

# MCJRP

## Measures and Perspectives on Success

### *Final Report of Findings*

---

Multnomah County  
Justice Reinvestment Program

February 2024



DEPARTMENT OF  
COMMUNITY JUSTICE  
Community Safety Through Positive Change



# Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program: Measures and Perspectives on Success Project

## Final Report of Findings

### Report Prepared by:

#### MAPS Evaluation Team

- Multnomah County Department of Community Justice
- Oregon Judicial Department
- Multnomah County District Attorney's Office
- Multnomah County Sheriff's Office

### Primary Contact:

#### Department of Community Justice

Multnomah County, Oregon  
421 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Portland, OR 97204  
503.988.3680  
<https://www.multco.us/dcj>

### Acknowledgements:

This project was supported by a grant awarded by the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission to support research and evaluation of the Justice Reinvestment Initiative (SB 3194).

The Measures and Perspectives on Success (MAPS) evaluation represented a collaboration of researchers across multiple agencies involved in the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP): Multnomah County Department of Community Justice, Multnomah County District Attorney's Office, Oregon Judicial Department, and Multnomah County Sheriff's Office.

In addition, this work was only possible because of the staff, stakeholders, participants, victims of crime/survivors of violence, and community partners who were willing to spend time sharing their thoughts and experiences about MCJRP. The evaluation team would also like to thank the entire MCJRP collaborative for supporting the evaluation team throughout this process.

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Staff and Stakeholder Feedback .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Key Thematic Findings.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Working Well .....	8
Not Working Well .....	8
Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic .....	11
Client Success.....	12
Program Success .....	13
Opportunity for Program Re-Alignment.....	14
Desired Program Changes or Additions .....	14
<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Participant Feedback.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>How Do Clients Feel about MCJRP? .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Did Clients Understand the Program? .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Did Clients Feel Respected while in the Program? .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>What Makes Clients Feel Respected?.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>How Was the MCJRP Assessment Experience? .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>How Was the MCJRP Supervision Experience? .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>How Helpful Were the Community-Based Services?.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>How Do Clients Define Success? .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>What Future Improvements Did Clients Suggest? .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Victim/Survivor and Partner Agency Feedback .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Victims of Crime Feedback.....</b>	<b>24</b>
More Ongoing Information .....	24
Treated with Respect and Being Heard.....	24
Victim Advocate Support .....	25
Successful Outcome .....	25
Recommendations and Final Thoughts from Victims/Survivors .....	25
<b>Victim/Survivor Provider Feedback.....</b>	<b>26</b>
Incorporating Victim/Survivor Needs into MCJRP .....	26
Improvements Needed .....	26
Success for Victims/Survivors and Participants.....	27
Final Thoughts of Victim/Survivor Providers .....	28

<b>Community Partner Feedback .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>The Key for Partner Success: Teamwork .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Community Partner Needs .....</b>	<b>30</b>
Review of Referral Practices and Sources.....	31
Practices and Guidelines for Urgent Communication with DCJ/POs.....	31
<b>Impacts on Client Engagement and Retention.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>MCJRP Participant Success.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Summary: Community Partner Feedback .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Participant Case Review .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Methods.....</b>	<b>35</b>
Sample .....	35
Procedure.....	35
Analytic Approach.....	36
Limitations.....	37
<b>Findings.....</b>	<b>37</b>
Documentation of Success for People Under Supervision .....	37
Thematic Coding Results .....	38
Overall Findings .....	41
<b>Recommendations.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Quantitative Outcome Analysis .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Program Description .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Quantitative Research Questions .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Procedure .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Sample.....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Variables .....</b>	<b>45</b>
Dependent Variables .....	45
Predictor variables .....	45
<b>Results.....</b>	<b>46</b>
Research Question 1: Demographics of Participants .....	46
Research Question 2: Impact of JSC and LS/CMI on Sentencing .....	48
Research Question 3: Recidivism Rates .....	49
Research Question 4: Time to Recidivate .....	56
Research Question 5: Impact of JSC and LS/CMI on Recidivism .....	58
<b>Discussion.....</b>	<b>64</b>
Take Home Messages.....	66
<b>Appendix A: Interview Protocols.....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Appendix B: Recruitment Materials .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Appendix C: Original MCJRP Process Diagram.....</b>	<b>67</b>

# Introduction

The Oregon Criminal Justice Commission funded a two-year evaluation of the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP) that began in January 2022. The primary goals of the evaluation project, entitled Measures and Perspectives on Success (MAPS), were to (1) establish a solid understanding of the experiences of people who participate in or are affected by the MCJRP process, (2) identify the factors that contribute to success for people who participate in MCJRP, (3) receive feedback from stakeholders and partners, and (4) understand the experiences of the victims of crime/survivors of violence. This report focuses on feedback from community partner agencies who serve individuals in MCJRP.

Four research questions guided the evaluation:

- 1) What are the experiences (positive and negative) of people who participate in the MCJRP process and how do these experiences inform improvements to the MCJRP program?
- 2) What factors contribute to the success of participants in MCJRP?
- 3) What factors contribute to treatment engagement and retention?
- 4) What are the experiences (positive and negative) of the victims of crime/survivors of violence who are affected by people in MCJRP and how do these experiences inform improvements to the MCJRP program?

To answer those research questions, the proposed methodology included the following components:

- Individual interviews with 40 participants
- Four focus groups with subgroups of participants – topics needing more detail based on the individual interviews
- Individual interviews with 16–24 MCJRP staff and stakeholders
- Individual interviews with 6–10 community treatment provider partners
- Individual interviews with victims of crime/survivors of violence impacted by MCJRP participants
- Individual interviews with representatives from victim/survivor agencies partnering with MCJRP
- Ten case reviews of MCJRP participants to determine how success-related data is recorded in the administrative data system (DOC400)
- Quantitative data analysis of outcomes for MCJRP participants

The interview protocols employed for the relevant components above are included in Appendix A of this report.

This report is divided into the following six sections to identify the methodology employed and summarize the key findings from the analysis.

- Staff and stakeholder feedback
- Participant feedback
- Victim/survivor and partner agency feedback
- Community partner feedback
- Participant case review
- Quantitative Outcome Analysis

## Staff and Stakeholder Feedback

Members of the operations and leadership teams, as well as past members of those groups, were invited to participate in an individual phone or video interview with one of the evaluation team members. Of the 45 people invited, 41 agreed to complete an interview for a response rate of 91.1%. Agencies represented across the interviews were (in alphabetical order):

- Metropolitan Public Defender
- Multnomah Defenders Inc.
- Multnomah County Department of Community Justice
- Multnomah County District Attorney's Office
- Multnomah County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council
- Multnomah County Sheriff's Office
- Multnomah Defenders Inc.
- Oregon Judicial Department
- Portland Police Bureau

Interviews were conducted over a nine-month period (early August 2022 through mid-May 2023). The duration of the interviews ranged from 7 to 73 minutes, with an average duration of 33.4 minutes.

Topics of these interviews included which components of the MCJRP model are working well and which are not working well, how equity and inclusion are implemented within the MCJRP model, what success looks like for both clients and the program, and the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Interviews were analyzed using qualitative thematic analysis. This process involved investigating every interview and discovering themes within through a grounded inductive perspective. Once these themes were identified, the interviews were coded for them deductively. Finally, the interviews were processed in a co-axial phase, where relationships between thematic codes were identified.

When a project like this one requests information from experts on their own work almost all information is useful in one way or another, as it allows us a micro level understanding of the day to day workings. However, for the sake of the scope of this project, only those themes that were identified by three or more individuals are reported here. There are likely key pieces of information offered by interviewees which do not rise to the level of a qualitative finding in a thematic analysis, but should still be considered by program leadership.

# Key Thematic Findings

## Working Well

Almost all respondents could point to a part of the MCJRP program they could personally testify as working well, and many respondents described positively functioning elements.

It is important to note that because there was such diversity among respondents in the specific role they played for the MCJRP program, much of what the respondents noted as working well were mentioned only once or twice. What this suggests is that there are many elements of the MCJRP program that work well, but due to the complexity of the program only those staff who interact with any given element are aware of the success. Broad awareness of any given element of MCJRP is much more likely to come out of an element that is NOT going well than one that is.

This important note aside, there were three elements that almost all respondents thought the current iteration of MCJRP performed well:

### Prison Diversion

Respondents were in broad agreement that one of the main goals of the MCJRP program was to divert individuals away from prison sentences and into community-based alternatives. They overwhelmingly thought that MCJRP was meeting this goal for its clients.



I think what's going well is those people that go through the MCJRP process, I see them in a lot of respects kind of coming into their leadership as people with lived experience and wanting to not only strengthen their families, but also to build stronger communities. I think that that's something that's working well.

### Evidenced Based

Respondents also believed a major goal of MCJRP was to give program clients access to evidence-based treatments and interventions. It was the general opinion that the MCJRP program functioned in this way by diverting clients away from prison (where they were unlikely to improve) and into programs that treated their substance use and mental health struggles directly.

### Individualized Programs

It was a very consistent opinion that for the MCJRP client population, client success was based on a very individualized set of goals (this is discussed further under the Client Success section that follows). Most respondents believed that MCJRP had the flexibility to meet such individualized client needs, and was generally avoiding the program pitfall of insisting on a one-size-fits-all approach to client recovery and desistance.

## Not Working Well

MCJRP is a complex program of multiple agencies and disciplines, each with their own expertise and demands. As mentioned above, staff from all parts of MCJRP were much more likely to be made aware of the elements of the program that had become difficult or dysfunctional. As such, there was more broad-based agreement on what elements of MCJRP were not going well and needed some form of change or repair.

## Judicial Settlement Conferences

Most respondents understood Judicial Settlement Conferences (JSCs) to be extremely important to both client and program success. However, it was very broadly reported that these meetings had become significantly less functional over the course of the program, with a decline escalating sharply at the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic. The JSCs in their current form struggle significantly in the following ways.

- Being scheduled in a timely manner
- Having every relevant party in attendance
- Having all necessary communication between parties prior to the conference
- Having all necessary communication following the conference

Respondents reported that when JSCs were significantly delayed or had poor attendance, clients were left with confusing and frustrating gaps in both treatment and accountability. In some cases, this resulted in clients falling out of the MCJRP program altogether. The weight of this response in the interviews suggests that this element of MCJRP is key to the program's future success and that improving the process of JSCs should be a priority for leadership.



All the research is clear that the closer in time you can make the intervention to the original incident, the better for outcomes. And so a process that can take a year or more to get people to resolve their case and then into a treatment intervention is a lot of lost time. And it's also not good for victims of crime who have to be ready, potentially, to go to trial, rearrange their schedules to accommodate court hearings-- eventually, sometimes, they become disinterested in following through because they're so frustrated with the length of time it takes to resolve a case.

## Siloing

Respondents widely reported that the MCJRP program struggled with information and communication siloing between partnering agencies and professionals. Although respondents could only speak to their isolated part of the program, the thread of information siloing became clear during the analysis. It was common for respondents to be largely unaware of another part of the program they did not directly play a part in. Respondents reported that this problem was escalating as new staff were hired into the program without historic program knowledge and experience.

For respondents, this siloing led to confusion and delays for clients and staff. Time was spent seeking out information on where a case is in its process, what decisions have been made, or what decisions need to be made. Sometimes this led to cases languishing as one element of the program was not aware they were needed to move it forward.

Respondents requested more information and training on how the MCJRP program is structured and how it functions across agencies and through the life of a case. They also requested either more cross-agency meetings or mandatory attendance at existing cross-agency meetings to rectify some of this problem.

## Dedicated Judicial Staff

It was a widely reported experience that the MCJRP program process became significantly more difficult when there was no longer a MCJRP-dedicated judge. When it existed, a dedicated program judge streamlined the client and agency process, and reduced the amount of required communication between all parties involved. With the current model of rotating judges, the burden of communication from MCJRP to the bench has increased significantly, and there is a greater burden of MCJRP staff having to continually explain and advocate for the MCJRP program philosophy while working to move their clients through the program.

## Continuity of Care

Respondents were frequently concerned about places in the MCJRP process where clients faced a gap in their care or access to interventions. These included access to medication, mental health treatment, and addiction services, including sober living facilities. Many of these points were not repeated, due largely to the siloing phenomenon discussed above, but the reported impact to clients was universally considered urgent.



...the more we can shrink the timeline from somebody, whatever the incident is, to the ... intervention, mental health, housing, a drug and addiction counseling treatment available on demand for people. Typically, when we interact with folks, especially at the very beginning [or the onset of their cases, they're probably at the point of being the most open to change, most of them [inaudible], where they at least have some recognition that things in their life are not going like they would hope they would. And we need to be able to kind of strike at that moment and get people into the help that they need.

Points where clients were in danger of losing continuity of care included when they were going into or out of jail/prison, during extended waits for their JSC, and delays in having other meetings with program staff or partner agencies.

Respondents pointed to a need to prioritize continuity of care and intervention, and a systematic review of the MCRP process to identify and eliminate these care/intervention gaps.

## Continuity of Staff

Respondents reported that the complexity of the MCJRP program meant that staff turnover was particularly burdensome to the process. When staff leave the program for other employment, or employment elsewhere in the program, there is an insufficient process to replace their institutional knowledge and expertise. This points to a need to retain staff where possible, and to develop sufficient onboarding processes for new staff.

## Speed of Access to Care

Respondents consistently reported that the current MCJRP process time for service provision was too slow to be fully beneficial to its clients. MCJRP clients need rapid access to their identified treatment and intervention needs. However, scheduling and availability challenges were slowing this access to the point where it had negative impacts on client success.

Respondents broadly believed that quick access to treatment and interventions must be considered a priority to program success, and that changes to the MCJRP program should be angled towards this goal.

## Accountability

There was frequent concern among respondents that clients were not being held accountable for their transgressions in a timely or sufficient manner. Many respondents believed having sufficient accountability was key to client success, particularly in regard to moving from a pre-contemplative state to a contemplative state in their recovery journey.



...this is a program that's supposed to assist, helpmate, and move people forward in the process. But we always have to have an underlying accountability. And that has been severely compromised as we go forward with the court system, the DAs, etc., on the accountability side. It appears that most people are facing prison time when they accept MCJRP. But the day after they get off probation, everybody seems to forget about the assault tool or the firearm or the major crime that got them there. And being able to hold people accountable to a certain level has been difficult at best.

A lack of sufficient accountability was believed to be the result of two issues: (1) difficulty in scheduling the necessary meetings and (2) general belief among program collaborators that only treatment should be offered in response to client transgression, rather than utilizing more traditional sanctions. To increase the ability of MCJRP to hold its clients accountable to their actions, adjustments would have to be made to both obstacles.

## Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic, lasting roughly from 2020 through 2022, resulted in a significant restructuring of essentially all government processes. MCJRP was possibly more impacted than most programs due to the fact that it is a cross-agency cooperation that, prior to the pandemic, relied heavily on in-person meetings between many different elements.

Many respondents reported that the pandemic's impact on MCJRP remained significant, with almost all elements of the process having changed. As such, it is difficult to truly separate the rest of this report from the specific impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. However there remain two particular lasting impacts.

## Case Backlog

Due to the constraints of the state-mandated social distancing requirements, cases moved extremely slowly through the MCJRP process, and many remain unresolved going back to 2019. This backlog of cases is slowing the process of all MCJRP cases, and leaving many clients in a difficult situation in regard to their legal status and to their access to MCJRP treatments and services. There was no single idea from respondents on how to handle this difficulty except to somehow bring in more staff to process the backlog.



It feels like there's some challenges with getting the evaluations done. Because of COVID, I think there are a lot of challenges with getting the evaluations done, and I'm not sure how we can get that jump-started. I may not have the data, so I may not know exactly what I'm missing, but it feels like, how do we move those cases?

## Loss of Existing Process

To comply with social distancing requirements during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, many of the process elements of the MCJRP program were radically altered or dropped altogether. Now that social distancing measures have been rescinded, many of these process elements have not been reimplemented

to their previous state. The result is that the current process is less predictable to staff, and respondents believe it is less responsive to client needs. While a complete return to pre-pandemic process may not be possible or even desirable, deliberate attention is needed to address gaps left by pandemic related disruption.

## Client Success

Respondents had consistent views about what constituted clients' success, which persisted across roles.

### Individualized Definitions of Success

Most respondents believe that one of the great successes of MCJRP was that it recognizes that its client population has highly individualized needs and therefore highly individualized goals. Success for a client may look like abstinence from substance use, entering appropriate treatment for their mental health, or gaining stable housing or employment. Success for a client in this program is defined by how well their personal needs and goals are met.

“

Each individual is going to be different based on what their goals are. I have had everything MCJRP and general supervision across multiple caseloads, everything from success is not going back to the prison, to success is having a job, having my own personal apartment or space type of thing.

### Reintegration

Most respondents also believed that success for clients meant that they successfully reintegrate with their community. Success in this regard means healthier relationships with families, stable employment, and the ability to obtain and hold stable housing.

“

But I think, overall, for MCJRP, that we have people successfully complete probation, and they don't recidivate, and that we're confident that they have enough in their lives so that they're not likely to come back. ... I mean, there's nothing more satisfying when you see that somebody has a job, they've developed relationships. One of my people ... never thought that he would have custody of his very young baby, but he ... brought her to court because he's just got custody.

### Recidivism Reduction

While respondents emphasized the importance of letting clients set their own goals, and emphasizing re-integrating with their community, they also acknowledged that client success meant that they were not recidivating in the kind of criminal activity that led them to MCJRP.

“

One level is that it gets them out of the cycle of committing crimes and going to jail or going to prison and getting out and then committing more crimes, being trapped in their addictions, which is often what's driving the criminal behavior. So one level of success is to better protect the community and reduce recidivism.

### Addiction Recovery

Respondents frequently emphasized addiction recovery as an important marker of client success, and often a key element necessary for reintegration and reduction in recidivism.

“

So I think maybe the first piece down the path of success would be stabilizing them. Whether that means they were houseless and now they have a place to live, whether it means, "Hey, I've been using drugs daily. I'm still sort of using, but I'm at least to the point where I can function outside of the drugs because I'm only using occasionally now." Right? Getting them a little bit more stable.

## Mental Health Stabilization

Respondents also noted that client success was defined by and reliant on any mental health issues being addressed and stabilized.



Somebody that struggles with depression and gets out of bed and is able to make breakfast that day, that's a big win for that person. So I think it's really about how motivation, self-worth, and even if they stumble, to redirect-- a setback doesn't take someone's success away.

## Program Success

While client success can be individually defined based on a given client's circumstances and goals, program success is defined by how the MCJRP program serves the community as a whole and how it functions as a collaboration. Such a definition includes client success, but includes other important considerations as well.

## Recidivism

Respondents believed that a successful MCJRP program should reduce recidivism in individual clients, and thereby reduce recidivism in the broader community.

## Community Stabilization

As recidivism reduces and as individuals receive needed treatments, respondents believed a successful MCJRP program should stabilize the broader community. The county as a whole should see a reduction in crime and benefit from having healthier and stabilized community members.

## Consistent Programming

For many respondents, a successful program meant having consistently available programming. Clients should be able to access treatments that meet their needs, and those treatments should be available year upon year. Some programming areas that respondents would like to see more of included culturally-specific services and using more peer mentors and social workers to support clients.

## Consistent and Reliable Communication

Respondents also believed that a successful MCJRP program needs consistent and reliable communication practices among all of its many actors and agencies. All staff involved in any client case should know the status of that case, and know where to go to find pertinent information regarding it. Client needs and successes should be known by all partners working on their case.



The process seems very complex, and I don't even know if there's any way of doing it. But if there would be a way of kind of in terms of just the flow and how it gets brokered, like, "If A, then B. If not B, then C. And if not C, then D or E." If there would be a way to kind of streamline that where it doesn't seem so confusing, especially for the participants – are people like me providing the direct services that are trying to explain this to the person when they're asking these questions?

## Appropriate Case Resolution Times

Respondents considered it vitally important that cases were resolved in an appropriate time frame. Delays in all or part of a case reduced the efficacy of the MCJRP strategy.

## Appropriate Accountability Responses

Respondents similarly considered it very important that violations and infractions committed by clients during their time in MCJRP be handled with proportionate and timely accountability measures. They believed that this kind of firm and swift accountability was key to clients eventually moving toward their own goals of success.

## Opportunity for Program Re-Alignment

Throughout the interviews, respondents volunteered one important idea regarding the future of MCJRP. Many respondents believed the post-pandemic period to be an opportunity to return to the goals and structure of MCJRP with the intention of improving the entire program. With so many processes already altered, the post-pandemic period may serve as an opportunity to re-align the program with community and client needs.

“

I think it's naive to think the world post-COVID is identical to how the world was pre-COVID, and I think it's necessary to have some changes to accommodate those changes. I don't know exactly what those are, but I think what we need to do is look at what we were doing pre-COVID, see what modifications need to be made because of changes in the world, and then move forward with that. I think we need to get back to some of our core principles that we've gotten away from, though, like making sure everybody has an evaluation before sentencing, etc. And there were pressures from COVID that made things impossible, and I get that. But I think that's important.

## Desired Program Changes or Additions

Respondents were quite passionate about the mission of MCJRP, and they offered many ideas of how to change or improve the program going forward. Many of these ideas were specific to the expertise and roles of the respondent and so were only mentioned once overall. However, there were two consistent ideas that were repeated across respondents and across roles.

### Expanded Access to MCJRP

Many respondents wished MCJRP could be offered to more clients and to clients who did not meet the current requirements of the program. These respondents believed the community and justice-involved individuals would greatly benefit from an expanded MCJRP program.

“

I think the program functions well in general, and I've been a big advocate of expanding the program. I think that was always the idea, was to see if it works, and if it does work, then we would use those principles in a broader context in the criminal justice system.

Some specific examples related to expanded access to MCJRP included:

- Moving away from charge-based eligibility
- Widen the eligibility net to ALL presumptive prison cases
- Ensure equity for those who are eligible

## Program Integration

Most respondents wished for alterations that would better integrate the elements of MCJRP. Agencies, partners, and staff members seem siloed within their own part of the program, and there was a desire for creating practices that would bring these elements together and facilitate more communication and cooperation.



So myself and other POs have found other programs that are more responsive to our clients needs or better at communicating. It's really important that we be in the know when our people are not attending or participating. And that's been an ongoing struggle, and so we can't intervene if we don't know what's happening.

Some specific examples provided by respondents that speak to enhancing the collaboration included:

- More engagement between prosecution and defense outside of the JSC context
- Warm handoff between pre-adjudication and post-adjudication
- Increased communication between agency leadership and the operations team, with an emphasis on greater investment from leadership
- Include more players who are actively involved in the MCJRP process (i.e., on the front lines) in the collaborative process

## Additional Suggestions for Improvement

As noted above, many of the ideas for program changes or additions were idiosyncratic to individual respondent roles or agencies. Due to the time since the interviews were conducted, some of these suggestions may have already been considered or implemented. However, some of the suggestions are still worth mentioning so they can be kept in mind as MCJRP embarks on its future path.

- Re-examine how MCJRP assessments are being administered, especially through a trauma lens (e.g., in-person vs. virtual), and that they guide the needs of each individual
- Consider limiting JSCs to cases that really require that level of review (e.g., may not be necessary in cases with a very clear trajectory)
- Allow judges to get to know participants and to be a stronger voice in the process
- Re-evaluate the violation policy and consider giving DCJ sanctioning authority
- Share successes in reports rather than focusing on violations
- Have supervision be based more on individualized needs than on risk levels – more tailored toward achieving success (as opposed to boilerplate conditions)
- More training on what MCJRP is, its purpose, and the roles of everyone involved
- More training on equity and the impacts of trauma
- More data sharing and transparency, and more use of data to inform recommendations
- Less focus on recidivism and revocations as outcomes and more focus on periods of success

## Summary

The overall sentiment of MCJRP staff and key stakeholders was that MCJRP has many strengths, but needs to focus on getting back to some of its roots and improving on components that are not working well. A common thread throughout the interviews was the need for improved communication and coordination across all the various parts of the collaborative. Many of the individual components are functioning sufficiently well, but the lack of cohesiveness of those components has resulted in challenges for MCJRP staff and partners, as well as for the clients.

During the process of conducting the interviews, one of the original diagrams of the MCJRP process that was developed during the 2012-2014 planning phase was uncovered. Although the data summarized above suggest that some parts of the model should change with the times and some of the notations in the diagram may no longer exist, remembering how MCJRP was envisioned might help guide future planning. That diagram is included in Appendix B of this report.

## Participant Feedback

To identify the individuals who would be invited to participate in individual interviews, an initial sample of 396 individuals on probation within MCJRP unit as of February 1, 2023 was secured. Of those 182 currently active individuals on supervision with the MCJRP unit were identified. Purposeful sampling from that group was used to reduce the total recruitment sample, which included all of the females (n=21), all of the people of color (n=64), and a random sample (45%) of the white men, for a total sample of 127 potential participants.

Recruitment was initially done through the six MCJRP unit POs by giving each of them a list of potential participants on their respective caseloads. The purpose of the evaluation and recruitment was explained to them and they were given a flyer to give to their supervisees and a script that could be used when reaching out to each potential participant (recruitment materials are included in Appendix C). After that first phase of recruitment and to secure more participants, the evaluation team sent emails and made phone calls to the individuals who had not already agreed to participate or opted out of participation through PO contact.

Ultimately, 20 participants were individually interviewed over a six-month period (late February through late August 2023). The duration of the interviews ranged from 10 to 40 minutes, with an average duration of 23.6 minutes.

Topics of these interviews included their perspective on the quality and clarity of the process, how fairly and respectfully they were treated, their access to the help they needed, how well they were heard and understood, and the successes they have had or hope to have. Similar to the staff and stakeholder process, participant interviews were analyzed using qualitative thematic analysis. The process involved reviewing every interview and discovering themes within the content, coding all of the interviews across those themes.

## How Do Clients Feel about MCJRP?

All participants in the client interviews felt positively towards the MCJRP program. They expressed gratitude for the opportunity to participate, and could list specific parts of the program that aided them on the road out of substance abuse and justice involvement. Some clients who had experience in other programs or jurisdictions compared MCJRP favorably. They found the experience much more humanizing and helpful than their previous experiences.

“

I do like what MCJRP does for people. ... It can be intense probation at times, but for people that are trying to do better, ... I think it is a really good resource and opportunity for people. ... It can be tough at times, but yeah, I think it is helpful for people in their lives. And I think it's cool that they do it.

One million thousand percent. I'm just so thankful for this program. This is part of the reason why I even wanted to do this interview is because this program literally saved my life in a lot of ways. Because again, I'm a first-time offender. My 16-to-18-month presumptive prison was optional probation, and I got this MCJRP program, ... and it's been a blessing. And if anything, it's helped me want to push to succeed more because I've been given the opportunity. So I'm very thankful for the program and what it's done. I think it's very helpful, especially for people like me who screw up once and don't want that one screwup to define the whole rest of their life.

## Did Clients Understand the Program?

Respondents overwhelmingly reported that the MCJRP program was explained to them thoroughly and that they understood it upon entering. Those who reported confusion early in the process were able to report that they understood it by the time of their interview. They reported that the staff they encountered took the time to explain the program and what choices they could or should make as they navigated through MCRP.

“

Well, it was explained to me three times. They explained it to me when I got charged, my lawyer and the judge explained to me, and told my lawyer to make sure that I know-- to explain it thoroughly. And then, when I got my PO she explained that I was on the MCJRP program. And I didn't know how it worked, and she just went over basic things.

## Did Clients Feel Respected while in the Program?

Respondents also overwhelmingly reported feeling respected by individuals they worked with in the MCJRP program. In particular, respondents reported feeling respected by their MCJRP judge. This sense of feeling respected was important for clients' sense of buy-in to MCJRP, and key to staying motivated on their journey through recovery.

“

My MCJRP judge, she seen me a couple of times. Yeah. I really liked her, actually. I feel like she believed in me. It gave me hope. You know what I mean? I wasn't getting a cold shoulder, like you can get sometimes with judges. You know what I mean? I feel really supported by her. .... She wanted me to do good, and she gave me opportunities.

## What Makes Clients Feel Respected?

Across respondents, similar actions were identified as having helped them feel respected by the various individuals they encountered throughout the MCJRP process.

- Sustained, respectful eye contact
- Being addressed and regarded as an individual
- Not being reduced to or regarded as the sum of their charges
- Being approached by their MCJRP team as there to aid in their challenges, not punish them or place further obstacles in their way.

“

You know what? Every time I came into her office to see her, she always greeted me with a smile. Most POs just come in with a straight face. She made me feel like she was having a good day and made me have a good day. I didn't feel nervous. My heart never beat it when I went to see my PO. I never felt like, "Oh, she's going to take me to jail." You know what I'm saying? I never felt fear with her.

I can only speak for myself, and part of the reason why I wanted to do this interview is that I actually felt like I was genuinely seen as a person, not just seen for the mistake that I made. ... I'm not a bad person. I made a bad decision

I like her because she pushes me. She takes me out of my comfort zone. She had me move out of my apartment that I was in, and I actually ended up staying a week in jail. But I feel like I needed it, and I feel like she does her job and really pushes people. ... But now, I have a job, and I'm planning on moving out of here.

About feeling respected, one participant explained, *“...she just made me feel like we were a team, even though this was the only time I'd ever talked to her, and that she was out to get me the resources and everything I needed to get back. And it was just like she didn't treat me like an animal that I felt like a lot of people in the system can treat others.*

Participants also reported being held accountable when they did make a mistake, but this did not interfere with their sense of being respected. They accepted consequences for these mis-steps as part of their arrangement with the program, so long as consequences were handed down respectfully. One respondent explained, *“ Yeah. It ... kept me out of jail and it opened my eyes. It's the chance that I needed, like a slap in the face, to realize what was going on.”*

Only a couple of participants reported feeling disrespected by MCJRP staff. In these cases they were restricted to a single difficult relationship among their entire MCJRP case team. Participants felt disrespected by staff when:

- Eye contact was not made or avoided.
- Participants felt personally judged by the staff member.
- Participants did not feel like they were being treated as an individual, and were being approached as “just a number” or as a sum of their charges.

“

I just felt like, to her, I was just this big piece of shit and I was a waste of her time. And I guess it was she just wanted to send me to prison. So it was like that's how I felt I was treated by her, just like another number. And then she was wanting to get rid of me because I didn't have the potential that she needed to-- she didn't see that potential to actually get me to be better and back to that tax-paying citizen.

I feel like I would've been off probation and did this a long time ago if I didn't feel like I was fighting against my PO. It was me against her, not me and her against my past ... it was like I felt like we were fighting each other more... So I was literally going on the run because she would be disrespectful. And so I'd be on the run for nine months.

## How Was the MCJRP Assessment Experience?

Participants generally found their LS/CMI assessment process to be positive. Many even found it to be a humanizing experience, as they felt it gave them a chance to present themselves and their situation in a holistic manner. Many also appreciated the respectful and sympathetic approach of their assessor.

“

She was just really very nice and very-- it almost felt like I could've been a part of her family. That's how much she cared about her position and her job, and she just took it very seriously. And actually, out of this whole process, that interview has always kind of stuck out to me because of how it was like we were buddies and we were family. I wasn't awkward with her like I can be with other people.

So all the questions they asked me, I was okay answering them in their entirety. ... So I've just never had anybody ask me questions like that before, other than the counselors maybe, if I wanted to do therapy.

## How Was the MCJRP Supervision Experience?

Most participants also found their supervision process to be humanizing and positive. Some even compared it favorably to their supervision experiences under other counties, where they felt they were treated only “as a number.” There were many instances where participants reported feeling like their assigned PO genuinely helped them get their lives back on track, and that they were being supported by a team.

“

Both my POs for both the MCJRPs have been excellent in getting housing and listening to what I have to say. That's stuff that works for me, so, yeah. ... Because when I was in Washington, the community supervision they have up there is horrible; they're just a number to them. They don't try to get to know you or meet you halfway where you're at or-- and in Oregon-- that's what I love about it here. Not to say that I'm going to keep getting in trouble because I love it, but, I mean, you're not just a number to them like in Washington -- it was just horrible.

## How Helpful Were the Community-Based Services?

Participants cited the long list of supportive services and resources as key to their success. Having help accessing and managing these resources also played a big part in fostering a positive relationship with their PO and case management team.

When participants were asked what they would do to improve the MCJRP program, they most frequently answered that they would expand the type and number of these services. There was a particular desire for more housing, and particularly more sober and transitional housing.

“

I mean, [my PO] definitely encourages me, in terms of ... the whole milestone ... thing. I graduated a parenting class, and they do this big family thing, which I think is actually really cool, which only encourages us to do more positive stuff .... So I signed up for two more classes just because it made me feel good having that little [support]. So I think it definitely has a positive impact, so I think it's helpful....

I was in a girls' group that was a resource they gave me that was outside of the outpatient treatment that I went to. I did the outpatient treatment center as well. I wish I would've gotten more housing help because still, now I'm about to finish my probation, and I'm still living in a street, a car on the side of the road.

## How Do Clients Define Success?

Clients understood that success in the MCJRP program would be different for each individual. They also believed their definition of success would change over time. They described that an individual who was struggling with substance use would likely define success through their ability to live soberly. Those who needed to regain a sustainable lifestyle would be likely to define success as finding a steady job and reliable housing.

Many spoke of early success versus long term success. Early success in MCJRP was smaller, immediate goals of stabilizing substance use and reforming social relationships. Later success looked like longer-term goals of moving up towards a career or starting a family.

The individualized nature of success as understood by clients is echoed by the interviews conducted among staff. The ability of MCJRP to allow for this inclusive flexibility between participants was recognized as one of the best parts of the program by both clients and staff. Some of the specific aspects of success noted by clients were:

- Completing MCJRP
- Staying “out of trouble” or out of the criminal justice system
- “Getting clean” or no longer dependent on substances
- Getting a place to live that is their own
- Repairing relationships
- Getting their own car or regaining their driver’s license
- Going to school, returning to school, or completing an education certificate
- Starting a business or career
- Starting a family

“

So I feel, like everything, there's different levels of success. Everything that you want to conquer that you do, every little baby step is a success. So it's like right now, I'm successful in not committing a crime, not doing drugs, not flaking off my family for that lifestyle. I'm successful in a lot of ways. But success in the future, to me, that would be stable housing and being able to be an independent person again, and being able to take care of myself and not have to ask people for.

Me genuinely putting the effort towards that stuff and getting it done, having this stuff done in the past, and able to look back on this [MCJRP?] experience in a good way and look at it as it changed me to be a better person....

Knowing that I want to stay clean and sober and work, provide for my family. And maybe someday in the future, I'm going to have my own family. So mainly me and my family. Yeah. I really like this second chance. And I'm glad they got me out of jail. I'm young, and I don't want to waste my time in jail. I like the opportunity.

## What Future Improvements Did Clients Suggest?

MCJRP clients were invited to share elements of the MCJRP program that could be improved. One consistent complaint among participants was the time it took to get their LS/CMI assessment completed and get admitted into the program.

Among participants, the biggest barrier to a successful MCJRP experience was struggling with a severe substance use disorder. When a client reported using drugs or alcohol regularly while in MCJRP, they were more likely to face the following issues.

- Struggle to understand the program
- Struggle to connect with their PO
- Struggle to connect with services
- Struggle to imagine completing the program

“

Only thing I would change is the waiting process, because once the interview-- if you're still incarcerated it's like you're sitting up there and you're not knowing if they're going to approve you or not.

The court process of the-- waiting for the interview. That interview process seemed kind of slower. It seemed like they didn't have enough people to do it or whatever. ... I would try to shorten the length of that, because just sitting in jail waiting for that interview and the court date and whenever it comes up. And then the interview's not done yet; you have to wait another two weeks to get the interview, and it just-- yeah.

Most respondents, whether they were seriously struggling with their substance use disorder or not, found housing to be the most difficult hurdle to stability and encouraged the program to focus on enhancing access to housing.

## Summary

Clients who participated in these interviews found MCJRP to be a positive experience, and reported that they were glad to have had the opportunity to participate. They particularly appreciated that they were treated with respect and that their individual plans were approached holistically.

Key to having a positive and successful experience in MCJRP was encountering respectful staff, as well as having full access to supportive programming in the community.

## Victim/Survivor and Partner Agency Feedback

A key component of this evaluation focused on feedback from victims of crime/survivors of violence (abbreviated “victims/survivors” for the remainder of the report) and community partner agencies who serve victims/survivors.

To identify the sample of victims/survivors to invite for participation in the study, all of the records in the original sample of 132 MCJRP participants were looked up in the Department of Community Justice (DCJ) Victim Rights Tracking Services (VRTS) database. Searching based on the state offender identification number (SID) and court case number, records that had victim/survivor information were identified (n=96) and that information was documented. The following criteria were created to select the records to include in the final sample (n=40):

- a victim/survivor associated with the identified MCJRP sentence date
- an adult victim/survivor that did not request no future contact
- a victim/survivor other than an organization or company
- a recent sentence date – 2021, 2022, or 2023
- Contact information for at least one victim/survivor

Across those 40 records, 66 individual victims/survivors were identified. The initial step was to reach out by email to the 42 individuals with an address on file. After sending up to two emails to those individuals, eight individuals responded, of which five completed an interview. Individuals without an email on record (n=24) were contacted by phone. Messages were left for the 20 individuals who did not answer and the four individuals who answered all declined participation. The duration of the interviews ranged from 14.1 to 26.6 minutes, with an average duration of 19.6 minutes. The interview covered topics including information received, being treated with respect, support from a victim advocate, being heard, experiencing success, and recommended changes.

MCJRP contracts with three community partner agencies that serve victims/survivors: Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization (IRCO), Lutheran Community Services, and Oregon Crime Victim Law Center. Individuals from all three agencies were invited to participate in an individual video or phone interview and four individuals agreed to participate representing all three agencies (one agency had two representatives participate). The duration of the interviews ranged from 18.9 to 42.3 minutes, with an average duration of 32.2 minutes. Topics of these interviews included involvement with MCJRP, additional support needed, incorporation of victims’/survivors’ needs in the MCJRP collaboration, and success for victims/survivors, as well as the individuals who committed the crimes.

# Victims of Crime Feedback

## More Ongoing Information

All of the victim/survivor respondents noted that although they got some information at the beginning of the process, they would have liked more ongoing communication. Many described getting phone calls or emails from the DA's office leading up to the proceedings, usually to describe the court process or to ask what they wanted as an outcome. Although MCJRP was not a familiar label, all of the respondents described getting information about the process. For example, one respondent noted, *"They just explained to me kind of like the terms, that he would plead guilty to the charges and then ... that he would receive some sort of inpatient therapy, whether that be for mental health or drugs. I believe, in this case, it was drugs."*

Not hearing from anyone for long periods of time was an experience across all of the victims/survivors. One respondent mentioned that it would have been *"emotionally useful"* to hear more about the process. Another victim described, *"In that six-month period, there was no communication given to me, like, 'This is still in process. This is what's happening.' And so if I'm going to be completely honest with you, I didn't think that anything was going to happen."* Once proceedings were completed, many respondents described that they would have appreciated information about what happened with the individual who committed the crime. Knowing what their status was, what consequences they received, and generally where they were located would have relieved the minds of the victims/survivors. Some of the respondents explained that they were anxious, not knowing if the individual would show up at their workplace or in their neighborhood. One victim/survivor suggested, *"... checking in maybe three, six months after the grand jury is, and not by mail, by actual phone call [to say] 'Hey, just checking in. Making sure everything's going well. These are the services.' Offering it again ... after the initial shock wears off."* One respondent talked about getting a call *"after the dust settled"* to discuss how to get repaid for expenses they incurred. Although that victim/survivor had already replaced the items stolen (due to need), they requested having their insurance deductible paid, *"And I never heard anything else."*

“

I have had a few contacts reach out to me through this process. One was for a court hearing for the arraignment, I believe. And then one was they were offering the person in this case, plea bargain, and they wanted to make sure that I was okay with the plea bargain terms. Outside of that, I haven't had much involvement or much information given to me.

## Treated with Respect and Being Heard

During the interviews, questions were asked about whether they were treated with respect by the system partners, including the judge, the DA, and the defense attorney. Although not all of the respondents were able to confidently identify each of those individuals, most of them spoke to feeling respected throughout the court process. One respondent described that they were *"asked questions in a very direct way so that there wasn't any confusion and gave me time to respond to the full, not interrupting me."* Another victim/survivor mentioned that the person they believe was the judge treated them with *"total respect."* For most of the respondents, feeling respected was associated with how they were encouraged to participate in

“

Just the way that I was addressed upon entering the courtroom. I mean, they greeted me and ended up welcoming me and thanking me for showing up to testify. And I felt comfortable when I went in there. It wasn't a situation where I was mistreated.

Not once did I feel I was being victimized again. ... I felt that I was treated with dignity and respect the entire time and I have no complaints.

the process. However, one respondent noted that they felt respected because they knew *“I wanted to be left alone.”*

One victim/survivor, however, described never being addressed during the proceedings, not having any say in the process, and just being present on video without participating. *“I don’t know if you’d call that disrespect ... I was basically ignored.”* Another respondent brought up that they didn’t feel respected by law enforcement prior to the court proceedings being initiated. They described, *“They did not care about my safety. ... I just felt like they were just there to dot the i’s and cross the t’s and didn’t necessarily care about anything other than the bare minimum.”*

There was variation across respondents about how well their voice was heard during the court process. Some thought they were heard well throughout the process, being asked their opinion and having the opportunity to share their experiences. Others, however, reported that their voice was either not considered consistently or not considered at all. One respondent noted that they repeatedly brought up two issues about the case that were not acknowledged, saying, *“And you can tell when it’s being written down, and they know that they kind of have to do that, and nothing is going to happen.”* Another respondent reported being contacted outside of the proceedings to ask about the plea bargain, yet they were ignored and not invited to speak during the court proceedings.

## Victim Advocate Support

All of the victims/survivors interviewed believed they were contacted by phone, email, or letter by someone who might have been a victim advocate. Some of the contact was before sentencing and associated with being given information about the process and being asked about the plea bargain (i.e., their opinion about the individual who committed the crime being in the program vs. jail). Other contact, which occurred both during and after the court process, focused on sharing information about getting services, asking how they were doing, or being compensated for lost wages or stolen possessions. As noted above, the victims/survivors would have appreciated having more contact after sentencing, although they did not identify that desired contact being from a victim advocate.

## Successful Outcome

For most of the victims/survivors, a successful outcome involved the person who committed the crime getting the help they need to prevent future criminal behavior. But some respondents were cautiously optimistic in that outcome by continuing to be vigilant about watching for the individual to come back. One respondent also noted that if that person is *“just a bad apple,”* they believed punishment would be the best approach. Finally, one victim/survivor was still struggling with the impact of the crime on their life, reporting that since the incident happened at their workplace, they had to quit their job because they were constantly wondering if the individual would return and that they can no longer work in downtown Portland where it happened. This individual could not consider a successful outcome for the person who committed the crime against them.



*If the criminal justice system was perfect – and obviously, I don’t know if that’s ever possible, but if the criminal justice system was perfect, I think that it would make sure that people get the help that they need. ... I think that we need to focus more on the deep-rooted problem that causes people to commit these crimes.*

## Recommendations and Final Thoughts from Victims/Survivors

All of the respondents were asked to identify any changes to the process to better support victims/survivors. Communication was brought up by every respondent. They encouraged the program to provide more information throughout the process and ensure that consistent communication keeps victims/survivors from guessing what is happening with the case or with the person who committed the crime. They asked for long-term follow-up after the sentencing process is completed, which could be every three to six months, but at least more often than they received. One respondent noted, *“Stress resolution is a good thing for the victim side, and so maybe knowing what’s going on, or what is going to happen, in more detail early on might help that process for the victim.”*

“

If you can reach out to the victim or that survivor and explain what’s happening and make sure that they’re okay with what is happening throughout the process, then you’ve done right not only by the victim, but by the suspect as well.”

Yes, I am a victim, but also the jail or prison isn’t always the best answer for everybody. And if someone can get the help that they need, whether that be addiction or mental health or whatever, sometimes a jail or prison cell isn’t going to be the best outcome for a person that needs other help.

Overall, the individuals interviewed balanced their needs against the needs of the individuals who committed the crimes. Their hope was for those individuals to stop committing crimes, but they were concerned about the ability of the justice system to accomplish that. They thought that MCJRP had the potential to provide the services and supports to those individuals, possibly interrupting their pattern of crime. Treatment for substance abuse and mental health issues were mentioned by all of the respondents, knowing that addressing those needs was more important than incarceration.

## Victim/Survivor Provider Feedback

### Incorporating Victim/Survivor Needs into MCJRP

One of the key takeaways from the interviews with community partners providing services to victims/survivors was for MCJRP to increase their focus on the victim/survivor perspective. Many respondents spoke of a disconnect between MCJRP and victims/survivors, and that although 10% of the Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI) funding goes to victim/survivor services, they would like to see a stronger tie to the work of the collaborative. *“It’s just like the victim services thing does feel like a side thing in a way.” One respondent noted that the victim/survivor service providers are “set up where we could really be a support to those [MCJRP] cases.”* Another respondent had a broader perspective and mentioned that Multnomah County actually does a better job at incorporating the victim perspective than other counties in Oregon. They added that it would be helpful if MCJRP could include more providers.

### Improvements Needed

The respondents identified a number of areas in which they believed MCJRP could improve to better support victims/survivors. One respondent noted that it would be helpful to improve support for victims/survivors by providing more funding for culturally-specific services. Many of the providers talked about having the ability to staff their programs with people who speak the languages and know the customs of a wide range of cultures, but that they would need more funding to support those services.

A number of respondents mentioned that it’s important for MCJRP to not just make symbolic gestures, but to truly engage with the victim community. A suggestion offered by some of the respondents was to incorporate the restorative justice process into MCJRP, providing an avenue through which more focus

could be on the victims/survivors. Another partner encouraged MCJRP to make the victim/survivor perspective more of a part of the process, rather than an exception. *“That should be a question tagged onto every planning session of policy, rules, changes. ‘How does this affect victims?’”*

Another improvement raised by the respondents was to connect with victims, possibly through an advocate, at all points during the adjudication process to inform them and ask for their input. Providers reported that victims/survivors are often an afterthought during the process, but they should be as informed as the person who committed the crime. This could be done by ensuring that a victim advocate is present when cases are screened so they can reach out to the victim/survivor to inform them more consistently. *“When the prosecutors are screening their cases for JRP, if they would reach out to the victim and say, ‘Did you know that this case is going into JRP, and are you okay with that? And here’s an attorney that you can talk to to let you know what your options are.’”* One respondent noted that they often hear that victims/survivors who go to court believe they’re going to a trial, even though it’s just someone pleading into MCJRP. Victims/Survivors often don’t know that they can be consulted about that decision, so they are, in essence, waiving their rights because they just don’t know.

In general, a call for better informing of victims/survivors was a clear request by the providers. One respondent commented that DAs and victim advocates could use more training to make connections regarding the victim perspective and that victim advocates often don’t get updates about the cases. More education and training about how to consistently inform and engage victims/survivors in the process would be beneficial for all parties.



So while the MCJRP is an opportunity for the offender to do better, the process to monitor that offender is actually doing better is not communicated with the victim. So the victims are normally in the dark as to what happened to their case and all they know is that this person never went to jail.

## Success for Victims/Survivors and Participants

Partners noted that there is a wide range of success for victims/survivors due to individual differences; however, many identified victim voice and having a real role in the process as a key feature of success. Also, being acknowledged that something happened that hurt them and that they need to be as involved in the process as they choose to be in order to heal. Another feature of success is helping victims/survivors recover their losses, which could be the cost of medical bills, recovery of or payment for personal property, or lost wages due to missing work to go to court and deal with the process in other ways.



We’re never going to make somebody whole. We’re never going to make somebody back to the way things were before the crime occurred. But we can give them the agency so that they feel like they had a real role and that they were part of the decision-making process.

One community provider mentioned that the victims they have worked with are resentful about there not being as many services and supports for victims/survivors as there are for those who committed the crimes. They have heard victims/survivors mention the lack of fairness with these circumstances, asking for more balance across the services. Making sure they get a victim advocate who can truly support them throughout the process was identified as a key to finding some success for victims/survivors.

As mentioned by many of the victims/survivors, community providers noted that one way in which the individuals who committed the crimes could find success is to receive the services they need to prevent

future crime. Respondents noted a number of other things that would align with success for MCJRP participants:

- Having role models
- Healing
- Addressing intergenerational violence and trauma
- Opportunities to get out of poverty
- Receiving treatment
- Educational opportunities
- Employment opportunities
- Acknowledging the pain caused to someone
- Making new and better choices

## Final Thoughts of Victim/Survivor Providers

Throughout the conversations with the victim/survivor community partners, two themes were prominent: incorporate the victim perspective and improve communication with victims. They asked for the MCJRP collaborative to raise the voice of victims/survivors, keeping that perspective at the forefront of their decision making. They also asked that MCJRP better support victim advocates, who they viewed as an answer to keeping victims informed throughout the process. Providers also identified that their skills in restorative justice can help support both of those goals.



There's communication. As I said, it feels so difficult to get people to talk about the very same topic that we are all trying to improve. So just collaboration, communication, incorporate the voices of the actual people who are receiving the services. Because it's like we have this group of people making decisions that they think are going to work. Have they sat down with the people, the actual people who are being affected by it? ... So if I could have a wand and get my wish, it would be that. Open a space for victims and even the perpetrators to talk about it.



There's a huge emphasis right now on criminal justice reform, and that's a necessary conversation. ... I think, though, that the victim voice is being left out a lot of those conversations about criminal justice reform. And I think that there's a perception that victims are not going to be able to see the need for reform or are going to be so one-sided about the punishment aspect of it that they're not going to be able to see it. And that's just not the case. Victims need to be included in these conversations. Victims need to be included in setting up appropriate models for things like JRP. ... And the victim perspective should be included from the beginning. Victims aren't a monolith. There's a whole bunch of differing opinions. And it's not that hard to get a couple of victims involved to say, 'What do you think about this?'

## Community Partner Feedback

Community partner agencies were invited to share their experiences regarding the MCJRP program through individual video or phone interviews. Ultimately 12 interviews were conducted, representing five partner agencies: SE Works, Volunteers of America, Pathfinders, CODA, and Bridges to Change. The services these partners provide to MCJRP clients include housing assistance, substance abuse treatment, employment assistance, parenting classes, mental health treatment, and mentoring. The duration of the interviews ranged from 14 to 33 minutes, with an average duration of 27.5 minutes.

Topics of these interviews included what partner agencies need to facilitate collaboration, what impacts the engagement and retention of MCJRP clients, and what they consider success regarding client outcomes. This report details the major results of these interviews with MCJRP community partner agencies.

Interviews were analyzed using qualitative thematic analysis. This process involved discovering themes throughout the interviews using a grounded inductive perspective. Once these themes were identified, the interviews were coded for them deductively. Finally, the interviews were processed in a co-axial phase, where relationships between thematic codes were identified.

## The Key for Partner Success: Teamwork

All positive experiences reported from partnered organizations stemmed from a functional teamwork dynamic. Such a dynamic was described as being both about having supportive relationships between and among staff, and about having work practices that facilitated group problem solving. Many partners specifically mentioned the existing practice of holding multidisciplinary team meetings (MDTs) to be important for maintaining a sense of teamwork.

“

I think one of the reasons why MCJRP has been as successful as it has is that there are a lot of people on all sides involved in it that really embrace kind of a harm-reductionist mentality and are able to recognize the small successes and not have absolutes about sobriety-or-nothing kind of thinking. These are clients that make small progress over long periods of time often, and it takes a lot of consistency and sticking with them and welcoming them back again and again and again.

Practices described as important for a successful partnership team included:

- **Regular meetings between all partners where the purpose is active problem solving.** One respondent noted that it's important to have everyone attend meetings in order to get the necessary work done, *“Find a day and time that works for everyone. So we can all come to the table and engage, not sometimes you show up. ... Somehow, set a date where all POs [probation officers] are available on that day so we can all come together as a group and meet.”* Another point about the meetings was that each partner's contribution is acknowledged and *“No one partner or agency is given precedence over any other partner or agency.”*

- **The ability to have rapid communication between partner staff and DCJ staff.**
- **Regular milestone and graduation celebrations where partners and staff are consistently present.** This practice was consistent prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, but the consistency of and attendance at the celebrations has not fully returned. One respondent described, *“We used to do milestones at the Multnomah Building, and everybody was told to come, right? So all the MCJRP clients would show up. And all the POs would show up, and it would be a big deal, and it was exciting, and we celebrated them. And it happened every single month. And we’re trying really hard to get back to it, but where we’re at right now, some of the POs show up, a few of the milestone people show up, but it’s not the celebration it used to be.”*

## Community Partner Needs

Community partner agencies offered many resources and practices that could enhance their ability to serve MCJRP clients.

- **Clear and timely communication between all partners.** Community partners described their need for information so each of them can do their best work to support MCJRP clients. One respondent described, *“Like someone getting kicked out of Bridges. You kind of find out-- I always feel like, ‘Well, if I would have known this was an issue, then maybe I could have helped support you, right? But I didn’t know, and now they’re getting kicked out.’ And I don’t mean substance use. That’s a given. But just behavior.”*
- **Increased and consistent funding and resources.** In order to provide ongoing, supportive services to MCJRP participants, some partners noted the need for stable and higher levels of funding to meet the increasing costs associated with providing the care. In addition, a number of respondents talked about the need for more resources, including expansion of services, culturally-specific services and workforce, and flexible funds and incentives. *“I think the only barrier we’re seeing right now to treatment is that there isn’t enough treatment services, just like there isn’t enough detox beds, just like there isn’t enough residential beds. The crisis just keeps growing. And even with 110 and all these services, it’s still not opening up. They decriminalized the drug charges, and that’s great, but if we didn’t open up more treatment beds and more detox beds, and more ASAM slots, what are we doing for those people that need help?”*
- **Better information sharing between agencies about all services MCJRP clients are receiving.** This included services from the partner providers, other providers not part of the MCJRP collaborative, and the parole and probation officers (POs). *“[We need] clear communication across the board with everyone, POs, participants, us as community partners. And also kind of being able to know, too, what other services they’re receiving because if they’re taking a parenting class at some other agency, do they need a parenting class from [a MCJRP partner] in addition to that, ... or do they need Recovery Support?”*
- **Increased and frequent PO participation at MDTs.** Some partners talked about wanting to have full participation of POs, rather than just a subset of them consistently participating in MDTs. With all the POs at all the MDTs, providers can check-in on all of their clients. *“Knowing who the POs are on the team and having those POs show up to MDT meetings, and [for the] staffings, have the POs present. And being able to have those conversations. And the only way now, unless the PO knows that it’s someone*

*who's being staffed that's on their caseload, they don't show up. But sometimes those conversations evolve and it would be nice if that PO was there for input."*

- **More community partners involved.** A few of the respondents thought it would be helpful to have more providers involved with MCJRP. For example, more housing providers (e.g., Oxford House, long-term housing) could better support the participants. *"I think having a housing partner at the table would be really quite helpful. We struggle every single time with housing. We don't have clean and sober housing there. ... I think more connection with housing and a housing need because when they finish MCJRP, they're going off a cliff if they don't have housing."*
- **Follow-up from POs for clients about their treatment.** Treatment providers would like POs to be more timely in talking with their clients about treatment issues or attendance, which could increase treatment engagement. *"And so we really are trying to get parole information to be more swift and sure with their sanctions to hold people more accountable in terms of if they miss treatment. To have more immediate follow-up with the individuals. And it doesn't have to necessarily be a negative reinforcer, but just some type of reinforcer that hey, we know you missed treatment. We've been getting monthly reports, we get weekly status updates, we are in constant communication [with treatment]."*

Two particularly pressing needs reported by multiple agencies addressed (1) referral practices and sources and (2) practice and guidelines for urgent communication.

## Review of Referral Practices and Sources

The COVID-19 global pandemic changed many practices across governance systems. Some of these were temporary, but many are proving to be permanent. For MCJRP partners, this has resulted in major disruptions to existing referral pipelines and practices, which has been exacerbated by the changes brought about by the implementation of Measure 110. While many partners affirmed the utility of this measure, the resulting changes in referrals have resulted in an unnecessary gap in providing services.



*In the beginning, we had a lot more clients. We had a lot more staff. And we had twice-a-month meetings, and it just seemed like it was a little bit more organized among everybody. But the pandemic kind of, like it did most things, it blew that to bits.*

Referral systems for each partner should be assessed for the following:

- Are referrals correctly matching clients with their needed services?
- Are providers getting referred clients that match their services?
- Are referrals being made at a rate that fills the program and utilizes it at a steady pace?

In cases where referrals are not at appropriate rates or are mismatched with the needs of the clients being referred, solutions will need to be found. Because MCJRP works with highly specialized partners, it should be expected that these solutions will be tailored to each partnership and their respective clients.

## Practices and Guidelines for Urgent Communication with DCJ/POs

Generally, partners were content with most communication practices between themselves, other partners, and DCJ. There was one exception for some partners: a need for better communication practices when there is an urgent or emergency need for a client. When the situation for a client shifts rapidly, it can take too long for a partner organization to get in touch with that client's designated PO. This can be further

complicated if a PO is no longer serving the client's caseload, and there has been no notice to the agency about the new PO. This results in complications for a client's treatment and their supervision status. Two needs in this area were identified:

- **Clearer guidelines for response times for POs to return communication from a partner organization.** As one respondent explained, *"There are certain things we can't do without permission from the PO, or input. And without knowing who to go to, it's a host of phone calls and emails to figure out. And you [need to] get someone to answer the phone or respond to an email before you can really move forward with that customer. So it delays that process."*
- A system for urgent communication in the case of an emergency or highly time sensitive issue.

## Impacts on Client Engagement and Retention

One of the most important goals of a partner organization is to simply engage clients in services. Once engaged, programs need to focus on retaining clients in those services. In this regard, the partners cited many of the same factors that impact client engagement and retention.

- **Housing:** The ability for a client to secure housing that matches their need level was cited by nearly all partner organizations as the most critical element of client success. It was also cited as the most difficult thing to currently obtain. Most community partners cited a need for more recovery housing and a need for lower barriers to renting. One respondent explained, *"Houselessness is a huge barrier. Not having working phones or changing phone numbers or not sufficient technology available to them. Housing resources, technology...right now, I think most of all, it's the housing piece that makes it really difficult for folks to show up for themselves."* Another community partner added, *"One of the challenges also is housing, which is a major issue in all programs. And being able to have, when someone releases, ... what we've experienced is [they are] told to go get a tent because there's no place for them to provide housing for them. And for me, to release from incarceration and have no place to go, that doesn't really make someone to want to follow through."*



I think sometimes it's just too much ... with court dates, treatment, plus meeting with your PO, plus doing UAs, plus looking for a job, plus going to meetings. And that's a lot for a person fresh in recovery.... But having that person to be like, 'You got this. It's just another test. You got this.' But when they overcome that and they get to their goal, to see their smile and the positivity is amazing.

- **Addiction and Relapse:** Unsurprisingly, relapse and the difficulties related to addiction was one of the biggest reasons identified for why a client will discontinue a program with one of MCJRP's partners. Partners urged for practices that minimize or eliminate gaps in addiction treatment and stable living environments as the best ways to keep clients from relapsing and in their programing.
- **Disruptions in Treatment:** Disruptions in medications, medical care, and therapeutic programming should be recognized as dangerous periods in a client's recovery. Regular and likely points of disruption should be identified, and then minimized or eliminated wherever possible. Partners indicated that some of these points are directly after a client is released from jail, movement from one type of housing to another, or when someone becomes unhoused. *"Well, I think one thing that is difficult is when patients, if*

*they're coming straight from jail, if they have been getting medication while they're in jail and they don't come with that medication, at least a week supply or something like that, ... and they may not even have a primary care or they may never been prescribed any kind of medication like the ones that they were prescribed in jail and so they're just kind of cut off from that medication."*

- **Follow-ups:** Having case management teams who proactively follow-up on a client's well-being was regularly cited by partners as having an enormous positive impact on client success. *"I honestly think that when we have patients who have a probation officer that is regularly checking in with the patient and the patient's counselor while they're here, that is helpful and it helps to really kind of send that message to that patient, hey, I'm checking in on you. I care about you and I want to see you succeed."*
- **Steady Job:** Those clients who were able to find work, even if part time, were reported as doing well in partners' programming.
- **Low barriers to services:** When services were difficult to enroll into, clients were much less likely to enter them at all. Some partners even reported that a difficult enrollment process could trigger a relapse into substance use. *"...sometimes they just have so much on their plate that it's hard to take on another program for them. And we tried really hard to be flexible with our class schedules ... because we know people work a lot of times. And we'll also provide dinner for people, too, because we understand you don't want to come just from work and then be hungry till 8:00. ... it can be mentally overloading to have so many different things to do all at once."*
- **Continuity of Staff:** A number of community providers noted that MCJRP clientele respond best to staff with whom they have a solid rapport. This necessitates programs to be staffed well and to experience as little turnover as possible.

## MCJRP Participant Success

The community partners were asked their opinions about what success looks like for MCJRP participants. Overall, most of the factors associated with success mentioned revolved around life stability and quality of life. The following areas of success were mentioned most frequently.

- **Recovery from Substance Abuse.** Many respondents noted that establishing recovery, even if for the first time in their lives, is a key factor to success because it can affect many other circumstances in their lives. However, not everyone endorsed abstinence from substances. One respondent noted, *"It's so subjective and it's so different for different people. ... for most people, it's a reduction in substance use or not engaging in substance use. For some people, just using less or using different substances can be a huge success given their history."*
- **Living Wage Job.** For many providers, clients being able to support themselves financially was a critical key to success. That brings self-respect and confidence that can impact other opportunities and ongoing success. *"Living wage jobs so they can provide for themselves and are able to pay for a home."*
- **Support System and Strong Relationships.** Without a strong support system, many respondents thought MCJRP participants would struggle with success. They mentioned people needing to feel supported, having positive relationships with family and friends, and surrounding themselves with a system of supportive services. One community partner noted, *"Feeling supported and understood. ... when you feel like – do you have a team*

*of people trying to support you? Then you don't quit, right? You're motivated consistently." Another provider described, "And that they have a support system, whether that's friends or family, or going to AA groups, or whatever those things that their support system is having that for them."*

- **Getting Off Probation and Reducing Criminal Activity.** A number of community partners felt an obvious measure of success would be for the MCJRP participants to successfully end their probation and discontinue or reduce their engagement in criminal behaviors and thinking.
- **Engaging in and Completing Treatment or Skills Training.** There was a great deal of agreement that getting MCJRP participants to fully engage in treatment and, ultimately, complete treatment or skills training, contributes to their success. *"So if they have main goals that they're working on and they can achieve measured success in those main goals then we would – we'd find that a wonderful sign of success."*
- **Stable Housing.** As noted above, one of the prominent barriers to engagement and retention in services is securing housing. This was also identified as one of the keys to success for MCJRP participants. When asked about success, one respondent said, *"Seems to come back to housing all the time."*
- **Managing Mental Health Issues.** Throughout the responses to what success looks like for MCJRP participants, a number of respondents mentioned aspects of mental health recovery. Some talked about managing trauma and the impact that has on their mental health, others talked about self-love and self-respect. One provider described, *"So if we can help them to know their value, so success is them knowing that value like feeling stable and mental health instead of living in the symptoms and feeling that despair. Feeling like, 'I'm okay. I'm not always perfect. And it's okay for me not to be okay, but my mental health is stable.' A new way of life."*

## Summary: Community Partner Feedback

Overall, most community partners described MCJRP as a functional collaboration that provides valuable supports to individuals who participate in the program. Although there were some suggestions for improvement, all providers are committed to ensuring that the MCJRP collaborative continues to be successful.



I think the program is amazing. It worked for me. I've seen it work for many other people. They do graduations to acknowledge their success and to really empower them. I think it's a phenomenal program.



It's a wonderful program ... I really believe in and appreciate being a part of. And, as anything else, it all needs to be tweaked as life changes. And I just think that this is one of those situations where life changes and we all have to adapt to make it so that it's successful for all.

## Participant Case Review

This component of the MAPS evaluation focused on a review of the existing administrative. The original approach was threefold: (1) identify the success-related data that exists across the agency data systems, (2) document the ability MCJRP currently has to measure success, and (3) determine other measures that need to be in place to fully capture the construct of success. Early in the evaluation, the first component of that approach involved reviewing data systems from the Oregon Judicial Department, Multnomah County District Attorney's Office, and Multnomah County Sheriff's Office. It was discovered that there were no documented success-related data elements within those systems, only the absence of negative events (e.g., recidivism) were recorded. As a result, the approach focused on reviewing DCJ POs' case notes, commonly called chronos, and the key research question for this component of the evaluation was: *How do DCJ POs document success?*

## Methods

### Sample

The sample was drawn from the previously described sample for the participant feedback component of this evaluation. All of the individuals were active in the MCJRP unit when the sample was drawn in February 2022, but may have been active or closed at the time of the case review. A sample was selected with the goal of being distributed proportional to the population on race/ethnicity, gender, and age. An initial subsample of six participants was used to establish and test the record review process. Of those six participants, five were supervised by the same MCJRP PO. In order to fully represent the sample, the number of POs would need to be expanded. As a result, four more POs were included in the sample for a total of six unique MCJRP POs. Additionally, two of the participants were not under the supervision of the MCJRP POs for enough time to accumulate the amount of data needed for a rigorous analysis. Therefore, two additional participants (one for each of the two POs) were selected as replacements in the sample. As such, the final sample included six POs and 2 cases per PO, for a total of 12 people under supervision. A full set of chronos for each person under supervision was analyzed.

### Procedure

All data was collected from the State of Oregon Offender Management System (OMS), which stores information regarding persons who are on community supervised with DCJ (e.g., assessments, office visits, case notes, communications, and contacts with service providers). With an initial review of that content, it was discovered that scheduled visits were a more comprehensive check in, while other notations logged were typically topical in nature. Therefore, the data collected from OMS was separated into two categories:

- 1) logged scheduled office visits, telephone or video visits, and home visits
- 2) all other logged entries, including notes, telephone calls, voice mail messages, text messages, emails, home visits, and assessments.

The timeframe for data collection was the date of entry into MCJRP program (2/11/21-8/25/22) until the date the participant's data was pulled (11/16/23-12/7/23). Chronos were pulled from OMS and the data was

downloaded as a PDF (the only option available). All chrono entries for each participant were recorded into a separate spreadsheet. The number of chrono entries varied across participants, ranging from 40 to 428 entries. The average time spent pulling and documenting the data was 4.2 hours per participant.

## Analytic Approach

Entries were first coded across the following predetermined themes: employment, education/training, housing, treatment, sobriety, family, relationships, reliable transportation, and milestone ceremonies. Themes that emerged outside of those codes were added as they were identified during data analysis.

Instances of success documentation were initially counted when POs recorded a positive affirmation. For the purpose of this analysis, a success documentation is a record that focuses on or highlights a successful moment for the client. As documentation of positive case notes was infrequent, the measurement criteria was broadened to encompass further instances of success. This included counting successes when some sort of positivity was expressed verbally by either the PO or person under supervision. Additionally, success documentation extended to situations where the person under supervision acknowledged their inability to meet goals or expectations; expressed an intention to succeed or comply with the program or the PO's expectations; or achieved and maintained employment, housing, or sobriety. Further successes were recorded when an effective reinforcement (ER; i.e., a reward given to the person supervision, such as a gift card) was distributed, travel permits were granted, an assessment was completed, restitution was paid, or community service hours were logged. This comprehensive approach aimed to capture a diverse range of indicators reflecting the participants' progress and achievements.

In addition to direct entries by the POs, proxy successes were documented when either a treatment or employment counselor communicated a success with the PO through email or phone calls. These indirect sources of documentation aimed to capture a broader perspective on the participants' accomplishments, involving insights from other professionals involved in the person's treatment or habilitation processes.

A final note about the chronos: Some information found in the chronos was excluded from the thematic coding procedure, which were associated with events that the PO would have had no influence over or involvement in. The following list itemizes the entry types that were excluded:

- participant was assigned a different PO
- entries while participant was in custody
- scheduling/rescheduling
- data changes
- DNA collection
- victim notifications
- notations of emails received where the PO did not log what was included in the email
- forms submitted
- substance abuse tracking when results were notated in subsequent entries
- attorney orders
- enter probation record (EPR) hits
- judicial detainers
- violation reports
- hearing notifications
- logs of referrals and referral emails
- placement details
- emails to providers about planning for interventions
- action plans
- sanction created
- SCRAM (alcohol monitoring bracelet) placement and download entries
- entries with no pertinent quant/qual information about participant
- entries about participant missing appointments
- court dates and appearances

## Limitations

It is important to note that there were limitations to this study. First, this study used purposive sampling and did not employ a random sampling technique, which increases sampling bias. Second, while initial intakes and assessments were meticulously logged by POs, providing a comprehensive view of the strengths and areas for improvement of people under supervision, documentation during subsequent office visits tended to focus primarily on identifying deficits or areas for growth. Consequently, the records might not have consistently captured successes that could have been present. This indicates that there is a potential gap in between what is documented and what POs are actually recognizing and acknowledging during their ongoing engagement with a person under supervision. In spite of the limitations, this study allowed a unique view into how POs document success among the people they supervise. It is strongly recommended that the findings are used as a pilot study that needs further investigation.

## Findings

Overall, findings revealed the lack of a standardized approach across POs for documenting participants' success. Based on the information that was available in OMS, the research did reveal some valuable insights into what is being recorded.

### Documentation of Success for People Under Supervision

In the data collection process, it was discovered that chrono entries contained limited subjective information, in other words, much of the content centered on factual events. As a reminder, information viewed as documentation of success is a notation, whether clearly stated as a success or stated as a proxy success, that contains a successful moment for the client. The POs appeared to adhere to a more evidentiary model, recording events that could easily be confirmed, rather than documenting their impressions or opinions about the person under supervision. It is important to note that although much of the chronos contained documented facts, subjectivity within how it was documented was still present.

When POs discussed success, it was relatively low in frequency and often portrayed as an indicator or metric rather than a success. For example, *"O<sup>1</sup> brought in a copy of a receipt from the courthouse, showing his restitution payment."* This chrono displays how the person under supervision addressed his probation requirement of paying for restitution, but it was not documented or acknowledged as a success.

There were many variations in the documentation of success across POs, with some POs focusing their documentation on deficits or logging success in a neutral manner, while others focused more on strengths and motivational strategies. Some examples from several POs include: (a) *"congratulated him for all his hard work and abstinence,"* (b) *"We had a conversation about some of her positive qualities and strengths. Gave her encouragement and discussed goals."* and (c) *"O appears forthcoming and contemplative about supervision."*

In general, chrono entries revealed a lack of an established standard or structure. Inconsistencies were observed both across different POs and across different entries made by the same PO. For instance, there was variability in the logging of email and text conversations – some entries were recorded verbatim, while others were presented as summaries of content. Another point of variation was noted in the logging of multiple ERs per person under supervision. Only one PO in the sample consistently doing so, while others

<sup>1</sup> "O" is an abbreviation for offender (i.e., MCJRP participant).

infrequently or never documented ERs. The absence of ERs in some entries raised uncertainty about whether they were not provided or simply went unlogged. While some POs documented office visits in a systematic manner, other POs did not follow a pattern in their documentation. Furthermore, there was no apparent established standard for the content of documentation, resulting in a lack of consistency both across different POs and within POs.

Although these inconsistencies made it difficult to conduct a thorough and systematic analysis, Table 1 presents summary statistics across the six POs (labeled A-F for anonymity). It is important to note that some of the data will be affected by the range of time on supervision that varied across the 12 participants. Based on the duration between the MCJRP start dates and the dates when the data was pulled from OMS, the range could be from approximately 15 to 34 months. However, looking at the average number of successes logged per office visit, the range was from 0.9 successes/visit for PO-D to 2.3 successes/visit for PO-B. In addition, the range of ERs given was from 0 for three POs to 10 for 1 PO.

Table 1: Summary Statistics for Logging Successes across POs

Table 1: Participant Demographics at Project Entry (N=98)						
	MCJRP POs					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Office Visits	32	16	27	42	19	11
Successes Documented for Office Visits	49	36	49	38	40	22
Average of Successes Logged per Office Visit	1.5	2.3	1.8	0.9	2.1	2.0
Entries other than Office Visits	24	21	16	74	39	21
Successes Documented for Non-Office Visit Entries	25	21	9	14	18	21
Average Successes Logged per Non-office Visit	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.2	0.5	1.0
ERs Given	0	10	2	2	0	0

The one exception to this inconsistent approach was when entries were statutorily required topics, such as assessments and earned discharge (EDIS) reviews. For those, documentation was consistent across POs.

## Thematic Coding Results

The following results relay the findings regarding PO documentation of success for the identified study areas: office visits; employment; housing; treatment and sobriety; family and relationships; transportation, restitution, and community service; and other milestones.

### Office Visits

Office visits and intakes were documented with the most detail out of the research categories. Some POs documented the specific time that the person under supervision reported to the office, whether it was on time, early, or late. In contrast, some entries provided a more general statement, such as, "*JII*<sup>2</sup> reported as directed" without specifying the exact timing. This became significant in the context of ERs, as some POs would document providing an ER for the person under supervision who arrived on time, which were

<sup>2</sup> "JII" is an abbreviation for justice-involved individual (i.e., MCJRP participant).

documented as successes. However, this analysis could not determine if the ERs were given out in a systematic and consistent way due to the wide variation in documentation.

## Employment

Differences in the approach to logging employment were observed across POs. Some POs recorded employment status even when there was no change, providing details such as the individual's current employment and supervisor information. For example, *"O is still employed at [redacted] and his supervisor is [redacted]. O usually works about 30 hours a week."* On the other hand, some POs typically documented employment only when there was a noteworthy change in employment. Specifically, the chronos were categorized as deficit based (e.g., loss of job, failure to get a job), neutral (e.g., no change in employment), and success-based (e.g., maintained or obtained employment, got a promotion). The following are examples of each type of employment chrono category.

### Deficit Entry

- *"He reports he has made attempts to contact [job services], but has not heard back. Told him...he has a lot of time and there is no reason he cannot be productive."*
- *"Directed to have full-time employment by his next OV with documentation of employment, W2, pay slips, and business info. Did not appear to be taking me seriously."*
- *"Directed to find a full-time job asap."*

### Neutral Entry

- *"O continues to work."*
- *"Work has been very busy, shifts change all the time."*

### Success Entry

- *"Congratulations on job were sent to JII."*
- *"He reported that he is working right across the street from their apartment now. The job is going well, he indicated that they have trusted him to open/close the store which they have not done in quite a while. He feels pretty proud of this."*

The systematic notation of employment, available as an option in chronos under data changes, was not consistently utilized to document employment. It was not used on every visit and was used more frequently by certain POs. Despite the availability of this option, no noticeable pattern could be identified during the analysis regarding its use. These variations in recording practices highlight how different POs use different approaches to documenting employment-related information. Additionally, it demonstrates the difficulty for researchers to accurately collect and maintain information about the employment status and changes for a person under supervision.

## Housing

Entries related to housing were predominantly made in an evidentiary or factual manner and only when changes occurred. For instance, *"O was turned down for housing at [redacted]. Discussed appeal and how he is going to approach it."* There were some chronos that appeared to be neutral, in that they contained more of an assessment of the situation, rather than a judgment. For example, *"Reported he was again behind on rent, but has it caught up and paid through November."* A different PO documented, *"O texted*

*that he did not get into the [housing facility], he can appeal next week... he may need help with housing until he is able to get into the [housing facility]."*

There were some POs who documented housing in a successful manner. For example, *"Housing is going okay, he is happy to have a place to live, it is challenging for him but he's glad to have it."* Another PO noted, *"The JII is making progress on the planned move in with his girlfriend. He stated that they decided to put it off for a few months to make sure it is what they both want. He talked about how he has learned about communicating together and how much difference this is making."*

These examples illustrate that housing-related documentation is often tied to specific events, such as residential changes or challenges faced by the person under supervision. These entries reflect a focus on significant housing-related developments rather than documentation of routine or stable aspects of housing. As such, the lack of standardization makes it difficult to identify people who have consistent and reliable housing.

## Home Visits

The majority of home visits were logged in a neutral manner, or simply reported whether the PO was able to contact the person under supervision during a home visit. Of the Chronos that detailed more information about the home visit, were still often logged in a neutral manner, for example: *"JII was home and no violations were noted."* However, there were a few instances where success was documented. One example of this is when a PO noted that the person under supervision was in compliance and recorded their success: *"O home, was cleaning/organizing his room. After asking permission, I checked his fridge, no prohibited items. He seems to be doing very well in this situation and is happy."* Similarly with the other thematic codings, to fully understand how successful people are under supervision in their home environment, utilizing a standard way to not only track successful contacts during the home visit, but also the qualitative portion of the home visit, would allow for a full understanding of how the home environment affects success.

## Treatment and Sobriety

Several people in the sample were actively working on achieving or maintaining sobriety. When sobriety was not maintained, it was typically documented in a deficit-oriented manner. For example, *"Discussed consequences should he not fully engage in treatment. Understands that he will do residential if he cannot successfully complete outpatient."* Another PO documented, *"Told him I was very disappointed in him."* In cases where sobriety was maintained, it was often noted in a neutral manner, such as *"JII reports maintaining sobriety,"* or sometimes not documented at all. However, a few outliers were identified and logged as successes. For instance, *"I commended O for all of his positive thinking processes and how this has really changed in the past few months."* Another positive notation included, *"He said that he messed up and drank over the weekend. He was very accountable about it and expressed how that decision was not a good one, acknowledging the misalignment with his desired way of living."*

Although there were only a few entries of this nature, when POs discussed sobriety in a specific manner, framing it as a goal and addressing it proactively, it was logged as a success. One PO documented, *"JII states that he is working on quitting smoking marijuana. We worked on a new Behavior Chain addressing this. He recognizes the negative consequences, such as it costing him money. Requested that he complete the rest of the Behavior Chain to explore alternatives or different outcomes and bring it back for discussion at his next office visit."*

Treatment needs, access to treatment, and treatment engagement and completion are essential to the success of people under supervision. It is important for there to be standardization, as it relates to documenting the various stages of treatment, particularly in relation to successful events.

## Family and Relationships

The documentation of people under supervision regarding their relationships was commonly recorded either in a neutral manner or in the context of goals. One neutral entry example was, *"We discussed expectations when bf is released from jail in [redacted]. He cannot live with her until in treatment and attending [treatment program]."* Although POs did not specifically document successes in this area, they did allude to successes by documenting improvements in relationships. For example, one PO wrote, *"Jill came with gf. states all is going well currently. They seemed to be in a better space with each other than the last time they were here."* Family and relationships are essential to the success of a person under supervision. The ability to document and understand the impact of relationships is dependent upon POs documented those successes in a standardized manner.

## Transportation, Restitution, and Community Service

There was very little documentation regarding transportation, restitution, and community service. When it was recorded, it was recorded in an evidentiary and factual manner (e.g., completed/not completed, needed/didn't need, paid/didn't pay).

## Milestone Ceremonies

All milestone ceremonies were logged as successes. However, we cannot guarantee that all POs were logging milestone ceremonies for all of the participants.

## Overall Findings

Overall, the findings suggest that being able to evaluate success of MCJRP participants using the documentation of POs in OMS is challenging. To do so requires consistent documentation of client progress through the program and much more attention paid to client strengths and successes. Often, only areas of growth or weaknesses were documented, leaving uncertainty about whether participants have other ongoing strengths that may not have been recorded. Documenting successes or strengths, even if they are unchanging (e.g., the person under supervision is maintaining stable housing, employment, or sobriety throughout the duration of supervision), would aid in the long-term evaluation of MCJRP.

## Recommendations

Ultimately, it is advised that the documentation practices of MCJRP POs be revisited and new procedures and standards established or existing standards be consistently implemented. Based on this analysis, the following recommendations can be provided.

- Create and implement a standardized approach for documenting:
  - success during office visits, for example, adopt a standardized method for documenting ERs given
  - housing status, for example, create standardized categories that can easily be queried in the downloaded data from chronos
  - important information from a home visit

- treatment and sobriety by creating a consistent manner of recording a person's treatment status
  - the use of EPICs and motivational interviewing
  - restitution and community service status of progress and completion.<sup>3</sup>
- Utilize the data change function for employment at every visit or document no change in employment.
  - Utilize the treatment module for consistently documenting participant engagement in treatment.
  - Implement an alternative way to capture the strengths and deficits of a participant's relational support system (e.g., ecomaps).
  - Ensure that all milestone ceremonies are being documented in chronos.

<sup>3</sup> Although there are other mechanisms for recording both restitution and community service, chronos should reflect the discussion of those statuses during supervision, especially if success can be noted.

## Quantitative Outcome Analysis

During the COVID-19 pandemic, Multnomah County's criminal legal system was forced to shut down court proceedings, and pivot to virtual responses in order to maintain safety. As a consequence, the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP) experienced severe disruptions in implementing the program, and were forced to change the way in which the program was implemented. As the County moved out of COVID-19 and mandates, returning to the original model, raised questions about the efficacy of the model. The current research project attempts to understand the efficacy of the pre-COVID model, and provides an opportunity to discuss the model from an evidence-based perspective. It is the hope of this team that these results will be a starting point for discussion.

## Program Description

The passage of SB3194 allowed for a small proportion of the population who were arrested on specific charges, to receive a probation sentence and remain in the community. To determine who should be eligible for, be offered to, and receive this downward departure, the MCJRP team created program criteria and a subsequent process. Eligible individuals are identified by the District Attorney's Office (DA), and the defendant and their representation is notified. If the defendant agrees, the Department of Community Justice (DCJ) will work with the defendant and the defense team to create a comprehensive, strengths-based, and individualized packet, which includes a risk assessment (Level of Service/Case Management Inventory, LS/CMI). Within 60 days of the indictment, the team (DA, Probation Officers, Defense, and other team members) meet in a Justice Settlement Conference (JSC) to review the packet and determine if supervision within the MCJRP program is appropriate.

For the purpose of this research project, as stated above, there were questions about the impact of receiving a LS/CMI and a JSC on the sentencing outcomes. More specifically, members of the MCJRP program, held concerns about bias within the model, especially within the context of the JSC. The first part of this project will attempt to address that. The second part will attempt to determine if the downward departure, or supervising people in the community versus in prison, had a positive impact on recidivism.

## Quantitative Research Questions

The first research question attempted to understand who went through the model pre-COVID.

**Research Question 1:** What are the demographics of the participants who had MCJRP-eligible cases?

**Analytical Strategy:** Demographic characteristics of participants were determined using descriptive statistics, including measures of central tendency.

The next research question focused on understanding who received the full model and the effects on sentencing outcomes.

**Research Question 2:** Net of controls, what is the impact of receiving a Judicial Settlement Conference (JSC) and/or a Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI) on sentencing?

**Analytical Strategy:** To determine the effect of the JSC and LS/CMI on sentencing outcomes, a multinomial logistic regression was used.

The final set of research questions examined the impact of the model on recidivism.

**Research Question 3:** What is the recidivism rate of participants who had MCJRP-eligible cases?

**Analytical Strategy:** Descriptive statistics were used to determine the rate of recidivism across multiple measures of offending. Additionally, Chi-Square tests were used to evaluate whether significant correlations existed between each recidivism measure and multiple variables of interest.

**Research Question 4:** What was the time to recidivate? Is time to recidivate significantly different by sentencing type?

**Analytical Strategy:** Descriptive statistics, including measures of central tendency, were used to assess time to recidivate. Additionally a one way ANOVA was used to determine if significant differences existed between groups.

**Research Question 5:** Net of controls, what is the impact of receiving a JSC and/or an assessment on recidivism outcomes?

**Analytical Strategy:** To determine the effect of the JSC and LS/CMI on sentencing outcomes, a logistic regression was used for each measure of recidivism.

## Procedure

This is a secondary analysis of data collected by various criminal legal system entities. For this project the following data systems were used to collect variables needed for this analysis. This analysis relies on two major data sources: the Multnomah County criminal justice data warehouse (also known as the DSS-J) and the DCJ-hosted MCJRP case tracking system formerly known as McSheets and now referred to as the MCJRP App.

Data related to demographic factors, current case information including charges and dates (e.g., file, disposition, MCJRP eligibility) were extracted from the data warehouse. Most of that data was provided by the Oregon Judicial Department's (OJD) eCourt case management system. Although some of the originating data comes from the DA's office. The MCJRP App, which was designed specifically for the MCJRP program, provides details of a defendant's case such as attorney information and future court dates. For this analysis, it serves as the main source for data regarding the completion of a LS/CMI or JSC. However, the MCJRP app does not provide LS/CMI scores because the LS/CMI is completed prior to sentencing and, per an agreement with relevant parties, must be stored separately. Instead this data is maintained internally by the county's research team and stored in an Excel data file.

## Sample

The original dataset consisted of a total of 3,419 court cases, including 2,673 unique individuals, who had a disposition date prior to March 2018 who would have been eligible to participate in the MCJRP. In other words, this sample includes all persons arrested during the timeframe who would have been eligible to participate in the MCJRP program. In order to properly analyze outcomes related to recidivism and avoid any

confounding effects of the pandemic and subsequent system-wide changes, the decision was made to reduce the sample to only those cases that had a disposition date prior to March 2018. This allowed for a 2-year follow-up period to measure recidivism prior to the start of the pandemic. The data was then deduplicated to include only the first disposed case per person.

The final sample included 1,866 unique individuals. The majority of the sample identified as male ( $n=1,480$ , 79.3%) and were mostly White ( $n=1,126$ , 60.3%). In terms of race, the next largest group consisted of Black/African American participants ( $n=437$ , 23.4%), followed by Latine ( $n=232$ , 12.4%), Asian/Asian American ( $n=57$ , 3.1%) and Something other racial/ethnic identities ( $n=14$ , 0.8%). The age of individuals when their case was first filed ranged from 18 to 69, with the average age being roughly 35 years. Within the sample, 848 (45.4%) individuals were sentenced to MCJRP Intensive Supervision, 623 (33.4%) were sentenced to prison, 189 (10.1%) received general probation, and 206 (11.0%) received some other specialty court sentence (e.g., Success through Accountability, Restitution, and Treatment [START], DUI Intensive Supervision Program [DISP]).

## Variables

### Dependent Variables

**Sentencing Outcomes:** The first outcome of interest was the sentencing outcome of the individual's MCJRP-eligible case. For analytical purposes, sentencing outcomes were collapsed into the following categories: (1) MCJRP Intensive Supervision, (2) Prison, and (3) General Probation or Specialty Court.

**Recidivism:** This research was also interested in investigating the impact of the MCJRP model on various recidivism outcomes. Recidivism measures were counted if they occurred within 2 years following the start of supervision and were dummy coded for each of the following: arrest, charges issued by the DA, charges received by the DA, conviction, sanction, and revocation. The date associated with the first occurrence of each recidivism measure was also captured in the data in order to accurately identify time to reoffend.

### Predictor variables

The purpose of this project was to determine if there were any disparities in outcomes among people that participated in the program. As such, demographic variables traditionally used as controls for outcome will be used as predictors for success.

**Intersectionality (Race/Ethnicity and Sex):** In the original dataset, race/ethnicity is a categorical variable that includes: White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Other. Given the low number of individuals in the Other category for both samples ( $n=13$ ,  $n=9$ ) and limitations with the data being able to provide a more precise racial or ethnic identity, these individuals were later removed from our regression analyses. Sex is a dichotomous variable with participants identified as men coded as 1 and participants identified as women coded as 0. In order to provide a more meaningful interpretation of the results, these two predictors were re-coded and combined into a single variable. Specifically, race/ethnicity was dummy coded where white individuals were coded as 0 and people of color were coded as 1. The dichotomous race and sex variables were then collapsed into 4 categories: white male, white female, female of color, and male of color.

**Age:** Age is calculated from the participants' birthdate to the time their case is filed. Due to issues with multicollinearity in our analysis, age was converted from a continuous variable into an ordinal variable. Age was binned and re-coded with the following categories: 18-25 years old ( $n=406$ , 21.8%), 26-30 years old

(n=341, 18.3%), 31–36 years old (n=400, 21.4%), 37–44 years old (n=357, 19.1%), and 45+ years old (n=362, 19.4%).

**Judicial Settlement Conferences and LS/CMI Assessments:** There are two core components of MCJRP that occur during the pre-trial phase of the model: the LS/CMI assessment and the JSCs. Within this sample, the JSCs were held for over half of the sample (n=1,221, 65.4%). Of those in the sample, 370 (19.8%) did not receive an LS/CMI as part of the MCJRP pre-trial process or that data was not available.

Of particular interest was the extent to which participation in a JSC and LS/CMI assessment impacted an individual's sentencing outcomes and subsequent recidivism. Due to significant correlations between these two variables, these predictors were collapsed into a single variable defined as a person receiving one of the following: (1) Both the JSC and LS/CMI (n=1,100, 58.9%), (2) Either the JSC or the LS/CMI (n=517, 27.7%), and (3) Neither the JSC nor the LS/CMI (n=249, 13.3%).

**LS/CMI Score:** The LS/CMI score is a categorical variable that represents the level of risk of the participant (interval variable). There were five levels of recommended treatment that participants could score: Very High (>30), High (20–29), Medium (11–19), Low (5–10) and Very Low (0–4). The purpose of this program is to serve people who score Very High Risk and High Risk. To obtain risk scores for individuals in the sample, a proxy LS/CMI score variable was created to match the SID associated with the LS/CMI risk scores as well as the date of the assessment closest to the date when the pre-trial report was released to the court. This allowed us to use the LS/CMI scores that were closest to the time when sentencing decisions were being made. Of those participants who received an LS/CMI, the majority of participants scored very high (n=661, 41.3%) or high (n=664, 41.5%). About 12.2% of participants scored medium (n=195), and the sample included a small number of participants who scored low or very low and were subsequently collapsed into one category (n=81, 5.1%).

**Sentencing Outcomes:** While also serving as a dependent variable in some portions of the analyses, sentencing outcomes also were hypothesized to play a role in recidivism outcomes. Therefore, sentencing outcomes were included in recidivism analyses while excluding those sentenced to prison. Instead this predictor was collapsed into the following categories: (1) MCJRP Intensive Supervision, (2) general probation, and (3) Other Specialty Court.

## Results

### Research Question 1: Demographics of Participants

As stated above, the overall sample included 1,866 unique individuals, the majority of whom identified as a man (n=1480, 79.3%) and as White (n=1126, 60.3%). Table 2 (next page) presents a breakdown of demographic characteristics by sentencing type.

**Table 2: Participant Characteristics by Sentencing Type**

	MCJRP Intensive Supervision		Prison		Other Specialty Court		General Probation		Total		
	848	45.4%	623	33.4%	206	11.1%	189	10.1%	1,866	100%	
Race/Ethnicity	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
African American/ Black	212	25.0%	131	21.0%	41	19.9%	53	28.0%	437	23.4%	N/A
Asian/Asian American	23	2.7%	18	2.9%	11	5.3%	5	2.6%	57	3.1%	
Latino/a/x	99	11.7%	90	14.4%	23	11.2%	20	10.6%	232	12.4%	
Other	6	0.7%	5	0.8%	1	0.5%	2	1.1%	14	0.8%	
White	508	59.9%	379	60.8%	130	63.1%	109	57.7%	1,126	60.3%	
Race and Sex	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
White Male	373	44.3%	321	51.9%	101	49.3%	83	44.4%	878	47.4%	X <sup>2</sup> = 40.914***
White Female	135	16.0%	58	9.4%	29	14.1%	26	13.9%	248	13.4%	
Female of Color	86	10.2%	26	4.2%	10	4.9%	11	5.9%	133	7.2%	
Male of Color	248	29.5%	213	34.5%	65	31.7%	67	35.8%	593	32.0%	
Age	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
18-25	202	23.8%	120	19.3%	33	16.0%	51	27.0%	406	21.8%	X <sup>2</sup> = 26.015*
26-30	159	18.8%	107	17.2%	39	18.9%	36	19.0%	341	18.3%	
31-36	186	21.9%	138	22.2%	48	23.3%	28	14.8%	400	21.4%	
37-44	145	17.1%	144	23.1%	38	18.4%	30	15.9%	357	19.1%	
45+	156	18.4%	114	18.3%	48	23.3%	44	23.3%	362	19.4%	
Judicial Settlement Conference (JSC) and LS/CMI Assessment	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Neither	95	11.2%	85	13.6%	22	10.7%	47	24.9%	249	13.3%	X <sup>2</sup> = 37.268***
JSC or LS/CMI	211	24.9%	196	31.5%	62	30.1%	48	25.4%	517	27.7%	
Both	542	63.9%	342	54.9%	122	59.2%	94	49.7%	1,100	58.9%	
LS/CMI Scores	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Low/Very Low	49	6.7%	17	3.2%	5	2.9%	10	6.2%	81	5.1%	X <sup>2</sup> =67.018***
Medium	108	14.8%	45	8.4%	12	6.9%	30	18.6%	195	12.2%	
High	330	45.1%	197	36.9%	68	38.9%	69	42.9%	664	41.5%	
Very High	244	33.4%	275	51.5%	90	51.4%	52	32.3%	661	41.3%	

\**p*<.05 \*\**p*<.01 \*\*\**p*<.001

**MCJRP Intensive Supervision:** Those supervised within MCJRP were predominantly White men (*n*=373, 44.3%), followed by men of color (*n*=248, 29.5%). Specifically, women of color were more likely to be in MCJRP than expected ( $\chi^2=40.914$ , *p*<0.001). MCJRP participants' ages were fairly evenly distributed with the largest category being 18-25-year-olds (*n*=202, 23.8%). The majority of MCJRP participants were either High or Very High Risk (*n*=330, 45.1%; *n*=244, 33.4%) and most received both the JSC and LS/CMI (*n*=542, 63.9%).

**Prison:** Of those sentenced to prison, over half were White males (*n*=321, 51.9%). The next largest intersectional category was men of color (*n*=213, 34.5%). Differences between groups were significant, with fewer White women and women of color being sentenced to prison than expected ( $\chi^2=40.914$ , *p*<0.001). The age proportions were fairly equal in their distribution, however the most common age for this group was 37-44 (*n*=144, 23.1%). Those sentenced to prison were predominantly Very High risk (*n*=275, 51.5%), followed by High risk (*n*=197, 36.9%). Findings regarding risk and sentencing type were significant, with more Very High

risk individuals than expected being sentenced to prison ( $\chi^2=67.018$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Nearly 55% of individuals received a JSC and LS/CMI ( $n=342$ , 54.9%).

**Other Specialty Courts:** Similar to MCJRP supervision, specialty court participants were more often White men ( $n=101$ , 49.3%) or men of color ( $n=65$ , 31.7%). Participants were relatively similar in age; however, the largest groups were those 31-36 years ( $n=48$ , 23.3%) and 45 years and older ( $n=48$ , 23.3%). Most scored between High and Very High on the LS/CMI ( $n=68$ , 38.9%;  $n=90$ , 51.4%). The majority of participants also received a JSC and LS/CMI ( $n=122$ , 59.2%).

**General Probation:** Participants in general probation were also mostly men (regardless of race/ethnicity), though the difference in proportions were smaller than for MCJRP and other specialty courts ( $n=83$ , 44.4%;  $n=67$ , 35.8%). There were significant differences between men of color and White men, with men of color more likely to be sentenced to general probation ( $\chi^2=40.914$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). The largest age category for general probation was 18-25-year-olds ( $n=51$ , 27.0%). Most probationers were High risk ( $n=69$ , 42.9%), followed by Very High risk ( $n=52$ , 32.3%). Proportionally, general probation consisted of more Medium risk individuals than other forms of supervision ( $n=30$ , 18.6%). Nearly half received both a JSC and LS/CMI ( $n=94$ , 49.7%).

## Research Question 2: Impact of JSC and LS/CMI on Sentencing

To evaluate the effect of the JSC and/or LS/CMI on sentencing outcomes, a multinomial logistic regression was employed (see Tables 3 and 4). Specifically, the model's outcome were the possible outcomes for a person under supervision: MCJRP Intensive Supervision, Prison, or General Probation/Other Specialty Courts (reference category). In this model, intersectionality and age were used as predictors to uncover any possible demographic bias. Also in this model were the JSC and LS/CMI variables, which tested the impact of the pre-trial settlement conference. Overall, the model demonstrated significant improvement when compared to an intercept only model and a reasonable goodness-of-fit ( $\chi^2 = 396.532$ ,  $p>0.1$ ).

**Table 3: Multinomial Logistic Regression Predicting MCJRP Supervision Sentence**

Full model (n=1,590)				
Race and Sex	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Male of color	0.85	0.283	0.631	1.144
Female of color	1.707	0.055	0.989	2.948
White female	1.124	0.575	0.747	1.689
Age	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
26-30	1.102	0.637	0.736	1.651
31-36	1.23	0.320	0.818	1.851
37-44	0.896	0.61	0.589	1.365
45+	0.795	0.252	0.537	1.177
JSC and/or LS/CMI	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Both	1.443	0.09	0.944	2.206
JSC or LS/CMI	1.048	0.845	0.652	1.686
LS/CMI Scores	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Low/Very Low	1.148	0.698	0.576	2.287
High	0.920	0.691	0.609	1.390
Very High	0.668	0.058	0.439	1.014
(Intercept)	0.00	0.021		

**Table 4: Multinomial Logistic Regression Predicting Prison Sentence**

Full model (n=1,590)				
Race and Sex	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Male of color	0.897	0.490	0.659	1.221
Female of color	0.737	0.350	0.388	1.398
White female	0.649	0.065	0.409	1.028
Age	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
26-30	1.091	0.699	0.703	1.692
31-36	1.484	0.076	0.959	2.297
37-44	1.72	0.014	1.114	2.655
45+	0.913	0.677	0.597	1.398
JSC and/or LS/CMI	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Both	1.363	0.183	0.864	2.15
JSC or LS/CMI	1.688	0.04	1.025	2.777
LS/CMI Scores	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Low/Very Low	0.968	0.938	0.423	2.215
High	1.262	0.340	0.783	2.035
Very High	1.713	0.026	1.068	2.749
(Intercept)	0.00	0.381		

When predicting the likelihood of an individual being sentenced to MCJRP Intensive Supervision, none of the predictor variables were significant. However, two variables approached significance. Specifically, women of color were more likely to be sentenced to MCJRP supervision when compared to White men (OR= 1.707, 95% CI [0.989, 2.948],  $p= 0.055$ ). Additionally, if an individual scored Very High on the LS/CMI, they were less likely to be sentenced to MCJRP supervision (OR = 0.668, 95% CI [0.439, 1.014],  $p=0.058$ ) when compared to Medium risk individuals. The JSC and LS/CMI variable was not a significant predictor of MCJRP supervision.

Several variables emerged as significant when predicting the odds of being sentenced to prison. First, having either the JSC or an LS/CMI (but not both) increased the likelihood of being sentenced to prison by nearly 69% compared to those receiving neither (OR= 1.688, 95% CI [1.025, 2.777],  $p<0.05$ ). Second, having an LS/CMI score that was Very High increased the likelihood of going to prison by 71% (OR= 1.713, 95% CI [1.068, 2.749],  $p<0.05$ ). Finally, those individuals between the ages of 37 and 44 were 72% more likely to be sentenced to prison when compared to 18-25-year-olds (OR= 1.72, 95% CI [1.114, 2.655],  $p<0.05$ ).

### Research Question 3: Recidivism Rates

In order to accurately measure recidivism outcomes, people who were sentenced to prison were removed from the sample (i.e., people sentenced to prison are incarcerated and unable to recidivate in the public sphere). This revised sample included 1,267 unique individuals. Again, the majority of participants were male ( $n=963$ , 76%) and White ( $n=753$ , 59.4%). The next largest racial categories that people identified as were Black/African American ( $n=320$ , 25.3%), Latine ( $n=146$ , 11.5%), Asian/Asian American ( $n=39$ , 3.1%), and, finally there was small, undisclosed racial/ethnic category ( $n=9$ , 0.7%).

**Recidivism:** Six different possible outcomes were used to measure recidivism: arrest, charges issued by the District Attorney, charges received by the District Attorney, conviction, sanction, and revocation. When collapsed into a single binary variable, nearly 63.9% of individuals ( $n=809$ ) recidivated in some manner (see

Table 5). Of all intersectionalities, men of color were more likely to recidivate ( $\chi^2 = 25.525$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Age as a continuous variable was also significant, with an increase in age being significantly correlated with a decreased likelihood of recidivism ( $r = -0.118$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). When analyzing the correlation between the binned age categories and recidivism, it appeared that younger individuals between the ages of 18 and 36 were more likely to reoffend compared to their older counterparts ( $\chi^2 = 26.136$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). As it relates to the impact of the MCJRP program (LS/CMI and JSC), those who received both a JSC and the JSC and LS/CMI were less likely to recidivate overall ( $\chi^2 = 7.240$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 5: Binary Recidivism Rates by Participant Characteristics**

	No Recidivism		Recidivism		Total		
	458	36.1%	809	63.9%	1,267	100%	
<b>Race/Sex</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
White Male	213	46.7%	348	43.4%	561	44.6%	$\chi^2 = 25.525^{***}$
White Female	90	19.7%	102	12.7%	192	15.3%	
Female of Color	45	9.9%	63	7.9%	108	8.6%	
Male of Color	108	23.7%	289	36.0%	397	31.6%	
Age (Continuous)							
Age (Continuous)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Test statistic
	(Range)		(Range)		(Range)		
	36.60	11.45	33.32	10.12	34.50	10.72	$r = -0.118^{***}$
	(18-69)		(18-68)		(18-69)		
<b>Age</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
18-25	75	16.9%	211	26.4%	286	23.0%	$\chi^2 = 26.136^{***}$
26-30	80	18.0%	154	19.3%	234	18.8%	
31-36	90	20.2%	172	21.6%	262	21.1%	
37-44	84	18.9%	129	16.2%	213	17.1%	
45+	116	26.1%	132	16.5%	248	20.0%	
Judicial Settlement Conference (JSC) and LS/CMI Assessment							
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Neither	56	12.2%	113	14.0%	169	13.3%	$\chi^2 = 7.240^*$
JSC or LS/CMI	104	22.7%	231	28.6%	335	26.4%	
Both	298	65.1%	465	57.5%	763	60.2%	
<b>LS/CMI Scores</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Low/Very Low	52	13.2%	13	1.9%	65	6.0%	$\chi^2 = 95.725^{***}$
Medium	85	21.6%	74	10.6%	159	14.6%	
High	156	39.7%	321	46.1%	477	43.8%	
Very High	100	25.4%	289	41.5%	389	35.7%	
<b>Sentencing Type</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
MCJRP Supervision	296	64.6%	571	70.6%	867	68.4%	$\chi^2 = 4.862$
Other Specialty Court	83	18.1%	125	15.5%	208	16.4%	
General Probation	79	17.2%	113	14.0%	192	15.2%	

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

To better understand the implications of what types of sentence the defendant received on recidivism, sentencing outcomes were re-coded as having been sentenced to either MCJRP Intensive Supervision, general probation, or another Specialty Court. Sentencing outcomes were not significantly correlated with the binary recidivism measure. These same analyses were then replicated for each type of recidivism measure.

**Arrest:** Approximately 41% of the sample had an arrest within two years of their supervision start date (see Table 6). Arrests were significantly associated with race and sex ( $\chi^2 = 36.245$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and occurred most often for White men (43.4%) and men of color (39.3%). There was also a significant correlation with LS/CMI scores with High and Very High risk participants being more likely to be rearrested ( $\chi^2 = 53.778$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Age was also correlated with arrest, particularly among participants ages 36 and below ( $\chi^2 = 17.886$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). The JSC and/or LS/CMI variable and sentencing outcomes were not significantly associated with arrest.

**Table 6: Arrest Recidivism Rates by Participant Characteristics**

	No Arrest		Arrest		Total		
	743	58.6%	524	41.4%	1,267	100%	
<b>Race/Sex</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
White Male	336	45.5%	225	43.4%	561	44.6%	$\chi^2 = 36.245^{***}$
White Female	142	19.2%	50	9.6%	192	15.3%	
Female of Color	68	9.2%	40	7.7%	108	8.6%	
Male of Color	193	26.1%	204	39.3%	397	31.6%	
<b>Age</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
18-25	146	20.1%	140	27.2%	286	23.0%	$\chi^2 = 17.886^{**}$
26-30	131	18.0%	103	20.0%	234	18.8%	
31-36	150	20.6%	112	21.7%	262	21.1%	
37-44	132	18.1%	81	15.7%	213	17.1%	
45+	169	23.2%	79	15.3%	248	20.0%	
<b>Judicial Settlement Conference (JSC) and LS/CMI Assessment</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Neither	91	12.2%	78	14.9%	169	13.3%	$\chi^2 = 5.284$
JSC or LS/CMI	185	24.9%	150	28.6%	335	26.4%	
Both	467	62.9%	296	56.5%	763	60.2%	
<b>LS/CMI Scores</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Low/Very Low	59	9.3%	6	1.3%	65	6.0%	$\chi^2 = 53.778^{***}$
Medium	112	17.6%	47	10.4%	159	14.6%	
High	278	43.6%	199	43.9%	477	43.8%	
Very High	188	29.5%	201	44.4%	389	35.7%	
<b>Sentencing Type</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
MCJRP Supervision	502	67.6%	365	69.7%	867	68.4%	$\chi^2 = 0.845$
Other Specialty Court	123	16.6%	85	16.2%	208	16.4%	
General Probation	118	15.9%	74	14.1%	192	15.2%	

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

**DA Charges Received:** Nearly 43% of individuals had charges that were received by the District Attorney (see Table 7). Race and sex were significantly correlated with this recidivism outcome ( $\chi^2=46.830$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) with this measure of recidivism occurring most often for men of color (41.2%) and white men (40.7%). LS/CMI scores were also highly correlated with charges being received ( $\chi^2= 58.206$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Nearly 90% of those who recidivated scored either High (44.4%) or Very High (44.4%) on the LS/CMI. Age was also correlated with this outcome, with those ages 18–30 being more likely than expected to have charges received by the District Attorney ( $\chi^2=12.253$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). Sentencing outcome was significant ( $\chi^2=6.409$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), with observed counts of recidivism for MCJRP participants and Other Specialty Court participants being higher than expected. The JSC and/or LS/CMI variable was not significantly associated with this recidivism measure.

**Table 7: Charges Received Recidivism Rates by Participant Characteristics**

	No Charges		Charges		Total		
	726	57.3%	541	42.7%	1,267	100%	
<b>Race/Sex</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
White Male	343	47.5%	218	40.7%	561	44.6%	$\chi^2 = 46.830^{***}$
White Female	137	19.0%	55	10.3%	192	15.3%	
Female of Color	66	9.1%	42	7.8%	108	8.6%	
Male of Color	176	24.4%	221	41.2%	397	31.6%	
<b>Age</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
18-25	140	19.8%	146	27.2%	286	23.0%	$\chi^2 = 12.253^*$
26-30	128	18.1%	106	19.8%	234	18.8%	
31-36	157	22.2%	105	19.6%	262	21.1%	
37-44	131	18.5%	82	15.3%	213	17.1%	
45+	151	21.4%	97	18.1%	248	20.0%	
<b>Judicial Settlement Conference (JSC) and LS/CMI Assessment</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Neither	92	12.7%	77	14.2%	169	13.3%	$\chi^2 = 2.948$
JSC or LS/CMI	182	25.1%	153	28.3%	335	26.4%	
Both	452	62.3%	311	57.5%	763	60.2%	
<b>LS/CMI Scores</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Low/Very Low	58	9.3%	7	1.5%	65	6.0%	$\chi^2 = 58.206^{***}$
Medium	114	18.3%	45	9.7%	159	14.6%	
High	270	43.3%	207	44.4%	477	43.8%	
Very High	182	29.2%	207	44.4%	389	35.7%	
<b>Sentencing Type</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
MCJRP Supervision	484	66.7%	383	70.8%	867	68.4%	$\chi^2 = 6.409^*$
Other Specialty Court	116	16.0%	92	17.0%	208	16.4%	
General Probation	126	17.4%	66	12.2%	192	15.2%	

\* $p<.05$  \*\* $p<.01$  \*\*\* $p<.001$

**DA Charges Issued:** Just over 35% of the sample had charges issued against them by the District Attorney (see Table 8). Similar to previous measures, race and sex ( $\chi^2=28.447$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and LS/CMI scores ( $\chi^2=55.833$ ,  $p>0.001$ ) were significantly correlated with recidivism. Men of color and those scoring High and Very High on the LS/CMI recidivated at a higher rate than expected. The JSC and/or LS/CMI variable, sentencing outcomes, and age were not significantly associated with charges being issued.

**Table 8: Charges Issued Recidivism Rates by Participant Characteristics**

	No Charges		Charges		Total		
	821	64.8%	446	35.2%	1,267	100%	
<b>Race/Sex</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
White Male	374	45.8%	187	42.3%	561	44.6%	$X^2 = 28.447^{***}$
White Female	149	18.3%	43	9.7%	192	15.3%	
Female of Color	71	8.7%	37	8.4%	108	8.6%	
Male of Color	222	27.2%	175	44.1%	397	31.6%	
<b>Age</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
18-25	171	21.3%	115	26.1%	286	23.0%	$X^2 = 4.775$
26-30	148	18.5%	86	19.5%	234	18.8%	
31-36	173	21.6%	89	20.2%	262	21.1%	
37-44	142	17.7%	71	16.1%	213	17.1%	
45+	168	20.9%	80	18.1%	248	20.0%	
<b>Judicial Settlement Conference (JSC) and LS/CMI Assessment</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Neither	105	12.8%	64	14.3%	169	13.3%	$X^2 = 3.529$
JSC or LS/CMI	206	25.1%	129	28.9%	335	26.4%	
Both	510	62.1%	253	56.7%	763	60.2%	
<b>LS/CMI Scores</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Low/Very Low	61	8.6%	4	1.0%	65	6.0%	$X^2 = 55.833^{***}$
Medium	128	18.1%	31	8.1%	159	14.6%	
High	300	42.5%	177	46.1%	477	43.8%	
Very High	217	30.7%	172	44.8%	389	35.7%	
<b>Sentencing Type</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
MCJRP Supervision	555	67.6%	312	70.0%	867	68.4%	$X^2 = 5.418$
Other Specialty Court	128	15.6%	80	17.9%	208	16.4%	
General Probation	138	16.8%	54	12.1%	192	15.2%	

\* $p<.05$  \*\* $p<.01$  \*\*\* $p<.001$

**Conviction:** Roughly 25% of the sample were convicted of a new offense within 2 years of their supervision start date (see Table 9, next page). Only LS/CMI scores ( $\chi^2= 29.96$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and age ( $\chi^2= 20.388$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) were significantly correlated with conviction. Specifically, those who were between the ages of 18-25 years and 31-36 years, and those scoring High and Very High on the LS/CMI were more likely than expected to be convicted of a new offense. Race and sex, the JSC and/or LS/CMI variable, and sentencing outcomes were not significantly correlated with conviction.

**Table 9: Conviction Recidivism Rates by Participant Characteristics**

	No Conviction		Conviction		Total		
	946	74.7%	321	25.3%	1,267	100%	
<b>Race/Sex</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
White Male	416	44.2%	145	45.7%	561	44.6%	$\chi^2 = 4.022$
White Female	154	16.4%	38	12.0%	192	15.3%	
Female of Color	82	8.7%	26	8.2%	108	8.6%	
Male of Color	289	30.7%	108	34.1%	397	31.6%	
<b>Age</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
18-25	191	20.7%	95	29.6%	286	23.0%	$\chi^2 = 20.388^{***}$
26-30	178	19.3%	56	17.4%	234	18.8%	
31-36	184	20.0%	78	24.3%	262	21.1%	
37-44	165	17.9%	48	15.0%	213	17.1%	
45+	204	22.1%	44	13.7%	248	20.0%	
<b>Judicial Settlement Conference (JSC) and LS/CMI Assessment</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Neither	124	13.1%	45	14.0%	169	13.3%	$\chi^2 = 2.350$
JSC or LS/CMI	241	25.5%	94	29.3%	335	26.4%	
Both	581	61.4%	182	56.7%	763	60.2%	
<b>LS/CMI Scores</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Low/Very Low	61	7.5%	4	1.4%	65	6.0%	$\chi^2 = 29.960^{***}$
Medium	136	16.8%	23	8.2%	159	14.6%	
High	345	42.5%	132	47.3%	477	43.8%	
Very High	269	33.2%	120	43.0%	389	35.7%	
<b>Sentencing Type</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
MCJRP Supervision	649	68.6%	218	67.9%	867	68.4%	$\chi^2 = 5.418$
Other Specialty Court	152	16.1%	56	17.4%	208	16.4%	
General Probation	145	15.3%	47	14.6%	192	15.2%	

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

**Sanction:** Almost 33% of the sample were sanctioned in the two years following the start of their supervision (see Table 10, next page). Sanctioning was significantly correlated with race and sex ( $\chi^2=16.045$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), the JSC and/or LS/CMI variable ( $\chi^2=6.321$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), LS/CMI scores ( $\chi^2=31.074$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), sentencing outcomes ( $\chi^2= 24.364$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), and age ( $\chi^2= 9.568$ ,  $p<0.05$ ).

Men of color and those with higher LS/CMI scores were observed to be sanctioned more than expected whereas those receiving both a JSC and LS/CMI were less likely to be sanctioned than expected. Interestingly, individuals under both MCJRP supervision and general probation were more likely to be sanctioned than expected. Similar to previous findings, those who were between the ages of 18-25 years and 31-36 years were more likely to be sanctioned.

**Table 10: Sanction Recidivism Rates by Participant Characteristics**

	No Sanction		Sanction		Total		
	850	67.1%	417	32.9%	1,267	100%	
<b>Race/Sex</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
White Male	379	44.9%	182	44.1%	561	44.6%	$\chi^2 = 16.045^*$
White Female	148	17.5%	44	10.7%	192	15.3%	
Female of Color	76	9.0%	32	7.7%	108	8.6%	
Male of Color	242	28.6%	155	37.5%	397	31.6%	
<b>Age</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
18-25	174	20.9%	112	27.3%	286	23.0%	$\chi^2 = 9.568^*$
26-30	162	19.4%	72	17.6%	234	18.8%	
31-36	173	20.8%	89	21.7%	262	21.1%	
37-44	143	17.2%	70	17.1%	213	17.1%	
45+	181	22.7%	67	16.3%	248	20.0%	
<b>Judicial Settlement Conference (JSC) and LS/CMI Assessment</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Neither	104	12.2%	65	15.6%	169	13.3%	$\chi^2 = 6.321^*$
JSC or LS/CMI	214	25.2%	121	29.0%	335	26.4%	
Both	532	62.6%	231	55.4%	763	60.2%	
<b>LS/CMI Scores</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Low/Very Low	62	8.4%	3	0.9%	65	6.0%	$\chi^2 = 31.074^{***}$
Medium	118	15.9%	41	11.7%	159	14.6%	
High	318	42.9%	159	45.6%	477	43.8%	
Very High	243	32.8%	146	41.8%	389	35.7%	
<b>Sentencing Type</b>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
MCJRP Supervision	569	66.9%	298	71.5%	867	68.4%	$\chi^2 = 24.364^{***}$
Other Specialty Court	168	19.8%	40	9.6%	208	16.4%	
General Probation	113	13.3%	79	18.9%	192	15.2%	

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

**Revocation:** Nearly 30% of individuals were revoked 2 years following the beginning of their supervision (see Table 11, next page). Revocation was significantly correlated with race and sex ( $\chi^2 = 19.290$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), LS/CMI scores ( $\chi^2 = 77.084$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), sentencing outcomes ( $\chi^2 = 9.034$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and age ( $\chi^2 = 12.52$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). White males and men of color were more likely to be revoked. Those with LS/CMI scores of Very High and those between the ages of 18 and 30 had higher counts of recidivism than expected. Interestingly, both MCJRP participants and Other Specialty Court participants had higher than expected counts of revocation, unlike their general probation counterparts.

**Table 11: Revocation Recidivism Rates by Participant Characteristics**

	No Revocation		Revocation		Total		
	890	70.2%	377	29.8%	1,267	100%	
Race/Sex	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
White Male	386	43.8%	175	46.5%	561	44.6%	$\chi^2 = 19.290^{***}$
White Female	155	17.6%	37	9.8%	192	15.3%	
Female of Color	84	9.5%	24	6.4%	108	8.6%	
Male of Color	257	29.1%	140	37.2%	397	31.6%	
Age	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
18-25	182	21.0%	104	27.7%	286	23.0%	$\chi^2 = 12.520^*$
26-30	157	18.1%	77	20.5%	234	18.8%	
31-36	184	21.2%	78	20.7%	262	21.1%	
37-44	153	17.6%	60	16.0%	213	17.1%	
45+	191	22.0%	57	15.2%	248	20.0%	
Judicial Settlement Conference (JSC) and LS/CMI Assessment	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Neither	111	12.5%	58	15.4%	169	13.3%	$\chi^2 = 2.328$
JSC or LS/CMI	242	27.2%	93	24.7%	335	26.4%	
Both	537	60.3%	226	59.9%	763	60.2%	
LS/CMI Scores	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
Low/Very Low	60	7.9%	5	1.5%	65	6.0%	$\chi^2 = 77.084^{***}$
Medium	135	17.8%	24	7.2%	159	14.6%	
High	350	46.2%	127	38.3%	477	43.8%	
Very High	213	28.1%	176	53.0%	389	35.7%	
Sentencing Type	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	Test statistic
MCJRP Supervision	603	67.8%	264	70.0%	867	68.4%	$\chi^2 = 9.034^*$
Other Specialty Court	136	15.3%	72	19.1%	208	16.4%	
General Probation	151	17.0%	41	10.9%	192	15.2%	

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$  \*\*\* $p < .001$

## Research Question 4: Time to Recidivate

Time to recidivate was measured as the number of days between the individual's supervision start date and date of their subsequent recidivism outcome. Below is a discussion of the results for each type of recidivism measure. Results are also displayed in Tables 12 through 14.

**Arrest:** The average time to arrest was roughly 251 days and ranged anywhere from 3 days to 730 days post supervision start date ( $n=524$ ,  $SD=198.69$ ). When comparing the average time to recidivate across sentencing types, there were no significant differences across groups. Likewise, no significant differences existed between categories of race and sex or age.

**DA Charges Received:** The average time between supervision start date and date of charges being received by the district attorney from law enforcement was 228 days and ranged from 2 to 730 days ( $n=541$ ,  $SD=191.60$ ). A comparison of means across sentencing types, race and sex, and age showed no significant differences.

**DA Charges Issued:** The average time between supervision start date and date of charges being issued by the district attorney was roughly 254 days and ranged from 2 days to 713 days ( $n=446$ ,  $SD=194.89$ ). There were significant differences across sentencing types, race and sex, or age.

**Conviction:** The mean number of days from supervision start date to conviction date was 297 days, with a range between 2 days and 717 days ( $n=321$ ,  $SD=182.89$ ). Average time to conviction was not significantly different for race and sex or sentencing type. However, it was significantly different between age groups ( $F=2.49$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). Differences were particularly apparent when comparing 31-36 year olds with those 45 years of age and older. The mean difference between groups was about 94 days, with 31-36 year olds recidivating faster than the 45+ group ( $M=250.54$ ,  $SD=172.23$ ;  $M=344.11$ ,  $SD=204.72$ ).

**Sanction:** The average time between supervision start date and the date of an individual's first sanction was 276.74 days and ranged from 2 days to 730 days ( $n=417$ ,  $SD=204.26$ ). There were no significant differences between groups for sentencing types, race and sex, or age.

**Revocation:** The average time to revocation was 342 days and ranged from 5 to 725 days ( $n=377$ ,  $SD=192.74$ ). Time to revocation did not differ significantly by sentencing types or race and sex. However there were significant differences between age groups ( $F=2.41$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). The largest difference was observed when comparing the youngest age group (18-25) with the oldest group (45+). On average, 18-25 year olds were revoked 82 days earlier than the 45 and older group ( $M=309.26$ ,  $SD=192.16$ ;  $M=391.47$ ,  $SD=188.92$ ).

**Table 12: Time to Recidivate by Sentencing Type (days)**

	MCJRP Intensive Supervision		Other Specialty Court		General Probation		Total		Test statistic
	<i>M</i> (Range)	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> (Range)	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> (Range)	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i> (Range)	<i>SD</i>	
Arrest	250.41 (3-714)	200.58	244.28 (3-730)	200.92	259.68 (3-710)	188.76	250.72 (3-730)	198.69	F=0.120
Charges Received	228.75 (2-730)	196.96	215.75 (6-709)	186.51	239.14 (5-711)	167.19	227.81 (2-730)	191.60	F=0.301
Charges Issued	247.81 (2-713)	194.12	252.76 (10-709)	195.34	290.28 (5-711)	198.36	253.84 (2-713)	194.90	F=1.095
Conviction	295.90 (3-717)	178.60	317.25 (6-716)	186.56	279.74 (2-690)	199.51	297.26 (2-717)	182.89	F=0.555
Sanction	282.72 (2-726)	203.88	268.03 (12-724)	219.06	258.59 (4-730)	199.35	276.74 (2-730)	204.26	F=0.475
Revocation	335.86 (5-720)	189.22	373.47 (7-725)	204.11	330.66 (6-642)	194.09	342.47 (5-725)	192.74	F=1.165

\* $p<.05$  \*\* $p<.01$  \*\*\* $p<.001$

**Table 13: Time to Recidivate by Race and Sex (days)**

	White Male		White Female		Female of Color		Male of Color		Total		Test statistic
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
	(Range)		(Range)		(Range)		(Range)		(Range)		
Arrest	242.68	193.06	206.60	206.29	302.83	212.18	259.17	212.18	250.72	198.69	F=1.999
	(3-714)		(3-688)		(17-730)		(4-708)		(3-730)		
Charges Received	230.51	191.51	171.25	168.20	248.98	192.28	235.44	196.67	227.91	191.99	F=1.901
	(4-715)		(4-682)		(18-711)		(2-730)		(2-730)		
Charges Issued	243.87	194.09	199.21	157.69	299.27	205.34	270.52	200.64	254.71	195.44	F=2.393
	(4-713)		(5-682)		(20-711)		(2-709)		(2-713)		
Conviction	293.36	172.76	249.00	167.64	354.35	212.44	308.95	192.24	298.36	183.23	F=1.901
	(5-716)		(5-697)		(5-706)		(3-717)		(3-717)		
Sanction	269.47	203.48	320.27	209.87	272.13	197.94	274.91	205.62	277.13	204.37	F=0.750
	(3-718)		(20-730)		(48-711)		(2-724)		(2-730)		
Revocation	317.56	193.14	341.92	183.71	401.50	183.66	365.06	193.13	343.00	192.73	F=2.391
	(6-725)		(41-682)		(101-705)		(5-725)		(5-725)		

\**p*<.05. \*\**p*<.01. \*\*\**p*<.001**Table 14: Time to Recidivate by Age (days)**

	18-25		26-30		31-36		37-44		45+		Total		Test statistic
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
	(Range)		(Range)		(Range)		(Range)		(Range)		(Range)		
Arrest	228.06	197.24	270.23	213.19	231.61	182.77	270.61	216.57	253.39	175.76	247.84	197.72	F=1.155
	(3-710)		(4-708)		(4-712)		(3-730)		(17-714)		(3-730)		
Charges Received	212.14	201.80	250.60	201.37	198.32	159.71	255.34	191.01	224.89	189.23	225.96	190.68	F=1.682
	(11-730)		(5-713)		(4-668)		(6-674)		(2-705)		(2-730)		
Charges Issued	230.84	191.64	277.40	207.43	238.16	179.45	273.75	191.85	250.56	200.24	251.88	194.12	F=1.047
	(11-711)		(3-713)		(4-690)		(6-636)		(2-706)		(2-713)		
Conviction	289.63	180.71	314.00	180.40	250.54	172.23	325.77	174.49	344.11	204.72	297.26	182.89	F=2.490*
	(2-692)		(21-716)		(5-694)		(6-660)		(3-717)		(2-717)		
Sanction	265.69	206.38	260.72	206.32	290.11	214.89	302.30	205.30	256.22	182.42	274.82	204.11	F=0.721
	(4-724)		(7-730)		(2-718)		(5-726)		(20-682)		(2-730)		
Revocation	309.26	192.16	339.19	197.23	324.15	181.22	377.58	196.27	391.47	188.92	341.85	192.61	F=2.410*
	(5-710)		(6-725)		(6-686)		(7-720)		(18-719)		(5-725)		

\**p*<.05. \*\**p*<.01. \*\*\**p*<.001.

## Research Question 5: Impact of JSC and LS/CMI on Recidivism

To better understand the relationship between the MCJRP pre-trial model (i.e., the JSC and LS/CMI) and recidivism, a logistic regression was employed for each measure of recidivism. In addition to the JSC and/or LS/CMI predictor, each model also included the following variables: Age, race/sex, LS/CMI scores, and sentencing type. Tables 15 through 20 provide detailed results of each logistic regression.

**Arrest:** The logistic regression model for arrest was overall statistically significant ( $\chi^2=106.378$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and the Hosmer and Lemeshow test demonstrated overall good fit ( $\chi^2=3.335$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). Several variables were significant in predicting the likelihood of an arrest. First, white females (OR=.548, 95% CI [0.36, 0.833],  $p<0.01$ ) were significantly less likely to be rearrested compared to white males whereas men of color were nearly 50% more likely to be rearrested (OR = 1.495, 95% CI [1.115, 2.006],  $p<0.01$ ). Additionally, those 45 years

of age and older were roughly 67% less likely to be rearrested (OR= 0.430, 95% CI [0.288, 0.644],  $p<0.001$ ) when compared to 18-25-year-olds. Although not statistically significant, the age category of 37-44 approached significance and also suggested a similar pattern of individuals potentially aging out of crime (OR = 0.665, 95% CI [0.440, 1.005],  $p=0.053$ ). When compared to Medium risk participants, those scoring Low or Very Low were significant less likely to recidivate (OR=0.295, 95% CI [0.116, 0.747]  $p<0.05$ ) whereas those scoring High and Very High were roughly twice as likely to face an additional arrest (OR=1.812, 95% CI [1.199, 2.737],  $p<0.01$ ; OR=2.581, 95% CI [1.688, 3.947],  $p<0.001$ ). Additionally, having both a JSC and an assessment as part of the pre-trial model significantly reduced the likelihood of arrest by nearly 40% compared to those who received neither (OR=0.611, 95% CI [0.397, 0.94],  $p<0.05$ ). Finally, sentencing outcomes were not significant in this model.

**Table 15: Logistic Regression Predicting Arrest**

		Full model (n=1,060)		
Race and Sex	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Male of color	1.495	0.007	1.115	2.006
Female of color	0.837	0.470	0.516	1.357
White female	0.548	0.005	0.36	0.833
Age	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
26-30	0.761	0.165	0.518	1.119
31-36	0.811	0.287	0.552	1.192
37-44	0.665	0.053	0.440	1.005
45+	0.43	0.000	0.288	0.644
JSC and/or LS/CMI	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Both	0.611	0.025	0.397	0.94
JSC or LS/CMI	0.823	0.431	0.507	1.336
Sentencing Type	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
MCJRP Supervision	1.434	0.061	0.983	2.093
Other Specialty Court	1.112	0.661	0.692	1.785
LS/CMI Scores	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Low/Very Low	0.295	0.010	0.116	0.747
High	1.812	0.005	1.199	2.737
Very High	2.581	0.000	1.688	3.947
(Intercept)	0.592	0.109		

**DA Charges Received:** The logistic regression model for charges received by the District Attorney was overall statistically significant ( $\chi^2=125.030$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and the Hosmer and Lemeshow test demonstrated overall good fit ( $\chi^2=3.44$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). Once again, the model produced several significant findings. In particular, White females (OR=0.660, 95% CI [0.436, 0.999],  $p=0.05$ ) were roughly 43% less likely to receive a charge from the DA, while men of color (OR=2.18, 95% CI [1.620, 2.936],  $p<0.001$ ) were nearly twice as likely when compared to White men. Two age categories were significant in the model (31-36, OR=0.611, 95% CI [0.413, 0.904],  $p<0.05$ ; 45+, OR=.536, 95% CI [0.360, 0.800],  $p<0.01$ ) and another approached significance (37-44, OR=.662, 95% CI [0.437, 1.003],  $p=0.051$ ). Despite not all three being significant, they suggest a similar trend: an increase in age results in reduced likelihood of DA charges received. LS/CMI scores were also significant and in the anticipated direction. Low scores reduced the likelihood of charges being received by roughly 65% (OR=0.352, 95% CI [0.145, 0.852],  $p<0.05$ ), whereas High scores doubled and Very High scores nearly tripled the odds of this outcome (OR=2.0, 95% CI [1.321, 3.028],  $p<0.001$ ; OR=2.788, 95% CI [1.818, 4.275],  $p<0.001$ ).

Interestingly, having been sentenced to MCJRP Intensive Supervision or a different Speciality Court made a person nearly twice as likely to have charges received when compared to those on general probation (OR=1.995, 95% CI [1.352, 2.945],  $p<0.001$ ; OR=1.753, 95% CI [1.085, 2.833],  $p<0.05$ ). The JSC and/or LS/CMI variable was not significant in this model.

**Table 16: Logistic Regression Predicting Charges Received by District Attorney**

Full model (n=1,060)				
Race and Sex	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Male of color	2.180	0.000	1.620	2.936
Female of color	0.988	0.961	0.610	1.599
White female	0.660	0.050	0.436	0.999
Age	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
26-30	0.821	0.320	0.557	1.211
31-36	0.611	0.014	0.413	0.904
37-44	0.662	0.051	0.437	1.003
45+	0.536	0.002	0.360	0.800
JSC and/or LS/CMI	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Both	0.661	0.061	0.428	1.020
JSC or LS/CMI	0.885	0.625	0.544	1.442
Sentencing Type	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
MCJRP Supervision	1.995	0.000	1.352	2.945
Other Specialty Court	1.753	0.022	1.085	2.833
LS/CMI Scores	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Low/Very Low	0.352	0.021	0.145	0.852
High	2.000	0.001	1.321	3.028
Very High	2.788	0.000	1.818	4.275
(Intercept)	0.346	0.001		

**DA Charges Issued:** The logistic regression model for charges issued by the District Attorney was overall statistically significant ( $\chi^2=102.795$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and the Hosmer and Lemeshow test demonstrated overall good fit ( $\chi^2=11.697$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). Similar to previous models, White females (OR=0.565, 95% CI [0.361, 0.885],  $p<0.05$ ) were less likely to have charges issued while men of color (OR=1.739, 95% CI [1.289, 2.345],  $p<0.001$ ) were more likely compared to White males. Only 45 years of age and older was significant among the age categories, with this group being less likely to have charges issued compared to 18–25 year olds (OR=0.644, 95% CI [0.427, 0.971],  $p<0.05$ ). Once more, LS/CMI scores were in the expected direction with Low scores reducing odds of this outcome and High and Very High scores increasing those odds (OR=0.305, 95% CI [0.101, 0.919],  $p<0.05$ ; OR=2.416, 95% CI [1.534, 3.805],  $p<0.001$ ; OR=3.015, 95% CI [1.896, 4.795],  $p<0.001$ ). Similar to the charges received model, those previously sentenced to MCJRP supervision or another Specialty Court were at an increased odds of having charges issued against them (OR=1.897, 95% CI [1.261, 2.855],  $p<0.01$ ; OR=1.923, 95% CI [1.171, 3.158],  $p<0.001$ ). Finally, having both a JSC and LS/CMI as part of the pre-trial model significantly reduced the odds of charges being issued by roughly 37% when compared to those receiving neither component (OR=0.63, 95% CI [0.407, 0.975],  $p<0.05$ ).

**Table 17: Logistic Regression Predicting Charges Issued by District Attorney**

Full model (n=1,060)				
Race and Sex	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Male of color	1.739	0.000	1.289	2.345
Female of color	1.056	0.827	0.645	1.730
White female	0.565	0.013	0.361	0.885
Age	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
26-30	0.907	0.628	0.611	1.347
31-36	0.781	0.225	0.524	1.164
37-44	0.868	0.511	0.569	1.324
45+	0.644	0.035	0.427	0.971
JSC and/or LS/CMI	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Both	0.630	0.038	0.407	0.975
JSC or LS/CMI	0.798	0.369	0.488	1.305
Sentencing Type	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
MCJRP Supervision	1.897	0.002	1.261	2.855
Other Specialty Court	1.923	0.010	1.171	3.158
LS/CMI Scores	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Low/Very Low	0.305	0.035	0.101	0.919
High	2.416	0.000	1.534	3.805
Very High	3.015	0.000	1.896	4.795
(Intercept)	0.218	0.000		

**Conviction:** The logistic regression model for conviction was overall statistically significant ( $\chi^2=58.927$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and the Hosmer and Lemeshow test demonstrated overall good fit ( $\chi^2=5.349$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). When predicting the likelihood of conviction, only two variables maintained significance: age and LS/CMI scores. For age, all but one category (31-36-year-olds) were significantly less likely to be convicted when compared to 18-25-year-olds. Having an LS/CMI score that was High or Very High more than doubled the odds of a conviction (OR=2.223, 95% CI [1.351, 3.658],  $p<0.01$ ; OR=2.482, 95% CI [1.491, 4.132],  $p<0.001$ ). Race and sex, sentencing type, and having had a JSC and/or LS/CMI did not significantly impact the likelihood of conviction.

**Table 18: Logistic Regression Predicting Conviction**

Full model (n=1,060)				
Race and Sex	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Male of color	1.090	0.601	0.789	1.506
Female of color	1.036	0.894	0.615	1.745
White female	0.785	0.298	0.498	1.238
Age	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
26-30	0.586	0.013	0.385	0.892
31-36	0.797	0.272	0.532	1.194
37-44	0.627	0.040	0.402	0.980
45+	0.387	0.000	0.245	0.612

**Table 18: Logistic Regression Predicting Conviction**

JSC and/or LS/CMI	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Both	0.957	0.856	0.594	1.540
JSC or LS/CMI	1.473	0.149	0.870	2.494
Sentencing Type	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
MCJRP Supervision	1.071	0.744	0.709	1.618
Other Specialty Court	1.023	0.932	0.611	1.713
LS/CMI Scores	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Low/Very Low	0.417	0.125	0.137	1.274
High	2.223	0.002	1.351	3.658
Very High	2.482	0.000	1.491	4.132
(Intercept)	0.234	0.000		

**Sanction:** The logistic regression model for sanctioning was overall statistically significant ( $\chi^2=68.073$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and the Hosmer and Lemeshow test demonstrated overall good fit ( $\chi^2=8.347$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). Results indicated that White females were significantly less likely to be sanctioned compared to White males (OR=0.573, 95% CI [0.364, 0.902],  $p<0.05$ ). Additionally, those between the ages of 26-30 and those 45 years of age and older were 40-50% likely to be sanctioned compared to 18-25-year-olds (OR=0.596, 95% CI [0.397, 0.893],  $p<0.05$ ; OR=0.5, 95% CI [0.329, 0.76],  $p<0.001$ ). As expected, lower risk individuals were at a decreased odds of sanctioning (OR=0.169, 95% CI [0.05, 0.576],  $p<0.01$ ) whereas higher risk individuals were significantly more likely to be sanctioned (OR=1.638, 95% CI [1.068, 2.514],  $p<0.05$ ; OR=1.992, 95% CI [1.282, 3.095],  $p<0.01$ ). Having been sentenced to a Specialty Court reduced the odds of a sanction being imposed by nearly 70% (OR=0.335, 95% CI [0.199, 0.565],  $p<0.001$ ) whereas being sentenced to MCJRP supervision had no significant bearing on this outcome. Having a JSC and/or LS/CMI had no significant impact on sanctioning.

**Table 19: Logistic Regression Predicting Sanctioning**

Full model (n=1,060)				
Race and Sex	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Male of color	1.325	0.071	0.976	1.798
Female of color	0.931	0.780	0.564	1.536
White female	0.573	0.016	0.364	0.902
Age	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
26-30	0.596	0.012	0.397	0.893
31-36	0.715	0.099	0.480	1.065
37-44	0.793	0.281	0.520	1.209
45+	0.500	0.001	0.329	0.760
JSC and/or LS/CMI	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Both	0.778	0.264	0.502	1.208
JSC or LS/CMI	1.028	0.914	0.626	1.686
Sentencing Type	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
MCJRP Supervision	0.884	0.519	0.609	1.285
Other Specialty Court	0.335	0.000	0.199	0.565

**Table 19: Logistic Regression Predicting Sanctioning**

LS/CMI Scores	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Low/Very Low	0.169	0.004	0.050	0.576
High	1.638	0.024	1.068	2.514
Very High	1.992	0.002	1.282	3.095
(Intercept)	0.633	0.168		

**Revocation:** The logistic regression model for revocation was overall statistically significant ( $\chi^2=115.946$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and the Hosmer and Lemeshow test demonstrated overall good fit ( $\chi^2=2.036$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). In terms of intersectionality, men of color were significantly more likely to be revoked compared to White men (OR=1.364, 95% CI [0.999, 1.862],  $p<0.05$ ). Those in the oldest age category (45+ years old) were nearly 55% less likely to face revocation compared to 18-25-year-olds (OR=0.458, 95% CI [0.296, 0.711],  $p<0.001$ ). An LS/CMI score of High or Very High doubled and quadrupled (respectively) the odds of a revocation when compared to Medium risk individuals (OR=2.015, 95% CI [1.223, 3.318],  $p<0.01$ ; OR=4.289, 95% CI [2.599, 7.078],  $p<0.001$ ). Having been sentenced to MCJRP or another Specialty Court doubled the odds of a revocation compared to general probation (OR=2.003, 95% CI [1.294, 3.101],  $p<0.01$ ; OR=2.165, 95% CI [1.283, 3.652],  $p<0.01$ ). Finally, having both the JSC and/or LS/CMI or at least one of them decreased the odds of a revocation (OR=0.559, 95% CI [0.385, 0.872],  $p<0.01$ ; OR=0.597, 95% CI [0.360, 0.991],  $p<0.05$ ).

**Table 20: Logistic Regression Predicting Revocation**

Full model (n=1,060)				
Race and Sex	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Male of color	1.364	0.050	0.999	1.862
Female of color	0.671	0.156	0.387	1.164
White female	0.677	0.089	0.432	1.062
Age	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
26-30	0.839	0.395	0.559	1.258
31-36	0.742	0.153	0.492	1.117
37-44	0.727	0.154	0.469	1.127
45+	0.458	0.000	0.296	0.711
JSC and/or LS/CMI	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Both	0.559	0.010	0.358	0.872
JSC or LS/CMI	0.597	0.046	0.360	0.991
Sentencing Type	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
MCJRP Supervision	2.003	0.002	1.294	3.101
Other Specialty Court	2.165	0.004	1.283	3.652
LS/CMI Scores	OR	p	CI Low	CI High
Low/Very Low	0.533	0.231	0.190	1.492
High	2.015	0.006	1.223	3.318
Very High	4.289	0.000	2.599	7.078
(Intercept)	0.220	0.000		

## Discussion

There were several important findings that came out of this study.

First, the results on who is likely to receive MCJRP probation, when compared to other probation, and prison were promising. Specifically, women of color were more likely to be sentenced to MCJRP when compared to White men. This may be an indication that there is an awareness of the over incarceration of women of color. In other words, this program may be diverting more women of color and keeping them in the community. Next, people who scored Very High on the LS/CMI were less likely to be sentenced to MCJRP probation. This may indicate the program is working in that it is sentencing high risk offenders to prison (i.e., there may be a safety concern by supervising them in the community).

Next, in addition to understanding who was likely to be sentenced to probation, this study examined if there was bias in who was being sentenced to prison. The results indicated that people who scored Very High, were between the ages of 37 and 44, were the most likely to be sentenced to prison. This may indicate that at some point in the defendant's life course, they are not improving and may need a sentence that is higher in severity. It is important to point out that intersectionality was not a significant predictor for prison, which demonstrates lack of intersectional bias. Again, these results indicate that the program is appropriately sentencing defendants.

Nearly two-thirds of people who were supervised by the DCJ recidivated in some manner (e.g., arrest, DA charges issued, DA charges received, conviction, sanction, and/or revocation). Of those who recidivate, men of color were most likely to recidivate. This is consistent with other DCJ research regarding the racial disparities within the specialty court system, and may indicate a need for culturally specific services within those specialty courts. The findings on age supports the literature regarding aging out of crime, younger defendants were more likely to recidivate than defendants who were older. This may indicate a need for more targeted interventions for the emerging adulthood population, as they may have higher needs.

The examination of the impact of the program, or the JSC on recidivism demonstrated promising results. Defendants who went through the full model were less likely to recidivate. This may be because this program is designed to give the defendants a head start, so to speak. This may indicate that identifying the needs sooner in the criminal justice process, may in fact be a benefit. Further, research should examine the services that are being brokered during pre-trial versus those who do not go through the program, to understand the impacts of this head start. These findings are interesting when coupled with the findings that regardless of the sentencing type (MCJRP, General Probation, and Specialty Court), there were no significant differences in recidivism. This may further support the hypothesis that it is the pre-trial phase that is impacting recidivism. Further research is needed to understand where the head start begins, while holding defendants' rights (i.e., innocent until proven guilty).

When recidivism was broken down into several stages of the criminal legal process, the findings were consistent with the larger body of research regarding recidivism. At the stage of arrest, men of color, people under 36, and those with High or Very High LS/CMI were most likely to be arrested. This may be consistent racial/ethnic biases present within the arrest phase of the criminal justice system. The same findings were consistent in the charges received and charges issued by the District Attorney, with men of color more likely to receive that outcome than their White men counterparts. Interestingly, this significance disappears at conviction. This may indicate that once the DA is given the opportunity to understand the case, they are more likely to see and respond to racial/ethnic biases.

An additional racial/ethnic finding that is important to note, is the findings concerning White women. White women, when compared to White men, were 45% less likely to be arrested, 34% less likely to have receiving charges by the DA, 43% less likely to have charges issued by the DA, and 43% less likely to be sanctioned. Although there were no significant differences during the conviction stage and for revocations, the findings indicate that the effect is still present: White women are less likely to receive the outcomes when compared to their White male counterparts. This trend is well documented within criminological theory, and is known as the Chivalry Hypothesis, which argues women, mainly White women, are treated with more leniency because they are viewed as in need of help from the system rather than responsible for their crimes (Herzog & Oreg, 2008).

As it relates to age, these results are consistent with the natural maturation process of aging out of crime. As stated earlier, age was an important factor in a prison sentence, but throughout the charging process, the impact of age was inconsistent. This may indicate that other protective and risk factors are impacting the outcome, but it also could be that there is some consideration of the natural maturation process as it relates to the outcomes.

Overwhelming the greatest predictor of the recidivating outcomes was the LS/CMI score. This, along with other studies about MCJRP regarding the use of the LS/CMI demonstrate that this risk assessment remains the most accurate and strong predictor of recidivism for people who scored Very High at all stages of the criminal justice system. This is yet another piece of data that confirms it continues to be a strong predictor for future behavior.

Among all of the models that examined recidivism, when compared to general probation, people under supervision within the MCJRP program did not significantly reduce the likelihood of some outcomes of recidivism. When compared to general probation, people who received MCJRP supervision were more likely to receive charges from the DA and have a DA issue a charge. This may indicate that some of the decisions incorporate participating in the MCJRP program.

Being supervised in the MCJRP unit had no effect on sanctioning, but did on revocations. People under MCJRP supervision were more likely to be revoked than general probation, but less likely than specialty courts. While the specialty courts were less likely to sanction, but more likely to revoke. This may be an indication that the specialty courts in Multnomah County work with the highest acuity and need in the County (e.g., Mental Health Unit and other courts working with people experiencing addiction), and as such, may have more leniency and understanding that violations are a part of recovery: lower rates of sanctioning. Whereas MCJRP may not use sanctioning as a motivator to change (i.e., sanctioning standards are a part of the program), but at some point, may need to decide about the program's overall fit for the person. Ultimately, further investigation, especially a matched sample should be conducted to tease this out.

Overall, this study confirmed what is present in the literature (evidence-based practice) and what the program discusses (practice-based evidence). Although this study had limitations, the results should be able to demonstrate that at a minimum, this program saves in prison costs, and gives people a quasi head start on addressing the criminogenic factors that impact their lives.

## Take Home Messages

### Likelihood of Sentencing Outcomes

- Women of color were more likely to be sentenced to MCJRP.
- People who had a very high LS/CMI assessment and people aged 37–44 were more likely to be sentenced.

### Outcome Results

- This sample had an over 64.0% recidivism rate.
- Men of color were consistently more likely to be arrested, to receive a charge from the DA, more likely to have the DA issue a charge, and more likely to be revoked when compared to White men.
- White women, when compared to White men, were less likely to be arrested, to have charges received, charges issued, and to be sanctioned.
- Age was mixed across outcomes, which may indicate that at times it is considered and at other times it is not.
- The LS/CMI remains the strongest predictor for all outcomes.
- Those defendants who received the full MCJRP model (JSC and LS/CMI) were less likely to recidivate.
- Being supervised in the MCJRP program did not significantly reduce the likelihood of any of the recidivism rates when compared to general probation supervision.
- Being supervised in the MCJRP unit had no effect on sanctioning, but did so on revocations.

### Further Research

- Complete a matching with those under general supervision based on intersectionality and risk scores to rule out any sampling bias.

## Appendix A: Interview Protocols

Staff and Stakeholder Interview

Participant Interview

Victim/Survivor Interview

Partner Interview

## MCJRP MAPS Key Informant Interview

Respondent ID: \_\_\_\_\_ Interview Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewer Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

### Introduction:

Thank you for making the time to talk with me. The purpose of this interview is to get your feedback about the entire MCJRP process in order to strengthen and improve the program. The questions focus on what's working, what could be improved, equity and inclusion, and defining success. The interview is likely to be about 30 minutes, but will be determined by how much you have to say.

Before I begin, did you get a chance to look at the consent information I emailed to you? ***[either go over the points below or remind that it's voluntary, confidential]***

1. Doing this interview is voluntary. You can be selective in what you tell us. You can stop the interview at any time. Your choice to do it or not will not affect your involvement with MCJRP, your employment, or your relationship with any of the agencies in the collaboration.
2. If you change your mind after you finish the interview and do not want us to include your feedback, you can let me know. We will remove your answers.
3. We will keep the information you tell us confidential. We do not record your name with your responses and we will not share your individual answers with anyone outside the evaluation team.
4. We expect that there is minimal to no risk for you participating in this interview. You may feel uncomfortable answering some of the questions, but you can skip those or any questions.
5. After we complete all of the interviews with other key informants, we will prepare a summary report that combines your comments with the comments from everyone else. If we include any quotes from what you say, we will do so only if your identity can be protected.
6. In order to make sure that I accurately capture everything you tell me, I would like to audio record this interview. Your name or identity will not be included in the recording. Once the recording has been reviewed and your responses are complete, it will be destroyed.

Do you have any questions before we begin? If you have any later, you can email me at [email address of interviewer].

Is it OK to continue with the interview?      Yes      No

Is it OK to audio record the interview?      Yes      No

**Verbal consent given:**      Yes      No

**Interviewer Signature Confirming Verbal Consent:**

\_\_\_\_\_

1. When did you start working with MCJRP (and in what role)?
2. Thinking about the MCJRP model that supports individuals involved with the justice system, what components are working well?  
*[Probes: try to capture comments about court/atty, assessment, supervision, treatment]*
  - a. What's not working well (for the MCJRP model that supports participants)?
3. Thinking about the MCJRP collaboration, what's working well?  
*[Probes: try to capture comments about Ops, JRSC, other multi-agency meetings, communication]*
  - a. What's not working well (with the MCJRP collaboration)?
4. What needs to be in place to better support your role within MCJRP?
5. How well do you believe MCJRP functions in an equitable and inclusive manner for the people it serves?
  - a. How is it working well?
  - b. In what ways can it be improved?
6. One of the primary goals of this evaluation is to better understand success.
  - a. What does success look like for the participants?
  - b. What does success look like for the MCJRP program/model?
7. With COVID, MCJRP has had to make a number of adjustments.
  - a. What needs to happen to bring back MCJRP as it was pre-COVID?
  - b. Should that be the goal?
8. If you could reimagine MCJRP to be as successful as possible, what would it look like?

## MCJRP MAPS Participant Interview

Respondent ID: \_\_\_\_\_ Interview Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewer Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

### Introduction:

Thank you for making the time to talk with us. I work for *[identify agency]* and am on a team that is evaluating the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program known as MCJRP.

The purpose of this interview is to get your feedback about the MCJRP process, from the court phase through the supervision phase. We want to learn from your feedback to strengthen and improve the program. The questions focus on the quality and clarity of the process, how fairly and respectfully you are being treated, your access to the help you need, how well you were heard and understood, and, most importantly, the successes you have had or hope to have. The conversation could last about 30 to 60 minutes, depending on how much you have to tell me.

Before I begin, I'd like to go over a few details with you. This information is in the document I emailed you already, but it's good to review some of the important points.

1. Doing this interview is voluntary. You can be selective in what you tell us. You can stop the interview at any time. Your choice to do it or not will not affect your involvement in MCJRP, your relationship with any of the agencies you work with, or your supervision.
2. If you change your mind after you finish the interview and do not want us to include your feedback, you can let me know. We will remove your answers.
3. We will keep the information you tell us confidential. We will not share your individual answers with anyone outside the people on the evaluation team. That means the judge or anyone with the court, your attorney, the prosecutor, your probation officer, or any of your service providers will not see your answers. The only exception, which would result in breaking confidentiality, is if you tell us about abuse of a child or you or someone else is in immediate danger of harm. Those would need to be reported.
4. We expect that there is minimal to no risk for you participating in this interview. You may feel uncomfortable answering some of the questions, but you can skip those or any questions.
5. After we complete all of the interviews with other MCJRP participants, we will prepare a summary report that combines your comments with the comments from everyone else. Your name or identity will NEVER be included in any report.
6. The feedback you and others provide will help MCJRP improve their support of people in the program and will help us know how to focus on participant successes.
7. In order to make sure that I accurately capture everything you tell me, I would like to audio record this interview. Your name or identity will not be included in the recording. Once the recording has been reviewed and your responses are complete, it will be destroyed.

Do you have any questions before we begin? If you have any later, you can email me at \_\_\_\_\_ or call me at \_\_\_\_\_.

Is it OK to continue with the interview?      Yes      No

Is it OK to audio record the interview?      Yes      No

**Verbal consent given:**    Yes      No

**Interviewer Signature Confirming Verbal Consent:**

***Before we get started, when I say “the MCJRP process” I mean everything that happens after you decide to participate. That includes going to court, working with your defense attorney, interactions with a deputy district attorney, working with a parole or probation officer (that is, your PO), receiving services, for example from treatment providers or organizations that help you with employment or housing, and graduating from the program. Do you have any questions about that?***

***I would like to start at the beginning of the MCJRP process by asking you about your experiences with the legal process.***

1. At the beginning, was the MCJRP process clearly explained to you?  
[probe:] Were you given enough information to know what to expect?
2. Were you treated with respect during the court process by:
  - a. the judge [probe:] Please tell me about that.
  - b. the deputy district attorney [probe:] Please tell me about that.
  - c. your defense attorney [probe:] Please tell me about that.
3. Do you feel like your race, culture, sex, disability status, and/or gender identity were honored during the court process?
4. During the court process, were you interviewed by a PO? They may have called it a risk assessment and would have asked you about your criminal justice involvement, friends and family, mental health needs, employment, etc.    ☐ Yes    ☐ No
  - a. How was that experience?
  - b. Were you treated with respect by the person who interviewed you?    ☐ Yes    ☐ No  
Probe: Please tell me about that.
  - c. Did you receive a copy of the report they created summarizing the interview?    ☐ Yes    ☐ No  
What did you think of the report?

***Now I would like to ask you about your experience with supervision after your court case was settled.***

5. Let's start by talking about your experience with your PO.
  - a. Is your PO available when you need them?
  - b. Can you talk openly about any issues you are facing? Are they adequately addressed?
  - c. Are you treated with respect?
  - d. Do you feel like your race, culture, sex, disability status, and/or gender identity were honored while working with your PO?
6. Have you been offered services during your supervision? Services can include help with employment, help with housing, mentoring, mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment, and so on.
  - a. Did you participate in any of those services?    ☐ Yes    ☐ No
    - 1) How helpful are the services?
    - 2) Do you feel like your race, culture, sex, disability status, and/or gender identity were honored while receiving those services?
    - 3) If you didn't participate in services, why not?
    - 4) What services, if any, do you wish you had been offered?

7. Have you ever been on supervision outside of MCJRP?      ☐ Yes      ☐ No
- a. How was it different? *[Probe: Where was it?]*
8. Tell me about success. What does/will it look like when you are successful, which can be now or after you are off supervision?
- [probe for details about what success means to them]*
- a. How do you see yourself achieving success? What does or did that process look like? *[Note: probe to understand their process of desistance]*
- b. How much do you believe MCJRP has had or will have an influence on that success?
- c. What else could be (have been) done to make it easier for you to be successful?

***I have one last question.***

9. Imagine that you are the person in charge of the MCJRP program. Thinking about the entire process, from the court through supervision and services, what would you change to make it better for people going through it?

## MCJRP MAPS Victim/Survivor Interview

Respondent ID: \_\_\_\_\_ Interview Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewer Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

### Introduction:

Thank you for making the time to talk with us. I work for the Multnomah County Department of Community Justice. As I already mentioned, I am on a team that is evaluating the Justice Reinvestment Program in our county, also called MCJRP. That is the program the person who committed the crime against you is in.

The purpose of this interview is to understand your experiences while the person who caused you harm goes through the MCJRP process. It is important for the program to hear from you to make sure it is supporting you as well. Your feedback can strengthen and improve the program. The questions focus on the clarity of the process, how fairly and respectfully you have been treated, access to the information and help you need, how well you were heard and understood, and, most importantly, how to improve the process for victims/survivors. The conversation could last about 30 minutes, depending on how much you have to tell me.

Before I begin, I'd like to go over a few details with you. This information is in the document I emailed you already, but it's good to review some of the important points.

1. Doing this interview is voluntary. You can be selective in what you tell us. You can stop the interview at any time. Your choice to do it or not will not affect your involvement in victim and survivor services, your relationship with any of the agencies you work with, or any part of the legal process.
2. You can skip any question you don't want to answer or you can stop the interview at any time. If you change your mind after you finish the interview and do not want us to include your feedback, you can let me know. We will remove your answers.
3. We will keep the information you tell us confidential. We will not share your individual answers with anyone outside the evaluation team. That means the judge or anyone with the court, the attorney, the prosecutor, or any of your service providers will not see your answers. Although we will protect the information you give us, your confidentiality will not be protected if you say something that makes us believe that you or others are in immediate danger of harm.
4. We expect that there is minimal to no risk for you participating in this interview. You may feel uncomfortable answering some of the questions, but you can skip those or any questions.
5. After we complete all of the interviews with other victims/survivors, we will prepare a summary report that combines your comments with the comments from everyone else. Your name or identity will NOT be included in the report.
6. The feedback you and others provide will help MCJRP improve the support/survivors in the future.
7. In order to make sure that I accurately capture everything you tell me, I would like to audio record this interview. Your name or identity will not be included in the recording. Once the recording has been reviewed and your responses are complete, it will be destroyed.

Do you have any questions before we begin? If you have any later, you can email me at \_\_\_\_ or call me at \_\_\_\_.

Is it OK to continue with the interview?      Yes      No

Is it OK to audio record the interview?      Yes      No

**Interviewer Signature Confirming Verbal Consent:**

\_\_\_\_\_

1. At the beginning of the process, were you given the information you needed in order to know what to expect?
  - a. How well was the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program or MCJRP explained to you?  
*[probe:]* Was MCJRP even mentioned?  
*[probe if not mentioned:]* Looking back over the process since it began, was there any information missing?  
*[probe:]* Where did you get the information from?  
*[probe if needed:]* Is there any way the process could be improved?
2. Were you treated with respect during the court process by:
  - a. the judge:  
     →In what ways did you feel respected/not respected?
  - b. the district attorney:  
     →In what ways did you feel respected/not respected?
  - c. the defense attorney:  
     →In what ways did you feel respected/not respected?
3. Did you receive the support you needed from a victim advocate:
  - a. During the court process (from the DA's Victim Assistance Program)?
  - b. Once the person was on supervision (i.e., after sentencing, from DCJ's Victim and Survivor Services unit)?
4. Everyone has unique characteristics, for example race, culture, gender, disability status, gender identity, etc. Was your identity respected or were you treated differently because of your identity?
5. How well do you believe your voice was heard?
  - 5a. *[If well heard:]* Describe how you could tell you were being heard.
  - 5b. *[If not well heard:]* Talk about why your voice wasn't heard well?  
*[probe if needed:]* What would you recommend to make it more possible for victims/survivors to be heard?
6. What will it look like when you see a successful outcome from this process?  
*[probe for details about what success means to them]*

***I have one last question.***

7. Imagine that you are the person in charge of the MCJRP program. Thinking about the entire process, from court through the person getting off supervision, what would you change to make it better for victims/survivors?

## MCJRP MAPS Partner Interview

Respondent ID: \_\_\_\_\_ Interview Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Interviewer Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

### Introduction:

Thank you for making the time to talk with me. The purpose of this interview is to get your feedback about MCJRP in order to strengthen and improve the program. The questions focus on your agency's role within MCJRP, what's working and what could be improved, service engagement and retention, and defining success. The interview is likely to be about 30 minutes, but will be determined by how much you have to say.

Before I begin, did you get a chance to look at the consent information I emailed to you? ***[either go over the points below or remind that it's voluntary, confidential]***

1. Doing this interview is voluntary. You can be selective in what you tell us. You can stop the interview at any time. Your choice to do it or not will not affect your involvement with MCJRP, your employment, or your relationship with any of the agencies in the collaboration.
2. If you change your mind after you finish the interview and do not want us to include your feedback, you can let me know. We will remove your answers.
3. We will keep the information you tell us confidential. We do not record your name with your responses and we will not share your individual answers with anyone outside the evaluation team.
4. We expect that there is minimal to no risk for you participating in this interview. You may feel uncomfortable answering some of the questions, but you can skip those or any questions.
5. After we complete all of the interviews with other partners, we will prepare a summary report that combines your comments with the comments from everyone else. If we include any quotes from what you say, we will do so only if your identity can be protected.
6. In order to make sure that I accurately capture everything you tell me, I would like to audio record this interview. Your name or identity will not be included in the recording. Once the recording has been reviewed and your responses are complete, it will be destroyed.

Do you have any questions before we begin? If you have any later, you can email me.

Is it OK to continue with the interview?      Yes      No

Is it OK to audio record the interview?      Yes      No

Verbal consent given:      Yes      No

Interviewer Signature Confirming Verbal Consent:

\_\_\_\_\_

1. First, please describe what your agency provides to individuals participating in MCJRP.  
*[probe for mentor services]*
  - a. What culturally-specific services are you able to offer?
  - b. *[if not being provide:]* What resources does your agency need to provide those services?
2. Please describe your involvement with MCJRP and how well that partnership is functioning.
3. What needs to be in place to better support your or your agency's involvement in MCJRP?.
4. What do you see as facilitators or barriers to treatment **engagement** for MCJRP participants?
  - a. What has your agency implemented or what else needs to be in place to reduce those barriers?
5. What do you see as facilitators or barriers to treatment **retention** for MCJRP participants?
  - a. What has your agency implemented or what else needs to be in place to reduce those barriers?
6. One of the primary goals of this evaluation is to better understand success.
  - a. What does success look like for the participants? *[probe about desistance]*
7. In your opinion, what would make MCJRP as successful as possible?
8. Do you have anything else to add about supporting MCJRP participants?

## Appendix B: Recruitment Materials

**Recruitment Emails**

**Participant Recruitment Script for POs**

**Participant Recruitment Flyer**

**Participant and Victim/Survivor Phone Scripts**

## Email Invitation for Key Stakeholders, Staff and Partners Individual Interviews

Subject: MCJRP Feedback Opportunity

Hello [name] and Greetings from the MCJRP Data Team!

We received funding from the Criminal Justice Commission to implement an evaluation of the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP). The project is called Measures and Perspectives on Success (MAPS). The primary goals of the evaluation are to (1) establish a solid understanding of the **experiences** of people who participate in or are affected by the MCJRP process, (2) identify the factors that contribute to **success** for people who participate in MCJRP, (3) understand the **experiences** of the victims of crime/survivors of violence, and (4) receive **feedback** from stakeholders and partners like you. Ultimately, we will use what we learn from this study to improve MCJRP for everyone involved.

**Through your work on Ops, JRSC, or both, you have valuable insight into what's working and what could be improved for MCJRP.** We would like to invite you to participate in an approximately 30-minute interview (depending on how much you have to say) that will allow us to gather feedback about MCJRP. Our findings could improve how we engage with MCJRP participants, how we support victims of crime/survivors of violence, and how we collaborate with community partners and stakeholders.

Participation in the interview is completely **voluntary and confidential** and will be conducted virtually or by phone (whichever you prefer). It will involve questions about what's working well, what can be improved, the collaborative process, and your perspective on success. Attached is the consent information for you to look at, which we will go over before beginning the interview.

If you are interested in participating, please let me know so we can schedule the interview.

Thank you for your time and we look forward to hearing from you,  
[Evaluation Team Member]

## Email Invitation for MCJRP Participants Individual Interview

Subject: Tell Us about Your Experience with MCJRP

Hello [name],

We are group of evaluators studying the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP). One of the study goals is to learn from you and your **experiences** going through the legal process and working with a Probation Officer. Another goal of the study is to identify the things that help you be as **successful** as possible. We will use what we learn from this study to improve MCJRP for people who participate in the future.

**As a MCJRP participant, you have valuable insight into what's working and what could be improved.** We would like to invite you to participate in a 30-60 minute interview. We will ask you questions about how clear the process is, how fairly and respectfully you are being treated, your access to the help you need, how well you were heard and understood, and, most importantly, the successes you have had or hope to have.

The interview is totally voluntary and confidential. It's your choice to do it or not. We can do the interview by phone, by video meeting, or in person. That's your choice, too. What you tell us will stay with us. We don't share your feedback with anyone else – not your PO, not your lawyer, no one. Attached is a document that has more information about the interview process, which we will go over before beginning the interview. To thank you for taking your time to talk to me, you'll get a \$50 gift card to Fred Meyer, Target, or Walmart – your choice.

If you are interested in doing the interview, please let me know so we can schedule it.

Thank you for your time and we look forward to hearing from you,

[Evaluation Team Member]

**If contacting participant based on PO referral after showing client MAPS recruitment flyer:**

Hi [name],

[PO name] let me know that you are interested in learning more about the evaluation we are doing for the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP).

As a MCJRP participant, you have valuable insight into what's working and what could be improved. Our goal is to learn from you and your **experiences** going through the legal process, working with a PO, and any services you may have received. Another goal of the study is to identify the things that help you be as **successful** as possible. Ultimately, we will summarize what we learn from everyone and give the program feedback about how to improve MCJRP.

The interview will take 30-60 minutes, depending on how much you have to say. We will ask you questions about how clear the process is, how fairly and respectfully you are being treated, your access to the help you need, how well you were heard and understood, and, most importantly, the successes you have had or hope to have.

The interview is totally voluntary and confidential. It's your choice to do it or not. We can do the interview by phone, by video meeting, or in person. That's your choice, too. What you tell us will stay with us. We don't share your feedback with anyone else – not your PO, not your lawyer, no one. Attached is a document that has more information about the interview process, which we will go over before beginning the interview. To thank you for taking your time to talk to me, you'll get a \$50 gift card to Fred Meyer, Target, or Walmart – your choice.

If you are interested, you can either respond to this email or [text/]call my [cell] phone at [number].

Thanks, [team member]

### Email Invitation for Victims of Crime/Survivors of Violence Individual Interview

Subject: Feedback Opportunity: Your Experience with the Justice System

Hello [name],

**As a victim of crime/survivor of violence, your voice deserves to be heard.** I am an evaluator on a team studying the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP). This is the program that the individual who committed the crime against you is in. One of the study goals is to learn from you and your experiences with the legal process. We will use what we learn from this study to improve MCJRP for people in the future.

We would like to invite you to participate in an approximately 30-minute interview. We will ask you questions about how clear the process was, how fairly and respectfully you were treated, if you received the help you needed, how well you were heard and understood, and, most importantly, how we can improve the process for victims/survivors.

The interview is totally voluntary and your responses are confidential. It's your choice to do it or not. We can do the interview by phone or video. That's your choice, too. We don't share your individual feedback with anyone else. We will summarize what you and others say during the interviews, never using your name or including your identity. Attached is a document that has more information about the interview process, which we will go over before beginning the interview. To thank you for taking your time to talk to me, you'll get a \$100 gift card.

If you are interested in doing the interview, please let me know so we can schedule it. If you are not interested, which is totally fine, I would appreciate a quick reply to let me know so I don't send you any future emails.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing from you,  
Debi Elliott

## Recruitment for MCJRP Participant Interviews

### Measures and Perspectives of Success Evaluation

The MCJRP: Measures and Perspectives of Success (MAPS) evaluation is hoping to gather feedback from participants about the MCJRP process, from the court phase through the supervision phase. We also want to learn what success means for them. The goal of the evaluation is to gather information that will strengthen and improve the program.

We are asking for your help to recruit individuals who are currently on MCJRP supervision so we can conduct individual interviews. All we are asking you to do is provide individuals with a flyer explaining the opportunity. They can either contact us on their own or give you permission to let us know they are interested. The following information explains what this involves. Thank you for being willing to help us out!

#### Who to Recruit

- ♦ We would like to get 40 people to participate in an individual interview.
- ♦ The goal is to get feedback from a wide range of individuals, particularly from historically underrepresented communities.
- ♦ We have identified a larger group of individuals in hopes of reaching our recruitment goal.
- ♦ You have been given a list of individuals identified who are on your caseload.

#### What to Do for Recruitment?

- ♦ All we need you to do is hand individuals on the list we provided an explanatory flyer. You can tell them something like this:  
 “We want to get feedback about how well the MCJRP program is working for you. A team from Multnomah County are asking for people to participate in a confidential interview that asks questions about what’s working for you, what could be improved, and what success looks like for you. They will not tell me, other POs, or anyone outside of their team how you answer the questions. Your answers and the ones that other people on supervision provide will get summarized and written up in a report that has no names or anything about your identity. I won’t even know if you did the interview or not. Also, whatever your decision is, it won’t affect your supervision in any way. It’s completely separate.”
- ♦ You can also say that ***we view them as the experts*** we need to hear from in order to improve the MCJRP process and services.
- ♦ They can either contact us directly (Debi’s email is on the bottom of the flyer) or you can ask them for permission to give the evaluation team their contact information.
- ♦ When we connect with them, we will further explain the process and schedule an interview.
- ♦ If they give you permission to share their contact information, please send an email to Debi ([debi.elliott@multco.us](mailto:debi.elliott@multco.us)) with their name, phone number, and email address, as well as any notes about the best time to contact them (or times to avoid, like morning because they work at night).

***Thank you!***

# SHARE YOUR FEEDBACK

## ABOUT THE

## Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP)



### Why?

As a MCJRP participant, we want to learn from your experience to get ideas for improving the program.

### What?

We are inviting you to take part in a 30–60 minute interview. It includes questions about how clear the process is, how fairly and respectfully you are treated, if you are getting your needs met, and your successes.

### When?

We will schedule a day and time that's convenient for you.

### Where?

The interview can be by phone, in-person, or by video. Whichever you prefer.

### Who?

We are a team from Multnomah County who are reviewing how well MCJRP is working.

### Choice & Privacy?

**Doing the interview is totally voluntary. It's your choice to do it or not. You can skip any question you don't want to answer.**

**The interview is completely confidential. What you tell us will stay with us. We don't share your individual feedback with anyone else.**

### Thanks

To thank you for taking your time to provide feedback, we will give you a \$50 gift card to Fred Meyer, Target, or Walmart – your choice.

If you are interested in hearing more or doing the interview, please email [debi.elliott@multco.us](mailto:debi.elliott@multco.us).



**MEASURES AND  
PERSPECTIVES  
OF SUCCESS**

## Phone Script to Invite MCJRP Participants for an Individual Interview

Hello, is this [name]?

My name is [name] and I am with a group of evaluators studying the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program or MCJRP.

***As a MCJRP participant, you have valuable insight into what's working and what could be improved.*** We would like to invite you to participate in an interview that will last about a half hour. Questions will be about how clear the process is, how fairly and respectfully you are being treated, your access to the help you need, how well you were heard and understood, and, most importantly, the successes you have had or hope to have.

The interview is totally voluntary and confidential. It's your choice to do it or not and what you tell us will stay with us. We don't share your feedback with anyone else – not your PO, not your lawyer, no one. To thank you for your and willingness to share your feedback, you'll get a \$50 gift card to Fred Meyer, Target, or Walmart – your choice.

Would you be interested in doing the interview? We can do the interview by phone, by video *[you can also offer in-person if that is something you are willing to do]*. *[work on scheduling the interview]*

\*\*\*\*\*

Other useful information:

- ♦ You can also say that ***we view them as the experts*** we need to hear from in order to improve the MCJRP process and services.
- ♦ I often ask if they use a calendar and would like an invite. (I offer google, but you can offer whatever you are comfortable with/able to use.)
- ♦ You can send them the flyer, in case they didn't get one from their PO – but you might want to give them your email vs. Debi's on the sheet.
- ♦ Be ready to conduct the interview at that time – if they are ready and willing, you might as well take advantage of that.

## Phone Script to Invite MCJRP Participants for an Individual Interview

Hello, is this [name]?

My name is [name] and I am with the Multnomah County Department of Community Justice. I'm part of a group of evaluators studying the Justice Reinvestment Program in our county. It's also called MCJRP. I'm reaching out to you because the person who committed the crime against you is in that program. For the evaluation, we want to make sure we include your perspective so the program can improve for other victims of crime/survivors of violence.

We would like to invite you to participate in an interview that will last about a half hour. Questions will be about how clear the process is, how fairly and respectfully you have been treated, if you received the help you needed, the help you needed, how well you were heard and understood, and, most importantly, how to improve the process for victims/survivors.

The interview is totally voluntary and your responses are confidential. It's your choice to do it or not and what you tell us will stay with us. We will protect your privacy. We will summarize what you and others say during the interviews, never including your name or identity. To thank you for your willingness to share your feedback, you'll get a \$50 gift card to Fred Meyer, Target, or Walmart – your choice.

Would you be interested in doing the interview? We can do the interview by phone or by video. *[If No: Thank them for their time. If Yes: Work on scheduling the interview]*

\*\*\*\*\*

Other useful information:

- ♦ Be very mindful of the sensitivity of the situation. Be willing to pause and address their concerns at any point in the conversation.
- ♦ If they ask how you got their name and contact information, explain that you work in the Department of Community Justice that includes the Victim and Survivor Services. Their information is completely protected and not used for any other reason than to reach out and request their feedback.
- ♦ You can also say that ***we view them as the experts*** we want to learn from them in order to improve the process.
- ♦ I often ask if they use a calendar and would like an invite. (I offer google, but you can offer whatever you are comfortable with/able to use.)
- ♦ Be ready to conduct the interview at that time – if they are ready and willing, you might as well take advantage of that.
- ♦ If they have questions about their case, offer to have an DCJ advocate call them. If they want to talk with an advocate, offer to make a referral and to give them DCJ’s advocate line number (503-988-7606). After the interview, if they wanted you to make a referral then complete this [online DCJ Advocate referral form](#) (review form for info you may need to ask the respondent or complete it with them).

**Police Investigate** — **D-Arrest** → **Jail Booking** → **Grand Jury** → **recog**

**DA Review** (Units: A, B, C, D) — **D** — **Arraignment** — **D** — **Sentence** — **D**

**Direct + present** — **divert** — **X-Plea** — **M-57 DA staffing M-11 gun min. cases** — **JSC** — **TRIAL** — **PLEA**

**PSRP: Virginia Risk Tool** — **Plea negotiations** — **Pretrial offer** — **Probation** — **local jail + Probation** — **Prison** — **post prison supervision** — **discharge**

**Alternatives to Prison & Specialty courts:**  
STOP Court - Drugs  
START Court - Property/drug

**MENTAL HEALTH - AXIS I diagnosis**  
DISP - misd + felony Dual Intensive Supervision  
DV - misd - deferred sentence  
Community Court - misd + violations  
Bud Clark Commons - misd + violations + homeless - closed  
Veterans DK+ - flagged Vet Cases

**Resources**  
\* Health Insurance  
\* SCT  
\*

