



The University of New Mexico

**Second Chance Center
Preliminary Process
Evaluation Study**

October 2008

Paul Guerin, Ph.D.

**Prepared for:
State of New Mexico and the
Second Chance Center**

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

The Second Chance Center in New Mexico officially opened in September 2006. Through mid-May 2008, 482 offenders had been referred to the program and 147 offenders had been admitted. As of mid-May 2008 42 offenders were students in the program.

In July 2007 the Institute for Social Research at the University of New Mexico received funds from the N.M. Legislature through N.M. Highlands University to conduct a process evaluation of the Second Chance Center in Bernalillo County New Mexico. N.M. Highlands University originally received these funds for the Second Chance Program in SB 190 (FY 2006). A one-page response from the Second Chance Center about this report is included as Appendix A.

The Second Chance Center (SCC) is designed as a secure, long-term, rehabilitation facility providing alternative sentencing for the judiciary in New Mexico. Typically, defendants who are facing a six months to a year sentence, probation/parole violators, or those in an early release/transition program can be referred to the facility by the judiciary (<http://www.secondchancecenter.net/reference-materials.php>). This is differentiated from the Second Chance Program (SCP) which is the actual program provided in the SCC. In this report we differentiate between the two by using the name for each, the acronym for each, or variously referring to the “Center” or “Program”.

The Center is designed to primarily house criminal justice offenders with substance abuse problems and according to program materials the SCC model excludes sex offenders and most violent offenders. Eligible offenders must not currently be receiving mental health treatment or medical treatment for an illness that would inhibit them from participating in the program and offenders must have a verifiable substance abuse problem. Eligible offenders should be subject to at least a six-month sentence or have that much time remaining on a sentence to be eligible. An offender may be sentenced to the SCC or volunteer to participate as a condition of his sentence. The SCC model is designed to be a “secure” residential facility. Offenders are required to sign an agreement to participate in “good faith” and not leave the facility and the facility is secure. Offenders who are terminated from the program and fail to complete the SCC program are referred back to the sentencing judge and district attorney for disposition of their case. Students who complete the program are, if directed by the court released directly or returned to the court.

Participants live in a dormitory style pod of 56 beds. The pod is equipped with pay phones and a free phone for use by indigents, a variety of games, books, a ping pong table, a television, and mailboxes. Services include Sunday Church services, a weekly commissary, daily outdoor recreation as weather permits, laundry service, uniforms, and basic hygiene supplies.

The typical day varies but is regimented and at the time of our study lasted from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. and includes meetings, job assignments, classroom study, group meetings, seminars, scheduled personal time, exercise and recreation, and individual sessions. The Second Chance Program curriculum is closely related to Criminon from which it licenses the techniques and materials used in its program that includes some aspects of Narconon. The Second Chance Program incorporates components of Criminon (a prison based rehabilitation program based upon techniques developed by L. Ron Hubbard, founder of the

Church of Scientology) and Narconon (a drug rehabilitation program that includes drug-free withdrawal, using vitamins and mineral supplements in tandem with training procedures adapted from basic courses in Criminon). The Narconon section of the program focuses on alleviating drug cravings based on a perspective that addiction involves a biochemical process in which the body has been poisoned and weakened by the use of drugs. According to program administrators the Second Chance Program while using content of Criminon and Narconon which is based upon techniques developed by L. Ron Hubbard, founder of the Church of Scientology, is entirely secular.

According to Second Chance Center literature the Second Chance Program consists of five core modules, the *Drug Rehabilitation Module*, the *Study Skills Module*, the *Self Respect Module*, *Life Skills Module*, and the *Reintegration Module*. The first four modules are delivered in the secure residential facility, on an intensive eight-hour a day, six-day a week course schedule over an average of six to eight months. The *Reintegration Module* begins in the facility and is continued post release to reintegrate successful offenders back into their communities. This is discussed more completely later in the report.

The Second Chance Program is a non-medical, social rehabilitation model using a manualized treatment approach and does not use licensed counselors or therapists. Each step of the program has a checklist giving the materials to be studied and drills to be done in a specified sequence, which guides the participant's progress through the courses at his own rate. According to the program the courses specifically address common deficits found in offenders with substance abuse histories, such as cognitive behavioral skills, life skills, and the development of moral values and restoration of self-esteem. According to program materials addressing these deficits will have a positive impact on the development of pro-social behaviors and reduced recidivism.

Manualized treatment is based upon the use of empirically based manuals in therapy settings. A significant area of contention in the use of manualized treatment relates to beliefs about how the manuals are applied. Those in favor of manualized treatment favor standardized therapy and suggest integrity to a manual allows staff to deliver the most effective treatment for a specific condition or diagnosis. Those more opposed to the use of manualized treatment suggest manualized treatment ignores the unique needs of individuals (Sanderson, 2006).

In January 2006 the Urban Institute funded by the Association for Better Living and Education (ABLE International), the non-profit organizations that administers Criminon and Narconon, completed the first phase of a two phase study on Criminon. The first phase focused on a process evaluation of Criminon. The report describes the content and delivery of the Criminon curriculum, reviews available literature regarding "best practices" in prisoner rehabilitation programming, conducted site visits with a number of existing Criminon programs, and assessed the extent to which Criminon is consistent with what research suggests are likely to be the most effective approaches to the behavioral reform of prisoners (LaVigne, Naser, and Owens, 2006).

The report describes the four core Criminon course modules, provides a brief description of complementary course offerings, describes the theory and logic of Criminon, and provides a review of evaluation literature on prison rehabilitation programs. Finally, the report

concludes with a description of elements of Criminon that are consistent with promising rehabilitation strategies.

The report notes the Criminon program contains many elements of effective cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT). According to the study, the Criminon curriculum places a strong emphasis on positive behavior change through changes in the way one thinks about his/her behavior, relationships and how those factor influence one's own life and the lives of those around him/her, self-respect and self-esteem, taking care of one's self, respecting others, fostering healthy relationships and behaviors (i.e. reducing criminal activity and substance abuse), reducing contacts with individuals who engage in anti-social activities (i.e criminal activity and substance abuse), and anger management. The report notes a unique approach of the program's curriculum is the intent to provide program participants with an understanding of how the learning process works and what skills they need to engage in the processes of studying, learning, and applying what they learn. This is different than the typical approach of teaching subject matter (i.e. reading, writing, and math). According to the report the Criminon program is highly adaptive because it can be delivered to juveniles, males and females, prison populations, and drug addicted individuals in the community.

The report notes that perhaps the single deficit of the Criminon program is it does not formally address the continuity of care from prison to the community. The report notes Criminon often links with Narconon, a fellow program administered by ABLE International, which is designed as a drug detoxification program. Narconon is briefly discussed next.

The Second Chance Center uses the sauna detoxification protocol of Narconon. This method of detoxification was developed by L. Ron Hubbard. The method is designed to detoxify the body and eliminate drugs and toxins and restore metabolic balance. The sauna is used as a method to manage some of the physical side effects of drug use and to alleviate drug cravings (Paredes, 2006). This step of the program is named the *New Life Detoxification Program*. The complete Narconon Program uses a number of different steps that includes drug prevention and education programs. These programs include a *Communications Course*, *Learning Improvement Course*, *Ups and Downs in Life Course*, *Personal Values and Integrity Course*, *Changing Conditions of Life Course*, *Way to Happiness Course*, and *Communication and Perception Course* (<http://www.narconon.org>). Many of these courses are similar to those offered by Criminon. Narconon and the Second Chance Program do not use traditional addiction treatment that is based primarily on counseling and nor does it use medications such as methadone or buprenorphine.

SCC Eligibility

The SCC receives its students from judicial referrals and accepts referrals for persons who are either incarcerated or facing incarceration. Eligibility criteria include:

- Must be male;
- Must exhibit a chronic substance abuse problem;
- Must be facing, or have remaining on his sentence at least six (6) months, preferably one year;
- Must not have any serious medical issues, be under psychiatric care or on psychotropic medications;
- Must not be facing charges involving a serious violent offense;
- Must not be a sex offender.

SCC Referrals

Referrals to the SCC are accepted from state, magistrate, municipal, metropolitan, federal, and tribal courts. Individuals not involved in the criminal justice system can also be referred to the SCC. According to program materials the following types of criminal justice system referrals are allowed:

- Initial Sentencing – Judges may place an offender on unsupervised or supervised probation on the condition that he enter and successfully complete the SCC. If unsuccessful, the offender would be returned to jail pending a hearing before the sentencing court.
- Probation Violation – Judges may refer an offender to the SCC if they violate probation
- Pre-Trial – Judges may refer offenders who are not able to bond out of jail pending trial. Proceedings in the offender’s criminal case should be stayed if this alternative is used.
- Parole Violation – The New Mexico Parole Board may order offenders to the SCC if they violate parole.
- Modification of Sentence – An offender may request a modification of their sentence that includes completion of the SCC.

Offenders can be referred by a judge, attorney, probation officer, or other staff who work with a Public Defender office or court (i.e. Social Worker). Typically, the process is initiated by the submission of a complete admissions application that is available on the Second Chance Center website (<http://www.secondchancecenters.com>) from the referral source. Second Chance Center staff is also available to visit District Courts in New Mexico to explain the program to Judge’s, Attorney’s and others and solicit referrals. Recently, the Second Chance Center negotiated agreements with a number of New Mexico counties to receive sentenced offenders who otherwise would be sentenced to a local detention facility.

Second Chance Center staff then conducts telephone or in-person interviews with potentially eligible individuals. This interview includes questions about the individual’s medical history, criminal history, and drug use history. Following the interview criminal background checks with a commercial vendor are completed. According to Center policy the completed file is then reviewed by a panel of SCC staff that may include the Executive Director, Medical Director, Admissions Director, and Course Supervisor. Referring individuals (i.e. judges) are informed about approved and rejected applicants. Approved individuals and involved parties are notified and sent an acceptance letter. Rejected individuals are also notified and basic information is entered into an electronic Microsoft Excel file maintained by the program.

After individuals are accepted by the SCP and ordered to attend a copy of the court Judgment and Sentence or other paperwork (i.e. Order Revoking Probation, Release Order, Order Deferring Sentence, and Order to Release Defendant to Third Party Custody) is supposed to be requested and if necessary an order to transport the individual to the Second Chance Center is completed.

According to program materials, upon successful completion of the program individuals may be released on supervised probation or may have a hearing before the sentencing judge to amend or defer their sentence (if they are in the program on an Order Deferring Sentence).

Programming

The SCP program is a long-term, social rehabilitation model delivered in a secure treatment facility designed to focus the offender on rehabilitation. As noted earlier the program utilizes Criminon and Narconon materials. Criminon manuals focus on emphasizing positive change through the development of pro-social attitudes such as:

- self control
- critical reasoning
- development of moral reasoning skills
- development of life skills
- self-esteem
- problem solving
- coping resources

The SCP is organized into five modules that are comprised of various courses. The next section briefly describes courses offered by the SCP organized by module and connects SCP courses by module to the related Criminon and/or Narconon course on which SCP courses are based.

The 147 students included in our study participated in 16 different courses. Table 1 (page 7) matches 14 of the different courses to the 5 core SCC modules. The *Bright Sky Literacy* course is designed to improve the literacy level of those students who because of their current literacy level cannot adequately participate in the program. This program is provided to students whose reading level is below what is needed to successfully participate in certain courses. The *Way to Happiness* course was occasionally provided to students. This course and the *Self Respect Part 1, Self Respect Part 2 and Self Respect Part 3* courses are similar.

Drug Rehabilitation Module

The SCP *Drug Rehabilitation Module* contains 5 courses. The *Orientation* course provides a brief introduction to the Center and Program including Center and Program rules. This course is meant to be completed in one to two days. There is no equivalent Criminon or Narconon course. The *Communication Course*, licensed by Criminon, covers a number of topics with a focus on teaching students to communicate clearly and articulately as well as how to respond appropriately and calmly to questions posed by others. A series of drills are used to reinforce key principles of communication.

The next course is the *Sauna Detox* course. This step of the complete Narconon program is intended to remove drug residues and other toxic substances from the body as well as reduce drug cravings. According to Narconon materials these residues remain locked in fatty tissues of the body and can be released into the blood stream years after the person has stopped taking drugs. The residuals can cause cravings for more drugs and need to be eliminated from the body. This removal is accomplished through an intervention that includes a regimen of exercise, sauna and vitamin and mineral supplements (<http://www.narconon.org>).

A daily regimen of physical exercise for 30 minutes is followed by continuous sweating in a sauna for 2.5 - 5 hours with short breaks for hydration to offset the loss of body fluids and cooling. Nutritional and mineral supplements are provided that center on gradually increasing doses of the vitamin niacin to enhance the release of lipids (fat-soluble molecules

such as fats, oils, waxes, and cholesterol) and increase circulation. Additional vitamins, minerals, electrolytes, and oils that includes vitamins A, D, C, E, B complex, B1; multi-minerals including calcium, magnesium, iron, zinc, manganese, copper, and iodine; sodium and potassium; and a blend of polyunsaturated oils including soy, walnut, peanut, and safflower are also provided. The program does not use drugs or medications and instead uses nutrition and nutritional supplements as important components (Paredes, 2006, <http://www.narconon.org>).

According to the Narconon International website (<http://www.narconon.org>) persons in Narconon programs should receive full medical physicals, a medical doctor's permission to participate in the program, and periodic medical reviews as needed. According to SCP staff a physical is completed for each student and each student is medically cleared to participate in the Sauna Detox course. The complete Narconon program takes four to six months to complete and includes a discharge plan and re-entry program.

The *Advanced Communication A* and *B* courses are equivalent to the Narconon *Communication and Perception* course. These two courses are designed to give students the ability to more fully communicate with others and their environment. In these two courses students redo a number of the lessons required in the *Communications Course* and also complete a series of new exercises which are designed to raise the perception and ability of students to handle the environment and control their lives. Each student also helps another student with the exercises. In taking responsibility for helping another, their own responsibility is increased and their ability to handle life and help others.

Study Skills Module

The Study Skills Module is comprised of a single course with the same name. The SCP *Study Skills* course is similar to the Criminon *Learning Skills for Life* and the Narconon *Learning Improvement* course. This course teaches students how to study, how to overcome the barriers to comprehension, how to retain knowledge, and apply what they have learned.

Self-Respect Module

The Self-Respect Module is comprised of three courses. The three SCP *Self Respect* courses use the Criminon *Way to Happiness* manual with additional drills and essays to help further develop moral code concepts. The *Way to Happiness* course teaches the student a non-sectarian moral code which is a guide to living a happy life based on the book *The Way to Happiness*. The *Way to Happiness* course during this study was not a regular part of the module and was offered infrequently.

Life Skills Module

The Life Skills Modules is comprised of three courses. The SCP *Changing Conditions of Life* course uses the Criminon *Improving Conditions In Life* course. This course helps students recognize their current condition in life. According to this course oftentimes when an individual has reached the point of criminal or unethical behavior, they have lost the ability (or never had the ability) to recognize their current condition in life. This course teaches a student to recognize the different conditions that a person or activity can be in as well and the steps to take to improve conditions of life.

The SCP *Ups and Downs in Life* course and *Potential Trouble Source Handling* course use the Criminon *How to Deal with Ups and Downs in Life* course. This section of the Criminon Program deals with establishing the skill to chart one's own course in life, with honesty and integrity, and to spot and handle negative personal associations which would tend to lead one astray.

The course teaches students the characteristics of both anti-social personalities and social personalities, so that they may recognize both and know the differences between the two. That way, they can better choose their friends and associates, and become more aware of their own attitudes and be made less susceptible to those who would have them revert to crime.

According to the Narconon International website (http://www.narconon.org/narconon_drug_rehabilitation/narconon_rehabprogram) the *Ups and Downs* course gives the student the ability to spot and handle those influences in his environment that would cause him to lose any gains he has made. Students learn the characteristics of the social personality as well as those of the anti-social personality so students can spot the differences and better choose friends and associates. According to Narconon materials completing this course makes students less susceptible to individuals who would influence them to revert to drugs.

Reintegration Module

Finally, the SCP contains the *Reintegration Module* with two courses offered in the facility. Prior to discharge from the program students are supposed to complete these courses. The *Transition Preparedness* course and *Life Review* course do not have an equivalent Criminon or Narconon course.

Table 1 Second Chance Modules and Courses

| SCP Modules | Second Chance Program Courses |
|----------------------------|---|
| Drug Rehabilitation Module | Orientation Communication Sauna Detox Advanced Communication A Advanced Communication B |
| Study Skills Module | Study Skills |
| Self-Respect Module | Self-Respect 1 Self-Respect 2 Self-Respect 3 Way to Happiness |
| Life Skills Module | Changing Conditions of Life Ups and Downs Potential Trouble Source Handling |
| Reintegration Module | Transition Preparedness Life Review |

The Second Chance Program *Reintegration Module* is designed to be continued post release for six months in three steps. The post discharge part of this module is designed to address the

immediate needs of students as it relates to re-establishing their life in local communities that includes housing and employment. The module also addresses the need to move students from a life of basic sustenance to a life of accomplishments. This step helps address areas of life that includes career planning, further education, financial planning, and relationship planning. According to the program, this step teaches students to conduct their lives with plans for the future versus living day by day. The third step assists students in implementing their 'life plan' with an emphasis on increasing self-reliance and decreasing reliance on outside agencies to foster success in life.

Second Chance Program Staff

Second Chance Program staff is composed of the instructors who provide the courses and administrators. According to the report published by the Urban Institute (2006)

“...Criminon instructors typically have experience and/or training in education or the social sciences, or have life or employment histories working with similar populations. However, there are no strict educational or employment requirements beyond a functional high school literacy level. As a result, instructors represent many walks of life – from ex-offender Criminon program graduates to corrections staff to volunteers from the community who may have no formal connection to the criminal justice system.” (page 21).

Also, according to Criminon materials, instructors complete the Criminon courses they supervise the students on to ensure they understand the course materials and what the courses can achieve with an individual. Program staff who are instructors are full- or part-time paid employees. According to Second Chance Center Administrators Second Chance Center Program staff is trained following Criminon and Narconon guidelines. The Second Chance Program does not employ any licensed counselors or therapists.

STUDY METHODOLOGY

Evaluation Study Design

The evaluation study design of the Second Chance Center focuses on a process evaluation. This is necessary to accurately document the development and implementation of the program. It will be necessary to complete a process evaluation before conducting an outcome evaluation that focuses on the effectiveness of the SCP.

The successful completion of a process evaluation and outcome evaluation is predicated on sufficient resources and time. What follows is a description of the methodology for the process evaluation and a brief description of a possible outcome evaluation.

Process Study Methodology

Process evaluations are aimed at understanding the internal dynamics of how a program operates. Process data permits judgments to be made about the extent to which the program is operating the way it is supposed to be operating. It also reveals areas in which relationships can be improved as well as highlighting strengths of the program that should be preserved. Process descriptions are also useful in permitting people not intimately involved in a program, for example: external funding sources, public officials, external agencies, to understand how a program operates. This permits external persons to make better decisions about the program. Process evaluations are particularly useful for

dissemination and replication of model interventions where a program has served as a demonstration project or is considered to be a model worthy of replications (Patton, 1986).

It is important to know the extent to which a program is effective after it is fully implemented, but it is also important to learn how the program was actually implemented. Where outcomes are evaluated without knowledge of implementation, the results seldom provide a direction for action because the decisions made lack information about what produced the observed outcomes. Unless one knows that a program is operating according to design, there may be little reason to expect it to produce the desired outcomes (Patton, 1986). Furthermore, until the program is implemented and a treatment is believed to be in operation, there is little reason to evaluate outcomes.

Process evaluations focus on how something happens rather than on the outcomes or results. Programs vary in their emphasis on process. Process evaluations are aimed at understanding the internal dynamics of how a program, organization, or relationship operates. Process data permits judgments about the extent to which the program or organization is operating the way it is supposed to be operating, revealing areas in which relationships can be improved as well as highlighting strengths of the program that should be preserved. Process evaluations are also useful in permitting people not intimately involved in a program for example, external funders, public officials, and external agencies - to understand how a program operates. This permits such external persons to make more intelligent decisions about the program. Process evaluations are particularly useful for dissemination and replication of model interventions where a program has served as a demonstration project or is considered to be a model worthy of replication (Patton, 1990).

Because there is little reason to believe programs with incompletely developed processes will have positive outcomes the emphasis in this funding cycle is on documenting and informing involved stakeholders regarding the development of the proposed program. The process evaluation focuses on the program clients (called students in the program). Available referral information, student demographics (e.g., ethnicity and age), current criminal charges, court information, and service information is reviewed.

The process evaluation of the program involves several tasks. First, we review program materials to better understand how the program operates from referral to discharge. Second, we conducted a small number of observations of program courses to better understand how the program operates. Third, we collected student level information that will allow us to report the progress of students from entry in the program to exit. Fourth, we conducted a survey of security and program staff and fifth, we collected limited recidivism information (new court cases and probation violations). Together these pieces of information allow us to document the development of the Second Chance Center program and later help determine its effectiveness.

Once a process evaluation is completed and we have an idea that the program is operating according to design an outcome evaluation will be possible.

Outcome Study Methodology

The second component is the performance of an outcome evaluation. It is important to study the extent to which a program is effective after it is implemented for a number of

reasons. First, knowledge involving clients and a program can be used in an interactive manner to create a self-correcting system and to improve programs. Second, both funding sources and service providers have a vested interest in utilizing scarce resources in the most effective manner. Third, outcome evaluation findings, if valid and reliable, can be used to make programs more useful to the target population.

The outcome evaluation's goal is to determine whether the program has accomplished the overall goal of increasing public safety by reducing recidivism among the population served by the program.

The outcome evaluation is intended to assess the effectiveness of the Second Chance Center by comparing key outcomes for those who participate in Second Chance Center programming with comparable individuals not participating in the Second Chance Center program.

STUDENT DATA ANALYSIS

Our study includes all offenders who had been referred and enrolled in the program between September 2006 and mid-May 2008. During this time 482 offenders were referred to the program, 147 offenders were admitted, and 105 offenders were discharged. As of mid May 2008 42 offenders were students in the program.

Referrals

The Second Chance Center in New Mexico officially opened in September 2006. Through mid-May 2008 482 offenders had been referred to the program and 147 offenders had been admitted. The remaining referred offenders had either not been accepted for a variety of reasons or they were still waiting to be paneled and their acceptance or rejection was pending. Reasons for non-acceptance included the offender did not need the services of the program – i.e., they did not have a substance abuse problem, they chose not to go to the program (some may have selected some other program), they were sentenced to jail or prison, they were taking prescription medications, their criminal histories or their current offense was too violent (i.e. vehicular homicide, kidnapping, shooting from a motor vehicle), or they had a medical condition (i.e. heart problem). In our review of automated referral records maintained by the program it was not clear why some offenders had not been accepted. Missing electronic information could potentially be resolved with a more detailed review of hard copy records.

Table 2 reports the month and year of referral to the program. Through December 2006 the program received 178 referrals. Referral records maintained by the SCC in an electronic file were missing the referral date for 123 of the referred offenders. Fifty-one percent of the referrals were received in the three months before the program opened and within the first four months the program had opened.

Table 2 Referrals by Month

| Month and Year | Count | Percent |
|----------------|-------|---------|
| June 2006 | 3 | 0.9 |
| July 2006 | 7 | 2.0 |
| August 2006 | 20 | 5.7 |
| September 2006 | 28 | 8.0 |
| October 2006 | 36 | 10.3 |
| November 2006 | 39 | 11.2 |
| December 2006 | 45 | 12.9 |
| January 2007 | 24 | 6.9 |
| February 2007 | 11 | 3.2 |
| March 2007 | 6 | 1.7 |
| April 2007 | 13 | 3.7 |
| May 2007 | 6 | 1.7 |
| June 2007 | 14 | 4.0 |
| July 2007 | 7 | 2.0 |
| August 2007 | 8 | 2.3 |
| September 2007 | 9 | 2.6 |
| October 2007 | 6 | 1.7 |
| November 2007 | 11 | 3.2 |
| December 2007 | 12 | 3.4 |
| January 2008 | 16 | 4.6 |
| February 2008 | 18 | 5.2 |
| March 2008 | 6 | 1.7 |
| April 2008 | 2 | 0.6 |
| May 2008 | 1 | 0.3 |

Missing 123

Table 3 reports the judicial districts from which individuals were referred. The largest number of referrals came from the Second Judicial District, followed by the Eighth Judicial District and the Fourth Judicial District. The Tenth Judicial District, Sixth Judicial District, and Twelfth Judicial District accounted for the fewest referrals. Five referrals were made by tribal courts, 8 were out of state court referrals, and two referrals were private citizens who were not involved in the criminal justice system.

Table 3 Referrals by Judicial District

| Judicial District | Count | Percent |
|------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 st Judicial District | 26 | 5.5 |
| 2 nd Judicial District | 120 | 25.4 |
| 3 rd Judicial District | 44 | 9.3 |
| 4 th Judicial District | 58 | 12.3 |
| 5 th Judicial District | 57 | 12.1 |
| 6 th Judicial District | 3 | 0.6 |
| 7 th Judicial District | 7 | 1.5 |
| 8 th Judicial District | 66 | 14.0 |
| 9 th Judicial District | 30 | 6.4 |
| 10 th Judicial District | 2 | 0.4 |
| 11 th Judicial District | 17 | 3.6 |
| 12 th Judicial District | 4 | 0.8 |
| 13 th Judicial District | 23 | 4.9 |
| Tribal | 5 | 1.1 |
| Out of State | 8 | 1.7 |
| Private | 2 | 0.4 |

Missing 8

Admissions

As noted earlier, 147 offenders were admitted as students between September 2006 and mid-May 2008. The following table (Table 4) reports the number of admitted students to the program by month and year. Within the first three months the program admitted 50 students and reached the operational capacity of 50 students. While the design capacity was 56 students the federal funding for the program limited the number of students to 50 at any one time. After reaching 50 students the Second Chance Center maintained a waiting list. Beginning in January 2007 and through April 2008 the number of accepted students ranged between 2 and 8 students a month with the exception of January 2008 when 13 students were admitted.

Table 4 Admissions by Month

| Month and Year | Count | Percent |
|----------------|-------|---------|
| September 2006 | 12 | 8.2 |
| October 2006 | 18 | 12.3 |
| November 2006 | 23 | 15.8 |
| December 2006 | 10 | 6.8 |
| January 2007 | 4 | 2.7 |
| February 2007 | 3 | 2.1 |
| March 2007 | 3 | 2.1 |
| April 2007 | 6 | 4.1 |
| May 2007 | 2 | 1.4 |
| June 2007 | 2 | 1.4 |
| July 2007 | 4 | 2.7 |
| August 2007 | 5 | 3.4 |
| September 2007 | 4 | 2.7 |
| October 2007 | 8 | 5.5 |
| November 2007 | 7 | 4.8 |
| December 2007 | 6 | 4.1 |
| January 2008 | 13 | 8.9 |
| February 2008 | 6 | 4.1 |
| March 2008 | 7 | 4.8 |
| April 2008 | 3 | 2.1 |

Missing 1

Table 5 reports race/ethnicity. The majority of individuals accepted by the program were Hispanic (65.3%), followed by Whites (20.1%), American Indians (7.6%), and African-Americans (5.6%).

Students in the program ranged from 19 years of age to 72 years of age with an average age of 32.9 years.

Table 5 Race/Ethnicity

| Race/Ethnicity | Count | Percent |
|------------------|-------|---------|
| White | 29 | 20.1 |
| African American | 8 | 5.6 |
| American Indian | 11 | 7.6 |
| Asian American | 1 | .7 |
| Hispanic | 94 | 65.3 |
| Other | 1 | .7 |

Missing 3

Table 6 reports the type of court the offender was referred and accepted from. The majority of students were referred from district courts in New Mexico (87 or 62.1%). Slightly more than 25% of students were referred from magistrate courts (26.4%), 8 (5.7%) were referred from municipal courts, and 5 (3.6%) from tribal courts. There was one private citizen who voluntarily joined the program and 2 out of state students (Missouri and Colorado) who were referred from their respective state's court system. Court information for seven

students was unknown. Because 45 of the students in the program were from a magistrate or municipal court they were in the program on a misdemeanor charge, whether it was a new crime or a probation violation. The remaining students (87) less the one private student, the five students from tribal courts, and the two out of state students, were in the program on a new felony charge or a felony probation violation.

Table 6 Court Type

| Court Type | Count | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| Municipal | 8 | 5.7 |
| Magistrate | 37 | 26.4 |
| District | 87 | 62.1 |
| Private | 1 | .7 |
| Tribal | 5 | 3.6 |
| Out of State | 2 | 1.4 |

Missing 7

The next table (Table 7) reports on the New Mexico judicial district, tribal court, or state from which each student was referred. The largest number of students was referred from the Second Judicial District (30), followed by the Eighth Judicial District (26), and then the Fourth and Fifth Judicial District with 20 referred students each. These four judicial districts accounted for almost two-thirds of all referred students. The Eleventh Judicial District Court and the Twelfth Judicial District Court each had one referral accepted, and the Tenth Judicial District Court did not have either of its' two referrals accepted. Both students listed as "out of state" were sentenced to the program from out of state courts and were privately paying for the program.

Table 7 Admitted Students by Judicial District

| Judicial District | Count | Percent |
|------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 st Judicial District | 13 | 7.8 |
| 2 nd Judicial District | 30 | 20.8 |
| 3 rd Judicial District | 5 | 3.5 |
| 4 th Judicial District | 20 | 13.9 |
| 5 th Judicial District | 20 | 13.9 |
| 6 th Judicial District | 2 | 1.4 |
| 7 th Judicial District | 2 | 1.4 |
| 8 th Judicial District | 26 | 17.4 |
| 9 th Judicial District | 12 | 8.3 |
| 10 th Judicial District | 0 | 0.0 |
| 11 th Judicial District | 1 | 0.7 |
| 12 th Judicial District | 1 | 0.7 |
| 13 th Judicial District | 4 | 2.7 |
| Tribal | 5 | 3.5 |
| Out of State | 2 | 1.4 |
| Private | 1 | 0.7 |

Missing 3

Fifty-three different judges referred the 141 accepted students (this number does not include the private student, 2 out of state students, or 3 students missing this information). The majority of judges (27) referred a single student. One judge referred 11 students and two judges referred 10 students. In 4 cases the judge was unknown (both out of state cases) and 1 case were private citizens.

Table 8 Accepted Students by Judge

| Number of Accepted Students | Count of Judges | Percent |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------|
| One | 27 | 51.0 |
| Two | 9 | 17.0 |
| Three or Four | 8 | 15.0 |
| Five or more | 9 | 17.0 |

The next table (Table 9) reports the student's most serious offense in the study. Many of the students who were in the program on new charges had multiple charges. The most serious offense for each student was collapsed into violent offenses, property offenses, drug offenses, DWI, public order offenses, traffic offenses, and probation violations.

Almost one-third of the accepted students were in the program as a result of a probation violation (i.e. stopped reporting, failed to comply, etc.). DWI offenses made up the next largest category of offenses (16.5%), followed by property offenses (13.7%) drug offenses (13.7%), violent offenses (12.9%), public order offenses (10.8%), and traffic offenses (0.7%). Charges were unknown in 5 cases, 2 cases were out of state, and one case was a private citizen. The program took a wide variety of offenses from fairly minor public order offenses to more serious violent offenses.

Table 9 Type of Offenses

| Type of Offense | Count | Percent |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| Violent Offenses | 17 | 12.2 |
| Child Abuse | 1 | 0.7 |
| Aggravated Assault Against a Household Member | 1 | 0.7 |
| Aggravated Battery Against a Household Member | 2 | 1.5 |
| Aggravated Fleeing a Law Enforcement Officer | 1 | 0.7 |
| Assault | 1 | 0.7 |
| Assault on Tribal Law Enforcement Officers | 1 | 0.7 |
| Attempted Robbery | 1 | 0.7 |
| Battery (PM) | 1 | 0.7 |
| Battery Against a Household Member | 2 | 1.5 |
| Battery on a Peace Officer | 1 | 0.7 |
| Domestic Violence | 2 | 1.5 |
| Robbery | 2 | 1.5 |
| Shooting at or from a Motor Vehicle (Personal Injury) | 1 | 0.7 |
| Property Offenses | 19 | 13.7 |
| Breaking and Entering | 2 | 1.5 |
| Burglary | 3 | 2.2 |
| Forgery | 4 | 2.9 |
| Fraudulent Use of Credit Card | 1 | 0.7 |
| Larceny | 3 | 2.2 |
| Receiving Stolen Property | 3 | 2.2 |
| Receiving, Transferring or Possession of a Stolen Vehicle, | 1 | 0.7 |
| Unlawful Taking of a Motor Vehicle | 2 | 1.5 |
| Drug Offenses | 18 | 12.9 |
| Abuse or Possession Glue or Aerosol Spray | 1 | 0.7 |
| Attempted Possession of Controlled Substance | 1 | 0.7 |
| Drug Trafficking | 2 | 1.5 |
| Possession of Controlled Substance | 11 | 8.0 |
| Possession of Drug Paraphernalia | 2 | 1.5 |
| Possession of Marijuana | 1 | 0.7 |
| DWI | 23 | 16.5 |
| DW degree unknown | 5 | 3.6 |
| DWI 2 nd | 1 | 0.7 |
| DWI 3 rd Aggravated | 3 | 2.2 |
| DWI 4 th | 4 | 2.9 |
| DWI 4 th Aggravated | 2 | 1.5 |
| DWI 5 th | 3 | 2.2 |
| DWI 5 th Aggravated | 1 | 0.7 |
| DWI 6 th | 3 | 2.2 |
| DWI 7 th | 1 | 0.7 |
| Public Order | 15 | 10.8 |
| Concealing Identity | 1 | 0.7 |
| Contempt of Court | 2 | 1.5 |
| Disorderly Conduct | 2 | 1.5 |
| Escape from a Community Custody Release Program | 2 | 1.5 |
| Possession of Firearm/Destructive Device by a Felon | 1 | 0.7 |
| Refusing to Obey or Assist | 1 | 0.7 |
| Resisting, Evading or Obstructing an Officer | 5 | 3.6 |
| Tampering with Evidence | 1 | 0.7 |
| Traffic | 1 | 0.7 |
| Driving while license suspended or revoked | 1 | 0.7 |
| Probation Violations | 46 | 33.1 |

Missing 8

Table 10 compares the crime category to charge level. Public order offenses (24.5%) accounted for 12 offenses and probation violations (22.4%) accounted for 11 misdemeanor offenses. Misdemeanor DWI offenses comprised 16.3% of misdemeanor offense, 14.3% were violent misdemeanor offenses, 10.2% were each property and drug misdemeanor offenses, and 2% were misdemeanor traffic offenses.

Probation violations accounted for 40.7% of all felony offenses, property crimes 16.3% of offenses, drug and DWI crimes each accounted for 15.1% of felony offenses, violent crimes 9.3% of offenses, and public order crimes 3.5% of all offenses.

More of the less serious offenses were for public order crimes that came from municipal and magistrate courts and the single traffic offense was from a lower court.

Table 10 Crime Category by Charge Level

| Crime Category | Misdemeanor | | Felony | |
|---------------------|-------------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| Violent | 7 | 14.3 | 8 | 9.3 |
| Property | 5 | 10.2 | 14 | 16.3 |
| Drug | 5 | 10.2 | 13 | 15.1 |
| DWI | 8 | 16.3 | 13 | 15.1 |
| Public Order | 12 | 24.5 | 3 | 3.5 |
| Traffic | 1 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Probation Violation | 11 | 22.4 | 35 | 40.7 |

Missing 12

The next table (Table 11) reports the type of offense by severity, either misdemeanor or felony. Fifty (36.5%) students were in the program on misdemeanor cases and 87 (63.5%) were in the program on felony charges. Two cases were out of state, one student was a private pay, and 7 were unknown.

Table 11 Misdemeanor or Felony

| Charge Type | Count | Percent |
|-------------|-------|---------|
| Misdemeanor | 50 | 36.5 |
| Felony | 87 | 63.5 |

Missing 10

During the time of this study the Second Chance Program did not clinically assess referred or admitted individuals for current substance use or substance use histories. As a part of standard Narconon policy each individual admitted to a Narconon program is given a detailed medical history exam as well as a detailed history of drug use including current drug use. This examination is done by a physician. Admitted students are also administered a drug test at entry and routinely monitored for drug use while in the program (Paredes, 2006).

While the program did not clinically assess each student for substance abuse each student was administered a survey by program staff that collected some substance abuse information. During the time the program was using funding provided by the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse

Treatment (CSAT) the program administered the federally required Government Performance and Records Act (GPRA) form. The CSAT GPRA form is designed to collect information about individuals served that is useful for reporting and documenting the performance of programs. Drug and alcohol use questions include: past 30 day use, route of administration (i.e. oral and nasal), days of use in past 30 days, and injection drug use.

After this funding was exhausted the program began to administer the Addiction Severity Index (ASI). The ASI is used widely in the assessment of substance abuse treatment. ASI scores can be used to profile a patient’s problem areas and then plan effective treatment. The ASI is also widely used in substance abuse research. The ASI was not used to profile a patient’s problem and then to plan treatment but as a potential research instrument.

Second Chance Program Services

The next table (Table 12) lists the courses completed by students who finished and graduated from the program. It is important to note as the program has developed since September 2006 courses have been added, removed, and changed. These changes have included adjustments to the content of the program, the names of courses, and the order the courses are taken by students. The courses listed in the table were typically taken in the order they are listed. In addition to the listed courses other courses are available for students. These courses include a literacy course (*Bright Sky Literacy*) and a course named *Condition Exchange*.

All the students who graduated completed all the courses in the Drug Rehabilitation module and the single course in the Study Skills module. Three students missed one to three of the three self-respect courses. Thirty-four of the 35 graduates did not complete at least one of the three courses in the Life Skills module. Eleven students did not complete one or both courses in the Reintegration module.

Table 12 Graduates Length of Stay in Program

| SCC Modules | Second Chance Courses | Number of Students | Average Days to Complete |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Drug Rehabilitation Module | Orientation | 35 | 1.5 |
| | Communication | 35 | 33.7 |
| | Sauna Detox | 35 | 49.7 |
| | Advanced Communication A | 35 | 34.7 |
| | Advanced Communication B | 35 | 34.3 |
| Study Skills Module | Study Skills | 35 | 65.3 |
| Self-Respect Module | Self-Respect 1 | 34 | 18.6 |
| | Self-Respect 2 | 33 | 24.8 |
| | Self-Respect 3 | 32 | 13.9 |
| | Way to Happiness | 6 | 7.3 |
| Life Skills Module | Changing Conditions of Life | 13 | 16.1 |
| | Ups and Downs | 22 | 34.4 |
| | Potential Trouble Source Handling | 21 | 1.2 |
| Reintegration Module | Transition Preparedness | 27 | 8.0 |
| | Life Review | 27 | 1.0 |

Table 13 reports the number of incident reports received by students while in the program. This table only includes students who were discharged from the program and so does not include the 42 active students. Slightly more than 50% of the students who were discharged from the program did not have an incident report, 23.5% had one incident report, and 11.2% had 5 or more incident reports.

Table 13 Number of Incident Reports

| Number of Incident Reports | Count | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|
| 0 | 51 | 52.0 |
| 1 | 23 | 23.5 |
| 2 | 3 | 3.1 |
| 3 | 6 | 6.1 |
| 4 | 4 | 4.1 |
| 5 | 8 | 8.2 |
| 6 | 1 | 1.0 |
| 7 | 1 | 1.0 |
| 9 | 1 | 1.0 |

Missing 7

Discharge

Table 14 reports the status of students discharged from the program. At the time of this study 42 students were active in the program. 35 students had completed the program, 16 students had received a medical discharge, 16 students had been released, 17 students had resigned, and 16 students had been terminated. We were unable to determine the discharge status for 6 students.

This section focuses on the 105 students who had been discharged from the program. Released students consisted of individuals who had “timed out of the program”, which means their sentence had ended prior to their successful completion of the program. It appears these students had been progressing satisfactorily through the program and given more time would have likely completed the program. At least two of the students who “timed out of the program” were sentenced to the program for 90 days or less. It is not clear why the Second Chance Center was accepting individuals who were not going to be in the program a minimum of six months.

Students were discharged as “resigned” for a variety of different reasons. Resignations primarily included students who disliked the program (i.e. at least one student wanted to participate in a medical model and another preferred an outpatient program). For 3 students there was no information in their file other than they “resigned from program”.

The “terminated” category consisted of students discharged for disciplinary reasons. This included at least 3 individuals discharged for testing positive for drugs. Other reasons included disruptive behavior, lack of participation, physical and sexual harassment of staff, failure to return from a court granted furlough, and bringing drugs into the facility.

“Medical discharge” included several individuals with high blood pressure, multiple physical ailments (i.e. gall bladder), one individual with cancer, and individuals with psychiatric problems.

“Completed” is comprised of students who were successfully discharged from the program. Students who completed the program comprised 35% of the students who were discharged and spent an average of 215 days in the program and on average took 12 courses. According to program staff the program is designed for 6 months and there are 14 courses. For reasons we don’t know many of the graduates did not take courses in the Life Skills Module (Changing Conditions of Life, Ups and Downs, and Potential Trouble Source Handling).

Students who were released from the program spent the second highest average number of days in the program (192.4 days) and took 6.3 courses. This was followed by students who were medically discharged (average length of stay 120.1 days and 3.3 courses), students who were terminated (average length of stay 114.1 days and 3.9 courses), and students who resigned (average length of stay 82.2 days and 2.9 courses).

Table 14 Discharge Status

| Discharge Status | Count | Percent | Average Length of Stay | Course Count |
|-------------------|-------|---------|------------------------|--------------|
| Completed | 35 | 35% | 214.7 | 12.0 |
| Medical Discharge | 16 | 16% | 120.1 | 3.3 |
| Released | 16 | 16% | 192.4 | 6.3 |
| Resigned | 17 | 17% | 82.2 | 2.9 |
| Terminated | 16 | 16% | 114.1 | 3.9 |

Missing 5

Table 15 reports discharge status by charge level. Almost 40% of the students who had misdemeanor charges resigned from the program and 30.4% were released before they completed the program. Almost 42% of those in the program on felony charges completed the program followed by 20.4% who were terminated from the program. It appears that students who were in the program on less serious charges were more likely to resign or be released from the program prior to completing the program primarily because they “timed out”. Conversely, students in the program on more serious felony charges were more likely to successfully complete the program or be terminated.

Table 15 Discharge Status by Charge Level

| Discharge Status | Charge Level | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Misdemeanor | | Felony | |
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| Completed | 3 | 13.0 | 31 | 41.9 |
| Medical Discharge | 3 | 13.0 | 12 | 16.2 |
| Released | 7 | 30.4 | 8 | 10.8 |
| Resigned | 9 | 39.1 | 8 | 10.8 |
| Terminated | 1 | 4.3 | 15 | 20.3 |

Missing 8

Table 16 reports the type of discharge by the average number of incident reports. On average students who were terminated from the program had the highest average number of incident reports. Considering these individuals were terminated from the program this is not unusual. Students who completed the program had the second highest average followed by students who were released, students who resigned, and students who were medically discharged.

Table 16 Type of Discharge by Number of Incident Reports

| Discharge Type | Mean | Count | Std. Deviation |
|-------------------|------|-------|----------------|
| Completed | 1.57 | 35 | 1.852 |
| Medical Discharge | .21 | 14 | .426 |
| Released | 1.38 | 16 | 2.062 |
| Resigned | .57 | 14 | 1.158 |
| Terminated | 2.19 | 16 | 2.786 |

Reintegration

This section discusses the community reintegration component of the program. The primary contact with program graduates during the study was via phone contacts by SCP staff with graduates and/or collateral contacts with family members or friends. This occurs because graduates were located geographically throughout the state making face to face contacts difficult. SCP staff who made these contacts recorded the result of each contact. Nine of the 35 graduates received no contacts and 9 graduates received 10 or more contacts. On average, graduates had 5.7 contacts during the average 398 days each graduate was in the community (range: 297 days to 465 days).

Table 17 Number of Reintegration Contacts

| Number of Reintegration Contacts | Count | Percent |
|----------------------------------|-------|---------|
| 0 | 9 | 25.7 |
| 1 | 3 | 8.3 |
| 3 | 1 | 2.8 |
| 4 | 3 | 8.3 |
| 5 | 4 | 11.1 |
| 6 | 2 | 5.6 |
| 8 | 2 | 5.6 |
| 9 | 2 | 5.6 |
| 10 or more | 9 | 25.7 |

Recidivism

This section reports official court data for students who had been released by the program for a variety of reasons. Discharge reasons included in this section are: completed (graduates), medical discharge, released (usually “timed out”), and individuals who resigned from the program. All students who were in one of the above categories and who at a minimum completed the Sauna Detox course are included in this section. We chose to only include students who completed this course because these students had completed, on average, more than 90 days in the program and by completing the Sauna Detox course had completed one of the more important courses. Fifty-eight of 62 students discharged from the program had completed the Sauna Detox course. While all 35 students who completed the program had also completed the Sauna Detox course, 5 students were missing information on their release date so days in the community could not be calculated. These 5 students are included in other tables in this section.

Table 18 reports the average number of days in the community for each discharge status category. On average, graduates had been in the community 398.3 days, students who had medically discharged 407.3 days, released students 279.5 days, and students who resigned 342 days.

Table 18 Days in the Community

| Discharge Status | Mean | Count |
|-------------------|-------|-------|
| Completed | 398.3 | 30 |
| Medical Discharge | 407.3 | 6 |
| Released | 279.5 | 13 |
| Resigned | 342.0 | 4 |
| Total | 364.6 | 51 |

The next table (Table 19) reports preliminary information on recidivism. The table reviews the number of students who had a probation violation or picked up a new charge after they discharged from the program by discharge status. Discharge types included in the table includes students who successfully completed the program, students who left by medical discharge, students who were released from the program, and students who resigned from

the program. This is a relatively short outcome period. Further research should expand this follow up period.

Table 19 Type of Recidivism by Discharge Status

| Recidivism | Discharge Status | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|
| | Completed | | Medical Discharge | | Released | | Resigned | |
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| New Charge | 3 | 8.6 | 4 | 25.0 | 2 | 18.8 | 3 | 17.6 |
| Probation Violation | 8 | 22.9 | 23 | 18.6 | 2 | 18.8 | 3 | 17.6 |
| No New Charge or Probation Violation | 23 | 65.7 | 7 | 43.8 | 7 | 43.6 | 8 | 47.0 |
| Unknown | 1 | 2.8 | 2 | 12.6 | 3 | 18.8 | 1 | 5.8 |

Missing 7

Three students (8.6%) who completed the program picked up new charges (Burglary, DWI 3rd, and Aggravated Assault), 8 students (22.9%) had technical probation violations, and 24 students (65.7%) did not have a probation violation or new charge.

Technical probation violations consist of violations of either standard conditions of probation and/or special conditions of probation. Technical violations do not include new charges. Standard conditions of probation include: maintaining employment (unless exempted), payment of probation costs, no possession or use of alcohol or drugs, complying with reporting requirements, not associating with individuals deemed detrimental, and being available to visits from probation officers. Commonly imposed special conditions include counseling and restitution.

Technical violations do not include charges for a new crime and should be considered as less serious than an arrest for a new charge. This is an important distinction. In time for this study we were not able to track down the reason for each probation violation or calculate the time in days to a new charge or probation violation.

As a very broad point of comparison, 32.5% of offenders released from a New Mexico Corrections Department facility are re-incarcerated in a state facility within one year, 44% within two years, and 46.7% within three years (NMCD). This reports only on incarcerated felons who are released from prison and within the time frames noted above and who end up back in prison either on a probation violation, parole violation, or a new charge. This does not include offenders who violated probation and/or were arrested on a new crime but were not back to prison. If this was included the percents would be higher.

Because the SCP is the only secure residential treatment facility in New Mexico, the program takes a wide variety of offenders (i.e. traffic offenses to violent felony offenses), and we lack a comparison group to make more direct recidivism comparisons.

The recidivism rate only reports criminal recidivism defined as a new arrest or probation violation and does not measure relapse into alcohol and/or drug use. Currently, because we

rely on official data sources for this study, we are not able to measure relapse into drug and/or alcohol use. The use of this information would require we track and survey offenders who have been in the program.

Table 20 collapses new charges and probation violations into one category (recidivism) and compares recidivism to discharge status. There were no statistically significant differences between discharge status and recidivism. This means students who completed the program were no more or less likely to have a new arrest or probation violation than a student who resigned from the program, was medically discharged, or was released. While there were no statistically significant differences a larger percent of students who completed did not pick up a new arrest or probation violation when compared to students who were released, medically discharged, or resigned.

Table 20 Recidivism by Discharge Status

| Recidivism | Discharge Status | | | | | | | |
|------------|------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|
| | Completed | | Medical Discharge | | Released | | Resigned | |
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| Yes | 11 | 32.4 | 7 | 50.0 | 6 | 46.2 | 6 | 42.9 |
| No | 23 | 67.6 | 7 | 50.0 | 7 | 53.8 | 8 | 57.1 |

SECOND CHANCE CENTER STUDENT AND STAFF SURVEY

This section reports on a survey administered to students and program and security staff designed to measure the social climate of the Second Chance Center. Because social climate has been recognized as a potential contributor to treatment success we decided it was important to investigate the social climate of the center and program from the perspective of the students and staff (both program staff and security staff). The data in this part of the study consists of the results of the *Correctional Institutions Environment Scale* (CIES) (Moos, 1987). The CIES is designed to ‘...measure the social climate of juvenile and adult correctional programs’ (Moos, 1987). The Scale consists of nine different subscales used to assess a variety of aspects of correctional life. Each of the nine different subscales fit into one of 3 different dimensions: the Relationship Dimension, the Personal Growth Dimension, and the System Maintenance Dimensions. Each of the nine subscales is summarized below in Table 21.

Table 21 CIES Subscale and Dimensions Descriptions

| Subscale | Description |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Relationship Dimensions | |
| Involvement | How active are residents in the day-to-day functioning of the program |
| Support | The extent to which residents are encouraged to help and support other residents; how supportive the staff is toward residents |
| Expressiveness | How much the program encourages the open expression of feelings by residents and staff |
| Personal Growth Dimensions | |
| Autonomy | The extent to which residents are encouraged to take initiative in planning activities and to take leadership in the unit |
| Practical Orientation | The degree to which residents learn practical skills and are prepared for the release from the program |
| Personal Problem Orientation | The extent to which residents are encouraged to understand their personal problems and feelings. |
| System Maintenance Dimensions | |
| Order and Organization | How important order and organization are in the program |
| Clarity | The extent to which residents know what to expect in the day to day routine of the program and the explicitness of program rules and procedures |
| Staff Control | The degree to which the staff use measures to keep residents under necessary controls |

Each individual who participated in the study was asked to complete two of the three CIES forms. The Real Form measures students' and staff's view of the program and the Ideal Form is designed to measure students' and staff's preferences about the program. The Real Form was administered first and each person surveyed was asked to answer each true/false question about how the facility actually operates; the Ideal Form administered second asked the same questions and the inmates were asked about what they believe the ideal conditions should reflect. The results of the Real Form can then be compared to the results of the Ideal Form to assess how the Center is serving the needs of the students in the program.

Surveys were administered anonymously. The majority of student surveys were administered by an ISR staff member, during the course of four different sessions on May 6, 2008. Following that date several more students anonymously completed the survey. A varying level of interest and understanding was expressed by those students taking the survey, some seemingly understanding the importance of accurately completing the surveys, and others were less interested in completing the surveys. Twenty-five of approximately 42 students

completed the survey. Both security staff and program staff were provided copies of each survey in an envelope and asked to complete the surveys. Staff was asked to complete the surveys anonymously and seal the surveys in the provided envelope. Sealed envelopes were provided back to ISR staff on a regular basis. Six members of the security staff out of approximately 30 security staff participated, and all 9 members of the program staff completed at least part of the two surveys.

Of the 40 individuals given the surveys only 18 completed both the real and ideal surveys successfully: 12 students, 1 security staff member, and 5 program staff members. It is important to determine which of the specific subscales were completely answered in order to make substantial comparisons later; this is summarized in the Table 22 below. Because of the small number of security staff that completed the surveys security staff data and results is not included in this section.

Table 22 Number of Individuals completing various subscales

| Subscale | Student | Security Staff | Program Staff | Total |
|------------------------------|---------|----------------|---------------|-------|
| Involvement | 21 | 2 | 6 | 29 |
| Support | 18 | 2 | 8 | 28 |
| Expressiveness | 20 | 1 | 6 | 27 |
| Autonomy | 23 | 1 | 6 | 30 |
| Practical Orientation | 22 | 2 | 7 | 31 |
| Personal Problem Orientation | 22 | 2 | 7 | 31 |
| Order and Organization | 23 | 1 | 7 | 31 |
| Clarity | 21 | 2 | 6 | 29 |
| Staff Control | 21 | 2 | 7 | 30 |

The small sample size in some columns above make comparisons between the real and ideal subscales difficult, as small sample sizes affect our ability to identify statistically significant differences between real and ideal conditions.

In analyzing the results of the survey, we compared the mean ideal and real values of each subscale for students and program staff as well as an aggregate of both groups. We first examined the average subscale values for all respondents. The results can be seen in the Table 23 below.

Table 23 Mean results of all individuals given CIES

| Subscale (N) | Real | Ideal | Difference |
|-----------------------------------|------|-------|------------|
| Involvement (29) | 5.59 | 6.07 | -0.48 |
| Support (28) | 5.14 | 6.32 | -1.18*** |
| Expressiveness (27) | 5.81 | 5.33 | 0.48 |
| Autonomy (30) | 5.10 | 5.97 | -0.87** |
| Practical Orientation (31) | 5.06 | 6.71 | -1.65*** |
| Personal Problem Orientation (31) | 4.48 | 5.45 | -0.97** |
| Order and Organization (31) | 5.29 | 4.9 | 0.39 |
| Clarity (29) | 6.34 | 6.03 | 0.10 |
| Staff Control (30) | 5.67 | 6.27 | -0.60 |

Notes: *=p<0.1, **=p<0.05, ***=p<0.01

A standard paired sample t-test was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the real and ideal scales. Four subscales result in significant differences: Support, Autonomy, Practical Orientation, and Personal Problem Orientation. All were negative, indicating the Center is falling short of expectations in each category.

Three of the statistically significant differences occur within the Personal Growth Dimension, the collection of Autonomy, Practical Orientation, and Personal Problem Orientation subscales. This indicates expectations for growth of individuals and preparation for release are falling short of what are perceived as ideal conditions.

The next several tables report each of these subscales, first for students and then for program staff. Table 24 reports the mean subscales for students.

Table 24 Mean results for students given CIES

| Subscale (N) | Real | Ideal | Difference |
|-----------------------------------|------|-------|------------|
| Involvement (20) | 5.55 | 5.95 | -0.40 |
| Support (17) | 4.47 | 6.23 | -1.76*** |
| Expressiveness (19) | 5.52 | 6.05 | 0.53 |
| Autonomy (22) | 4.73 | 6.09 | -1.36*** |
| Practical Orientation (21) | 4.95 | 6.95 | -2.0*** |
| Personal Problem Orientation (21) | 4.14 | 5.33 | -1.19** |
| Order and Organization (22) | 5.04 | 4.91 | 0.14 |
| Clarity (20) | 6.25 | 6.20 | 0.05 |
| Staff Control (20) | 5.05 | 5.95 | -0.90 |

Notes: *=p<0.1, **=p<0.05, ***=p<0.01

The only subscale in which a statistically significant difference is present is once again under Practical Orientation, with the real conditions once again falling short of ideal conditions. Another point of interest is the difference between the real and ideal conditions of the Autonomy subscale is now positive. While not statistically significant this finding indicates staff believe students are given too much autonomy in planning activities and taking leadership roles in the center, as opposed to the students who believe they are not given enough.

Table 25 Mean results for Program Staff given CIES

| Subscale (N) | Real | Ideal | Difference |
|----------------------------------|------|-------|------------|
| Involvement (6) | 6.33 | 6.33 | 0.00 |
| Support (8) | 6.38 | 6.75 | -0.38 |
| Expressiveness (6) | 5.17 | 4.83 | 0.33 |
| Autonomy (6) | 7.17 | 6.00 | 1.17* |
| Practical Orientation (7) | 5.14 | 6.14 | -1.0** |
| Personal Problem Orientation (7) | 5.57 | 5.86 | -0.29 |
| Order and Organization (7) | 6.00 | 4.86 | 1.14 |
| Clarity (6) | 5.83 | 5.50 | 0.33 |
| Staff Control (7) | 6.71 | 7.29 | -0.57 |

Notes: *= $p < 0.1$, **= $p < 0.05$, ***= $p < 0.01$

Examining the program staff we see a similar trend as before. The statistically significant differences lie within the Personal Growth dimension of the CIES. Program staff believe the center is falling short in teaching students the practical skills they will need after release, but in a reverse of the opinions of the students, that students are given more autonomy to plan activities and take leadership roles within the center than is thought to be ideal.

While the mission of the Second Chance Center is to help inmates rehabilitate and reintegrate into society, these results indicate some in the program feel the center is falling short. Though the sample size of the survey restricts what we can conclude, some preliminary conclusions can be drawn. Most important among these is students feel they are not being prepared adequately for reintegration into society. The Personal Growth dimension of the survey which explicitly indicates how well individual feel they are being prepared to deal with the challenges of release, repeatedly fall short for students.

SECOND CHANCE CENTER STAFF FILE REVIEW

For this study ISR staff also reviewed employee files for two types of staff. First, we reviewed security staff employee files and second, employee files of program staff who provide the Second Chance Program curriculum modules, sauna detoxification, and other parts of the rehabilitation program.

Staff records consist of their application forms, any background checks completed, employment history, educational background and training, start date and end date (if no longer employed), job performance information (job reviews, commendations, reprimands, etc.), and some demographic information (DOB, marital status, gender and race/ethnicity).

This information is necessary and important in order for us to understand the backgrounds and qualifications of relevant staff to assess how well the program is operating in regards to its design and known best practices. For example, well trained, more experienced and higher performing security and program staff are desirable and we expect they will produce better outcomes. These outcomes include better performing students and higher program completion rates.

While we were not able to document training provided to program staff in employee records we were told Second Chance Center Program staff is trained following Criminon and Narconon guidelines.

We do not report information from employee files here because the information on both types of employees was incomplete. Employee files commonly included an Employee Agreement form, a Confidentiality Agreement form, a Staff Handbook Receipt form, and Employment Eligibility form, a W-4 form, and a Salary and Benefits form. Commonly missing forms included a Personnel Information form, Personal Background Survey, Resume, and Hiring Interview. The missing forms would have allowed us to report on staff work histories, training, and education that is relevant to their current position.

DISCUSSION

Drug Use and Crime

According to a 2005 publication by the federal Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT) there is strong empirical evidence that substance abuse treatment reduces crime. Additionally, researchers from the Treatment Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania (2005) found substance abuse treatment, results in significant reductions in crime and alcohol/drug use as well as improved ability to function in health and social areas. For many who need alcohol and drug treatment, contact with the criminal justice system is their first opportunity for treatment and possibly their first occasion to be diagnosed with a substance abuse problem. More intensive treatment is needed for offenders who are in a recurring cycle of crime and drug abuse. Research suggests addicted offenders commit fewer crimes during periods of non-use and studies of offender populations have shown cessation of and continued abstinence from drug use is linked to reduced rates of re-offending and re-arrest. Rather than focusing on populations of sporadic users of illegal drugs, it may be more effective for criminal justice programs to focus their resources on preventing continued drug abuse by high-use offenders or concentrating on serious juvenile offenders who are at risk of delinquency and future crime as adults (CSAT, 2005).

According to the National Institute for Drug Abuse (NIDA) a history of drug use does not in itself indicate the need for drug abuse treatment. Offenders who meet drug dependence criteria should be given higher priority for treatment than those who do not. Less intensive interventions that may include self-help groups may be appropriate for offenders who are not drug dependent. NIDA also notes medications can be an important component of effective drug abuse treatment for offenders because medications allow the bodies of offenders to function normally while being treated. According to NIDA, despite evidence of their effectiveness for opiates and alcohol addiction medications are under utilized in the criminal justice system.

The connection between drug abuse and crime is well known and is involved in three types of offenses: offenses linked to drug abuse, offenses defined by drug possession or trafficking, and offenses connected to a criminal lifestyle (e.g. associating with gangs involved in drug trafficking). Arrestees frequently test positive for recent drug use (Zhang, 2004). In a 2002 Bureau of Justice Statistics survey (BJS 2005) 68% of jail inmates reported symptoms in the year before their admission to jail that met substance dependence or abuse criteria and 16% of convicted jail inmates said they committed their offense to get money for

drugs. According to this survey 2 in 5 inmates were dependent on alcohol or drugs, while nearly 1 in 4 abused alcohol or drugs, but were not dependent on alcohol or drugs.

A 2004 BJS survey of state prison inmates and federal prisoners found a majority of state inmates (53%) and almost half of federal inmates (45%) were abusing or were dependent on drugs in the year before their admission to prison (BJS 2006). Dependence criteria included a range of behavioral, cognitive, and physiological problems. A national survey conducted in 2002 found 2% of U.S. residents to be drug dependent or drug abusing. Further, a majority (56%) of state inmates used drugs in the month before the offense in 2004, while a third (32%) committed their current offense under the influence of drugs. One in six state inmates committed their current offense to get money for drugs. Marijuana remained the most commonly used drug, with 40% reporting use in the month before the offense, followed by cocaine or crack (21%), stimulants (12%), and heroin and other opiates (8%). State prisoner reports of overall drug use in 2004 were almost unchanged since 1997. According to the New Mexico Corrections Department (Governor Richardson's Task Force On Prison Reform, 2008) approximately 85% of offenders confined in a New Mexico facility have substance abuse problems and may have co-occurring disorders (both a substance abuse diagnosis and mental health disorder).

Research has also shown untreated substance abusing offenders are more likely to relapse to drug abuse and return to criminal behavior. This can bring about re-arrest and re-incarceration, jeopardizing public health and public safety and taxing criminal justice system resources. Treatment offers the best alternative for interrupting drug use.

Second Chance Program Recap

As noted elsewhere since the program opened in September 2006 and through mid-May 2008, 482 offenders had been referred, 147 had been accepted as students, and 105 students had been discharged from the program. In mid-May 2008, 42 offenders were students in the program.

Offenders were referred to the Center by all 13 Judicial Districts and 5 New Mexico Native American tribes (Jemez, Navajo, Sandia, San Juan, and Ohkay Owingeh). At least one offender was accepted from 11 of the 13 Judicial Districts and 5 New Mexico Native American tribes. The largest number of students was accepted from the Second Judicial District (30), followed by the Eighth Judicial District (26), and then the Fourth and Fifth Judicial District with 20 referred students each. These four judicial districts accounted for almost two-thirds of all referred students. The Eleventh Judicial District Court and the Twelfth Judicial District Court each had one referral accepted, and the Tenth Judicial District Court did not have either of its' two referrals accepted. Both students listed as "out of state" were sentenced to the program from out of state courts and were privately paying for the program.

Fifty-three different judges referred the 141 accepted students (this number does not include the private student, 2 out of state students, or 3 students missing this information) with three judges accounting for 21% of the students. Almost one-third of the accepted students were in the program as a result of a probation violation (i.e. stopped reporting, failed to comply, etc.). DWI offenses made up the next largest category of offenses (16.5%), followed by property offenses (13.7%) drug offenses (12.9%), violent offenses (12.2%), public order

offenses (10.8%), and traffic offenses (0.7%). Charges were unknown in 5 cases, 2 cases were out of state, and one case was a private citizen. The program took a wide variety of offenses from fairly minor public order offenses to more serious violent offenses. As expected more of the less serious offenses were for public order crimes that came from municipal and magistrate courts.

Students who completed the program comprised 35% of the students who were discharged from the program during the study period and on average spent almost 215 days in the program and on average took 12 courses. Students who were released from the program spent the second highest average number of days in the program (192.4 days) and took 6.3 courses. This was followed by students who were medically discharged (average length of stay 120.1 days and 3.3 courses), students who were terminated (average length of stay 114.1 days and 3.9 courses), and students who resigned (average length of stay 82.2 days and 2.9 courses).

Three students (8.6%) who completed the program picked up new charges (Burglary, DWI 3rd, and Aggravated Assault), 8 students (22.9%) had technical probation violations, and 24 students (65.7%) did not have a probation violation or new charge.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation of this program was based upon common research and evaluation practices that are similar to methods we have used in the past with similarly situated programs involving substance abusing criminal justice system involved individuals. While we recognize the controversy surrounding the Second Chance Center and the need to address this issue our process evaluation was not shaped or guided by this controversy.

Our process evaluation is focused on how the program has been implemented and how it operates and how current practices impact the delivery of the program. Our research does not study the controversy surrounding the Second Chance Program, Narconon, Criminon and Scientology. We also do not investigate the controversy over the safety and effectiveness of the Narconon methodology.

Public Program Controversy

While it is outside the scope of our work we briefly discuss the controversies surrounding the Second Chance Program and the use of Narconon and Criminon. Discussion and further study of the Second Chance Program, Narconon and Criminon beyond this report is warranted. A quick search of the internet on Narconon and Criminon quickly uncovers the public controversy focusing on the supposed connections of each to Scientology and the methods used by Narconon. Since its establishment, Narconon has faced controversy over the safety and effectiveness of its rehabilitation methods. As noted elsewhere the Narconon detoxification method is designed to eliminate drug residues and reduce the cravings that may be caused by these residues. A recent evaluation study of a Narconon drug abuse prevention program in California noted the Narconon drug rehabilitation methodology does not reflect widely accepted medical and scientific evidence and some information is misleading because it is overstated or does not distinguish between drug use and abuse (Wood 2005). Cecchini (2007) in her review of the Hubbard detoxification method notes this detoxification regimen holds promise and cites preliminary data indicating the ability of this method to eliminate cocaine and valium metabolites in sweat and urine in a small sample

of 6 recovering addicts from a non-published study. Cecchini also notes that at present, much more is unknown than is known regarding long-term drug retention and effects and that this subject deserves careful evaluation given its potential implications for drug abuse prevention and drug rehabilitation.

Criminon is less controversial than Narconon and as noted earlier in this report, according to the Urban Institute (2006), Criminon contains many elements of effective cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT). The curriculum places a strong emphasis on positive behavior change through changes in behavior, relationships, self-respect and self-esteem, taking care of one's self, respecting others, fostering healthy relationships and behaviors (i.e. reducing criminal activity and substance abuse), reducing contacts with individuals who engage in anti-social activities (i.e criminal activity and substance abuse), and anger management.

Evidence Based Practices

There is research evidence that some types of programs targeting criminal justice involved offenders do better than other programs. In 2006 the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (2006) conducted a comprehensive assessment of 291 evaluations of all types of adult corrections programs; including drug courts, sex offender treatment programs, and boot camps, in the United States and other English speaking countries. Of the programs for drug-involved offenders drug courts reduced recidivism by 10.7% compared to treatment-as-usual groups, in-prison therapeutic communities with community aftercare reduced recidivism by 6.9%, and in-prison therapeutic communities without community aftercare reduced recidivism by 5.2%. Drug treatment in the community reduced recidivism by 12.4% and drug treatment in jail reduced recidivism by 6%. The study also found general and specific cognitive-behavioral treatment programs for the general offender population reduced recidivism by 8.2%. Overall, the general conclusion reached by the study was some adult corrections programs work and some do not and resources should be focused on evidence based programming and ineffective programming should be avoided.

New Mexico policy makers should take into account evidence based substance abuse treatment practices and research based principles of drug addiction treatment and use this information to help inform policy decisions. While evidence based best practice research has its limitations it is the best information we have on what works. Further, evidence based practices should be used to inform policy in other areas including sentencing, education, and health.

The recently completed report by New Mexico Governor Richardson's Task Force on Prison Reform (Bigelow, 2008) recommends a more concerted effort to coordinate state resources and improve the infrastructure to treat the widespread substance abuse and behavioral health needs of individuals involved in the criminal justice system. Further, the report echoes the need noted above to support and fund services and treatments that are evidence based and supported by research.

According to the Narconon International website (http://www.narconon.org/narconon_results):

“The Narconon Program has one of the highest success rates in the field of drug rehabilitation with outside studies showing 75% of the graduates going on to lead stable, ethical, productive drug-free lives.”

This site goes on to note these results have been documented by numerous reviews, studies, and white papers on different components of the Narconon drug rehabilitation and drug prevention programs.

Our review of available literature (both cited on this website and found elsewhere) does not support this view. There has been limited independent research published in peer reviewed journals on the Narconon drug rehabilitation program. Much of the literature cited by Narconon is on the drug prevention program and most is not independent research published in peer reviewed journals.

The results of this study as well as other information regarding best practices should be used to inform policy and decisions regarding the funding and implementation of programs serving criminal justice involved offenders in New Mexico including the Second Chance Program.

Clinical Assessment and Clinical Staff

During the time of the study the Second Chance Program did not conduct a clinical assessment to measure the type and severity of each individual’s substance abuse problem and need for treatment. It is not clear how the program objectively knew each offender in the program needed this level of care. **The program should develop and implement a thorough plan to clinically screen referred offenders and subsequently complete a clinical assessment of each admitted individual in order to document and better serve the needs of potential students.** Offenders who are not drug dependent may be better served by a less intensive program and this type of intensive program should target more serious users. The type and intensity of services should be based on the needs of the individual and not by the treatment setting, in this case a secure residential treatment facility. **A clinical assessment should include a diagnosis and some type of criteria for a placement level of care that could focus on the American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) levels of care. This clinical assessment should be conducted by a licensed clinician.**

Further and connected to the previous point, during the time of this study the program did not employ any licensed counseling staff to assess students or oversee the delivery of the program to students. According to program administrators the program did employ for a period of time two different licensed counseling staff that helped in the delivery of the courses and in the reintegration module. As noted elsewhere the program utilizes staff trained to deliver the Criminon and Narconon courses which is based on manuals. At a minimum, the program should employ a clinician to assess students and to clinically consult with program staff on the services provided to students.

According to the federal National Institute of Drug Abuse effective treatment includes a number of principles including no single treatment is appropriate for all individuals, individual treatment plans should be assessed regularly and modified as necessary, medications are an important element of treatment, and recovery is a long term process and often requires multiple treatment episodes.

In our review of court documents it appears some members of the court system did not understand the nature of the Second Chance Program and how the Program differs from traditional substance abuse treatment programs. The Second Chance Center describes itself as a rehabilitation program and not a treatment program. The Center should make clear it does not use licensed clinical staff but uses staff trained to administer the Criminon and Narconon courses and provide credentials of the program staff.

Eligibility and Program Length of Stay

The SCC is designed as a minimum six-month program in which offenders are treated for a substance abuse problem and so meets the definition of a “secure residential treatment facility” (30-22-8.2). During this study 105 of the 147 students were discharged. Sixteen of these students were discharged as “released” primarily because they “timed out” of the program. Students “timed out” because they did not have enough time on their sentence to complete the program. At least two students were sentenced to the program for 90 days and one was sentenced to 83 days. Additionally, at least 2 students were sentenced to the program for 365 days, which is longer than the design length of the program and greater than the average number of days it takes to complete the program based on the students who completed the program. The Second Chance Center should not accept individuals with sentences that are too short (less than 180 days) or sentences that are too long (greater than approximately 280 days). The Center could move towards accepting students who are sentenced to the completion of the program. **To accomplish this, the Center needs to make it clear to the court system and other interested parties about the minimum and maximum length of the program and reject referrals that violate eligibility criteria.**

The SCP should review criminal offenses eligible for their program. As shown in Table 11 the program took a wide range of offenses. The program admitted two individuals with misdemeanor driving while license suspended or revoked (66-5-39) offenses and three individuals with third degree felony violent offenses: two aggravated assault against a household member (30-3-16C) offenses and one shooting at dwelling or occupied building; shooting at or from a motor vehicle (30-3-8B) offense. Offenders with less serious offenses, like traffic offenses, may not need such an intensive program and may be better served by a less intensive program. Individuals charged with third degree violent felonies may violate current SCC eligibility criteria that note the Center does not accept most violent offenses. **The Center should more completely define which charges are not eligible and reject referrals that violate eligibility criteria.**

Medical Histories

It would be beneficial for the program to more completely collect medical histories and to complete a thorough medical assessment of offenders being admitted to the program. Sixteen percent of the students (16) who left the program were discharged for medical

reasons and on average spent 120 days in the program. **The Center should conduct a more complete medical assessment that should reduce this occurrence.**

Staff Files

For this report we reviewed program staff and security staff employee files but because of the lack of information we were not able to report on the employment histories, education, or background of staff employed in these two areas. **The Center should maintain employ files that include work histories, resumes, and job interviews for all employees. The Center should also develop policies regarding minimum job requirements for program and security staff.**

Recidivism

This section briefly discusses official recidivism data we were able to obtain on students who discharged from the program. This information consists of new arrests that led to new court cases and probation violations we found on the N.M. Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) public website (www.nmcourts.com).

Between the time students were discharged from the program and we conducted our review of information using publicly available court information found on the website www.nmcourts.com each graduate had been in the community 398.3 days, students who had medically discharged 407.3 days, released students 279.5 days, and students who resigned 342 days. This is a relatively short outcome period and further research should expand this follow up period. A more complete search of arrests should also be completed using law enforcement records.

Three students (8.6%) who completed the program picked up new charges (Burglary 30-16-3[B] a F4, DWI 4th 66-8-102[G] a F4, and Aggravated Assault 30-3-2 a F4), 8 students (22.9%) had technical probation violations, and 24 students (65.7%) did not have a probation violation or new charge.

Technical probation violations consist of violations of either standard conditions of probation and/or special conditions of probation. Technical violations do not include new criminal charges. Standard conditions of probation include: maintaining employment (unless exempted), payment of probation costs, no possession or use of alcohol or drugs, complying with reporting requirements, not associating with individuals deemed detrimental, and being available to visits from probation officers. Commonly imposed special conditions include counseling and restitution.

Technical violations do not include charges for a new crime and should be considered as less serious than an arrest for a new charge. This is an important distinction. In time for this study we were not able to track down the reason for each probation violation or calculate the time in days to arrest for a new criminal charge or picking up a probation violation.

As a very broad point of comparison 29.9% of male offenders released from a New Mexico Corrections Department facility in fiscal year 2007 (July 2006 – June 2007) were re-incarcerated in a state facility within 1 year (personal communication with NMCD staff September 2008). This only reports on incarcerated felons who are released from prison and

within the time frame noted above ended up back in prison either on a probation violation, parole violation, or a new charge. This statistic does not include offenders who violated probation or parole and/or were arrested on a new crime but did not end up back in prison. If this was included the percent would be higher. This information is only broadly comparable because the Second Chance Center includes misdemeanor offenders (36.5%) while the NMCD only includes felony offenders. The NMCD data includes all male offenders who went back to prison (new charges and parole or probation violations) and not all offenders who violated probation or who were arrested on new criminal charges. Many offenders who violate probation or pick up new criminal charges do not go back to prison but may get jail time or further probation. Also, the Second Chance Program analysis only includes those who successfully completed the program whereas the NMCD includes all offenders regardless of how well they performed in prison.

Available national data on recidivism of prisoners released in 1994 (BJS, 2002) found that within the first year of release from prison 44.1% of the offenders released from prison were rearrested, within the first 2 years, 59.2%, and within the first 3 years of their release, an estimated 67.5% of the 272,111 released prisoners were rearrested at least once.

This section does not include a group that is directly comparable to the Second Chance Center group and this analysis only includes successful program participants. A more complete analysis would directly compare Second Chance Program students with a matched group of offenders (i.e. matched on age, race/ethnicity, criminal history, and substance abuse) for whom we know what they received so we can compare services. A more complete analysis would include successful and unsuccessful students as well as other outcomes of interest such as changes in substance use, employment, living arrangements, social and family relationships, and education.

Additional analyses should be conducted of these data that compare the technical violation rates and re-arrest rates of successful students with unsuccessful students. A future outcome study should use at least one matched comparison group.

Because the program is not yet fully implemented and the program has not been in operation long enough to have released an adequate number of participants for a long enough period of time to track outcomes it is not possible to conduct an outcome study. An outcome study should also consider other measures of success including reductions in substance use and improvements in other indicators of social stability like employment, family relationships, and living arrangements.

Re-Entry

Prisoner re-entry has become a major focus of research and policy because of the increasing number of offenders being released and national data that shows approximately 67% will be re-arrested and 50% will be re-incarcerated in three years. Research shows that relapse to drug use and recidivism to crime are significantly lower if the drug offender continues treatment after returning to the community.

Narconon policy includes preparation for re-entry that includes programming while they are in the full program but does not include assistance beyond leaving the program. According to Paredes (2006) staff maintains regular contact with the family of the client during the

student's participation in the residential program and work in coordination with the student to formulate a thorough re-entry plan. Basically, this re-entry plan is a therapeutic contract that specifies the strategies that will be applied by the student once he is back the community. The format of the plan follows a standardized outline that is sufficiently flexible to incorporate coping strategies learned or formulated during participation in the program. Part of this plan consists of a detailed personal assessment of the problems and situations that may have led the person into the substance abuse lifestyle. . Re-entry is included as part of programming offered by Criminon and consists of the same course offerings offered in various prison facilities.

In response to the need for re-entry the SCP contains the *Reintegration Module* that has two courses that are offered in the facility. Prior to discharge from the program students are supposed to complete these courses. The *Transition Preparedness* course and *Life Review* course do not have an equivalent Criminon or Narconon course. The program also employs a staff member who is responsible for tracking graduates after they are released from the Center into the community. The primary type of contact with program graduates during the study was via phone contacts by SCP staff with graduates and/or collateral contacts with family members or friends. This occurs because graduates were located geographically throughout the state making face to face contacts difficult. SCP staff who made these contacts recorded the result of each contact. On average graduates had 5.7 contacts in the average 398 days each graduate had been in the community (range: 297 days to 465 days). As described in the *Background and Introduction* section of this report the *Reintegration Moduls* community phase has not been fully implemented.

The survey administered to students indicates some staff and students felt the Center is falling short of rehabilitating and reintegrating students into their communities. The Personal Growth dimension of the survey which explicitly indicates how well student feel they are being prepared to deal with the challenges of release, indicates students do not feel they are being prepared well enough for release.

While difficult given the geographic dispersion of offenders who complete the program additional efforts should be made to reintegrate offenders.

Based upon this study the Second Chance Program at the time this study was conducted was not operating the way it was designed to be operating. This report is useful for noting how the program has been implemented to date and what changes need to be made to implement the program more closely following Criminon and Narconon methods and policies put forth by the Second Chance Center. Only after the program has been fully implemented can a study be conducted to study its effectiveness.

REFERENCES

Bigelow, J. *Governor Richardson's Task Force on Prison Reform Increasing Public Safety in New Mexico Before, During and After Incarceration: New Directions for Reform in New Mexico Corrections.* (2008)

Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 1994.* 2002)

Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Substance Dependence, Abuse and Treatment of Jail Inmates, 2002.* (2005)

Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Drug Use and Dependence, State and Federal Prisoners, 2004.* (2006)

Cecchini, M. and LoPresti, V. *Drug residues store in the body following cessation of use: Impacts on neuroendocrine balance and behavior – Use of the Hubbard sauna regimen to remove toxins and restore health .* Medical Hypotheses , Volume 68 , Issue 4 , Pages 868 - 879i (2007)

Center for Substance Abuse Treatment.. *Substance Abuse Treatment for Adults in the Criminal Justice System. Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series 44.* (2005)

Criminon International. *Criminon Program: Effective Criminal Rehabilitation*
<http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=151667> (1993)

Criminon International. *A Program Making Criminal Rehabilitation Possible.* Hollywood: ABLE International. (2005)

LaVigne, Nancy; Naser, Rebecca and Owens, Colleen. *The Criminon Program Evaluation: Phase I.* Urban Institute Justice Policy Center (2006)

Moos, Rudolph. *Correctional Institutions Environment Scale: A Social Climate Scale 2nd edition.* (1987)

National Institute of Justice. *Fact Sheet: Drug Related Crime.* (1994)

National Institute of Justice. *Evaluation of Drug Treatment in Local Corrections.* (1997)

Paredes, Alfonso. *The Narconon Drug Rehabilitation Program: A Descriptive Overview.*
http://www.stopaddiction.com/pdf/Narconon_program_overview_DrParedes.pdf. (2006)

Sanderson, W.C. *Evaluating Adherence and Flexibility in the Use of a Manual in Clinical Practice Pragmatic Case Studies in Psychotherapy,* <http://pcsp.libraries.rutgers.edu>
Volume 2, Module 1, Article 3, pp. 1-5, 02-17-06

Second Chance Center. *Second Chance Center Brochure.*
<http://www.secondchancecenter.net/reference-materials.php>

Treatment Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania. *Economic Benefits of Drug Treatment: A Critical Review of the Evidence for Policy Makers.* (2005)

Wood, Deborah. *Narconon Drug Abuse Prevention Program Evaluation. Evaluation of the Narconon Drug Abuse Prevention Program, prepared for the California Department of Education by the California Healthy Kids Resource Center.* (2005)

Zhang, Zhiwei. National Opinion Research Center (NORC). *Drug and Alcohol Use and Related Matters Among Arrestees 2003.* (2004)

Appendix A: Second Chance Center Response



Second Chance Program™ New Mexico

Dear Members of the New Mexico Legislature:

The Second Chance Program (SCP) would like to thank the Institute of Social Research for its evaluation of our program. You allocated funds for SCP in 2006 in SB 190 part of which we used to fund this evaluation. Even though we are unaware of any other program in this State that has been independently evaluated since its inception, by starting the evaluation in our pilot period we felt it could help us bring the State the most effective rehabilitation programming possible within the current cost parameters of the criminal justice system. We promised you our program would be transparent from the beginning.

SCP is a unique program which provides the Judiciary an alternative sentencing option delivering rehabilitation to offenders in a long-term residential, *secure* setting. To help keep program and housing costs below the current cost of *only* housing an inmate in the New Mexico Corrections Dept. (NMCD). SCP uses a manualized approach in rehabilitation, addressing both substance abuse issues as well as criminal behavior. Thus SCP can scale up to larger delivery at a lower per person cost than traditional therapist driven treatment. SCP is licensed by Criminon International whose manuals have been evaluated by the Urban Institute. They concluded that the manuals align with what was "best practice" in the criminal justice system.

Since opening, all but two of those offenders accepted have been previously incarcerated. Judges have been reluctant to sentence their multiple offenders to community-based programs as those offenders can present a security risk.. Statewide SCP offers the Judiciary long-term rehabilitation in a medium security jail facility. Inmates sentenced there cannot leave without judicial approval. While there they participate in rehabilitation that is run 6-days a week, 8-hours a day. Since most county jails cannot afford long-term rehabilitation, SCP provides a unique and viable alternative for the entire state.

For the past three months, SCP has instituted a number of changes to not only streamline our delivery but to improve our results. These changes include: 1. Refining our initial screening procedures 2. Lowering the literacy level of the study materials 3. Improving the reintegration module 4. Adding more drug education and 5. Improving our record keeping

SCP relies on information from the offender, his judge, district attorney, public defender and the court social workers with whom we work to determine if the offender has a substance abuse issue. SCP is considering hiring a clinician to deliver drug screening to incoming offenders as well. As a result of this report, many suggestions by ISR will be implemented.

We make no claims about our recidivism rate in the United States, though have referenced three independent university studies that showed our program in Mexico had less than 10%. The Governor's Task Force on Prison Reform found the reincarceration rate for the NMCD to be 47.6%. This only shows those who returned to the NMCD and not those returning to the jail system or out of state. Nor does it look solely at those with substance abuse issues. Since our secure rehab program is unique and all but two offenders accepted were previously incarcerated, our results cannot be compared with other programs. In future studies that document our results, a control group can give us a point of valid comparison.

We are confident enough about our results that we offer the government a "guarantee." We will take back into the program any graduate who reoffends at no additional cost to the government.

We will be asking the legislature for additional funds so ISR can further evaluate the improvements implemented by SCP as well as documenting the results. We thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely,



Joy Westrum
Board of Directors