

**LAMOILLE RESTORATIVE CENTER:
RESILIENCE BEYOND INCARCERATION PROGRAM
OUTCOME EVALUATION**

FINAL REPORT

January 2016



SUBMITTED TO:

Heather Hobart
Executive Director

Tricia Long
Program Director

Lamoille Restorative Center: Resilience Beyond Incarceration

SUBMITTED BY:

Peter Wicklund, Ph.D., Research Associate
Crime Research Group

P.O. Box 1433

Montpelier, Vermont 05601

(802) 230-4657

www.crgvt.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY of PREVIOUS OUTCOME EVALUATIONS	i
BACKGROUND	i
Previous RBIP Outcome Evaluations:.....	i
SUMMARY OF 2015 OUTCOME REPORT	iii
METHODOLOGY	iii
SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	5
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	5
How was Recidivism Determined?	5
RESEARCH QUESTION 1: WHICH RBIP PARTICIPANTS WERE CONVICTED OF CRIMES AFTER THEIR ENTRY INTO THE PROGRAM?	6
Summary of Findings.....	6
Detailed Findings.....	7
RESEARCH QUESTION 2: WHAT CRIMES DID RBIP PARTICIPANTS COMMIT?	8
Summary of Findings.....	8
Detailed Findings.....	8
Participant Offense Levels and Patterns.....	8
Participant Offense Types.....	9
CONCLUSIONS.....	11

SUMMARY of PREVIOUS OUTCOME EVALUATIONS

BACKGROUND

The Resilience Beyond Incarceration program (hereafter the “RBIP”) is a program within the Lamoille Restorative Center, which operates as a non-profit, community-based agency located in Hyde Park, Vermont, serving the Lamoille Valley region. The Resilience Beyond Incarceration Program was formerly called the Community Justice Project (CJP). The earlier evaluations will refer to the CJP. The RBIP is a prevention program for children of incarcerated parents. The RBIP’s primary goal is to prevent children from becoming involved in the criminal justice system as young adults. The RBIP works to mitigate the trauma associated with parental incarceration and reduce the adverse effects on children.

Previous outcome evaluations of the RBIP were conducted in 2012, 2013 and 2014 and were based on adult criminal history records from the Vermont Criminal Information Center (VCIC). For the 2015 study, in addition to the VCIC adult records, for the first time juvenile criminal records were made available for the RBIP participants through the Courts Administrator’s Office (hereafter the “CAO”). The following section provides an overview of the previous outcome evaluations through 2014, and includes additional summaries of the RBIP participants’ juvenile criminal activities during this time period.

Previous RBIP Outcome Evaluations:

2012:

- Total sample = 125
 - 60 Juveniles (under 16)
 - Three subjects were found to have juvenile records with a total of five offenses adjudicated by the court.
 - The offenses included: simple assault, consumption of alcohol by a minor, grand larceny, burglary, and unlawful mischief.
 - 65 Adults
 - Two adults were found to have previous juvenile records with a total of two adjudicated offenses.
 - The offenses included: engaging in a prohibited act and simple assault.
 - 21 adults were found to have VCIC criminal records.
- Recidivism:
 - Six of the 21 adults with criminal records were convicted of a crime after they entered the program and were classified as recidivists.
 - Adult Recidivism:
 - **Six recidivists or 4.8% of total cohort (n=125)**
 - A total of five subjects were adjudicated for juvenile offenses during the study period and were considered recidivists. They included two adults – one of which was also an adult recidivist -- and three juvenile subjects.
 - Juvenile Recidivism:
 - **Five recidivists or 4.0% of total cohort (n=125)**

2013:

- Total sample = 142
 - 66 Juveniles
 - 17 new juveniles entered the program.
 - One of the new subjects was found to have a previous juvenile record with one adjudicated offense for unlawful mischief.
 - 76 Adults
 - 11 of the original juveniles from the 2012 study reached the age of 16 years and were added to the adult sample.
 - Two of the 11 juveniles added to the adult sample in 2013 had previous juvenile records. One subsequently added another adjudicated offense of alcohol consumption by a minor to their record in 2013.
 - The only adult subjects with VCIC criminal records were the original 21 adult subjects from the 2012 study.
- Recidivism:
 - One additional adult subject from the original 21 with VCIC records from the 2012 study was convicted of a crime in 2013, bringing the total number of recidivists to seven.
 - Adult Recidivism:
 - **Seven recidivists or 4.9% of the total sample (n=142)**
 - One new juvenile subject was adjudicated for an offense in 2013, bringing the total number of recidivists to six.
 - Juvenile Recidivism:
 - **Six recidivists or 4.2% of total cohort (n=142)**

2014:

- Total sample = 162
 - 72 Juveniles
 - 20 new Juveniles entered the program.
 - None of these new subjects were found to have previous juvenile records.
 - 90 Adults
 - 14 juveniles from the 2013 study reached the age of 16 and were added to the adult sample.
 - The only subjects that were found to have VCIC criminal records were the original 21 adult subjects from the 2012 study.

2014: (Overview cont.)

- Recidivism:
 - Eight additional adult subjects from the original 21 adults with criminal records from the 2012 study were convicted of crimes during the 2014 study period, bringing the total number of adult recidivists to 15.
 - Adult Recidivism:
 - **15 recidivists or 9.3% of the total sample (n=162)**
 - Two new adjudicated juvenile offenses occurred during the 2014 study year, increasing the total of juvenile recidivists to eight. One offense was for consumption of alcohol by a minor committed by a juvenile subject from the 2012 study. The other was for disturbing the peace-phone/threaten to harm committed by an adult subject from the 2012 study.
 - Juvenile Recidivism:
 - **Eight recidivists or 4.9% of the total sample (n=162)**

SUMMARY OF 2015 OUTCOME REPORT

The administrators of the RBIP contracted the Crime Research Group to conduct a fourth follow-up outcome evaluation of the program to update the recidivism rates from the previous studies, including an additional 80 new subjects. This report presents results from this evaluation.

METHODOLOGY

An outcome evaluation attempts to determine the effects that a program has on participants. In the case of the RBIP, the objective of this outcome evaluation was to determine the extent to which the RBIP reduced incidents of convictions among its participants.

An analysis of the criminal history records of 242 participants of the RBIP from January 1, 2002 to June 30, 2015, was conducted using the Vermont criminal history records as provided by the Vermont Criminal Information Center (VCIC) at the Department of Public Safety. The Vermont criminal history record on which the analysis was based included all charges and convictions prosecuted in a Vermont Superior Court – Criminal Division that were available as of August 24, 2015. The criminal records on which the study was based do not contain Federal prosecutions, out-of-state prosecutions, or traffic tickets.

This study also included juvenile records for the RBIP participants for FY2006 to FY2015, made available by the CAO. This data provided additional information on criminal histories of the RBIP participants, and their juvenile criminal activities during the last four years of tracking the outcomes of this program.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

- 1. The RBIP continues to show results that indicate it is a promising approach for preventing the children of incarcerated parents from becoming involved in the criminal justice system as young adults. The 2015 Outcome Evaluation for the RBIP revealed that none of the new adult subjects in the study had criminal records (14 juveniles from the 2014 research reached the age of 16 and were added to the adult cohort), resulting in no increase in number of recidivists over the 15 recidivists identified from the 2014 study. In fact, from 2012 to 2015 a total of 38 juveniles had reached the age of 16 and were added to the adult cohort, and none were found to have criminal records. The recidivism rate determined in this study based on the total study cohort was 6.2% (15 recidivists divided by 242). These results represent a decrease in recidivism from the rate of 9.3% determined in the 2014 study.**
- 2. Investigating the newly available juvenile records from the CAO revealed that a total of 10 of the 242 participants of the RBIP had juvenile adjudicated offenses, resulting in a juvenile recidivism rate of 4.1%. This rate is essentially unchanged from the juvenile recidivism rates retroactively determined for the previous RBIP outcome studies for 2012 to 2014, and only two juvenile recidivists were added since the 2014 study.**
- 3. The adult and juvenile recidivism rates are relatively low when compared to recidivism measures between 24% and 61% found in other studies for similar juvenile subjects.¹ Although these results show confirmation of the effectiveness of the RBIP, care must be taken when making the claim that that these results are due primarily to the benefits the participants receive from the program. The studies cited did not include juvenile subjects from Vermont, and therefore a valid control group is not available for comparison.**
- 4. The research also showed that among the adult RBIP participants it appears that there is a low probability that these subjects will be arrested and convicted of violent or felony offenses. Only three of the 15 recidivists from the 2014 study were convicted of new crimes in 2015. Their new convictions consisted of six misdemeanors – two violations of temporary restraining orders, two violations of probation, one theft, and one unlawful trespassing violation.**

¹ A detailed literature review of recidivism rates for high risk juveniles can be found in the 2013 Outcome Evaluation at this link: <http://crgvt.org/reports/reportscrimjust/reports/lccjpeval2013.html>

INTRODUCTION

This outcome evaluation of the RBIP was designed to answer two questions associated with the behavior of subjects who were participants in the RBIP from January 1, 2002 to June 30, 2015.

1. Which participants of the RBIP were convicted of crimes during that period of time?
2. What crimes were the participants of the RBIP convicted of during that period of time?

This outcome evaluation was supported through funds provided by the Lamoille Restorative Center (LRC). However, the findings and conclusions, expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the LRC.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

An outcome evaluation attempts to determine the effects that a program has on participants. In the case of the RBIP the objective of this outcome evaluation was to determine the extent to which the RBIP reduced incidents of convictions among its participants.

An indicator of new criminal behavior that is commonly used in outcome evaluations of criminal justice programs is the number of participants who are convicted of a crime after they enter the program. An analysis of the criminal history records of the 242 subjects who were participants in the RBIP from January 1, 2002 to June 30, 2015, was conducted using the Vermont criminal history record of participants as provided by the Vermont Criminal Information Center (VCIC) at the Department of Public Safety. The Vermont criminal history record on which the recidivism analysis was based included all charges and convictions prosecuted in a Vermont Superior Court – Criminal Division that were available as of August 25, 2015. The criminal records on which the study was based do not contain Federal prosecutions, out-of-state prosecutions, or traffic tickets.

For this study, juvenile records were also made available through the CAO for the time period of FY2006 to FY2015. This data provided additional information on histories of juvenile delinquency of the RBIP participants during the last four years of tracking the outcomes of this program.

How was Recidivism Determined?

For the RBIP outcome evaluation, a “zero tolerance” standard for recidivism was used such that any RBIP participant who was convicted of any crime prosecuted in a Vermont Superior Court – Criminal Division, including violations of probation and motor vehicle offenses, after their entry into the program would be considered a recidivist. This standard was also extended to the juvenile records of the RBIP participants. In order to determine which subjects recidivated, a recidivism clock start date was set to January 1, 2002. Using this start date and the criminal records from the VCIC and the juvenile records from the CAO, a subject was considered a recidivist if s/he committed and was convicted, or adjudicated in the case of juveniles, of any new offense after the recidivism start date and prior to the end date of the study.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: WHICH RBIP PARTICIPANTS WERE CONVICTED OF CRIMES AFTER THEIR ENTRY INTO THE PROGRAM?

Summary of Findings

The request for criminal records from the VCIC on the 242 participants of the RBIP yielded records for only the original 21 subjects from the 2012 study that had VCIC records at that time. In fact, apart from these original 21 adult subjects, none of the new adults added to this study since the first outcome evaluation in 2012 were found to have criminal records (from 2012 to 2015, 38 juveniles reached the age of 16 and were added to the adult cohort).

The current study also showed that there was no increase in number of recidivists over the 15 recidivists from the 2014 study. In total, 6.2% of the 242 participants in the RBIP were convicted of a crime. Only three of these recidivists were convicted of new crimes since the 2014 study, committing a total of six new offenses. The recidivism rate determined in this study is lower than the recidivism rate of 9.3% determined in the 2014 study. However, the difference observed between this study and the 2014 study was determined to be statistically insignificant in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions at a significance level of $p < 0.05$.

A new addition to this 2015 installment of the RBIP tracking study was the availability of juvenile records from the CAO. The data provided added insight into the juvenile criminal activities of the RBIP participants during the time period of this study. The juvenile records revealed that of the 242 RBIP participants only ten subjects were adjudicated for juvenile offenses. The juvenile recidivism rate based on the total sample cohort was determined to be 4.1% (ten recidivists divided by 242). Utilizing the juvenile records retroactively to determine recidivism rates for the outcome studies conducted in 2012 to 2014, showed that the rates remained essentially the same. The rates determined were 4.0% for 2012, 4.2% for 2013, and 4.9% for 2014.

The adult and juvenile recidivism rates determined in this study are low compared to recidivism measures between 24% and 61% found in other studies for similar juvenile subjects.² It should be noted, however that the studies cited did not include juvenile subjects from Vermont. The comparatively low recidivism rates determined in this study, along with the fact that no new criminal records were found for the juveniles who reached the age of 16 during that last three study years, indicates the RBIP to be a very promising and potentially effective program. However, it cannot be claimed with certainty that these results are due primarily to the effectiveness of the RBIP since a valid Vermont control group is not available for comparison.

² A detailed literature review of recidivism rates for high risk juveniles can be found in the 2013 Outcome Evaluation at this link: <http://crgvt.org/reports/reportscrimjust/reports/lccjpeval2013.html>

Detailed Findings

Table 1 presents cumulative data regarding how many RBIP participants were convicted of a crime during each study year, comparing the running totals of count and percentage of the current results with the previous outcome evaluations conducted in 2012, 2013 and 2014. A search of adult criminal records through the VCIC for the 242 subjects who participated in the RBIP revealed that the same 15 recidivists from the 2014 study, or 6.2% of the total participants, had arrests that ended in convictions. Searching the juvenile records from the CAO showed that only 10 RBIP participants, or 4.1% of the total study sample, were adjudicated for juvenile offenses, and only two juvenile recidivists were added since the 2014 study.

Table 1
Running Totals of Count and Percentage of RBIP Participants Adjudicated/Convicted for Any Juvenile and/or Adult Offense

	2012 Evaluation		2013 Evaluation		2014 Evaluation		2015 Evaluation	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Juvenile Recidivists	5	4.0%	6	4.2%	8	4.9%	10	4.1%
Adult Recidivists	6	4.8%	7	4.9%	15	9.3%	15	6.2%
Total Recidivists*	10	8.0%	12	8.5%	20	12.3%	22	9.1%
Total Sample	125	100.0%	142	100.0%	162	100.0%	242	100.0%

*The number of total recidivists does not reflect the sum of the juvenile and adult recidivists. In the 2012 and 2013 studies one subject had recidivated crimes in both the juvenile and adult records. In the 2014 and 2015 the same situation applied to three subjects.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2: WHAT CRIMES DID RBIP PARTICIPANTS COMMIT?

Summary of Findings

The 15 recidivists were convicted of a total of 62 crimes, averaging 4.1 convictions per recidivist – a slight, but statistically insignificant increase over the number of convictions shown in the 2014 study. Only three subjects of the 15 recidivists were convicted of new crimes in 2015, consisting of six misdemeanors – two violations of temporary restraining orders, two violations of probation, one theft, and one unlawful trespassing violation. It should be noted that Table 2 and 3A only show a total increase of five convictions instead of six, from 57 to 62. This is due to one subject’s 2014 conviction subsequently being expunged from their record.

Reviewing the types of offenses committed by the juvenile recidivists (Table 3B) revealed that the 10 subjects were adjudicated for a total 14 offenses, averaging 1.4 offenses per recidivist, which is essentially unchanged compared to the previous three studies. Only two of the 10 juvenile recidivists were adjudicated for new offenses in 2015. The offenses included: disturbing the peace, grand larceny, and unlawful mischief.

Detailed Findings

Participant Offense Levels and Patterns

Table 2 shows a summary of the running totals of all crimes committed by participants of the RBIP. The proportion of felonies to misdemeanors decreased slightly from 2014, however the difference is not statistically significant.

A similar analysis was not possible for the juvenile offenses, since the data does not include the severity of the crimes in terms of misdemeanors or felonies.

Table 2
Running Totals of Offense Levels of All Crimes for Which RBIP Recidivists Were Convicted

	2012 Evaluation		2013 Evaluation		2014 Evaluation		2015 Evaluation	
	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%
Felony	3	20.0%	3	13.0%	8	14.0%	8	12.9%
Misdemeanor	12	80.0%	20	87.0%	49	86.0%	54	87.1%
Total	15	100.0%	23	100.0%	57	100.0%	62	100.0%

Participant Offense Types

Table 3A and 3B (following page) shows a summary of the running totals of the types of adult (3A) and juvenile (3B) offenses committed by participants of the RBIP. The shaded values show where there is an increase in the number of a particular type of offense committed since the 2014 study.

Table 3A
Adult Convictions: Running Totals of Types of Crimes for Which RBIP Recidivists Were Convicted

	2012 Evaluation		2013 Evaluation		2014 Evaluation		2015 Evaluation	
	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%
Theft	1	6.7%	1	4.3%	7	12.3%	8	12.9%
Failure to Appear	0	0.0%	3	13.0%	6	10.5%	6	9.7%
Disorderly Conduct	2	13.3%	3	13.0%	5	8.8%	5	8.1%
Simple Assault	2	13.3%	3	13.0%	5	8.8%	5	8.1%
Unlawful Mischief	1	6.7%	1	4.3%	4	7.0%	3	4.8%
Vs. Justice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	5.3%	3	4.8%
Careless & Negligent Driving	1	6.7%	2	8.7%	3	5.3%	3	4.8%
Burglary	1	6.7%	1	4.3%	3	5.3%	3	4.8%
Alcohol Violation	2	13.3%	3	13.0%	3	5.3%	3	4.8%
Shoplifting	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	3.5%	2	3.2%
Fraud	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	3.5%	2	3.2%
Attempting to Elude	1	6.7%	1	4.3%	2	3.5%	2	3.2%
Disturbing the Peace	1	6.7%	1	4.3%	2	3.5%	2	3.2%
Assault & Robbery	2	13.3%	2	8.7%	2	3.5%	2	3.2%
Temporary Restraining Order	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	3.2%
Violation of Probation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	3.2%
Unlawful Trespass	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	2	3.2%
Possession/Sale Stolen Prop	1	6.7%	1	4.3%	1	1.8%	1	1.6%
Lascivious Conduct	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	1	1.6%
Kidnapping	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	1	1.6%
DUI-2nd Offense	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	1	1.6%
Domestic Assault*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	1	1.6%
Driving License Suspended	0	0.0%	1	4.3%	1	1.8%	1	1.6%
Arson	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	1	1.6%
Total Convictions	15	100.0%	23	100.0%	57	100.0%	62	100.0%
Number of Recidivists	6		7		15		15	
Average # of Convictions	2.5		3.3		3.8		4.1	
Median # of Convictions	2		3		4		4	
Maximum # of Convictions	2		2		2		2	

Table 3B
Juvenile Offenses: Running Totals of Types of Offenses for Which RBIP Recidivists Were Adjudicated

	2012 Evaluation		2013 Evaluation		2014 Evaluation		2015 Evaluation	
	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%
Alcohol-Minor-Consumption	1	14.3%	2	22.2%	3	27.3%	3	21.4%
Assault-Simple	2	28.6%	2	22.2%	2	18.2%	2	14.3%
Burglary	1	14.3%	1	11.1%	1	9.1%	1	7.1%
Disturbing Peace-Phone/Threaten Harm	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%
Grand Larceny Greater >\$900	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%
Prohibited Act-Engage In #1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	1	7.1%
Unlawful Mischief < \$250	1	14.3%	1	11.1%	1	9.1%	1	7.1%
Unlawful Mischief Greater Than \$250	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%
Disorderly Conduct - Abusive Or Obscene	1	14.3%	1	11.1%	1	9.1%	1	7.1%
Disorderly Conduct-Fight	1	14.3%	1	11.1%	1	9.1%	1	7.1%
Juvenile Under 16 Misrepresenting Age	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	1	9.1%	1	7.1%
Total Convictions	7	100.0%	9	100.0%	11	100.0%	14	100.0%
Number of Recidivists	5		6		8		10	
Average # of Convictions	1.4		1.5		1.4		1.4	
Median # of Convictions	1		1		1		1	
Maximum # of Convictions	2		2		2		2	

CONCLUSIONS

- 1. The RBIP continues to show results that indicate it is a promising approach for preventing the children of incarcerated parents from becoming involved in the criminal justice system as young adults. The 2015 Outcome Evaluation for the RBIP revealed that none of the new adult subjects in the study had criminal records (14 juveniles from the 2014 research reached the age of 16 and were added to the adult cohort), resulting in no increase in number of recidivists over the 15 recidivists identified from the 2014 study. In fact, from 2012 to 2015 a total of 38 juveniles had reached the age of 16 and were added to the adult cohort, and none were found to have criminal records. The recidivism rate determined in this study based on the total study cohort was 6.2% (15 recidivists divided by 242). These results represent a decrease in recidivism from the rate of 9.3% determined in the 2014 study.**
- 2. Investigating the newly available juvenile records from the CAO revealed that a total of 10 of the 242 participants of the RBIP had juvenile adjudicated offenses, resulting in a juvenile recidivism rate of 4.1%. This rate is essentially unchanged from the juvenile recidivism rates retroactively determined for the previous RBIP outcome studies for 2012 to 2014, and only two juvenile recidivists were added since the 2014 study.**
- 3. The adult and juvenile recidivism rates are relatively low when compared to recidivism measures between 24% and 61% found in other studies for similar juvenile subjects.³ Although these results show confirmation of the effectiveness of the RBIP, care must be taken when making the claim that that these results are due primarily to the benefits the participants receive from the program. The studies cited did not include juvenile subjects from Vermont, and therefore a valid control group is not available for comparison.**
- 4. The research also showed that among the adult RBIP participants it appears that there is a low probability that these subjects will be arrested and convicted of violent or felony offenses. Only three of the 15 recidivists from the 2014 study were convicted of new crimes in 2015. Their new convictions consisted of six misdemeanors – two violations of temporary restraining orders, two violations of probation, one theft, and one unlawful trespassing violation.**

³ A detailed literature review of recidivism rates for high risk juveniles can be found in the 2013 Outcome Evaluation at this link: <http://crgvt.org/reports/reportscrimjust/reports/lccjpeval2013.html>