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**Abstract:** Offenders who are returning back into society from jails or prisons face difficulties and need support to succeed in their transition. The Preventing Parolee Crime Program (PPCP) is a community-based program located in California and by the Department of Correction. The mission of the program is to reduce parolee recidivism rates by providing service. The programs consist of employment services, housing assistance, substance abuse treatment, and literacy training. This report will explain and evaluate effectiveness of the PPCP intervention programs. The review of this program involves two studies that have been conducted on PPCP program, a review of PPCP intervention programs/strategy on other crime prevention websites, the existence of any PPCP programs in the city of Rochester NY as well as other communities, and the types of crime this program is intended to reduce.

1. Describe it:

The Preventing Parolee Crime Program was funded in 1998 by the California State Legislature and is run by the California Department of Corrections. This program supports returning offenders who are on parole to the community. The ex-offenders are provided with the appropriate services that they will need to succeed in their transition into the community. The re-entry programs that are included in the PPCP program consists of six service providers that offer drug abuse treatment, job training and placement services, math and literacy skill development, and housing. The program’s intentions are to reduce crime and the incarceration of parolees. The program was created to address the problem of high recidivism rates in California by paroles. Recidivism in this context means the re-incarceration of an ex-offender. Overall, the goal of the program is to aid the ex-offenders in becoming a productive in their communities after incarceration.

2. Is the program or something similar reviewed on [http://www.crimesolutions.gov/](http://www.crimesolutions.gov/) or Blueprints for Violence Prevention ([http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/](http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/))?
Yes, this program has been reviewed on the crimesolutions.gov. The PPCP program was rated as promising, meaning that there has been some evidence indicating that the program works. According to the crime solution website, it is shown that parolees who participate in the PPCP program have a lower rate of recidivism then that of non-PPCP paroles. The PPCP program is still active today. This program or anything similar was not reviewed on Blueprints for Violence Prevention.

3. **What types of crime is it intended to prevent or reduce?**

The PPCP program is intended to prevent and reduce crimes that are being committed by ex-offenders, as well to prevent technical violations. It is also focused on reducing public disorder crimes, drug and alcohol offenses, and other types of crimes against a person. Being that the programs mission is to reduce recidivism rates among parolees, the crime reduction and prevention efforts are concentrated on the parolee’s crimes and not on non-parolees.

4. **Is there a clear theoretical foundation?**

Yes, there is a clear theoretical foundation to PPCP. Parolees are provided with services that can aid them in successfully transitioning back into society. With the success of parolee integration into society, the numbers of parolee’s re-offending will be lower than that of non-parolees. Overall, the program wants to lower the number of people in prison and, by supporting these individuals in integrating back into society, can help reduce the numbers of prisoners.

5. **Is there a direct, indirect or no clear link to Crime reduction?**

The PPCP program has a direct link to crime reduction among parolees. The program is focuses on parolees and the reduction of re-offending. It’s direct because the PPCP program
mission is to reduce recidivism rate among parolees, therefore concentrating their attention on discontinuing crimes committed by these ex-offenders.

6. **Describe the logic model. Diagram it. How is it intended to reduce crime?**

   Below is a diagram that demonstrates the logic of the program in detail.

   ![Logic Model Diagram]

This program is intended to reduce crime by providing services and supporting the needs of parolees in their reintegration back into society. This will aid them in become productive and not re-committing other offenses.

7. **Does this program or strategy exist in this community? If yes, what agency is it operated through? How long has it been in existence here? How is it funded?**

   Yes, there is similar program that exist in Rochester NY. The Monroe County Re-Entry Task Force provides services to high-risk offenders who are returning back to society from prison as well as lowering the number of recidivism rates. The program works closely with the NYS Division of Parole and the NYS Department of Correctional Services. The MCRTF is run
through the Catholic Family Center and has been in existence since 1917, but at that time it was not known as MCRTF but as a program that helped men released from prison find employment. The program is state funded as well as supported by community contributions.

8. Does it exist in other communities? If yes, where?

Programs like PPCP that are motivated in reducing the numbers of recidivism rates among ex-offenders who are re-integrating back into society are all found throughout the U.S. the map below can be found at http://www.nationalreentryresourcecenter.org/national-criminal-justice-initiatives-map. The map highlights the national reentry and other criminal justice initiatives that are designed to reduce recidivism rates of ex-offenders who are returning from jail, prison, and juvenile facilities according to the National Reentry Resource Center. These programs also aid ex-offenders in successfully transitioning back into society.

When visiting the website one can click on the state to see a list of its programs. This map gives us a clear picture of the effort that states are putting in when it proteins to aiding ex-offender in their transition.

Yes, research does exist on its effectiveness. Research shows that the PPCP program reduces re-incarceration rates among parolees. Parolees who use the services provided up PPCP have a low chance in re-incarceration than that of non-PPCP parolees. It is also shown that even exposure to PPCP services can impact re-incarceration rate. Studies show that the longer the parolee stays in the program the more effective the service will be for that parolee. Overall, PPCP demonstrates to have an effective on the number of re-incarcerated parolees.


10. Provide a review of the research
   a. What was the research design.

Sheldon X. Zhang, Robert E.L. Roberts, and Valerie J. Callanan conducted a cost-benefit study of the statewide program involving community-based services for parolees in California, which is focused on California’s Preventing Parolee Crime Program (PPCP). To conduct this study the researchers used four major components. According to Zhang, Roberts and Callanan (2006), the four components used are as followed:

1. To determine an observation period for the assessment of costs and benefits.
2. Calculating the cost basis for the PPCP services during the observation period.
3. Estimate the extent of any beneficial program effect on parolee recidivism and the financial benefits flowing from them.

4. Calculate the ratios of financial benefits to program costs.

The PPCP program started to receive their funding in 1998 and the observation period of the program began in 2000 and ended in 2003. According to the researcher’s (2006), the study used the entire statewide non-PPCP releases as it comparison population (pg.344). The strategy that was used by the researchers to calculate the financial benefits of the PPCP was to focus on potential incarceration costs avoided due to the effectiveness of program intervention (Zhang, Roberts, and Callanan, 2006, pg.344). The study also estimated on the program effectiveness by looking at ex-offenders who received the PPCP services and those who did not. The costs of the PPCP program were also estimated to show program effectiveness. The researchers showed this by compared the PPCP program costs to incarceration costs.

Sheldon X. Zhang, Robert E.L Roberts, and Valerie J. Callanan also conduct an evaluation on the Preventing Parolees Crime Program (PPCP) and its effects on recidivism and re-incarceration rates. In this study the researchers use a result-oriented approach and come up with three research questions.

1. To what extent did the PPCP as a whole reduce recidivism and re-incarceration?
2. To what extent did each of the individual programs affect recidivism and re-incarceration?
3. To what extent did the duration and quality of a parolee’s participation in the PPCP services affect the likelihood of his or her recidivism and/or re-incarceration?
In this study the population consisted of all California parolees who were released to parole between 2000 and 2002. According to the researchers (2006), the primary unit of analysis was the time spent on active parole (“parole spell”) between the parole release date and either one of the following: an exit from parole because of re-incarceration or disappearance and the ending date of June 30, 2003. (pg.7). June 30th was selected in this method because it ensures at least a 1 year observation period for every parole spell in this study.

b. Describe the data.

The data that was used in this study come from three sources. The first source was official automated recording system maintained by the California Department of Corrections (CDC), which included the Offender-Based Information System (OBIS) and the statewide Parole Data Base (SPDB). This data followed the movements of the paroles throughout the California prison and parole system (Zhang, Roberts, and Callanan, 2006, pg.345). It also proved the researchers with the criminal history and background demographics of the parolees. The second source was the treatment tracking data which was collected by the PPCP service provider and forwarded to the CDC was also used. This data source provided the researchers with information about the numbers of parolees who used the PPCP services. It also provided the researchers with what specific program was used and the outcome of the services that were provided. The third source was the program expenditures obtained from CDC internal accounting documents, such as the invoiced amounts paid to service providers, management oversight staff costs, and cost of the programs evaluation (Zhang, Roberts, and Callanan, 2006, pg.345).

The data used in the evaluation on the Preventing Parolees Crime Program (PPCP) and its effects on recidivism and re-incarceration rates, come from two primary sources. The first sources used come from the California Department of Correction’s official record of parolee
movement into and out of parole, which was stored in two databases: Offender-Based Information System and Statewide Parole Data Base. The second sources of data used in the study come from service provider records of parolee participation in the program. This study also consists of two groups, the treatment group and the comparison. As stated by the researchers (2006), a multivariate linear modeling approach was employed to assess the effects of the program participation on recidivism, while controlling for potential differences in recidivism risk factors across the treatment and comparison group (pg.10).

**c. Summarize the findings.**

The researchers found that a total of 28,708 paroles were released and admitted into PPCP services during the study period. According to the researcher’s (2006), during their study there were 211,211 releases that did not include admission to PPCP services (pg.345). When it comes to the similarity of PPCP parolee and non-PPCP parolee the researchers found a high degree of similarity between the two. They did find some minor differences between the two groups related to race and gender. It was found that the percentage of African-Americans among the PPCP participants was higher than others.

The researchers also discovered that paroles enrolled in the PPCP remained out of prison for a period for an average of 446.7 days compared to 393.1 days for non-PPCP participants. It was also found that parolees who completed their services remained prison-free for 522.6 days during this study. When conducting the cost-benefit analysis the researchers discovered that within two years the average cost per-client amounted to $302.54. Cost-benefit findings indicated that the PPCP was cost-effective during the study observation period. There were also no statistically significant differences between both groups with recognition to recidivism. Overall, the researchers found that their cost-benefit study indicated that the statewide services
under PPCP not only reduced rate of re-incarceration among its participants, but it also resulted in saving greater than the investment made (Zhang, Roberts, and Callanan, 2006, pg. 348).

In the PPCP and re-incarceration study, the researchers found that 44.8% of PPCP participants were re-incarcerated within 12-months compared to non-PPCP participants that had a 52.8% in-incarceration rate within 12-months. As stated by Zhang, Roberts, and Callanan (2006), PPCP participants who met at least one program’s treatment goal had a recidivism rate of 20.1% below non-PPCP participants and those who had met more than one treatment goal had a re-incarceration rate of 47.1% below the comparison (pg.13). Overall, they found that meeting PPCP treatment goals were consistently associated with lower rates of returning back to prison and absconding, across all service components. It was also shown that even parolees who were unable to complete their enrolled services still benefited from their exposure to the services.

11. How would you rate this program or strategy?
   a. **Generally recognized as effective**
   b. Good likelihood that it is effective
   c. Inconclusive
   d. Probably not effective
   e. Generally recognized as not effective
   f. Harmful or likely to be harmful

12. **Explain your rating.**

   I rated the PPCP program as generally recognized as effective; because research shows that the PPCP does indeed reduce the numbers of parolees who return back into the prison system. I feel that the parolees are provided with the accurate services needed to aid them in re-entering successfully back into the community. Generally, the studies show that there is a difference
between parolees who receive PPCP service and non-PPCP parolees. It shows that parolees who use the services do indeed succeed in the re-entry process than that of non-PPCP parolees.

13. Finally, provide a one paragraph summary of the program, the findings and your recommendation.

This program aids returning offenders who are on parole. The ex-offenders are provided with the appropriate services that they will need to succeed in their transition into the community. The reentry programs that are included in PPCP program consists of six service providers that offer drug abuse treatment, job training and placement services, math and literacy skill development, and housing. The studies above found that that meeting PPCP treatment goals were consistently associated with lower rates of returning back to prison and that the statewide services under PPCP not only reduced rate of re-incarceration among its participants, but it also resulted in savings. The studies show that re-entry services do indeed aid ex-offenders in their return back into society.

However, in the PPCP studies it was found that parolees who used PPCP service have a lower chance of being re-incarcerated than non-PPCP parolees, but not by a statistically significant difference. I will recommend that not only should an evaluation of the program be conducted, but the input of the parolees who are receiving PPCP service should be sought as well. Getting the parolees input of what work for him/her or what doesn’t work, can help the providers pinpoint the best services for their clients. Thus, this can have even a reducing impact on the numbers of parolees who re-enter back into the prison system. Also an evaluation on ex-offenders on probation as well as juveniles who are returning back to the community should also be conducted.