharge during DORA, 75% of probationers and parolees reported no drug use in the previous month, and 90% of both groups reported no alcohol use.
- Both treatment and Corrections' (UDC) records showed improvements in employment for DORA participants.
- Both groups experienced a drop in LSI scores from intake to one year follow-up (for those that had LSI's during both time periods).
- Treatment completion rates in Statewide DORA (about 50% for probationers and parolees) were favorably compared to similar interventions in other states. Just under half of RIP participants in Pennsylvania completed treatment (Warner & Kramer, 2009), while only one-third of Proposition 36 participants who entered treatment completed (Kilmer & Iguchi, 2009).

### **2009 Study's Suggestions and Next Steps**

The primary suggestion in the 2009 DORA statewide report was to continue funding of supervision and treatment for active DORA Statewide participants to allowing active DORA participants to continue and finish the program under similar conditions as the early completers. This fidelity to the program was deemed necessary to evaluate the Statewide model's effectiveness. The 2009 study's recommendations also included tracking recidivism outcomes for a minimum of 24 months follow-up beginning on the date the offender is released into the community in order to sufficiently capture recidivism events (Barnoski, 1997).

## Updated 2010 Results

### Treatment Services

As a requirement of being in the study sample, all offenders had substance abuse treatment admissions during supervision. When treatment data was updated for the 2010 report, five (5) probationers and two (2) parolees who met the 2009 study criteria of having treatment admissions during supervision did not have any records in the statewide DASMHS database. DSAMHS staff indicated that the treatment providers may have removed those records from the statewide repository. For those with updated treatment data, the average number of admissions and days in treatment increased for both probationers and parolees. The percent who completed at least one treatment admission during supervision increased to over 60% for both probationers and parolees, with 56% of both groups having completed their most recent/final treatment admission during DORA. Only 7% of probationers and 3% of parolees remained active in during supervision treatment at the end of the 2010 follow-up period (6/30/2010).

**Table 2 – Treatment Services**

	Probation		Parole	
	2009	2010 <sup>1</sup>	2009	2010 <sup>1</sup>
Average # of Tx Admissions	2.1	2.4	1.7	1.8
Average # of days in Tx	227	273	221	233
<b>Maximum Tx Intensity (excluding Detox)</b>				
Percent Residential	24.9	27.3	13.3	13.8
Percent Intensive Outpatient	44.5	44.1	27.7	27.4
Percent Outpatient	30.6	28.6	59.0	58.7
<b>Participation in Tx Levels</b>				
Percent with Detox Tx Admissions	5.7	6.3	4.2	5.4
Of those, Average # of days in Detox	7	9	8	8
Percent with Residential Tx Admissions	27.5	29.9	13.8	14.1
Of those, Average # of days in Residential	96	102	87	90
Percent with Intensive Outpatient (IOP) Tx Admissions	56.5	58.7	34.9	35.6
Of those, Average # of days in IOP	121	129	101	96
Percent with Outpatient Tx Admissions	72.4	77.0	88.7	88.6
Of those, Average # of days in Outpatient	182	217	196	209
<b>Discharge Statuses During DORA (could be more than one per person)</b>				
Percent Completed	53.2	64.1	54.3	60.5
Percent Transferred	48.1	25.3	35.1	37.0
Percent Dropout	13.2	16.0	9.3	11.9
Percent Terminated	12.5	16.8	10.6	12.1
Percent Incarcerated	10.7	12.9	15.0	16.8

<b>Table 2 – Treatment Services</b>				
	Probation		Parole	
	2009	2010 <sup>1</sup>	2009	2010 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Discharge Status at Most Recent Tx Discharge</b>				
Percent w/ No Discharge(s)	6.8	0.9	7.6	1.0
Percent Completed	47.6	55.6	49.9	55.6
Percent Transferred	18.2	12.9	10.6	7.7
Percent Dropout, Terminated, Incarcerated	23.8	28.1	29.3	33.1
Percent Other/Died	3.5	2.6	2.7	2.7
<b>Active in DORA Treatment at Study End</b>				
Percent active in DORA treatment at study end	16.8	6.8	11.1	3.2

<sup>1</sup>DSAMH data for 2010 update N = 1330, Prob = 925, Parole = 405

### Assessment and Other Outcomes

When treatment discharge data was tracked through 6/30/2010, DORA probationers and parolees continued to have positive outcomes at their last treatment discharge. For example, the vast majority continued to report no drug or alcohol use in the previous 30 days and living in a private residence.

<b>Table 3 – Assessment and Other Outcomes</b>				
	Probation		Parole	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
<b>Status at Last Tx Discharge During DORA</b>				
Percent No Drug use in previous 30 days	77.0	80.8	77.4	76.6
Percent No Alcohol use in previous 30 days	89.6	89.8	90.7	91.8
<b>Change in Living Arrangement Status from Tx Admit to Last Discharge During DORA</b>				
Percent remained Homeless/Institutionalized	8.4	6.6	2.9	3.5
Percent from Private Residence to Homeless/Institutionalized	9.5	8.7	11.7	12.7
Percent from Homeless/Institutionalized to Private Residence	12.6	13.6	9.0	8.5
Percent remained in Private Residence	69.5	71.1	76.3	75.3
<b>Change in Employment Status from Tx Admit to Last Discharge During DORA</b>				
Percent lost Employment Status	10.0	11.6	10.9	10.4
Percent same Employment/Unemployment Status	65.3	60.7	60.1	60.1
Percent gained Employment Status	24.7	27.7	29.1	29.5

### DORA Outcomes

By the end of the new study period (July 1, 2010), the majority of probationers (60%) and parolees (87%) had exited supervision. The successful supervision completion rate improved for both groups to 48% for probationers and 35% for parolees. Successful supervision *plus* treatment completion rates also improved to 52% for probationers and

32% for parolees. Average follow-up time increased to just over two years from DORA start, and approximately one year since DORA exit (for those who have exited).

**Table 4 – DORA Outcomes**

	Probation		Parole	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
Percent still active on probation/parole at study end*	74.4	39.6	50.1	13.5
Percent exited probation/parole at study end	25.6	60.4	49.9	86.5
<b>Follow Up Periods</b>				
Average # of days since legal start	449	814	441	806
Average # of days since DORA start	391	756	419	784
Average # of days since supervision end (of those who exited)	159	328	223	429
<b>Of those who Exited</b>				
Percent Successfully Completed Probation/Parole	41.2	48.0	23.2	35.2
Percent Unsuccessful (Total)	44.9	39.5	74.4	61.4
Returned to Prison	24.8	18.5	74.4	60.8
Unsuccessfully Discharged	19.7	19.9	0.0	0.6
Fugitive for 1 year or greater	0.4	1.1	0.0	0.0
Percent Other Exit (Total)	13.8	12.5	2.5	3.4
Neutral Discharge	10.9	10.7	1.5	2.8
Died	2.9	1.8	1.0	0.6
<b>Probation/Parole and Tx Outcomes Combined</b>				
Percent Successfully Completed Probation/Parole <i>and</i> 1+ Tx Admission During Supervision	34.9	41.5	20.2	31.5
Percent Successfully Completed Probation/Parole <i>and</i> Final Tx Admission During Supervision	34.5	40.7	20.2	31.5

\*Percent active reported here does not include those who were out on fugitive for 1+ year at each study's end date.

### **Predictors of Successful Completion**

The same set of variables that were compared to final exit status in the 2009 report were replicated in this updated 2010 study. Demographic, criminal history, treatment history, and during DORA supervision (e.g., PO contact frequency) and treatment variables were compared to final exit status to determine which factors were related to successful completion versus negative exit (including unsuccessful discharge, commitment to prison (any reason), and fugitive status open for one year or greater at study end). Because more participants had exited DORA at the time of this 2010 study, sample size for the analyses increased (Probationers 2010 N = 492, 222 failure, 270 success; Parolees 2010 N = 340; 216 failure, 124 success).

The following table (Table 5) compares the factors were significantly related to successful probation completion in the 2009 and 2010 analyses. Items listed in the table were significantly related to exit status when each was examined separately (bivariate analyses). An additional footnote has been added to indicate if the factors remained

significantly related to exit status in a multivariate logistic regression model when controlling for other significant factors.

Six factors were significantly related to probation exit status in the 2010 multivariate analysis (correctly predicted 66% of failures and 83% of successes). Five of those six overlapped with the 2009 findings and showed a similar relationship with exit status:

- Each point higher a probationer’s LSI score was at intake, they were about 10% less likely to have a successful discharge (16% in 2009 analysis)
- Having a drug conviction at the DORA qualifying conviction increased the odds of successful probation completion by about 1.8 times (2.5 in 2009 analysis)
- Older age at DORA start and longer time in treatment during DORA continued to be associated with incremental gains in the likelihood of successful probation completion
- Those who required higher levels of treatment were about half as likely to have successful completion of probation (two-thirds less likely in 2009 analysis).

The continued relationship between higher treatment levels and lower success rates with the larger 2010 sample doesn’t support the 2009 hypothesis that those requiring higher levels of treatment may have as great of success in DORA as those who do not if sufficient follow-up time is allowed. Instead, this continued relationship between severity of treatment need and exit status suggests that it is more difficult to obtain positive criminal justice outcomes with those who have greater substance abuse problems.

---

**Table 5 – Factors Significantly Related to Successful *Probation* Completion**

---

Fewer convictions prior to DORA qualifying conviction (not sig. in 2010)
Lower LSI Score at intake <sup>1, 2</sup>
Having a drug conviction at the DORA qualifying conviction <sup>1, 2</sup>
Fewer prior treatment episodes at first DORA treatment admission (sig. in 2010 bivariate)
Older age at DORA start <sup>1, 2</sup>
Fewer days from DORA start to 1st PO contact (sig. in 2010 bivariate)
More days in treatment during DORA <sup>1, 2</sup>
Utilizing less intensive treatment (e.g., outpatient instead of IOP) <sup>1, 2</sup>
New in 2010: Minorities about 2/3 less likely to successfully complete probation <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Significantly related to successful completion in 2009 multivariate analyses

<sup>2</sup>Significantly related to successful completion in 2010 multivariate analyses

---

Table 6 serves the same function as Table 5, except for examining factors related to successful *parole* completion. The 2010 model correctly predicted 82% of parole failures and 52% of successes. The same four (4) factors that were significantly related to parole completion in the multivariate 2009 analysis remained statistically significant in the 2010 multivariate analysis and showed a similar relationship with exit status:

- Parolees were about 5% less likely to successfully complete parole for each additional point on their intake LSI score (10% in 2009 analysis).
- Older age at intake and more days in treatment during DORA continued to incrementally increase the likelihood of successful parole completion.

- Parolees who required more intensive treatment during DORA were about 60% less likely to complete parole (70% in 2009 analysis).

An additional factor reached statistical significance in the 2010 multivariate analysis: fewer days from DORA start to first contact with the parole officer now significantly improves the likelihood of successful exit from parole. This factor was significant in the bivariate 2009 analyses, but failed to reach statistical significance in the multivariate model.

Again, the new follow-up data do not support the original hypothesis that offenders requiring higher levels of substance abuse treatment may do as well as those who do not, if given sufficient follow-up time. The continued relationship between higher levels of substance abuse treatment and negative supervision exit likely indicates that it is more difficult to obtain positive criminal justice outcomes with those requiring higher levels of treatment.

**Table 6 – Factors Significantly Related to Successful Parole Completion**

Lower LSI Score at intake <sup>1,2</sup>
Older age at DORA start <sup>1,2</sup>
Fewer days from DORA start to 1st PO contact <sup>2</sup>
More days in treatment during DORA <sup>1,2</sup>
Utilizing less intensive treatment (e.g., outpatient instead of IOP) <sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Significantly related to successful completion in 2009 multivariate analyses

<sup>2</sup>Significantly related to successful completion in 2010 multivariate analyses

### Reductions in Criminal Behavior

The detection of criminal behavior has increased from the 2009 report findings for both the probationers and parolees. This is not surprising, as the increased follow-up time has allowed for increased opportunities for re-offense. Approximately 15% of probationers and parolees have experienced a new conviction from an arrest/offense that occurred during DORA supervision. Just over half of parolees have returned to prison (65%, with the majority returning for a violation (42%)), while 11% of probationers have returned to prison (again, the majority (8%) for a violation).

**Table 7 – During Supervision Reductions in Criminal Behavior**

	Probation		Parole	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
<b>Noncompliance</b>				
Percent with fugitive status(es)	11.2	15.2	15.7	20.1
Of those, Average # of days out on fugitive status	82	127	42	43
Percent with at least one probation/parole restart	19.1	26.5	1.5	1.7
Of those, Average # of days from DORA start to first restart	220	300	104	104

**Table 7 – During Supervision Reductions in Criminal Behavior**

	Probation		Parole	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
<b>New Convictions</b>				
Percent with new conviction(s)	8.9	14.3	7.6	15.2
Of those, average # of new convictions	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.7
Of those, average # of days from DORA start to first offense	216	315	211	304
Of those, percent with new drug conviction(s)	36.1	37.6	41.9	37.1
Of those, percent with new person conviction(s)	6.0	8.3	16.1	8.1
Of those, percent with new property conviction(s)	33.7	39.1	35.5	50.0
Of those, Maximum charge severity				
Percent Class B	3.6	2.3	0.0	0
Percent Class A	22.9	21.1	32.3	29.0
Percent 3 <sup>rd</sup> Degree Felony	66.3	66.9	58.1	61.3
Percent 2 <sup>nd</sup> Degree Felony	4.8	7.5	9.7	8.1
Percent 1 <sup>st</sup> Degree Felony	2.4	2.3	0.0	1.6
<b>New Prison Admissions</b>				
Percent with new prison admission for violation	4.8	8.4	31.0	41.5
Of those, average # of days b/w probation/parole start and prison for violation	318	453	238	307
Percent with new prison admission – new charge	1.5	2.8	6.1	11.1
Of those, average # of days b/w probation/parole start and prison for a new charge	254	411	230	343
Percent with new prison admission – any reason	6.3	11.2	37.1	52.6
Of those, percent released onto parole	11.9	40.4	53.0	65.4

Considerably more DORA statewide participants have exited supervision by the end of the 2010 study period. Because of this (and increased follow-up time for those who had exited at the end of the 2009 study period), recidivism rates have increased for both probationers and parolees. The average follow-up period for the entire group of exited participants is right around one year. About one in five (19%) of probationers have been re-arrested since exiting supervision, while about one in three (28%) of parolees have. New conviction rates are considerably lower (6% probationers; 12% parolees).

**Table 8– Post Supervision Reductions in Criminal Behavior**

	Probation		Parole	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
Number who have exited	238	562	203	352
Percent exited probation/parole at study end	25.6	60.4	49.9	86.5
Average # of days since supervision end	159	328	223	429
Percent with new arrest(s)	8.5	18.7	10.8	27.6
Of those, Average # of days to first arrest	93	221	193	306
Of those, Average # of arrests	2.3	2.6	1.9	2.7
Of those, Percent with drug arrests	45.0	38.5	31.8	39.2
Of those, Percent with person arrests	15.0	13.5	13.6	14.4

**Table 8– Post Supervision Reductions in Criminal Behavior**

	Probation		Parole	
	2009	2010	2009	2010
Of those, Percent with property arrests	45.0	44.2	27.3	48.5
Percent with new conviction(s)	1.7	6.2	3.9	11.9
Percent with new prison commitment for new charge and/or subsequent violation	0.0	2.3	10.8	24.7
Percent with new probation for new charge	1.7	4.4	0.0	1.7

**DORA Statewide vs. Historical Sample**

A historical sample of offenders that would have qualified for DORA from Fiscal Years 2003-2007 was identified in the 2009 study. These offenders met the DORA criteria on LSI levels and prior offense histories, with exclusion of those with prior paroles or who were not US citizens. The outcomes presented in Table 9 are for those following their first qualifying probation or parole during this time period. The DORA outcomes in Table 9 have been updated through July 1, 2010. In general, DORA probationer prison admissions remain slightly lower than the historical sample, while DORA parolee prison admissions remain slightly higher than the historical sample. There doesn't appear to be much difference between the DORA and historical samples on new conviction rates at this time.

**Table 9 – DORA vs. Historical Sample**

	Probation		Parole	
	FY03-07	DORA	FY03-07	DORA
<b>Prison Admissions after Probation/Parole Start</b>				
Percent with new prison admission w/ in 6 months	2.7	1.3	17.1	13.7
Percent with new prison admission w/ in 1 year	7.7	5.1	32.3	34.2
Percent with new prison admission w/ in 2 years	16.6	10.2	47.8	54.4
<b>New Convictions after Probation/Parole Start</b>				
Percent with new convictions w/in 6 months	1.8	4.8	1.5	3.9
Percent with new convictions w/ in 1 year	7.6	8.8	10.2	11.8
Percent with new convictions w/ in 2 years	17.1	15.8	22.8	22.1

**Treatment Completers vs. Non-Completers**

As previously noted, 64.1% of statewide DORA probationers and 60.5% of parolees completed at least one treatment admission during DORA. Statewide participants who have exited DORA supervision (probation or parole ended) were split into those who had completed at least one treatment admission during DORA supervision (Tx Completers) and those who had not (Non-Completers). These two groups were compared on post-DORA criminal justice outcomes. The average follow-up times were 328 days for probation and 429 days for parole.



As shown in Table 10, treatment completers, both probationers and parolees, had better post-DORA criminal justice outcomes than non-completers. The difference in drug arrests did not reach statistical significance when examined only out of those who had a new arrest. New prison admissions were not examined for probationers, as prison admission rates were too low for probationers to examine.

An interesting thing to note is that 90% of parolees who didn't complete treatment went to prison when they exited DORA. The 44% that is shown in Table 10 is for those who had a new prison admission following that (i.e., not the event that ended DORA, but a subsequent return to prison). The average time in prison for the 90% of parolee non-completers that exited DORA directly into prison was just over 6 months (185 days).

**Table 10 – Treatment Completers vs. Non-Completers**

	Probation		Parole	
	Non-Completers	Tx Completers	Non-Completers	Tx Completers
Percent with new BCI Arrest <sup>1,2</sup>	22.9	16.2	39.9	18.3
Percent with new BCI <i>Drug</i> Arrest	9.5	5.8	14.9	7.9
Percent with new conviction <sup>1,2</sup>	10.0	4.0	20.9	5.4
Percent with new prison admission <sup>1,2</sup>	--	--	43.9	10.9

<sup>1</sup>Significant difference between Probation Non-Completers and Tx Completers

<sup>2</sup>Significant difference between Parole Non-Completers and Tx Completers

## **Discussion and Conclusion**

Compared to the 2009 Statewide DORA findings, this report showed increased successful supervision and treatment completion, but also increased during and post supervision recidivism with the increased follow-up time. Successful supervision plus treatment completion increased to 42% for probationers and 32% for parolees. However, new convictions during supervision increased to about 15% in each group, while post supervision new arrests increased to 19% for probationers and 28% for parolees.

Many of the same factors that were related to early successful supervision completion remained significantly related to supervision completion with this longer follow-up and more exited participants. These factors provide some recommendations on which participants may best succeed within the DORA statewide model and what areas need improvements. Namely, probationers who had a drug conviction at their DORA-qualifying event were more likely to successfully exit probation. Screening criteria could identify those offenders for DORA, rather than a general criminal offender who may have substance abuse issues in addition to overall criminality. Another important factor to consider is the continued relationship between the intensity of treatment required by the participants and supervision exit status, with those who require higher levels of treatment having worse criminal justice outcomes. This may suggest that those individuals do not receive the support they need in the current DORA model to achieve similar rates of success as offenders who require less intensive treatment. Lower risk offenders (lower LSI score, older age) continue to have higher successful completion rates. Again, we would caution that although higher risk offenders do not have as positive of outcomes, intensive programs should be targeted toward higher risk individuals. Lastly, decreasing the amount of time between DORA start and offenders' first contact with the probation/parole officer and increasing the amount of time offenders are in treatment will help with improving the successful completion rate.

### **Suggestions and Next Steps**

Similar to the 2009 report, we recommend that statewide DORA funding continue for those who remain in supervision and treatment to allow active DORA participants to continue and finish the program under similar conditions as those who have already exited. This consistency in implementation is necessary to evaluate the statewide model's effectiveness.

Additional follow-up time is also required to examine the full impact of statewide DORA on post supervision recidivism outcomes. With approximately a year follow-up post supervision exit in this report, 19% of probationers and 28% of parolees have been re-arrested, up from 9% and 11%, respectively, in the previous report. Additional follow-up time is required to capture the majority of recidivism events that are likely to occur. The DORA pilot study has been updated through November 2010 (see update report at <http://ucjc.law.utah.edu/>) and after three years follow-up the post supervision recidivism rate has finally appeared to level off.

## Bibliography

- Andrews, D., & Dowden, C. (2006). Risk principle of case classification in correctional treatment: A meta-analytic investigation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 50, 88-100.
- Barnoski, R. (1997). *Standards for improving research effectiveness in adult and juvenile justice*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., & Rooney, J. (2000). A quasi-experimental evaluation of an intensive rehabilitation supervision program. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27(3), 312-329.
- Kilmer, B., & Iguchi, M. (2009). *Drug treatment for drug-abusing criminal offenders: Insights from California's Proposition 36 and Arizona's Proposition 200*. Website created by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Substance Abuse Policy Research Program:  
[http://saprp.org/knowledgeassessments/knowledge\\_detail.cfm?KAID=17](http://saprp.org/knowledgeassessments/knowledge_detail.cfm?KAID=17)
- Warner, T. D., & Kramer, J. H. (2009). Closing the revolving door? Substance abuse treatment as an alternative to traditional sentencing for drug-dependent offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(1), 89-109.