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National membership association of state government officials that engages members of all three branches of state government.

Justice Center provides practical, nonpartisan advice informed by the best available evidence.
What is Justice Reinvestment?

A data-driven approach to reduce corrections spending and reinvest savings in strategies that can decrease recidivism and increase public safety

The Justice Reinvestment Initiative is supported by funding from the U.S. Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and The Pew Charitable Trusts
Justice reinvestment includes a two-part process spanning analysis, policy development, and implementation.

### Pre-enactment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bipartisan, Interbranch Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assemble practitioners and leaders; receive and consider information, reports, and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyze data sources from across the criminal justice system for comprehensive perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complement data analysis with input from stakeholder groups and interested parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policy Option Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present a policy framework to reduce corrections costs, increase public safety, and project the impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post-enactment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Policy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify needs for implementation and deliver technical assistance for reinvestment strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Monitor Key Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor the impact of enacted policies and programs; adjust implementation plan as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Type</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Filings</td>
<td>Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentencing</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Department of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Supervision</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Decision Making</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>Counties/CCAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Department of Corrections/Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs/Department of Human Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our judicial survey showed an encouraging response rate and wide consensus on many issues, including the need for more treatment resources.

• 96 of ~146 judges responded (66%), 51 of 60 judicial districts were represented (85%).
• 60 percent of judges do not receive a sentencing recommendation in their local pre-sentence investigation.
• Most judges are aware of their jail population but two-thirds say it does not have an impact on their sentencing or violation sanction decisions.
• The biggest problems judges see are the need for more treatment options, and mandatory minimum sentencing laws.
• The vast majority of judges are satisfied with probation, but also recognize that there are high caseloads and inadequate resources.
• Judges expressed general satisfaction with the sentencing guidelines.
Engaging victims and victim advocates in justice reinvestment

Process—Victim Advocate Focus Groups
April 11, 2016, Harrisburg
July 11, 2016, Camp Hill
July 12, 2016, Philadelphia
July 28, 2016, Cranberry Township
August 15, 2016, State College
Brief survey for those not able to attend.

Issues Raised
• **Fragmentation:** Every county works differently, and victims need more transparency about the processes.
• **Notification:** “Opt out” vs. “opt in.” Pretrial stage and early accountability proceedings.
• **Compensation and reparations:** Quicker access, greater eligibility, benefits, and utilization. Victims need help with immediate financial loss due to property crimes such as larceny and burglary.
• **Neighborhoods:** Support for areas with generations of violence.
• **Programming:** Batterers Intervention Programming consistency. Mandatory supervision for sex offender max outs refusing treatment. Increased support for victim awareness/understanding the impact of the crime for individuals at diversion/reentry; and evaluation to determine if programming is evidence-based and effective.
• **Awareness:** Victims don’t know about the resources available to them.
Counties bear a large and increasing share of the cost of probation. High caseloads and other challenges hinder the adoption of evidence-based practices.

In 2014, 60% of Pennsylvania probationers were misdemeanants, the sixth highest percentage among 43 states. The national average was 38%.

Probation Survey
Average active caseload size among probation officer respondents was 132.

Among those that indicated that more than half of their caseload was high risk, 59% reported spending less than half of their week in direct contact with probationers.

The large volume of misdemeanants on probation can present a challenge when trying to focus supervision on those with higher risk and more serious offenses.
Recap of Findings about Sentencing

An array of options and mandates overlays the guidelines, and yet the guidelines allow wide variation with insufficient guidance. Property and drug offenses drive sentencing volume and comprise large proportions of sentences to jail and prison.

Felony Judicial Proceedings by Sanction Type, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction Type</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>6,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>2,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Jail</td>
<td>10,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>8,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27,846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justice Center analysis of Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing data.
Pennsylvania has a high incarceration rate and the highest parole supervision rate in the country.

Reminder that the parole supervision rate includes local parole which is a feature many states do not employ.

Glossary of terms used in this presentation

Community Corrections:

Community Correction Centers (CCC)—Thirteen state facilities housing parolees, parole violators, or individuals participating in SIP that are administered by the Bureau of Community Corrections division of the DOC.

Community Contract Facilities (CCF)—The Bureau of Community Corrections also contracts with 40 private entities that provide services similar to CCCs throughout Pennsylvania.

Contract County Jail (CCJ)—A county correctional facility that has contracted with DOC to provide correctional or other services.

Halfway Back Population—People with technical parole violations who are sent to CCCs and CCFs to receive specialized programming for technical parole violators.

County Intermediate Punishment (CIP)—A direct sentencing alternative that consists of a restrictive intermediate punishment, such as a short jail stay or home confinement, and a restorative sanction/probation period.

Judicial Proceeding—Unit of analysis for sentencing data. A judicial proceeding includes all offenses committed by an offender that are sentenced on a given date and may contain a single criminal incident or multiple criminal incidents.

Offense Gravity Score (OGS)—Score assigned to the gravity of the current conviction offense for use in the sentencing guidelines. Offense Gravity Scores range from 1 to 14 on the Y axis of the sentencing guidelines grid.

Prior Record Score (PRS)—Score that depicts the seriousness and extent of an individual’s prior criminal record for use in the sentencing guidelines. Prior Record Scores range from 0 to 5 with two additional higher categories for repeat offenders, on the X axis of the sentencing guidelines grid.

Split Sentence—A sentence that combines jail or prison incarceration with a probation sentence to follow the incarceration and any parole period.

State Correction Institution (SCI)—Used in this presentation to distinguish secure prison facilities generally from community corrections.

State Intermediate Punishment (SIP)—A sentencing alternative designed for individuals convicted of a drug-related offense, or for a crime that was motivated by the defendant’s consumption of or addiction to alcohol and other drugs. Prior to sentencing, the judge must request that the DOC conduct a thorough drug and alcohol and risk assessment of the individual.
### County Impacts

1. **Challenge:** Insufficient state policy guidance and funding for probation, indigent defense, pretrial services, and diversion limits effectiveness

### Sentencing Guidance

2. **Sentencing Guidance**

### Supervision Violations

3. **Supervision Violations**
Reminder: County-based probation presents a challenge with governance, and current efforts to drive reform necessarily involve a host of entities.

Goal 3
Establish, with AOPC, CCAP, PCCD, and PBPP, a policy and organizational infrastructure and technical assistance resources to support the successful implementation of evidence-based practices at the local and state levels.

CCAPPOAP Evidence-Based Practices Strategic Plan, 2016-2018.
Funding and governance of probation and related programs is an accumulation of components rather than a conscious design.
Indigent defense is a critical part of the system that can have large impact on volume, cost, and human effects.


1. Intensive work
2. Solutions need investments
3. Few sentence reductions
4. “Nonviolent” debate
5. Race not explicit
6. Indigent defense neglected
7. Data is key
8. Implementation is key
9. Champions needed

“Compared with a person without effective counsel, a defendant represented effectively is more likely, following his or her arrest, to have the charges dismissed, to be released on pretrial supervision, or to receive a sentence to probation instead of to prison. Similarly, a person who is effectively represented and convicted of a crime that carries a prison sentence is more likely to receive a shorter sentence than someone with a similar conviction who does not receive effective representation.”
The Texas Fair Defense Act of 2001 created state policy and funding for indigent defense.

**Core Policies**
- Explicit local plan for defense
- Prompt access to counsel
- Neutral criteria for selecting attorneys
- Counsel qualifications matched to case level
- Counsel compensation standardized
- Criteria for indigence
- Consistent collection of key performance measures

**Selected Accomplishments**
- Appointment rates have increased, particularly in misdemeanor cases
- State support increased from $7M to $29M*
- Regional Capital Public Defender covering rural Texas
- Mental health public defenders in 4 counties
- Guidelines for indigent defense caseloads published in 2015

*County expenditures also increased.*
Pennsylvania is now the only state that takes no responsibility for ensuring the independence and quality of counsel under the Sixth Amendment.

“While recognizing the difficult fiscal environment the Commonwealth faces currently, the advisory committee urges the General Assembly to perform its duties under the U.S. Constitution and as a civilized society by finally addressing the deficiencies that undermine its indigent criminal defense system by reforming the system to comply with national standards.”

The “System” Lacks:
- Independence
- Training
- State Support
- Investigators

- Social Workers
- Parity
- Time
- Data

National and Pennsylvania research shows the cascading negative impact of pretrial time in jail.

The Hidden Costs of Pretrial Detention
Detaining low-risk defendants, even just for a few days, is strongly correlated with higher rates of new criminal activity both during the pretrial period and years after case disposition.

Low-risk defendants had a **40% higher chance of committing a new crime before trial** when held 2 to 3 days compared to those held one day or less and **51% higher chance of committing a new crime** in the next two years when held 8 to 14 days compared to one day or less.

Distortion of Justice: How the Inability to Pay Bail Affects Case Outcomes
Pretrial detention leads to:

- 13% increase in the likelihood of conviction, 21% increase in the likelihood of pleading guilty,
- Higher average court costs,
- Incarceration sentences that are 4.6 months longer on average.

LJAF: [http://www.arnoldfoundation.org/initiatives/case-studies/performing-foundational-research](http://www.arnoldfoundation.org/initiatives/case-studies/performing-foundational-research)
Experts recommend key tools and strategies states can provide to move from resource-based to risk-based pretrial decisions.

1. Pretrial risk assessment
2. Pretrial supervision
3. Citation in lieu of arrest
4. Elimination of bond schedules
5. Screening of criminal cases by an experienced prosecutor
6. Presence of defense counsel at initial appearance
7. Availability of detention with due process
8. Collection & analysis of performance measures

The proportion of Pennsylvania’s jail population being held pretrial varies widely by county.

Nationally, the average proportion of the local jail population that is being held pretrial is ~60%.

Among 48 Pennsylvania jails in the 2013 Annual Census of Jails, the average percent of the confined population that was awaiting trial was only 43%.

This is likely due in part to a larger proportion of inmates in Pennsylvania serving longer jail sentences.

But there is also a tremendous range of pretrial population percentages across counties which speaks to a lack uniformity in pretrial process.

Many counties are addressing pretrial challenges, and there is movement toward better practice.

**Pennsylvania Pretrial Services Association 2015 Survey Results:**
- 25 counties have no pretrial services function.
- 37 counties do have pretrial services, and all but one provide supervision.
- Most pretrial departments are in probation but some are in the jail and some are nonprofits.
- 12 programs use a risk assessment but use at least six different instruments.
- Most programs make referrals for treatment and other resources.
- Most programs are involved with local problem-solving courts.

**Pretrial Pilot Project Information:**
- CCAP pilot counties are Bucks, Blair, Columbia, Lackawanna, & Potter.
- Seven pretrial services grants are to be awarded in September (up to $236,000 per county).
- Allegheny and Berks have exceptional programs.
- 37 counties have pretrial programs but few are research-driven or follow NAPSA standards.
- PCCD study (in progress) shows “sparse use of actuarial pretrial risk assessment instruments.”
However, a national guide to pretrial laws shows Pennsylvania lacks statewide policy in three key areas where other states are moving forward.

1) Presumption in favor of releasing defendants on personal recognizance or an unsecured bond (23 states).

2) Requiring courts to impose the least restrictive condition, or combination of conditions, that will reasonably ensure appearance and safety (16 states).

3) Authorizing or requiring courts to consider the results of an actuarial risk assessment (15 states).

Court rules, 234 Pa. Code Rule 520 et seq., do not achieve these policies, although (2) ‘least restrictive condition’ is arguably encouraged in Rule 524.
Initiatives like Stepping Up provide a roadmap for addressing the intersection of behavioral health and criminal justice.

Seven counties in Pennsylvania have passed resolutions to reduce the number of people with mental illness in jails and teams from Allegheny, Berks, and Franklin attended the National Stepping Up Summit in April.

Summary information collected by DOC in 2015 indicates that out of a statewide jail population of 36,000, nearly 10,000 people (27%) at any given time are on psychotropic medications.

2014 County Prison Statistics data collected by PA DOC.
Section One Summary and Policy Direction

Challenge: Insufficient state policy guidance and funding for probation, indigent defense, pretrial services, and diversion limits effectiveness.

- Limited statewide governance and funding of probation hampers counties’ ability to adopt consistent evidence-based practices, including caseload management, graduated sanctions, and program referrals.
- Pennsylvania is the only state in the country that does not provide funding support for indigent defense. The cost of indigent defense is borne entirely by the counties.
- Pretrial risk and needs assessment is not required by the state, and as a result, many counties do not use assessment results to inform decisions about pretrial diversion, release, and supervision.

Policy Direction: Improve the capacity of county justice systems to provide effective defense, assessment, diversion, and supervision.

- Settle upon a single state-level agency and new funding mechanisms to guide practices such as risk assessment, supervision levels, and responses to violations.
- Incubate a state-level presence for the support and improvement of indigent defense.
- Use risk assessment to inform the pretrial release decision, type of supervision, and conditions.
- Help counties safely divert appropriate populations to treatment.
Overview

1. County Impacts

2. Sentencing Guidance
   Challenge: There is insufficient guidance for choosing among sentencing options and targeting supervision resources to reduce recidivism

3. Supervision Violations
Reminder: Sentencing disposition guidance is lacking for large volume populations where recidivism could be lowered…

…and sentencing patterns can vary widely across the state.

Judicial Survey
60% of judges said the guidelines are very important in helping them determine which option to use.

Judicial Survey
Three out of four judges rely most on professional judgment in making a disposition choice in Levels 2 and 3 of the sentencing guidelines but large percentages also cite criminal history, risk, offense gravity, statutory requirements, and plea agreements.
SIP requires a multi-stage selection process and multi-phase program, but lacks meaningful sentencing guidance.

Selection Process

Step 1 Eligibility
Court determines eligibility by statute and Sentencing Guidelines:
- Crime motivated by addiction
- Excludes certain convictions (weapons, violence, sex offenses)
- 10 years free of violence
- Facing a minimum sentence of 30 months or more

Step 2 Assessment
Committed to DOC for comprehensive assessment, further review of eligibility and determination of treatment needs/amenability

Step 3 Sentencing
Within 60 days of commitment, the court, District Attorney and Sentencing Commission will receive DOC’s recommendation. If all parties agree to SIP recommendation, the sentence will commence.

SIP Program Design

SIP Phase 1
Confinement/Inpatient Treatment
Minimum of 7 months in SCI with at least 4 months in an institutional therapeutic community

SIP Phase 2
Inpatient Treatment
Minimum of 2 months in a community-based therapeutic community

SIP Phase 3
Outpatient Treatment
Minimum of 6 months in an outpatient addiction treatment program while housed in a community corrections facility or an approved residence

SIP Phase 4
Supervised Reintegration
A period of reintegration into the community for the balance of the 24 months

When the minimum sentence recommended by the guidelines includes confinement in a state facility [Levels 3-5], CIP and SIP should be considered in lieu of confinement for eligible offenders.

204 Pa. Code § 303.11 (b)
Cost savings from SIP suggest expansion, but streamlining and better targeting are warranted.

SIP Program Total Volume, May 2005 to Sept. 2014

| DOC New Court Commitments | 101,700 |

Eligible for SIP
- 22,123 (22%)

Evaluated for SIP
- 5,232 (24%)

Sentenced to SIP
- 4,318 (83%)

Recidivism for SIP is comparable to prison releases. Those who fail SIP have a higher recidivism rate but their volume is relatively small.

Cost Savings
“Current estimates indicate that on average the Commonwealth will save approximately $33,250 per SIP participant due to their total reduced stay under PA DOC custody.

Upon revocation from SIP, the court may sentence the individual to any of the sentencing options available at the initial sentencing with credit for time served.

Low Risk—223 (27%)
Medium Risk—473 (56%)
High Risk—140 (17%)

Probation and CIP are distinct sentencing options under two different agencies and two different sources of limited state funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>CIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Created</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>None stated</td>
<td>Diversion from confinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Term</td>
<td>Up to maximum penalty</td>
<td>Up to maximum penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td>12 mitigating factors to suggest use</td>
<td>Nonviolent, elaborately defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>List of 14</td>
<td>Same list plus electronic monitoring and intensive supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funding Agency</td>
<td>PBPP</td>
<td>PCCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funding</td>
<td>$24M</td>
<td>$18M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Funding</td>
<td>$117M - the portion spent locally on CIP is unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Probation sentencing is permitted for up to the maximum penalty, and 35 percent of probation terms are longer than three years.

In addition to the proportions subject to longer probation terms, those with split sentences may also spend a period of time on local or state parole.

2014 American Law Institute Model Penal Code:
- Probation is for accountability and risk reduction.
- Terms should be limited to three years for felonies.
- Early termination should be authorized and encouraged.
- Lesser sanctions should be used before revocation.

Judicial Survey
72 percent of judges said extending the length of supervision following jail and parole is a very important factor in their decision to add a probation term.

Justice Center analysis of Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing data.
Probation terms don’t show the incremental increase expected across sentencing level categories.

Median Property and Drug Probation* Sentence Lengths (months) by Sentencing Grid Level, 2014

- Felony probation terms show some differentiation but are all long.
- Misdemeanor probation terms are largely uniform.

Justice Center analysis of Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing data.

* Includes probation alone and split sentences.
Probation terms are not correlated with PRS scores, a disconnect between sentencing and risk reduction.

Justice Center analysis of Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing data.
Felony probation terms within an example grid cell and crime type show a large range and geographic disparity, but not racial disparity.

Probation Sentence Lengths (months) for Specific OGS 6, PRS 0 Felony Crime, 2014

6,0 Felony Drug Possession w/Intent to Deliver by Probation Length and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median Probation Lengths (months) by County Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 8</td>
<td>Very few cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justice Center analysis of Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing data.

* Counties with fewer cases will have larger variance.
Sentencing practices often lead to long parole periods that cannot be terminated early except for commutations.

### Jail sentences with minimum sentences over 90 days in 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>DUI</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Violent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentences that were</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than twice the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean length of</td>
<td>3.9 x</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.3*</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum in relation to</td>
<td>longer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.7 x</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>longer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum sentences average more than twice the minimum, especially for property and DUI offenses.

### Prison sentences in 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>DUI</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Violent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentences that were</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than twice the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean length of</td>
<td>3.3 x</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum in relation to</td>
<td>longer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.4 x</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>longer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judicial Survey
97 percent of judges anticipate parole at most halfway through the parole window for prison sentences, and none anticipate a max out.

---

*17% were 90 days to 5 years (Max 20 times longer than the min)
As a result, 46 percent of parole supervision terms are longer than three years.

The average length of stay on parole supervision for those revoked to DOC in FY2015 was two years. 30% were revoked within the first year on parole, 64% within two years, and 82% within 3 years.

First-time successful parolees served an average of three years before completing their parole term.

24% of those on parole for longer than three years were initially assessed as high risk.

Independent research has shown that those on high supervision have similar recidivism rates as those on low supervision after three years or more on parole in PA.

Average initial parole length 3.7 years (median 2.9 years)

Justice Center analysis of Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing data, Kiminori Nakamura, University of Maryland, Applying Redemption to the Length & Level of Parole Supervision.
Reminder: Reducing probation and parole caseloads can improve supervision and reduce recidivism.

Probation caseloads are high, but structured probation lengths could provide relief by exchanging longer supervision for better supervision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014</th>
<th>State Probation/Parole</th>
<th>County Probation/Parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Agents</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Cases (All supervision types and levels)</td>
<td>33,082</td>
<td>187,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Active Caseload per Agent</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While higher caseloads are less of an issue for parole supervision, these are still important resources that could be redirected to further drive down recidivism, and there is little public safety benefit to holding people past three years.
Challenge: There is insufficient guidance for choosing among sentencing options and targeting supervision resources to reduce recidivism.

• SIP is a complex sentencing option that creates savings but needs better targeting.
• CIP and probation are distinct sentencing options under two different agencies and two different sources of limited state funding.
• Probation terms are uncorrelated with criminal history, which impedes ability to focus supervision based on risk of recidivism.
• Sentencing practice contributes to state parole terms that extend well beyond the period when likelihood of recidivism is the highest.

Policy Direction: Simplify sentencing options so that supervision and program resources are prioritized by risk and cost-effectiveness.

• Simplify SIP and design it to be more broadly utilized.
• Merge probation and CIP into a single sentencing option, a continuum of supervision and interventions designed as a behavioral change agent.
• Provide guidance for setting the length of probation terms based on criminal history (PRS).
• Provide for accelerated parole discharge to focus parole supervision and programs on periods when risk of recidivism is the highest.
Overview

1. County Impacts

2. Sentencing Guidance

3. Supervision Violations
   Challenge: Responses to probation and parole violations are costly and are not informed by a person’s risk and needs
Pennsylvania has the third-highest rate of adults on correctional control among states, with large volumes on supervision.

Pennsylvania ranks third among states in rate of people under correctional control (2,920 per 100,000).

Includes federal, state, and local incarceration as well as state and local supervision.

73% of Pennsylvania’s total correctional control population is on probation or parole.

An estimated 23 percent of people admitted to prison in 2014 were on probation or CIP at the time.

New Court Commitments to DOC in 2014

10,313


871,946 Judicial Proceedings

Match based on prison admission dates that fell within the calculated probation start and end dates from previous probation sentences.

Percent Matched as Probationer Admitted to Prison

23%
A large probation supervision population can provide a driver for the prison population.

Local Probation and CIP Population 90,515

PA Prison Population 48,881

Probation Violators 17%

Note: Estimated probation violator proportion of the population based on 2,351 matched admissions from the previous slide x 2.3 year minimum sentence x 150% average percent of minimum served at first release = 8,100 beds.

Justice Center analysis of DOC Admission data and Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing data.
Most probation violators admitted to prison have property/drug convictions, have substance use issues, and are short mins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 New Prison Commits</th>
<th>Non-probation Violators</th>
<th>Probation Violators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property and Drug Offense</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Mins*</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Min Sentence Length</td>
<td>3.7 years</td>
<td>2.3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate or High Risk</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanants</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Indicator</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more prior adult convictions</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probation violators constituted 28% of the 4,889 property and drug offense admissions to prison in 2014.

Justice Center analysis of DOC Admission data and Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing data.

* Short mins are prison admissions with a minimum sentence of a year or less.
Implementing evidence-based practices in probation would help reduce recidivism and avoid correction costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Opportunity to Strengthen Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large and growing county supervision population</td>
<td>Use risk assessment to drive case management and focus officer time on higher-risk cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision revocations adding cost to jail and prison</td>
<td>Provide a consistent range of non-custodial responses to violation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow and costly responses to serious violations</td>
<td>Enable swift, certain, and proportional 2 to 3 day jail stays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient program capacity for higher-risk county probationers and parolees</td>
<td>Integrate state funds for probation (CIP, D&amp;A RIP, and grant-in-aid) and make systematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long supervision periods stretch resources</td>
<td>Frontload supervision resources within the early period of the probation term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many outcomes and performance measures for county supervision are unknown</td>
<td>Collect county supervision data statewide to enable regular analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since 2012 the number of parole violators admitted to the SCI dropped by 19 percent, with some diverted to community corrections.

Since enactment of Pennsylvania’s 2012 justice reinvestment policy framework, the number of technical parole violators diverted to community corrections has increased, and lengths of stay for those recommitted to prison have decreased. The impacts have generated savings that are being reinvested into public safety strategies.

**SCI Admissions by Type, 2010–2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Parole Violators</th>
<th>New Commitments</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>18,383</td>
<td>10,815</td>
<td>1,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>18,233</td>
<td>10,964</td>
<td>1,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5,623 31%</td>
<td>10,810</td>
<td>1,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7,278 36%</td>
<td>11,520</td>
<td>2,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5,854 32%</td>
<td>10,321</td>
<td>2,058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justice Center analysis of Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole data.
Parole violator admissions to community corrections equaled the number of people returning to the SCI at the end of 2015.

**Monthly Parole Violator Admissions by Facility Type, April 2012–Dec 2015**

- SCI Parole Violator Admissions
- CCC/CCF/CCJ Parole Violator Admissions

Average length of stay for parole violators in community corrections has held steady in recent years.

**Median Length of Stay by Facility Type, 2015 Releases**

- Halfway Back: 1.9 months
- Parole Violator Centers: 2.3 months
- Contract Jails: 4.3 months

**Important Note:** DOC reports that due to budgetary constrictions in 2016, substantial numbers of technical violators that were being housed in CCJs are now being returned to the SCI where the marginal costs per day are much lower than the contract per diem.
Capped periods for technical parole violators have not dropped the average length of stay below one year.

If only those admitted after Jan. 1, 2013 are included, the average drops from 13.4 months to 6.7 months. 51% of that group spent more than 6 months in the SCI and 10% were incarcerated for more than 12 months.

Technical parole violations that meet the “fab five” criteria may be exempt from capped returns to the SCI if they meet criteria such as refusing programming or getting certain misconduct reports.

Fab five violators include:
1. Violations of a sexual nature
2. Assaultive behavior
3. Possession of a weapon
4. Absconding
5. An identifiable threat to public safety
Technical violators represent 56% of parole recommitments, and their volume is up substantially.

The proportion of parole recommitments that were technical violators has not changed dramatically over the past five years, but the volume is up 33%.

FY2015 Parole Recommitments to the SCI or CCJs: 5,718

- Convicted Violators*: 2,514 (44%)
- Technical Violators: 3,204 (56%)

Property and drug offenses constitute 48% of technical violators and 27% of all parole recommitments.

Justice Center analysis of Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole data.
In addition to parole supervision, Pennsylvania invests heavily in community correction programs and sanctions.

Community Corrections and Parole Supervision Expenditures, FY2015

- Parole Supervision $126M (FY16)
- Non-residential Service Lots $8M
- CCJ $23M
- CCC $30M
- CCF $78M

Total $267M
Community corrections is made up of a blend of various population types, population sizes, risk levels, and housing types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Corrections Population</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Supervised by</th>
<th>Facility Types</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
<th>Medium Risk</th>
<th>High Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>DOC facility staff</td>
<td>CCC and CCF</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole to Center</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Facility staff and PBPP agent</td>
<td>CCC and CCF</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfway Back</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Facility staff and PBPP agent</td>
<td>CCC and CCF</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Violators</td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>DOC or contract facility staff</td>
<td>CCC, CCJ, and CCF</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some facilities have both open and secure beds. 48 of 69 total facilities serve more than one type of population. 17 facilities serve three or all four population types.

CCC and CCFs house an average of 69 people (range 27 to 156). CCCs house an average of 72 people (range 1 to 240). CCJs house an average of 71 people (range 7 to 189).

Larger proportions of medium- and high-risk people are found in the Halfway Back and Parole Violator populations. Low-, medium-, and high-risk individuals mix within facilities.

Many center beds are occupied by people leaving prison, limiting usage for response to violations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Facility Type</th>
<th>Community Corrections Beds Occupied, CY-end 2015</th>
<th>4,722</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOC Community Corrections Centers (CCC) (15 Facilities)</td>
<td>1,067 (23%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Contract Facilities (CCF) (37 Facilities)</td>
<td>2,650 (56%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted County Jail (CCJ) (17 Facilities)</td>
<td>1,005 (21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Population Type</th>
<th>SIP 571 (12%)</th>
<th>Paroles to Center 2,080 (44%)</th>
<th>Halfway Back Parolees 736 (16%)</th>
<th>Parole Violators 1,335 (28%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of parolees are released to centers instead of an approved home plan.

Volume paroled to center up 38% (1,901 people) over the past five years. The parole board's practice is to parole those without an approved home plan to community corrections centers.

Justice Center analysis of Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole data.
Recidivism rates are higher for people released to a center versus released to home plan, regardless of risk.

These results are in alignment with the evaluation of community corrections in 2009 by Latessa, Lowenkamp, and Bechtel at the University of Cincinnati which found:

- The comparison group consistently had significantly lower recidivism for all five outcome measures than the treatment group.
- Within programs, there was a mix of risk levels. Most programs did not separate offenders by risk level and were not conducting their own validated and normed actuarial risk assessment on their target population.
- Interaction between offenders of various risk levels may contribute to the higher recidivism rates for the treatment group.
- Placement into programming, dosage of treatment, and case management planning should be done with the most recent risk evaluation taken into consideration.


* Based on DOC RST risk assessment instrument.
Some community corrections facilities have had better recidivism results in general or within certain risk groups.

1-year Overall Recidivism Rate Percentage Point Difference Compared to Parole to Home Plan by CCC/CCF Program and Risk Level,* 2006–2011 Releases

Each segment represents the relative recidivism rate for paroles to a particular CCC/CCF in comparison to those paroled to home plans for low-, medium-, and high-risk populations.

PA DOC analysis of community corrections recidivism data.

* Based on DOC RST risk assessment instrument.
Performance-based contracting in CCFs is showing promise as one aspect of a comprehensive recidivism-reduction strategy.

**Performance-based Contracting**

In early 2013, DOC re-bid all contracts for the operation of CCF centers with the idea that contractors should be held accountable for their role in recidivism reduction.

If a CCF reduces its recidivism rate below the baseline recidivism range within a given 6-month period of the contract, they receive a 1% increase in their per-client daily charge rate for the next period. Increases in recidivism will result in warnings and possible contract cancellation.

**Results from the first two marking periods:**
- The overall recidivism rate was down in both periods.
- In total, 17 CCF contract periods showed reduced recidivism and received the 1% incentive.
- Only two centers have received warnings for increased recidivism above baseline.

**Are community corrections programs following the principles of effective intervention?**

1. Prioritize high-risk people
2. Address criminogenic needs
3. Implement programs with fidelity
Parole supervision employs a sanctions matrix to structure violation response but lacks policy guiding program placement.

PBPP’s Violation Sanctions Matrix

Uses Three Factors
- Violation Severity
- Parolee Risk Score
- Prior Adjustment

To guide responses from three ranges:

High-range Responses
- Inpatient Alcohol or Drug Treatment
- CCC/CCF Halfway Back
- PV Center
- Contract Jail
- SCI

Medium-range Responses
- Cognitive behavioral
- Day reporting
- Family reunification
- Housing Group
- Domestic Violence Group
- Increased Urinalysis Testing
- Outpatient Alcohol or Drug Treatment

Low-range Responses
- Written travel restriction
- Written warning
- Community service
- Curfew (increased curfew)
- Refer to ASCRA groups

Although a range of state-funded residential and nonresidential programs are available, the absence of policy to sort parolees into programs based on risk, need and violation behavior limits potential for maximizing impact.
Current policies lack admission criteria to prioritize participants based on assessed risk and need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Length of Stay</th>
<th>Annual Admissions</th>
<th>Per Diem</th>
<th>Cost per Sanction</th>
<th>Cost per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halfway Back</td>
<td>1.9 months</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$4,280</td>
<td>$16M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Violator Center</td>
<td>2.3 months</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$5,601</td>
<td>$16M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Jail</td>
<td>4.3 months</td>
<td>1,700*</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>$15M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SCI Parole Violators          | 13 months              | 4,800*            | Marginal $17  
Fully Loaded $100 | Marginal $6,727  
Fully Loaded $39,569 | Marginal $32M  
Fully Loaded $190M |

The cost of the more intensive, restrictive options are considerable, requiring these resources to be focused on higher-risk parolees who have committed the most serious violations.

* As noted earlier, the admissions pattern for technical violators is shifting in 2016, which will affect average length of stay and costs.

January 2016 PA DOC JPM and JRI Dashboards, Cost per day information received from PA DOC.
More than 15,000 state-funded prison and community correction beds are used to sanction probationers and parolees.

**PA Prison Population**
- 48,881

**State Parole Population**
- 40,636

**Local Probation and CIP Population**
- 90,515

**Community Corrections Population**
- 4,722
  - Probation Violators: 17%
  - Parole Violators: 13%

**State Parole Population**
- 40,636

---

Justice Center analysis of DOC Admission data, Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing data and Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole data.
Incarcerating probation and parole revocations cost Pennsylvania taxpayers an estimated $421 million per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Probationers Admitted to Prison in 2014</th>
<th>Average Minimum Prison Sentence Length among these Admissions</th>
<th>Annual Cost of Prison per Person*</th>
<th>Minimum Estimated Cost to Imprison 2014 Probation Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>2.3 years</td>
<td>$36,500</td>
<td>$197M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole Revocations Admitted to Prison in 2014</th>
<th>Average Length of Stay</th>
<th>Annual Cost of Prison per Person*</th>
<th>Total Estimated Cost to Imprison 2014 Parole Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6,134</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$36,500</td>
<td>$224M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This does not include the costs associated with probation and parole violators awaiting hearings, probationers serving jail revocation sentences in local jails, or parole violators being housed in community corrections facilities.

Justice Center analysis of DOC Admission data and Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing data.

* Fully loaded cost per year
In recent years, many states have implemented swift, certain, proportionate sanctions for technical violators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sanctions Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Up to 30 days of confinement for “high level” supervision violations. SAC reduced the length of stay and encouraged more appropriate and proportionate responses to violations. SAC participants were less likely to recidivate—20% less likely to receive any felony conviction, and 30% less likely to receive a violent felony conviction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Enable probation to respond to violations of supervision conditions with 2 to 3 day jail sanctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Allows judicial districts to establish a program of short jail sanctions but does not require it. Sanctions can range from 3 to 21 days, even for low-level violations if the individual has had multiple violations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probation revocations to prison fell by half. Recent analysis indicates violators with a “quick dip” were less likely to abscond or be revoked to prison and more likely to be successful on supervision than those that did not receive a quick dip in response to supervision violations.

Judicial Survey:
82 of 94 (87%) said administrative violation hearings/sanctioning by probation officers was either currently allowed, or that they would support it, perhaps with judicial review.

Section Three Summary and Policy Direction

3

Supervision Violations

**Challenge:** Responses to probation and parole violations are costly and are not informed by a person’s risk and needs.

- Incarcerating people who have failed on probation and parole supervision costs Pennsylvania taxpayers an estimated $420 million per year.
- People who have violated the terms of their probation or parole occupy nearly one-third of prison beds.
- People paroled from prison occupy more than half of the state’s community corrections beds, even though they are more likely to fail on parole than people released from prison straight to parole supervision.
- Parole violators are not matched to programs based on their individual risk and needs, which contributes to the likelihood they will fail on supervision.

**Policy Direction:** Structure how sanctions and programs are used in response to supervision violations.

- Incentivize and guide the adoption of swift, certain, and brief sanctions for minor supervision violations.
- Emulate states that are using shorter sanction periods for more serious supervision violations to achieve the same sanctioning impact with dramatically lower cost.
- Tailor admissions to community correction programs based on risk, violation severity, and cost-effectiveness.
## Summary for Discussion of Policy Directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Capacity of county justice systems:</th>
<th>Pursue</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Single agency for probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. State support for indigent defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Risk assessment for pretrial release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Simplify sentencing options:</th>
<th>Pursue</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SIP expansion and streamlining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Probation and CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Probation terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Parole discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Supervision violations:</th>
<th>Pursue</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Swift and certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Sanctions in lieu of revocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Community corrections admissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Pennsylvania Justice Reinvestment Timeline

Data Analysis
- Initial Analysis
- Detailed Data Analysis
- Impact Analysis

Policymaker and Stakeholder Engagement
- Stakeholder Engagement and Policymaker Briefings
- Policy Option Development
- Ongoing Engagement
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