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Introduction

- Fear of these crimes and need for treatment.
  - (Braddock & Renzema, 1998; Bragg, 2007; Cain, 2008; Cohen & Jeglic, 2007; Daly, 2008; English et al., 2000; Petrunik & Deutschmann, 2008; Pratt, 2000; Terry & Ackerman, 2009; Sample & Kadlec, 2008; Wright, 2008)
- The recidivism rates of sex offenders are very low in comparison to other types of offenders.
  - (Hanson & Bussiere, 1998; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004)
- It is estimated that between 5% and 14% of them will be rearrested for a new sex crime within the first few years of their release.
  - (Levenson, Prescott, & D’Amora, 2010; Nicholaichuk, Gordon, Gu, & Wong, 2000; Beech, Mandeville-Norden, & Goodwill, 2012)
- 58% of sex offenders never attend treatment and 68% of those who begin treatment do not complete it.
  - (Langevin, 2006).
- Those who remain in the program until it is complete but do not reach the treatment program goals have higher recidivism rates than those who similarly complete treatment but achieve the goals.
  - (Marques et al., 2005)
Good Lives Model

• Good Lives Model: a strengths-based approach to offender rehabilitation that asserts that individuals’ strengths as well as environmental factors are pivotal in the rehabilitation process (Barnett, Manderville-Norden, & Rokestrow, 2014; Scoones, Willis, & Grace, 2012; Ward & Stewart, 2003).
  – This model equips offenders with the knowledge, skills, opportunities, and resources necessary to satisfy their life values in ways that do not harm others.
  – Primary goods are certain states of mind, personal characteristics, and experiences such as life, inner peace, spirituality, knowledge, excellence in work, etc. and secondary goods are approach goals that provide concrete means of securing primary goods (Birgden, 2002).

• Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT)
  – Cognitive Behavioral Approach
  – Characteristics: support-oriented, cognitive-based, and collaborative
Background of Programs

- The sex offender programs (iHeLP, oHeLP, & bHeLP) are offered to inmates when they are approaching eligibility for parole in their felony sentence.
  - iHeLP: inpatient, high risk to sexually reoffend, 2-3 years, specific housing unit, group and individual therapy.
  - oHeLP: outpatient, moderate risk to sexually reoffend, about a year to complete, group therapy.
  - bHeLP: outpatient, low risk to sexually reoffend, 9 weeks

- Admission Criteria:
  - Screened by clinicians based on Static 99-R, Stable, and Acute, Pre-sentence Investigation, class study, staff input, and institutional behavior.
  - Sex offenders who deny their offense are not excluded from treatment.
Research Question

• Do people who complete sex offender treatment programs while incarcerated have lower recidivism rates than people who don’t?
  – Population: males released during FY2012 and FY2013 who had sex offender treatment program recommendations
  – Treatment Group: Satisfactory or adequate progression
  – Comparison Group: Unsatisfactory progression, termination, withdrawals

• Original analytic strategy: Propensity Score Matching
  – Simulate random assignment into treatment and control condition
  – Not enough data for causal analysis

• Adjusted strategy: Exploratory study
  – Identify differences on key characteristics
  – Explore foundational information for future research
Sample

- Male inmates released from correctional facilities in a Midwestern state with sex offender treatment recommendations
  - 4,275 total releases in Fiscal Years 2012 & 2013
  - 251 (5.9 %) of releases had sex offender treatment recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comparison Group (64.9%)</th>
<th>Treatment Group (35.1%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bHeLP</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oHeLP</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iHeLP</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recidivism 2012 & 2013

Total Sample size = 251

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Total Recidivated</th>
<th>New Recidivists</th>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recidivism & Program Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Recidivated</td>
<td>13 Recidivated</td>
<td>28 Recidivists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment Group:** Those that completed program adequately/satisfactory.

**Comparison Group:** Those that dropped out/ had recommendation and did not start/ completed unsuccessfully.

Other Programming for Recidivists:
- Had a violence recommendation (n=3)
- Had a substance use recommendation (n=12)

Not Statistically significant, $p=.11$
### Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recidivated</td>
<td>NOT Recidivated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recidivated</td>
<td>NOT Recidivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bHeLP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oHeLP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iHeLP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Demographics

## Race Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Age at Release Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Release</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 &amp; Up</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Original Convictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Crime Type</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact-Child</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact-Adult</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Violation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sex Related</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Release Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release Type</th>
<th>Comparison Group (n=170)</th>
<th>Treatment Group (n=89)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parole</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical violation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law violation on Parole</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law violation after Parole</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discharge</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Reason for Return to Prison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recidivism Crime Type</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paroled</td>
<td>Discharged</td>
<td>Paroled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contact –Child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact-Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact-Adult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Law Violation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sex Related Law Violation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sex Related Technical Parole Violation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Considerations

- Program design and target population
  - Good Lives Model research primarily based in Canada and UK
  - Studies of GLM effectiveness in US tied primarily to community settings
  - No known studies of GLM applied in US prison setting
  - Importance of fidelity of program implementation
  - Significant cultural differences between US and Canada/UK
- Outcome measurement (Relationships, unemployment, financial stability)
- Individual Characteristics
  - Sentence length
  - Pre- and post-incarceration risk assessment scores
  - Recidivism offenses
- Follow-up Period
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### Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact-Child Offense Arrest</th>
<th>Contact-Adult Offense Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERSTATE TRANSFER SEXOFFENSE</td>
<td>SEXUAL ABUSE OF INMATE/PAROLEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXUAL ASSULT OF CHILD 2ND DEG</td>
<td>SEXUAL ASSAULT 1ST DEGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXUAL ASSULT OF CHILD 1ST DEG</td>
<td>SEXUAL ASSAULT 2ND DEGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXUAL ASSULT OF CHILD 3RD DEG</td>
<td>SEXUAL ASSAULT 3RD DEGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXUAL ASSAULT ON A CHILD</td>
<td>SEX ABUSE/PRCTED INDIV 1ST DEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCEST</td>
<td>SEX ABUSE/PRCTED INDIV 2ND DEG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>