Specialized Substance Abuse Supervision (SSAS) in Nebraska:
A Study of the First Year of Implementation

Report prepared by
Carolyn Meeks, M.A.
Jane Meza, Ph.D.
Elizabeth Lyden, M.S.
Kathleen M. Grant, M.D.

University of Nebraska Medical Center

for the

Office of Probation Administration
Nebraska Supreme Court
State of Nebraska

August 12, 2008

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....1

Report

Introduction.....2

Background.....5

Methods.....7

Results.....11

Challenges and Strengths.....21

Discussion.....23

Recommendations.....25

Appendix

1. Survey Questionnaire.....A1
2. Reasons for Original Convictions.....A6
3. Programs: SSAS Probationers.....A7
4. Programs: Non-SSAS Probationers.....A13
5. Technical Violations that Resulted in Incarceration.....A22
6. Law Violations in First Six Months.....A23
7. SSAS Parolees.....A24

Executive Summary

The State of Nebraska initiated Specialized Substance Abuse Supervision (SSAS)-enhanced probation in March 2006 for moderate- to high-risk felony drug offenders. SSAS utilizes Evidence-Based Practices which have been shown to be effective in reducing offender recidivism. This study compares recidivism in felony drug offenders sentenced to SSAS-enhanced probation to a matched group of offenders sentenced to non-SSAS-enhanced probation. Offenders sentenced to SSAS-enhanced probation were more likely to receive each of the Evidence-Based Supervision Practices than the offenders sentenced to non-SSAS probation. Fewer SSAS probationers had technical, law or total violations and fewer were incarcerated for probation violations that had occurred in the first six months of their probation; however, these differences were not statistically significant. Offenders sentenced to SSAS were significantly more likely to participate in educational or vocational services than non-SSAS offenders. SSAS and non-SSAS offenders were significantly more likely to be employed at the end of their first six months of probation than at the onset of probation. Probationers across both groups who received incentives were significantly less likely to have a positive drug screen or probation violation than probationers who did not receive incentives. Methamphetamine conviction was associated with negative drug screens, and methamphetamine as primary drug of abuse was associated with lack of probation violations.

Introduction

In 2003-04, the Kennedy Commission of the American Bar Association concluded its study of U.S. incarceration, stating that if society were to institute proven alternatives to incarceration, "in many instances society may conserve scarce resources, provide greater rehabilitation, decrease the probability of recidivism and increase the likelihood of restitution."[1]

In Nebraska, as in other states, correctional spending has increased significantly. Stricter drug legislation and mandatory minimum sentencing have resulted in larger demands on incarceration capacity. States like Nebraska are searching for less costly but effective strategies that will ensure the community's safety while addressing incarceration and recidivism, particularly for those whose offense is related to a substance use disorder.

This study examines short-term recidivism rates, and factors that may affect these rates, in a population of probationers in Nebraska who received Specialized Substance Abuse Supervision (SSAS), which is probation enhanced with Evidence-Based Practices (EBP). The study compares the first group of SSAS probationers—those who entered SSAS during its first year of implementation—and a control group of Nebraska probationers who entered non-SSAS probation during the same time period.

Purpose of this Study

Evidence-Based Practices are professional practices supported by reliable and valid research. In the corrections field, Evidence-Based Practices are those "practices that have been proven through scientific corrections research 'to work' to reduce offender recidivism."[2] "Recidivism" is defined for this study by the State of Nebraska Office of Probation Administration as a probationer being "arrested and convicted on a new charge while on probation."[3]

In March 2006, the State of Nebraska initiated SSAS-enhanced probation for some moderate- to high-risk felony drug offenders. SSAS utilizes **Evidence-Based Practices** (Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Use of Incentives, Positive Reinforcement, and Motivational Interviewing) which, in other studies, have resulted in 10%-31% reductions in recidivism rates.[4]

Supervision Practices, along with Programs, are utilized in SSAS based on two principles of Evidence-Based Practice. The first of these, the "need principle" refers to the

---

[1] Warren, R. K. "Evidence-Based Practice to Reduce Recidivism: Implications for State Judiciaries." Crime & Justice Institute/National Institute of Corrections, Aug 2007, p. 10.
[2] Warren, R.K., *op. cit.*, p. 19.
[3] Carey-Minardi, D., personal communication.
[4] Warren, R.K., *op. cit.*, p. 18.

"criminogenic (crime-generating) needs" of the offender—attitudes, values, and behaviors most associated with criminal behavior.[5] SSAS attempts to refer each probationer to **programs** specifically appropriate for him/her—*classes, support groups, 12-step programs, etc.*—to address the underlying personal need that, if unaddressed, could lead to more criminal behavior by that individual.

The second principle of EBP, the "risk principle" refers to the probability that an offender will commit another crime. Using suitable, statistically validated instruments to help determine which offenders are the most appropriate targets for a recidivism- or risk-reduction strategy ensures that tax dollars are spent wisely. Effective risk reduction strategies target medium- and high-risk offenders.[6]

SSAS was implemented at five Nebraska sites (Douglas, Sarpy/Cass/Otoe, Lancaster, Buffalo/Dawson, and Dakota County sites). We reviewed the records of 89 probationers who were sentenced to SSAS in Nebraska during the one-year period from March 1, 2006 through February 28, 2007. A total of 11 SSAS Probation Officers supervised these 89 probationers. During the same time period, four SSAS Officers supervised nine parolees who chose to enter SSAS as part of their parole.

With the long-term goal of building a safe society by reducing crime in the state, the purpose of this social science study, authorized by the Supreme Court of Nebraska, is to compare recidivism rates of two groups of felony drug offenders who entered probation during the first year (March 1, 2006-February 28, 2007) of SSAS implementation in Nebraska.

This study compares recidivism rates at six months post-entrance for:

- those sentenced to SSAS as a requirement of probation, and
- a matched group sentenced to non-SSAS probation.

In addition, this study provides a descriptive "snapshot" of:

- those who voluntarily entered SSAS as part of their parole during the same time period.

Significance of the Study

Nebraska's corrections budget almost tripled in the decade ending in 2005.[7] During that same period, the state's prison population increased by 34%, and the number of probationers decreased by 7%. Whereas in 1996, 22% of new inmates to Nebraska prisons were drug offenders, by the year 2005 drug offenders accounted for 30% of all new inmates to the state's prisons. In 2006, the Nebraska prison system, with a prison population of 4,706, was operating at 138% of design capacity. At this rate, it is projected that Nebraska will have a state prison population of 5,273 (an increase of 567

[5] Warren, R.K., *op. cit.*, p. 2 and pp. 23-24.
[6] Warren, R.K., *op. cit.*, p. 2 and pp. 21-23.
[7] Public Safety Performance Project: Work in the States: Nebraska. www.pewpublicsafety.org

incarcerated persons) by the year 2011[8] —further straining the capacity of the Nebraska prisons, as well as increasing pressure on the State's budget. Incarceration costs Nebraska's taxpayers approximately $30,000 per inmate per year.[9]

Twice as many Nebraskans are sentenced today for drug violations as were sentenced two decades ago. In 1985, the average sentence for a drug violation was 23-27 months, compared to the average 2005 sentence of 24-48 months for the same violation.[10] While longer sentences do isolate offenders, and prevent them from re-offending, incarceration does not lead to better outcomes long-term, and in some cases incarceration actually increases the likelihood that a prisoner will offend.[11]

This study was undertaken to assess the effectiveness (evidenced by recidivism rates) for the 89 probationers who entered SSAS in its first year of implementation in Nebraska. If SSAS-enhanced probation were to show promise through better outcomes than non-SSAS-enhanced probation, the significance for each SSAS probationer would be a more positive, productive life in society, and the significance for the Nebraska taxpayer would be a safer society and fewer tax dollars expended on incarceration or on less effective probation.

Hypothesis and Study Aims

Hypothesis: Felony drug offenders sentenced to SSAS probation will have decreased recidivism when compared with offenders sentenced to non-SSAS probation.

The study had two Aims:

Aim 1: Compare recidivism between felony drug offenders sentenced to SSAS and those sentenced to non-SSAS enhanced probation.

The primary outcome measure was the proportion of individuals who re-offended during the six months following sentencing. Secondary outcome measures included the percentages who violated probation during the six months following sentencing, were incarcerated for those violations, had positive drug screens and were employed at six months.

---

[8] Public Safety Performance Project/Pew Center on the States/Vera Institute of Justice, "Nebraska," updated Feb. 2007: www.percenteronthestates.org .

[9] Howard, E. "Supreme Court to Senators: You do Your Job...." Nebraska StatePaper.Com: http://nebraska.statepaper.com. Aug. 31, 2007. Article quotes Kermit Brashear, chair of Nebraska Community Corrections Council, in his remarks to the Nebraska Legislature.

[10] Parker, A. K. M.Ed. "Jail Diversion: A Step along the Path to Mental Health Reform." Jan. 23, 2006. Parker (Director, Center for Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services) made this presentation before the Nebraska Legislature.

[11] Andrews, D.A., I. Zinger, R.D. Hoge, J. Bonta, P.Gendreau, F.T. Cullen, "Does Correctional Treatment Work? A Clinically Relevant and Psychologically Informed Meta-analysis." *Criminology* 28:396 (1990). ALSO Smith, P., C. Goggin, P. Gendreau, "The Effects of Prison Sentences and Intermediate Sanctions on Recidivism: General Effects and Individual Differences." Ottawa, CA: Solicitor General (User Report 2002-01).

Aim 2: Identify those factors (e.g., treatment modality, drug of choice) which were associated with improved outcomes in felony drug offenders on probation.

Research questions included:

- What are the characteristics of the probationers in this study?
- What services (Practices, Programs, education or vocational rehabilitation) were available to these probationers during the first six months of their probation period, and did they access these services?
- How many probationers violated probation (technical and/or law violations) during the first six months of their probation period? How many have been incarcerated for these violations?
- What comparisons can be made between SSAS and non-SSAS probationers in terms of recidivism and the factors contributing to recidivism?

Background

Two primary strategies for community-based supervision of probation have emerged over the last several decades.[12]

- The first approach measures the completion of a probation order as "success." An offender's suitability for probation is generally determined after a fact-finding presentence investigation and relies heavily on the instincts of judges and probation personnel. This approach emphasizes individual accountability from offenders and officers, and is driven by *compliance* and contact standards. In this strategy, criminal behavioral change is not the standard for determining "success."

- A second approach looks toward evidence for behavioral change and a reduction in the likelihood of repeated crimes by the offender. The presentence investigation relies more heavily on statistically reliable, validated instruments, as well as the instincts of judges and probation personnel. Evidence-Based Practices (EBP), employed in this approach, emphasize *outcomes*. Interventions in this second approach are considered effective when they reduce offender risk/recidivism, thus making a positive long-term contribution to public safety.

Nebraska is transitioning from a compliance to an EBP/outcomes approach for probation supervision.[13] In support of EBP, outcomes research has shown that resources applied to high-risk offenders can have better results than those same resources applied to low-risk offenders.[14] EBP actually provides for a better utilization of limited financial and human

---

[12] Rowoldt, S. "The Transformation to Evidence-Based Practices: Shifting from Compliance to Long-Term Behavioral Change." *A New Day in Probation: A Publication of the Nebraska Probation System.* Issue #1, Jan. 2008.

[13] Rowoldt, op. cit., AND "Road Map towards EBP," in *Nebraska Probation: Moving Forward.* May 2008.

[14] Wilson, J.Q. *Crime and Public Policy.* ICS Press, 1983.

resources because it recognizes that not all offenders need, or learn from, the same level of supervision or treatment. EBP replaces a "one size fits all" approach with individualized reality-based supervision based on an offender's unique needs.

Probationers in both the SSAS and the non-SSAS populations for this study could have been assigned by the judge, with input from Probation, to one of three "types" of probation:

- "Traditional" probation—As defined by the State Office of Probation Administration, in traditional probation "the Probation Officer brokers out for services, and the Probation Officer meets with the probationer on a regular basis—either in the Office or at the probationer's home—even if only to do a drug screen."[15]
- Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP)—A probationer in this more intensive type of probation for high-risk/high need offenders is under the supervision of one of the most highly skilled and experienced Officers. ISP serves as an intermediate level of supervision between traditional probation and jail/prison for adults.
- ISP/WEC—In this level of probation a four-month Work Ethic Camp (WEC) experience precedes ISP. WEC, in McCook, NE, works with felony offenders who lack life stabilization and who are disengaged in multiple areas of their lives, resulting in crime which is often related to substance abuse. WEC includes work detail, short-term residential substance abuse treatment, education, cognitive behavioral therapy in groups, and community transition assistance.

Judges mandated any of the three types of probation, as they deemed appropriate after presentence investigations using validated instruments when sentencing SSAS offenders. In non-SSAS probation, a Probation Officer would, at minimum, broker out for services and meet regularly with the probationer. Optimally, in SSAS probation, a SSAS Probation Officer would utilize Traditional Probation Practices with each probationer in his/her charge, as well as the four Evidence-Based Practices of SSAS:

- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT in groups). Much research has found that CBT programs rooted in social-learning theory are the most effective in reducing recidivism.[16] CBT is based on the observation that most behaviors, including criminal behaviors, are learned. CBT affects an individual's thinking patterns positively with training in pro-social cognitive and behavioral skills.

- Incentives. Use of Incentives, sometimes called Contingency Management, also relates to social-learning theory, which posits that learning is more likely to take place when a person is rewarded for that learning.[17] Incentives can be monetary or cash-equivalent (such as gift cards or free passes to sporting events), or non-monetary but rewarding (such as parties or awards to honor milestones). Contingency management research continues to find better retention in treatment

[15] Carey-Minardi, D., personal communication.
[16] Currie, E. *Crime and Punishment In America.* Holt Paperbacks, 1998.
[17] Bandura, A. *Social Learning Theory.* New York: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

programs, and lower rates of drug use, for those who receive incentives vs. no incentives.[18]

- Motivational Interviewing (MI). Research has demonstrated that a probationer's intrinsic motivation to change behavior can be activated when an Officer utilizes communications techniques that help clients to explore and to resolve their ambivalence or lack of motivation in a positive way.[19]

- Positive Reinforcement. Frequent positive feedback, with positive outweighing negative feedback by four to one, promotes optimal learning.[20]

Taken as a whole, these four Practices provide integrated support and healthy challenge to probationers. For offenders with multiple criminogenic needs, research has shown that addressing at least four of those needs produces better results.[21] Increasingly, as *all* Probation Officers are becoming familiar with and trained in EBPs, even the non-SSAS Officers can be expected to utilize some of the Practices in supervising their probationers.

The State of Nebraska launched SSAS in March 2006 in an effort to improve effectiveness, reduce recidivism, and return felony drug offenders to more productive and positive lives following sentencing.

Methods

Population and Study Sample

The population for this study was felony drug offenders who had been sentenced in Nebraska to SSAS probation between March 1, 2006 and February 28, 2007. Probationers had been sentenced as adults and their probation sentences resulted from drug convictions.

Research staff gathered data on 89 SSAS probationers who participated in SSAS at any of the five operating SSAS sites in Nebraska (Douglas, Sarpy/Cass/Otoe, Lancaster, Buffalo/Dawson, and Dakota County sites). A control group was identified by a computer-matched set from among the 440 non-SSAS probationers who entered probation statewide during the same one-year timeframe. The control group was matched by age group (16-26, 27-39, 40 years and older), gender; and class of conviction (Felony II, Felony III/IIIa, and Felony IV). Excluding Felony I and General Felony from the non-SSAS group resulted in 391 non-SSAS subjects available for matching. A total

---

[18] Rawson, R.A., M.J. McCann, F. Flammino, et al. "A Comparison of Contingency Management and Cognitive-Behavioral Approaches for Stimulant-Dependent Individuals." *Addiction* 101(2):267-274.
[19] Miller, W. and S. Rollnick. "What is Motivational Interviewing?" *Behavioral and Cognitive Psychotherapy* 23:325-334 (1995).
[20] Cullen, F.T. "Rehabilitation and Treatment Programs," in Crime: Public Policies for Crime Control. Wilson, J.W. & J. Petersilia, eds. Oakland, CA: ICS Press, 2002.
[21] Gendreau, P., S. French, A. Taylor. "What Works (What Doesn't)"—Revised 2002: "The Principles of Effective Correctional Treatment." Unpublished, University of New Brunswick, CA.

of 88 non-SSAS subjects were selected for the control group (one of the strata resulted in two SSAS subjects but only one non-SSAS subject).

89 SSAS probationers were included in this study.

A dataset from the State Office of Probation Administration contained baseline information on probationers [probationer ID number, Probation Officer, drug of abuse, class of felony offense, Simple Screening Instrument *(SSI)* scores, Offender Sentencing Worksheet *(OSW)* scores, zip code of probationer's residence, and demographic information].

Eleven SSAS probationers were excluded from the original cumulative list of 100 SSAS probationers:

- 2 were disallowed because of corrupted data (determined by the State)
- 9 were disallowed because they had been sentenced to ISP/WEC, had spent four months in WEC before entering SSAS. Their actual entrance to SSAS was after February 28, 2007 (i.e., outside of the one-year window for this study).

88 non-SSAS probationers were included in this study.

The computer-matched set initially included 88 non-SSAS probationers. This initial list, provided by the State Office of Probation Administration, contained information on probationers who, for various reasons, were disallowed from the study. A computer program was used to randomly select new matches for the disallowed probationers. The following represent the reasons why, over time, 21 probationers were disallowed from the non-SSAS portion of the study:

- 1 was disallowed because the official probation file was not available.
- 5 were disallowed because they had entered WEC first, and the entrance dates were after February 28, 2007.
- 9 were disallowed because they were Interstate Compact cases; the Probation Officers did not have access to all the information to complete the interview successfully.
- 6 were disallowed because of out-of-state zip codes.

Nine SSAS parolees were included in this study, with the decision to provide a descriptive "snapshot" of these parolees as a baseline for possible future studies. These nine SSAS parolees were not included in the analyses for Aims 1 and 2.

Because the SSAS program was also made available to parolees during that same one-year timeframe, the study included parolees who voluntarily entered SSAS at three of the five SSAS sites. Two of the initial 11 parolees were disallowed because their entrance dates were after February 28, 2007. SSAS Officers provided information on the SSAS parolees using the same questionnaire as was used for the probationers.

National Institute of Drug Abuse research indicates success rates for mandated drug treatment are similar to voluntary treatment. SSAS participation was *mandatory* for probationers but *optional* for parolees. Time in prison preceded SSAS parole, whereas SSAS was required as an alternative to prison time for SSAS probationers. The study examines the questionnaire responses on SSAS parolees but does not do a comparison between SSAS and non-SSAS parolees, nor between SSAS probationers and SSAS parolees, but instead provides a qualitative description of the SSAS parolees. Biostatisticians determined that a meaningful comparison study would have required a larger group of SSAS parolees as well as a control group of non-SSAS parolees.

Procedure and Timeframe

This was a retrospective study. Interviews were conducted with the SSAS/Probation Officers only (exception: one SSAS parolee case involved an interview with a Parole Officer).

This study was approved by the University of Nebraska Medical Center's (UNMC) Institutional Review Board. This study involved no communication with probationers or parolees themselves. The Research Assistant referred to probationers/parolees by identification numbers only. No study personnel received names of probationers/parolees.

Research staff instructed the Officers to access the official hard-copy records to provide data for the interviews. The interviews were pre-scheduled and occurred by telephone with questions provided to Officers in advance by email. The Research Assistant conducted the interviews from late March through late June 2008. Responses were recorded onto paper surveys and entered into a computerized database. Entries to the database were double-checked for accuracy before the database was sent to UNMC biostatisticians for analysis.

Survey Instrument

Research staff created a survey to capture information retrospectively regarding each probationer. The State Office of Probation Administration provided input into the questionnaire and approved the survey instrument. The dataset provided by the State Office of Probation Administration listed a significant amount of information for each probationer. The survey questions were designed to fill the gaps needed for this recidivism study and solicited information from the SSAS/Probation Officer about the probationer at entrance date, during the six months post-entrance, and at the six-month post-entrance date. One question regarded the probationer's current status. The SSAS/Probation Officer provided responses to the survey questionnaire by telephone for his/her assigned probationers with research staff.

Survey questions included the name and site of the reporting SSAS/Probation Officer as well as the following information about the Probationer:

- Basic information on Probationer
  - Entrance date to SSAS/probation
  - Length of probation sentence
  - Type of probation (traditional, ISP, ISP/WEC)
  - Language of origin
  - Mental and physical disabilities, if any
- "Snapshot" of Probationer at entrance date
  - Primary drug of abuse
  - Employment status
- Practices/Programs/Experiences of Probationer in first six months
  - Evidence-Based Practices
  - Participation in Programs
  - Education and/or vocational rehabilitation
  - Probation violations, nature of violations, and results of violations
- "Snapshot" of Probationer at six months post-entrance date
  - Enrolled in education or vocational rehabilitation
  - Employment status
  - Volunteer in community (not court-ordered or as restitution)
  - Probation Status
    - Active
    - Successfully discharged
    - Unsuccessfully discharged
- Current probation status, if known
- Any other information relevant to this study

A copy of the survey questionnaire is included in the Appendix.

Analysis Plan

The primary outcome measure for this study is:

- The percentage of probationers who re-offended during the six months following entrance to SSAS or non-SSAS probation.

Secondary outcome measures relate to the six months post-entrance to SSAS or non-SSAS probation:

- The percentage who violated probation during the six months
- The percentage incarcerated during the six months
- The percentage of positive drug screens during the six months
- The percentage of probationers employed at six months post-entrance.

The recidivism rate was compared between the two groups using a Chi-square test or Fisher's Exact test where appropriate. McNemar's test was used to compare the change in employment status at the beginning and end of the six-month timeframe post-entrance to SSAS or non-SSAS. Continuous variables were compared between groups using t-tests or a Mann-Whitney test where appropriate. Logistic regression was used to identify factors related to outcomes. A p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

A Portrait of the Study Population at Entrance Date

- What are the characteristics of the probationers in this study?

Non-SSAS study subjects were matched to the SSAS subjects for age group, gender, and Felony II, III/IIIA, and IV convictions. Ages ranged from 19 to 64. Almost 60% of both SSAS and non-SSAS groups were male. Approximately twice as many African Americans were in the SSAS group as in the non-SSAS group. Twice as many Hispanics were in the non-SSAS group as in the SSAS group. Most probationers in both the SSAS and non-SSAS groups were sentenced to probation for Felony IV offenses. (Table 1)

While methamphetamine was the most frequent primary drug of abuse in both groups, more SSAS than non-SSAS probationers (66% v. 52%) were identified as primarily methamphetamine users ($p=0.06$). All but one SSAS and two non-SSAS participants were native English speakers. Physical and mental disabilities that may have affected participation were similar between the two groups, with the exception of mental illness, with almost twice as many SSAS as non-SSAS probationers with mental illness, although this did not reach significance ($p=0.13$). Non-SSAS probationers were significantly more likely to be employed at the start of probation ($p=0.03$). (Table 1)

Table 1: Probationers' Characteristics*				
N (%)	*Total N=177*	*Non-SSAS N=88*	*SSAS N=89*	*p value*
Age				
16-26	50 (28)	25 (28)	25 (28)	
27-39	52 (29)	26 (30)	26 (29)	
40+	75 (42)	37 (42)	38 (43)	
Minimum age	19	19	21	
Maximum age	64	57	64	
Gender				
Male	104 (59)	52 (59)	52 (58)	
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	12 (7)	8 (9)	4 (4)	
Race				
African American	22 (12)	7 (8)	15 (17)	
Other	14 (8)	11 (12)	3 (4)	
Caucasian	141 (80)	70 (80)	71 (80)	
Convicted Class				
Felony 2	10 (6)	4 (5)	6 (7)	
Felony 3/3A	29 (16)	15 (17)	14 (16)	
Felony 4	138 (78)	69 (78)	69 (78)	
Methamphetamine conviction	95 (54)	51 (58)	44 (49)	
Primary Drug of Abuse				
Alcohol	7 (4)	3 (3)	4 (4)	
Marijuana	34 (19)	21 (24)	13 (15)	
Amphetamine	2 (1)	2 (2)	0	
Methamphetamine	105 (59)	46 (52)	59 (66)	0.06
Cocaine	17 (10)	7 (8)	10 (11)	
Oxycontin	2 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	
Hydrocodone	2 (1)	2 (2)	0	
Heroin	1 (0.6)	1 (1)	0	
Alprazolam	1 (0.6)	1 (1)	0	
Other	5 (3)	3 (3)	2 (2)	
Don't Know	1 (0.6)	1 (1)	0	
English as First Language	174 (98)	86 (98)	88 (99)	
Physical Disabilities	15 (8)	8 (9)	7 (8)	
Mental Retardation	2 (1)	2 (2)	0	
Mental Illness	23 (13)	8 (9)	15 (17)	
Employed at Entrance Date	86 (49)	50 (57)	36 (40)	0.03

*p values only listed for items that are significant or approaching significance.

All convictions were for non-alcohol drug offenses. The State of Nebraska dataset provided information on the drug-related felony offenses. The most frequent felony drug convictions for both the SSAS and the non-SSAS (40% v. 45%) groups were for possession of (meth)amphetamine and possession of a pharmaceutical controlled substance (SSAS 26% v. non-SSAS 8%). (Table 2) See Appendix for a complete list of original convictions.

Table 2: Probationers' Original Convictions (From State Dataset)*			
N (%)	*Total N=177*	*Non-SSAS N=88*	*SSAS N=89*
(Meth)amphetamine-related	95 (53)	51 (58)	44 (49)
Cocaine-related	19 (11)	7 (8)	12 (13)
Marijuana-related	11 (6)	7 (8)	4 (4)
Possessing Pharmaceutical Controlled Substance	30 (17)	7 (8)	23 (26)

*see Appendix for remainder of convictions

Services Provided in First Six Months

Probationers in the SSAS and the non-SSAS groups were assigned at sentencing to a type of probation: Traditional, Intensive Supervision (ISP), or ISP/WEC (in which a four-month Work Ethic Camp preceded the start of ISP probation). In this study, twice as many non-SSAS as SSAS probationers were in Traditional probation ($p=0.0001$), whereas almost three times as many SSAS (64%) as non-SSAS (23%) probationers were assigned to ISP ($p<0.0001$), which is intended for higher-risk offenders. There were 2.5 times more non-SSAS (20%) than SSAS (8%) probationers assigned to WEC prior to ISP ($p=0.02$). (Table 3)

- Were Evidence-Based Practices utilized with SSAS probationers as proposed? with non-SSAS probationers?

SSAS probationers were significantly more likely to receive Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Incentives, Positive Reinforcement and Motivational Interviewing than their non-SSAS counterparts ($p<0.0001$ for each). In the first year of implementation of SSAS at five sites in Nebraska, it appears that Motivational Interviewing (99%) and Positive Reinforcement (96%) were consistently utilized in SSAS, whereas Incentives (60%) and CBT (46%) in groups were less consistently employed.

Additionally, more than one-third of the non-SSAS probationers received Motivational Interviewing (35%) and Positive Reinforcement (34%), while fewer than 10% received Incentives or CBT in groups. (Table 3)

- Were Programs addressing offenders' criminogenic needs attended by SSAS probationers? by non-SSAS probationers?

Because of the "need" principle of Evidence-Based Practices, in an ideal world each probationer would be referred to, and would participate in, programs/groups/activities that would address the particular, individual criminogenic needs that drive the behavior leading to crime. The study questionnaire attempted to elicit from Officers the program participation of SSAS and non-SSAS probationers.

The "programs" varied from specific sites (e.g., Reporting Centers) to support groups (e.g., Alcoholics Anonymous) to professionally provided services (e.g., mental health services) to a specific form of therapy (e.g., Moral Recognition Training).

Officers listed "Reporting Centers"—the "one-stop shop" for services that is a feature of SSAS—at 74% utilization by SSAS and 1% utilization by non-SSAS ($p<0.0001$). SSAS probationers frequently accessed Drug Testing, Substance Abuse Treatment, and 12-Step Programs. Non-SSAS probationers less frequently participated in Substance Abuse Treatment or a 12-Step Program but were frequently drug tested. Mental Health Services were accessed by 27% of the SSAS group compared to 16% of the non-SSAS group, as may have been expected by the greater Mental Illness reported in the SSAS group; however, the difference is borderline statistically significant ($p=0.07$). Thirty SSAS probationers took one or more Life Skills Training classes, compared to nine non-SSAS probationers ($p=0.0002$). (Table 3)

Some in the SSAS group accessed cognitive-behavioral approaches through Thinking For a Change (19%), whereas the non-SSAS group had little exposure to this approach (2%). (Table 3)

Table 3: Services Provided

N (%)	*Total N=177*	*Non-SSAS N=88*	*SSAS N=89*	*p value*
Type of Probation				
Traditional Probation	75 (42)	50 (57)	25 (28)	0.0001
Intensive Supervision (ISP)	77 (43)	20 (23)	57 (64)	<0.0001
ISP w/ Work Ethic Camp (WEC)	25 (14)	18 (20)	7 (8)	0.02
Supervision Practices*				
Traditional Practices	175 (99)	87 (99)	88 (99)	0.99
CBT in groups	45 (25)	4 (5)	41 (46)	<0.0001
Incentives	61 (34)	8 (9)	53 (60)	<0.0001
Positive Reinforcement	115 (65)	30 (34)	85 (96)	<0.0001
Motivational Interviewing	119 (67)	31 (35)	88 (99)	<0.0001
Programs Participated In*				
Moral Recognition Training	5 (3)	1 (1)	4 (4)	0.18
Mental Health Services	38 (21)	14 (16)	24 (27)	0.07
Reporting Centers	67 (38)	1 (1)	66 (74)	<0.0001
Drug Testing	171 (97)	84 (95)	87 (98)	0.40
Substance Abuse Treatment	143 (81)	60 (68)	83 (93)	<0.0001
Thinking For a Change	19 (11)	2 (2)	17 (19)	0.0003
Life Skills Training	39 (22)	9 (10)	30 (34)	0.0002
12-Step Program*	145 (81)	61 (69)	84 (94)	<0.0001
Other	37 (21)	23 (26)	14 (16)	0.09
Type of 12-Step Program*				
Alcoholics Anonymous	93 (53)	48 (55)	45 (51)	0.60
Cocaine Anonymous	3 (2)	1 (1)	2 (2)	1.00
Narcotics Anonymous	51 (29)	31 (35)	20 (22)	0.06
Crystal/Meth Anonymous	5 (3)	0	5 (6)	0.06
AA/NA Combination	35 (20)	5 (6)	30 (34)	<0.0001
Other 12-Step Group	13 (7)	3 (3)	10 (11)	0.05

*Some probationers participated in more than one Practice/Program/Group

Probation Violations, Incarcerations and Current Status

- Was there a difference in probation violations between SSAS and non-SSAS offenders during the first six months of probation?

SSAS offenders were less likely to commit violations than the non-SSAS offenders while on probation, but the differences were not statistically significant. Thirty-one (35%) SSAS probationers violated probation (technical violation, law violation, or both) during the first six months of their SSAS probation as compared to 37 (42%) non-SSAS probationers (p=0.33). (Table 4)

Thirty-three percent (33%) of SSAS probationers and 38% of non-SSAS probationers had technical violations (p=0.49). The most frequent technical violations were testing positive for drug use (SSAS 21% v. non-SSAS 30%, p=0.21) and failing to report (SSAS 11% v. non-SSAS 10%, p=0.82). (Table 4)

Six (7%) SSAS and 11 (13%) non-SSAS probationers committed law violations (misdemeanor/felony/misdemeanor+felony) in their first six months of SSAS or non-SSAS probation (p=0.19). Among the six SSAS re-offenders, a total of three misdemeanors and four felonies were committed. Among the eleven non-SSAS re-offenders, there were nine misdemeanors, one felony, and one "other" (DUI). See Appendix for Technical Violations that Resulted in Incarcerations, and Law Violations in the First Six Months of Probation.

Among probationers with any violation, SSAS probationers had a mean of 1.7 (SD 0.9) violations while non-SSAS probationers had a mean of 2.4 (SD 1.9) violations (p=0.43). Non-SSAS offenders who violated probation had a greater number of violations than the SSAS offenders who violated probation:

Total Violations:	Non-SSAS 71 v. SSAS 43
Technical Violations:	Non-SSAS 60 v. SSAS 36
Law Violations:	Non-SSAS 11 v. SSAS 7.

- Were SSAS or non-SSAS probationers more likely to serve time in jail or prison for having violated probation during the first six months of SSAS?

SSAS offenders were less likely to be incarcerated for probation violations that they incurred during the first six months of their probation but this difference was not statistically significant. Eleven (12%) SSAS probationers, and 13 (15%) non-SSAS probationers, served some time in jail or prison for violations that occurred in the six-month probation period (p=0.64). (Table 4)

Six SSAS, and seven non-SSAS, probationers were incarcerated at some point for a technical violation of probation that occurred during the first six months of their SSAS or non-SSAS participation. The most frequent reason for the incarceration was

"absconding," also referred to as "failure to complete participation in program." (See Appendix for complete list of Technical Violations that Resulted in Incarcerations.)

Some incarcerations did not begin until after the end of the first six months of SSAS or non-SSAS participation. Five SSAS probationers and six non-SSAS probationers have served time in jail or prison for law violations that occurred during the first six months of their probation. These incarcerations could have begun before or after the end of the first six months of probation. In addition, a decision on incarceration was still pending at the time of the interview for one additional non-SSAS probationer's law violation. (See Appendix for complete list of Law Violations in First Six Months of SSAS and non-SSAS Probation)

- What was the status of SSAS and non-SSAS offenders at six months after entry into probation?

There was no significant difference in probation status at six months between the two groups. Eighty (90%) SSAS probationers and 82 (93%) non-SSAS probationers were still on probation at six months post-entrance to SSAS (p=0.64). Eight SSAS probationers and six non-SSAS probationers were incarcerated in either jail or prison at the six-month end-date. (Table 4)

Table 4: Violations, Incarceration and Status

N (%)	*Total N=177*	*Non-SSAS N=88*	*SSAS N=89*	*p value*
Violations[+]				
Total # probationers w/ Technical and/or Law Violations*	68 (38)	37 (42)	31 (35)	0.33
Total # probationers w/ Law Violations*	17 (10)	11 (13)	6 (7)	0.19
Total # probationers w/ Technical Violations*	62 (35)	33 (38)	29 (33)	0.49
Positive drug test	45 (25)	26 (30)	19 (21)	0.21
Failure to report	19 (11)	9 (10)	10 (11)	0.82
Failure to complete program	13 (7)	9 (10)	4 (4)	0.14
Failure to get an evaluation	4 (2)	4 (5)	0	0.06
Other	15 (8)	12 (14)	3 (3)	0.01
Incarceration				
Total # probationers incarcerated (Jail or Prison) for violations they incurred in first six months of probation	24 (14)	13 (15)	11 (12)	0.64
Status at End of First Six Months				
Still on Probation	162 (92)	82 (93)	80 (90)	0.64
Jail	7 (4)	4 (5)	3 (3)	
Prison	7 (4)	2 (2)	5 (6)	
Discharged	1 (0.6)	0	1 (1)	

*In first six months

[+]Probationers could have multiple violations

Positive Engagement

- Did SSAS and non-SSAS probationers differ in employment, educational, or vocational measures?

In order to have a fuller understanding of a probationer's exposure to opportunities to engage the wider community, survey questions solicited input about a probationer's employment at the entrance date and six months later, as well as whether a probationer received education or vocational rehabilitation in the six months post-entrance. As a way of getting a "snapshot" of the probationer's engagement with the community at the six-month date after entrance, questions about enrollment in an educational or vocational rehabilitation program, employment, and volunteering (not as a requirement of probation or as restitution for a crime) were included.

Significantly fewer SSAS probationers than non-SSAS probationers were employed at entrance date ($p=0.03$). Significantly more SSAS probationers than non-SSAS probationers accessed education or vocational rehabilitation during and at six months post-entrance ($p<0.0001$). At the six month date post-entrance, more SSAS probationers than non-SSAS probationers were employed at least part-time and/or volunteered in the community, but these findings were not significant. (Table 5)

For both groups, there was a statistically significant difference in the proportion of probationers employed at the start of probation compared to their employment at the end of the six-month timeframe (non-SSAS: 57% at beginning of probation to 64% at six months; $p=0.03$; SSAS: 40% at beginning of probation to 69% at six months; $p<0.0001$).

Table 5: Engagement with the Community

N (%)	*Total N=177*	*Non-SSAS N=88*	*SSAS N=89*	*p value*
Employed at Start of Six-Month Timeframe	86 (49)	50 (57)	36 (40)	0.03
Education or Vocational Rehab during Six Months	44 (25)	8 (9)	36 (40)	<0.0001
Enrolled (educ or voc rehab) at end of Six-Month Timeframe	28 (16)	8 (9)	20 (22)	0.01
Employed at end of Six-Month Timeframe	117 (66)	56 (64)	61 (69)	0.49
Volunteering at end of Six-Month Timeframe	20 (11)	8 (9)	12 (13)	0.36

Current Status of SSAS Probationers

- What is the current status of SSAS and non-SSAS probationers?

There was a trend towards a positive outcome in the SSAS offenders when compared to the non-SSAS offenders. At the time of the study interview, Officers reported that 68 (82%) of SSAS participants had positive status (still on probation or successfully discharged) vs. 15 (18%) with negative status (unsuccessfully discharged or

revoked/incarcerated). For non-SSAS participants, 56 (69%) had positive vs. 25 (31%) with negative status. (The "other" category included positive, negative or "neutral" responses.) (Table 6)

Table 6: Current Status				
N (%)	*Total N=169*	*Non-SSAS N=84*	*SSAS N=85*	
Current Probationer Status at Time of Interview (if Known)				
Still on Probation	103 (60)	39 (46)	64 (75)	
Discharged, Successful	20 (12)	17 (20)	3 (3.5)	
Discharged, Unsuccessful	4 (2)	4 (5)	0	
Discharged, Revoked	28 (17)	18 (21)	10 (12)	
Other	14 (8)	6 (7)	8 (9)	
Positive and Negative Outcomes (excludes neutral outcomes (N=8))				
Current Status at Time of Interview (if Known)	*N=164*	*N=81*	*N=83*	*p value*
Positive Outcome: Still on Probation or Successful Discharge, or Positive Other	124 (76)	56 (69)	68 (82)	0.06
Negative Outcome: Discharge Unsuccessful or Revoked/Incarcerated, or Negative Other	40 (24)	25 (31)	15 (18)	

Factors Associated with Outcomes

- Are there factors associated with improved outcomes in felony drug offenders on probation across both groups?

While there were no significant differences in the percentages of probationers with violations of probation or negative drug tests for non-SSAS compared with SSAS probation, two outcome measures (Negative Drug Tests and Probation Violations) occurred with sufficient frequency in order to examine various factors that may have been associated with them.

In univariate analysis, probationers across both groups who received Incentives were more likely to have Negative Drug Tests than those who received no Incentives. Offenders who were on probation because of a methamphetamine conviction were also more likely to have a Negative Drug Test than those on probation for other drug-related offenses. No other factors (e.g., employment) were significantly associated with Negative Drug Tests. (Table 7)

In multivariate analysis, group (SSAS or non-SSAS), methamphetamine as primary drug of abuse, use of incentives, substance abuse treatment, participation in a 12-step program and employment status at entrance were used as predictors of the improved outcome of negative drug tests. Use of Incentives was marginally associated with Negative Drug Tests after adjusting for the other variables (OR=2.56, 95%CI: 0.99, 6.67, p=0.05). Specifically, offenders who received Incentives were 2.56 times more likely to have a Negative Drug Test than offenders who received no incentives after adjusting for the other variables in the model. SSAS or non-SSAS group, methamphetamine as primary

drug of abuse, substance abuse treatment, participation in a 12-step group and employment status at entrance were not significantly associated with negative drug tests.

Table 7: Negative Drug Tests (*N=132*)			
Factors	***N (%)***		***p value***
	Yes	***No***	
Meth conviction	77 (81)	55(67)	0.03
Received Incentives	52 (85)	80 (69)	0.02
ISP	72 (71)	60 (80)	0.16
Meth as primary drug of abuse	83 (79)	49 (68)	0.10
CBT + WEC	6 (86)	126 (74)	0.49
Motivational Interviewing	88 (74)	44 (76)	0.78
Mental illness	17 (74)	115 (75)	0.92
Substance Abuse Treatment	109 (76)	23 (68)	0.38
12-Step Group	111 (77)	21 (66)	0.26
Employed at Entrance Date	66 (77)	64 (72)	0.49

In univariate analysis, probationers who received Incentives and had methamphetamine as the primary drug of abuse were less likely to violate probation (p=0.02 and p=0.05, respectively). Though not statistically significant, there was a trend toward fewer probation violations in probationers who were employed at entrance date and those who participated in 12-Step Groups. There is no evidence of any difference in probation violations between those with or without mental illness. (Table 8)

In multivariate analysis, group (SSAS or non-SSAS), methamphetamine as primary drug of abuse, use of incentives, substance abuse treatment, participation in a 12-step group and employment status at entrance were used as predictors of the improved outcome of no Probation Violations during the 6-month timeframe. Use of Incentives was significantly associated with no violations of probation, after adjusting for the other variables. Specifically, probationers who received incentives were 2.42 times less likely to violate probation than probationers who received no incentives (OR=2.42, 95%CI: 1.07, 5.51, p=0.03). Employment at entrance was significantly associated with no violations after adjusting for the other variables in the model (OR=2.07, 95%CI: 1.07, 4.00, p=0.03). Specifically, offenders who were employed at entrance were 2.07 times less likely to violate probation than offenders who were not employed at entrance after adjusting for the other variables in the model. SSAS or non-SSAS group, methamphetamine as primary drug of abuse, substance abuse treatment and participation in a 12-step group were not significantly associated with the improved outcome of no violations.

Table 8: No Probation Violations (N=109)			
Factors	*N (%)*		*p value*
	Yes	*No*	
Meth as primary drug of abuse	71 (68)	38 (53)	0.05
Meth conviction	63 (66)	46 (56)	0.16
Received Incentives	45 (74)	64 (55)	0.02
Mental Illness	13 (63)	95 (57)	0.56
Participation in 12-Step Group	94 (65)	15 (47)	0.07
Employed at Entrance Date	59 (69)	49 (55)	0.09

SSAS Parolee Study

Nine parolees who voluntarily entered SSAS after incarceration during the first year of SSAS implementation were included in this study. Four SSAS Officers supervised these parolees and completed the study questionnaire for all but one parolee. One Parole Officer completed one study questionnaire.

- How did parolees do in SSAS?

There was no matched group of parolees with whom to compare the SSAS parolees; therefore, only descriptive data are available for this group. (See Appendix for descriptive statistics on these parolees.)

English was not the first language for one parolee. One parolee had a mental illness and one was employed at the start of parole. Three took part in educational or vocational rehabilitation during their time in SSAS, and two were enrolled at six months. Five were employed and two were volunteers after six months in SSAS.

Traditional Probation Practices were used with all parolees. Positive Reinforcement and Motivational Interviewing were utilized with eight of the nine parolees (88.9%) while four (44%) participated in CBT (groups) and five (56%) received Incentives.

All parolees were drug tested. The most frequently utilized programs were Substance Abuse Treatment (n=6) and Alcoholics Anonymous (n=7).

There were two violations among the parolees during their SSAS parole. One was a technical violation (positive drug test) that resulted in a sanction. The second was a law violation (two misdemeanors: domestic assault 3rd degree, resisting arrest; and one infraction: possessing marijuana). A revocation was filed on this parolee, charges were dismissed, and he/she returned to prison.

Some parolees were successfully released from parole after only five months of SSAS. At six months post-entrance to SSAS, one parolee was incarcerated. SSAS Officers could report Current Status as of the interview date for only four parolees ("successful"). The Current Status (at interview date) for five parolees was unknown.

Challenges and Strengths of the Study

Challenges

There were a number of challenges in the implementation and analysis in this retrospective study. Staff turnover among Officers in the probation system resulted in discrepancies between the information received in the original State dataset and the current reality. Chief Probation Officers provided alternative reporting Officers when needed.

In a number of instances terms used in the study questionnaire resulted in some confusion and uncertainty between research staff and SSAS/Probation Officers. For example:

"*Supervision Practices*." There appeared to be some "give" with terms among different Officers, both SSAS and non-SSAS. This likely reflects the transitional nature of SSAS implementation.

"*Traditional Probation Practices*." A non-SSAS Officer asked for a definition, and the State Office of Probation Administration provided one[22] for all the following interviews.

"*Programs participated in*" as a survey category evoked a range of interpretations by Officers. At sites across the state, available programs varied. (See Appendix for complete list of specific "Programs" utilized in SSAS and non-SSAS offenders).

"*Violations" language* utilized in the study questionnaire also appeared to be unfamiliar to some Officers, who expressed mild frustration with how to "fit" complex information into a pre-arranged format. A final question was added to the survey instrument,[23] providing for relevant information that none of the survey questions alone could capture.

"*Cognitive" practices and programs*. "Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) in groups" is listed as a Supervision Practice. "Cognitive programs" as a general term is also associated with two "Programs participated in" (*Moral Recognition Training* and *Thinking for a Change*), although these are not CBT.

"*Positive urine screen*." The wording of the survey instrument says only "positive urine screen." For consistency's sake, researchers entered data on *any positive test for drugs or alcohol* (urine screen, breathalyzer test, etc.) as "positive urine screen."

In a number of instances involving probationers who were sentenced to the Work Ethic Camp (WEC), re-interviews with SSAS/Probation Officers were necessary. These probationers initially completed four months of WEC. In the first research interviews, these initial four months were included in the six months of probation. However, because this study compares the first six months of SSAS and non-SSAS, we re-interviewed Officers to "start the six month clock" at actual SSAS programming (for SSAS probationers), or the start of actual probation or ISP (for non-SSAS, ISP/WEC

---

[22] Carey-Minardi, Deb. "Traditional Probation Practices means that the Officer brokers out for services, and the Officer meets with the probationer on a regular basis—either in the Office or at the probationer's home—even if only to do a drug screen." Personal communication.

[23] "Is there anything else about this probationer that you want us to know?" is Question 11.

probationers). "CBT in groups" had occurred in WEC. Re-starting the interview "clock" meant that for many ISP/WEC probationers (both SSAS and non-SSAS), "CBT in groups" was not counted as a Supervision Practice, even if they had participated in CBT groups in WEC.

Parolees who volunteered for SSAS were added to the study population in consultation with Parole Administration and the Office of Probation Administration. Due to differences in Probation and Parole recordkeeping systems and procedures, low numbers (nine) of SSAS parolees, and lack of a matched control group, the parolee portion of the study is descriptive only. (See Appendix)

While all SSAS probationers were served in one of the five SSAS sites, the non-SSAS control group was matched from probation offices statewide. It is possible that there are significant differences unrelated to SSAS in those counties where SSAS has not been implemented. For example, the largest urban areas in the state included three of the five SSAS sites. It is possible that the ability to recruit well-trained probation officers (either SSAS or non-SSAS) may vary by county/site.

The challenges inherent in any retrospective study were evident in this comparison. Because this study examines "real world" individuals, procedures and processes, Officers and research staff were obligated, at times, to characterize individuals or situations in a research questionnaire that may not have fully described the probationer's specific situation.

Lastly, because the SSAS and non-SSAS groups were not randomized in a "blinded" fashion at the time of their sentencing to SSAS or non-SSAS, it is possible (despite our best attempts to have a well-matched control group) that judges, Officers or others involved in the sentencing process, may have injected some bias (e.g., more severely impaired individuals assigned to SSAS) into their decision regarding SSAS or non-SSAS sentences.

Strengths

This study has a number of strengths that contribute to its usefulness. The research team had the strong support of the State of Nebraska Office of Probation Administration, with easy access to their leadership and significant input from them in study design and implementation. The Office of Probation Administration leadership were generous with their time and support of the research staff as the study questionnaire was designed, and they assisted with orienting the research staff to the probation system, its language and the nuances of various probation programs, practices, violations, and sanctions. Their support of the study contributed to the confidence of the probation staff as Probation Officers and SSAS Officers were contacted by research staff. Similarly, the Office of Probation Administration database was available in a secured manner to research staff to obtain baseline information about SSAS and non-SSAS probationers. The availability of a large pool of non-SSAS probationers from which to draw a matched control group also contributed significantly to the study. The ability to have a matched group, while

maintaining the privacy of the probationers, was critical to the quality of the study and its findings.

The willingness of State of Nebraska SSAS Officers and Probation Officers to participate in the study was indispensible to the research team. Officers were asked to obtain, review and describe the information in official records of multiple probationers, often without having had recent contact with the probationer. This frequently necessitated that officers commit a significant amount of time to this portion of the research study process and they were frequently re-contacted for clarification or additional information.

The ability to characterize accurately the SSAS and non-SSAS probationers and their specific offenses, while not an aim of the study, provides background data and enriches the study findings. Additionally, the ability to accurately and precisely describe probation violations and their consequences and the status of probationers at six months and at the time of the study contributes to the specificity of the findings. Lastly, the ability to identify factors associated with improved outcomes is critical and represents a contribution to the field.

Discussion

Findings from this study confirm that SSAS was implemented across five diverse sites with some consistency beginning in March 2006. While there was some variability in services provided to individual SSAS probationers, SSAS officers appear to have been trained and to have implemented four state-of-the-art Evidence-Based Practices that were employed across all sites. Positive Reinforcement and Motivational Interviewing were utilized on almost all SSAS probationers.

SSAS probationers were significantly more likely to be unemployed than non-SSAS probationers at entrance date. There was a trend toward greater use of methamphetamine as the primary drug of abuse in the SSAS group and, paradoxically, a trend toward greater methamphetamine-related convictions in the non-SSAS group. More SSAS than non-SSAS probationers had mental illness but this difference was not statistically significant. Unemployment and mental illness are frequently associated with poorer substance use disorder treatment outcomes.[24] Thus, the SSAS group in the first year of SSAS implementation may have been more impaired at entrance that the non-SSAS control group.

SSAS probationers received significantly more Evidence-Based Practices (Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Incentives, Positive Reinforcement and Motivational Interviewing) than non-SSAS probationers and were significantly more likely to receive Substance Abuse Treatment and to attend 12-Step Programs (such as Alcoholics Anonymous), both of which have been associated with improved substance use disorder treatment outcomes. SSAS probationers were also significantly more likely to participate in educational or

[24] Hser, Y.I., Evans, E., Teruya, C., Huang, D., Anglin, M.D.: Evaluation and Program Planning: 30 (2); 187-196 (May 2007).

vocational rehabilitation while on probation which may have been a factor in their exceeding the rate of employment of the non-SSAS group by the end of the first six months of probation.

There were no statistically significant differences in the primary or secondary outcome measures between the SSAS and non-SSAS group examined in Aim 1. While not significant, the SSAS group had fewer re-offenses, fewer violations, fewer incarcerations and fewer positive drug tests during the first six months of probation. Similarly, fewer SSAS than non-SSAS probationers were incarcerated for probation violations that occurred in the first six months despite greater unemployment and mental illness in the SSAS group at entry to probation. The general positive outcome (either successful discharge from probation or still being on probation) was greater in the SSAS than non-SSAS group and approached significance ($p=0.06$).

It is important to note that these positive findings, while not statistically significant, represent SSAS's first year of implementation. During this first year, two of the four Evidence-Based Practices were utilized with most SSAS participants, while two were not yet in widespread use in SSAS. As SSAS continues toward full implementation and matures into the widespread utilization of all four EBP, the greater use of Incentives may be expected to show continuing positive results. Similarly, as implementation of CBT in groups increases, positive outcomes may more frequently result. The cumulative effect of the utilization of all four Supervision Practices together may have the synergistic positive effect that has been seen in previous studies of EBP.

Lastly, use of Incentives was associated with "No Violations" and "Negative Drug Screens" across both SSAS and non-SSAS groups and was robust ($p=0.02$). This is consistent with recent findings in the substance abuse literature.[25] Use of Incentives (even at only nine percent utilization) appears to have been a factor in the successful outcomes for some non-SSAS probationers in this study. This is not an argument against SSAS but FOR the use of this EBP for all probationers in the state.

This study confirms recent findings that suggest that methamphetamine use disorders have treatment outcomes which are similar to other drugs of abuse. In this study, methamphetamine as the primary drug of abuse was associated with fewer probation violations, and having a methamphetamine-related conviction was associated with negative drug tests. Probation administrators may need to ask further if there are different practices (subtle or overt) that are being used with methamphetamine-related offenders that are also contributing to these positive outcomes, and whether those practices could become more explicit and more utilized with non-meth drug offenders.

Recommendations

The primary outcome measure (law violations during the first six months of probation) for this study resulted in a small difference between non-SSAS and SSAS groups (13% v. 7%). A study powered to achieve a significant difference (if the trend were to persist) would have to be, by necessity, large and may not be practical. If future studies are planned, primary outcome measures such as total "number of violations," "evidence of drug use" or "positive/negative probation outcome status" with a larger number of probationers enrolled over a longer period of time may be desirable.

This study contributes to the growing body of literature which supports the use of incentives in the treatment of substance use disorders. Findings from this study and the simplicity with which they can implemented, would support the widespread implementation of Incentives in probationers.

Appendix

Appendix 1: Survey Questionnaire

SSAS v non-SSAS Recidivism Study
SSAS Officer / Probation or Parole Officer Phone Interview Form

Today's Date __ __ / __ __ / __ __

Time in: __ __ : __ __ Time out: __ __ : __ __ Interviewer:_____

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE:
SSAS Recidivism Study

Script: **The University of Nebraska Medical Center, through a contract with the State's Office of Probation Administration, is conducting a study to determine the rate of recidivism among those who entered SSAS-enhanced probation/parole in comparison to those who entered non-SSAS-enhanced probation/parole. This is a retrospective study, and it involves probationers/parolees who entered SSAS between March 1, 2006 and February 28, 2007. Our study looks at each probationer/parolee during the first six months of their probation/parole period. We are going to be asking you, as the (SSAS) or (Probation/Parole) Officer, a few questions to help us have a "snapshot" of the probationer(s)/parolee(s) WHEN THEY WERE IN THE FIRST SIX MONTHS OF THEIR PROBATION/PAROLE.**

1. Name of Officer: _____

2. I am speaking now with a
__Probation Officer __Parole Officer __former ISP Officer* __SSAS Probation Officer
**Titles changed as of 1/1/08*

3. Located at:
__*SSAS Site* __*Non-SSAS Site:* _____
__Douglas County
__Sarpy/Cass/Otoe County
__Lancaster County
__Dakota County
__Buffalo/Dawson County

concerning:

4. **Probationer#** _____ or **Parolee#** _____

Group: ___SSAS __Non-SSAS

Entrance Date to __Probation __Parole and/or __SSAS: __ __ / __ __ / __ __
[For SSAS participants, must check SSAS plus probation or parole.] *[To be included, Entrance Date must be within 3/1/06- 2/28/07.]*

__Sentenced to probation or __Released on parole for how many months (length of probation/parole)? ____ months

What type of probation/parole? __Traditional
__ISP
__ISP/WEC (N/A for parole)

Six-month date of this person's original __Probation entrance/Parole date
and/or __SSAS Entrance __ __ / __ __ / __ __

---WE WILL REFER TO THE PERIOD OF TIME BETWEEN THE ENTRANCE DATE AND SIX-MONTHS POST-ENTRANCE AS THE "SIX-MONTH TIMEFRAME" IN THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS—

Were you the Officer assigned to this person at the Entrance Date? __Yes __No

Were you the Officer assigned to this person at the end of the six-month timeframe? __Yes __No

5. ***Primary Drug of Abuse at Entrance Date:*** (check one)

__ alcohol __Don't know
__ cannabis
  __ marijuana
  __ hashish
__ amphetamine
__ methamphetamine
__ cocaine
__ opiates
  __ oxycontin *(OxyContin, OxyJR)*
  __ oxycodone *(ETH-Oxydose, Oxyfast, OxyIR, Percocet, Percodan, Oxycodone, Oxycodan, Endodan, Endocet, Oxycocet, Roxicodone, PMS-Oxycodone Acetaminophen)*
  __ hydrocodone *(Vicodin, Anexsia, Co-Gesic, Hycet, Lorcet, Lortab, Hycodan, Hycotuss, Lortab, Zydone, Hycet, Hydrocodone, Margesic, Stagesic, Xodol, Maxidone, Norco, Tussionex)*
  __ heroin
  __ opium
  __ _____
  __ _____
__ LSD
__ PCP
__ Benzodiazepine
  __ diazepam *(AccuDial, Valium, Diastat, Diazepam, Diazepam Intensol)*
  __ alprazolam *(Niravam, Alprazolam, Xanax)*
  __ chlordiazepoxide *(Librium, Limbitrol, Chlordiazepoxide)*
  __ clonazepam *(Klonopin)*
  __ lorazepam *(Ativan, Lorazepam)*
  __ _____ ***Comments:***
__ Barbiturates
__ Other: _____

6. What ***Supervision Practice(s)*** were utilized during the six-month timeframe?
(check all that apply)

__ Traditional Probation Practices
__ Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) in groups
__ Use of Incentives
__ Positive Reinforcement
__ Motivational Interviewing
__ Don't know

What ***programs*** did this person get referred to, and participate in, during the six-month timeframe?
(check all that apply)

__ Moral Recognition Training
__ Mental Health Services
__ Reporting Centers
__ Drug Testing
__ Don't know

__ Substance Abuse Treatment
__ Thinking for a Change
__ Life Skills Training
__ _____
__ _____
Comments:

__ 12-Step Program:
__Alcoholics Anonymous (AA)
__Cocaine Anonymous (CA)
__Narcotics Anonymous (NA)
__Crystal Meth/Meth Anon(CMA)
__Gamblers Anonymous (GA)
__AA/NA combination group
__ _____

7. Is <u>English</u> this person's first language? __Yes __No __Don't know

8. ***"Return to Community: Employment / Education / Volunteering"***

Is this person **physically disabled**? __ Yes __ No __ Don't know

If yes, type of disability:_____

Is this probationer/parolee a person with **mental retardation**? __ Yes __ No __ Don't know

If yes, type of mental retardation: _____

Is this probationer/parolee a person with **mental illness**? __ Yes __ No __ Don't know

If yes, type of mental illness: _____

At the start of the six-month timeframe, was this person **employed**? __ Yes __ No __ Don't know
If yes: __Full time? (30 or more hours per week) __Don't know
__Part time? Number of hours per week _____ __Don't know
__Homemaker; not working outside the home

During the six-month timeframe, was this person in need of, and participate in, **additional education or vocational rehabilitation**?
__ Yes __ No __ Don't know

At the end of the six-month timeframe, was this person **enrolled in an educational or vocational rehabilitation** program?
__ Yes __ No __ Don't know

If yes:
Full time? (9 or more credit hours, or 20 or more contact hours, per week) __Yes __No __Don't know
Part time? (less than 9 credit hours, or less than 20 contact hours, per week) __Yes __No __Don't know

At the end of the six-month timeframe, was this person **employed**? __Yes __No __Don't know
If yes: Full time? (30 or more hours per week) __Yes __No __Don't know
Part time? __Yes __No Number of hours per week _____ __Don't know

At the end of the six-month timeframe, was this person engaged in any other community organization on a **volunteer basis** (other than for restitution or as a requirement of probation/parole)?
__ Yes __ No __ Don't know

If yes, how many hours per week? _____ __Don't know

[Say "For the following questions about violations, remember that we are asking only about the six-month timeframe."]

9. ***"Probation/Parole Violation"/ "Re-Offense" / "Incarceration"***
Were there **violations of probation/parole** by this person during **six-month timeframe?**
__ Yes __ No __ Don't know

If yes, **how many** violations? #____ __Don't know

__1st __2nd __3rd __ incidence of violation of probation/parole: **Probationer/Parole #:** _____

__ **Technical violation** of probation/parole
- __ Failure to report
- __ Positive urine screen
- __ Failure to complete participation in program
- __ Failure to obtain an evaluation
- __ _____
- __ _____
- __ _____

What was the **result** of this incidence of a technical violation?
- __ Sanction
- __ Revocation of probation/parole
  - __Jail # of days____ [for parolee, unlikely jail]
  - __Prison # of days____
  - __Probation/parole continued, with conditions
  - __Other: _____ *Comments:*
    _____
    _____

__ **Law violation** ("Re-Offense")
- __ misdemeanor
  - __ Class I offense: _____
  - __ Class II offense: _____
  - __ Class III offense: _____
  - __ Class IV offense: _____
  - __ Class V offense: _____
- __ felony
  - __ Class I offense: _____
  - __ Class II offense: _____
  - __ Class III offense: _____
  - __ Class IV offense: _____

What was the **result** of this incidence of law violation charges?
- __ Sanction
- __ Revocation of probation/parole
  - __Jail # of days____ [for parolee, unlikely jail]
  - __Prison# of days____
  - __Probation/parole continued, with conditions
  - __Other: _____ *Comments:*
    _____
    _____

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS APPLY ***ONLY*** IF A MOTION TO REVOKE PROBATION/PAROLE HAS BEEN FILED.

What happened regarding the original probation sentence/parole order?
__Probation/parole was revoked & defendant was sentenced to _____?
__Probation/parole was continued with additional conditions _____?
__Charges were dismissed as part of a plea agreement.
__No changes to the probation/parole; continued as originally ordered.
__Other: _____ *Comments:*

What happened regarding the new law violation/offense?
__The defendant was sentenced on the new law violation to:
- __Jail [for parolee, unlikely jail]

__Prison
__A new term of Probation/Parole
__Other: _____ *Comments:*

Use additional sheets if there have been more violations of probation/parole.

10. ***"Incarceration, continued"***

What was the status of this probationer/parolee at the end of the six-month timeframe?

__Don't know
__Still on probation/parole
__Incarcerated: __Jail __Prison
__Discharged from probation/parole

If you know it, what is the ***current*** status of this probationer/parolee?

__ Active __ Discharged: Other: *Comments:*
__ Successful _____
__ Unsuccessful (No consequences) _____
__ Revoked (Consequences) _____

11. Is there anything else about this probationer/parolee that you want us to know? __Yes __No

If yes, please explain:

_____
_____
_____
_____

Appendix 2: Reasons for Original Convictions						
Reason	*Total (N=177)*		*Non-SSAS (N=88)*		*SSAS (N=89)*	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Amphetamine Sale Drug Funds-Cooperating Ind. O	1	0.56	1	1.14	0	
Amphetamine-Possession	76	42.94	40	45.45	36	40.45
Amphetamine-Possession with Intent	17	9.6	9	10.23	8	8.99
Amphetamine-Selling	1	0.56	1	1.14	0	
Anabolic Steroid - Possession with Intent	2	1.12	2	2.27	0	
Barbiturate-Possession	1	0.56	1	1.14	0	
Cocaine-Possession	13	7.34	6	6.82	7	7.87
Cocaine-Possession with Intent	1	0.56	1	1.14	4	4.49
Cocaine-Selling	2	1.12	0		1	1.12
Dangerous Drugs	3	1.69	3	3.41	0	
Marijuana Possession-more than oz. less than I	2	1.12	2	2.27	0	
Marijuana-Possession-More than 1 lb.	2	1.12	1	1.14	1	1.12
Marijuana-Producing-Harvesting	2	1.12	1	1.14	1	1.12
Marijuana-Selling	5	2.28	3	3.41	2	2.25
Not Useable	1	0.56	1	1.14	0	
Obtain Controlled Substance by Misrepresentation	1	0.56	1	1.14	0	
Obtaining Controlled Substance-Forged Prescription	1	0.56	1	1.14	0	
Pharmaceutical Controlled Substance-Possession	30	16.95	7	7.95	23	25.84
Possess or Obtain Legend Drug without Prescription	1	0.56	1	1.14	0	
Possession Cont. Substance other than Original	2	1.12	2	2.27	0	
Possession With Intent to Deliver	9	5.08	4	4.55	5	5.62
Hallucinogen-Manufacturing	2	1.12	0		1	1.12

Appendix 3: SSAS Probationers (N=89)—"Programs Referred to and Participated in"									
Moral Recog Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
SSAS Officer 1—Sarpy/Cass/Otoe (N=10)									
			x	x			AA		
		x	x	x			AA		
			x	x			NA		
	x	x	x	x			AA		
		x	x	x long-term res			AA		
			x	x	x		AA		
			x	x	x		AA	½ way hse	
			x	x			AA		
		x	x	x			AA		
			x	x		Parenting Class	AA		
0	1	4	10	10	2	1	10		
SSAS Officer 2—Lancaster (N=15)									
				x short-term res					
		x	x	x short-term res AfterCare		Employmt Class	AA/NA		
			x	x short-term res					
		x	x	x IOP AfterCare			AA/NA	RestorJustice	
		x	x	x short-term res AfterCare		Employmt Class	AA/NA	ElecMonitor	
		x	x				AA/NA		
		x	x	x short-term res AfterCare	x	Employmt Class	AA/NA		
	x	x	x	x short-term res AfterCare	x	Anger Managemt	AA/NA	Reconstructn Project + RestorJustice	¾ way hse

(SSAS Officer 2 continued)

Moral Recog Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
	x WomenTrauma Grp	x	x	x IOP AfterCare		Anger Managemt Attitudes Time Mgmt CommunResourc	AA/NA	RestorJustice	
	x	x	x	x IOP AfterCare			AA/NA		
		x	x	x short-term res AfterCare	x	Anger Managemt	AA/NA	RestorJustice	½ way hse
		x	x	x short-term res IOP AfterCare		Anger Managemt Employmt Class Stress Mgmt	AA/NA		½ way hse
		x	x	x short-term res AfterCare	x	Employmt Class	AA/NA	RestorJustice	¾ way hse
		x	x	x short-term res AfterCare			AA/NA		½ way hse
		x	x	x IOP AfterCare	x	Stress Mgmt Attitudes Parenting Class CommunResourc	AA/NA	RestorJustice	
0	3	13	14	14	5	9	13		
SSAS Officer 3—Sarpy/Cass/Otoe (N=3)									
			x	x		x	AA/NA		
	x	x	x	x			AA/NA		
			x	x			AA/NA		
0	1	1	3	3	0	1	3		
SSAS Officer 4—Douglas (N=11)									
		x	x	x			AA sponsor	ElecMonitor	
	x		x	x res trtmt		x	AA + MA sponsor		
			x	x		x	AA + CA sponsor	Wellspring + SienaFrancis	

(SSAS Officer 4 continued)

Moral Recog Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
		x	x	x			AA sponsor	PreTreatmt	
		x	x				AA		
			x	x			AA sponsor		
			x	x			AA + MA sponsor	SienaFrancis	
	x		x	x			AA + MA sponsor	SienaFrancis	
			x	x			AA + MA sponsor	SienaFrancis	
	x		x	x res trtmt			AA/NA	Spring Ctr + SantaMonica	¾ way hse
		x	x	x			AA + CA sponsor		
0	3	4	11	10	0	2	11		
SSAS Officer 5—Dakota (N=2)									
x		x	x	x		x	NA		
		x	x	x AfterCare		x	AA/NA	"Pathfinder"	
1	0	2	2	2	0	2	2		
SSAS Officer 6—Dakota (N=6)									
x	x WomenSupport Grp	x	x	x		x	AA/NA	Relapse Prevention Educ	
x		x	x	x		x	AA		
	x	x	x	x			AA		
	x	x	x	x	x	x	AA/NA		
		x	x	x	x	x Parenting Class	AA		
	x	x	x	x		x	AA		
2	4	6	6	6	2	5	6		
SSAS Officer 7—Douglas (N=12)									
		x	x	x		Parenting Coach	AA/NA	PreTreatmt	
		x	x	x IOP			AA/NA		

(SSAS Officer 7 continued)

Moral Recog Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
		x	x	x Methadone Clinic			NA	½ way hse	
		x	x	x res trtmt			AA/NA		
	x	x	x	x IOP			AA		
		x	x	x IOP			AA		
		x	x	x			AA/NA	½ way hse	
		x	x	x			AA/NA		
			x	x			AA/NA		
	x		x	x			AA/NA		
	x	x	x	x			AA/NA		
		x	x	x			AA/NA		
0	3	10	12	12	0	1	12		
SSAS Officer 8—Buffalo/Dawson (N=1)									
		x	x	x		x	AA + NA	Crt-Ordered CommService	
0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1		
SSAS Officer 9—Douglas (N=10)									
		x	x	x 1/2way hse			CMA		
		x	x	x 1/2way hse			AA/NA		
	x		x		x		AA	½ way hse	
		x	x	x			AA	PreTreatmt	
		x	x	x			NA	PreTreatmt	
		x	x	x			AA	DiabolicalBehavior Techniques	
								No Programs	
		x	x	x			unknown which	PreTreatmt	
		x	x	x			NA		
			x		x		AA		
0	1	7	9	7	2	0	9		

Moral Recog Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
SSAS Officer 10—Lancaster (N=17)									
		x	x	x short-term res IOP	x		AA + NA		
	x	x	x	x		Anger Managemt	AA + NA	Sober House	
		x	x	x short-term res		Anger Managemt	AA + NA	House of Hope	
		x	x	x IOP			AA + NA	RestorJustice	Crt-Ordered CommService
		x	x	x IOP AfterCare ContinuingCare	x	x Attitudes Time Mgmt CommunResourc Money Mgmt Stress Mgmt	AA	RestorJustice	Crt-Ordered CommService
			x	x short-term res long-term res			AA + NA		
	x WomenTrauma Grp	x	x	x IOP		Anger Managemt	AA		
		x	x	x IOP	x	x CommunResourc Stress Mgmt	NA	RestorJustice	Crt-Ordered CommService
	x	x	x	x		x	AA + NA		
		x	x	x IOP ContinuingCare	x	x Attitudes Time Mgmt Money Mgmt Stress Mgmt		RestorJustice	Crt-Ordered CommService
	x	x	x	x short-term res long-term res	x	x Money Mgmt	AA + NA		CommService as req of long- trm trtmt

(SSAS Officer 10 continued)

Moral Recog Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*Sub Abuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
		x	x	x IOP		x Anger Mgmt Attitudes Time Mgmt CommunResourc Money Mgmt Stress Mgmt	AA + NA	RestorJustice ½ way hse	Crt-Ordered CommService
	x	x	x	x short-term res			AA + NA		
	x	x	x	x short-term res		x Money Mgmt			
	x WomenTraumaGrp	x	x	x short-term res		x Anger Mgmt	AA	Dual Diagnosis	
		x	x	x IOP					
	x	x	x	x short-term res long-term res	x		AA + NA		
0	8	16	17	17	6	11	14		
SSAS Officer 11—Buffalo/Dawson (N=2)									
x		x	x	x			AA + NA		
		x	x	x res trtmt		x	NA		
1	0	2	2	2	0	1	2		

Appendix 4: Non-SSAS Probationers (N=88)—"Programs Referred to and Participated in"

Moral Recog Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
Non-SSAS Officer 1—Douglas/North (N=6)									
	Indiv Counseling		x						
			x	x			AA/NA		
			x	x			AA		
			x						
			x	x					
			x	x			AA/NA		
0	1	0	6	4	0	0	3		
Non-SSAS Officer 2—Hall (N=1)									
	Codependency Grp		x	x			NA		
0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 3—Douglas/South (N=2)									
	Indiv Counseling		x			Appropriate Decisions Class			
	Indiv Counseling		x				AA + NA		
0	2	0	2	0	0	1	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 4—Madison/Norfolk (N=1)									
			x	x		x at Rescue Mission	AA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 5—Dakota (N=1)									
			x	x AfterCare			AA + NA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 6—Lancaster (N=4)									
			x	x					
			x	x			AA		
			x	x			AA		
			x	x					
0	0	0	4	4	0	0	2		

Appendix 4: Non-SSAS Probationers (N=88)—"Programs Referred to and Participated in"

Moral Recon Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
Non-SSAS Officer 7—Sarpy (N=1)									
	WomenSupportGrp		x	x			NA	Tour of Prison	
0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 8—Polk (N=1)									
			x	x				Surveillance-house visits/employer contacts	
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 9—Douglas/North (N=1)									
			x	x			AA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 10—York/Hamilton (N=1)									
	x Indiv Counseling		x	x res trtmt			AA + NA	½ way hse	
0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 11—Merrick (N=1)									
			x	x					
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 12—Hall (N=1)									
	x		x	x			AA + NA		
0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 13—Douglas/South (N=1)									
								No Programs	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 14—Lancaster (N=1)									
			x	x short-term res IOP			AA + NA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		

Appendix 4: Non-SSAS Probationers (N=88)—"Programs Referred to and Participated in"

Moral Recon Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
Non-SSAS Officer 15—Saline/Fillmore (N=2)									
			1	1			AA	MADD VictimImpact Panels	
			1	1			AA + NA + AA/NA		
0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2		
Non-SSAS Officer 16—Douglas/South (N=1)									
			x						
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 17—Valley County (N=1)									
								No Programs	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 18—Scotts Bluff (N=2)									
			x	x			AA + NA		
			x	x			AA		
0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2		
Non-SSAS Officer 19—Hall (N=2)									
			x	x IOP			NA		
			x	x		x	AA		
0	0	0	2	2	0	1	2		
Non-SSAS Officer 20—Saunders (N=1)									
	x		x				AA	ElecMonitor	
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 21—Douglas (N=1)									
			x	x			AA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		

Appendix 4: Non-SSAS Probationers (N=88)—"Programs Referred to and Participated in"

Moral Recon Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
Non-SSAS Officer 22—Wayne County (N=1)									
			x						
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 23—Wayne County (N=1)									
			x	x AfterCare IOP			AA + NA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 24—Douglas/North (N=1)									
								No Programs	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 25—Lancaster (N=1)									
			x baseline only						
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 26—Adams (N=1)									
				x			AA	ElecMonitor	
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 27—Box Butte (N=1)									
			x				AA + NA		
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 28—Douglas (N=1)									
			x	x					
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 29—Cass (N=3)									
			x	x outpatient			AA + NA	Crt-Ordered CommService	

Appendix 4: Non-SSAS Probationers (N=88)—"Programs Referred to and Participated in"

Moral Recon Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
			x	x outpatient			AA + NA	Crt-Ordered CommService	
			x	x			AA + NA	Crt-Ordered CommService	
0	0	0	3	3	0	0	3		
Non-SSAS Officer 30—Seward County (N=1)									
			x	x outpatient IOP AfterCare			AA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 31—Madison/Norfolk (N=1)									
			x	x			AA + NA	Crt-Ordered CommService	Community Support
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 32—Douglas/North (probationer was at South) (N=1)									
			x	x					
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 33—Red Willow/McCook (N=1)									
	x		x	x					
0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 34—Madison/Norfolk (N=1)									
			x	x			NA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 35—Washington/Blair (N=2)									
			x	x			AA	Regular doctor visits	
	Indiv Counseling		x				AA		
0	1	0	2	1	0	0	2		

Appendix 4: Non-SSAS Probationers (N=88)—"Programs Referred to and Participated in"

Moral Recon Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
Non-SSAS Officer 36—Douglas/South (N=1)									
			x	x			AA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 37—Douglas (N=2)									
			x	x			NA		
	x		x	x AfterCare			AA	ElecMonitor	
0	1	0	2	2	0	0	2		
Non-SSAS Officer 38—Jefferson/Fillmore/Saline (N=4)									
			x	x					
			x					SubAbuseEval	
			x	x			AA/NA		
			x	x			AA	ElecMonitor	
0	0	0	4	3	0	0	2		
Non-SSAS Officer 39—Douglas/South (N=1)									
			x	x				Weed&Seed	
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 40—Lincoln County/North Platte (N=1)									
			x	x					
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 41—Dodge/Fremont (N=1)									
			x	x			AA + NA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 42—Platte/Columbus (N=1)									
			x	x		x	AA + NA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1		

Appendix 4: Non-SSAS Probationers (N=88)—"Programs Referred to and Participated in"

Moral Recon Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
Non-SSAS Officer 43—Lancaster (N=1)									
			x	x		x Parenting	AA	ElecMonitor	
0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 44—Platte (N=1)									
			x				AA	SubAbuseGroup	½ way hse
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 45—Sarpy (N=1)									
			x	x	x		AA		
0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 46—Dodge (N=1)									
			x	x		Appropriate Decisions Class			
0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 47—Douglas/South (N=1)									
			x						
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 48—Phelps (N=1)									
			x						
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 49—Dodge/Washington (N=1)									
			x					SubAbuseEval	ElecMonitor
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 50—Douglas/North (N=1)									
x		x	x	x		x	NA		
1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1		

Appendix 4: Non-SSAS Probationers (N=88)—"Programs Referred to and Participated in"

Moral Recon Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
Non-SSAS Officer 51—Adams (probationer was from Garden County) (N=1)									
	x		x				AA + NA sponsor	½ way hse	
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 52—Platte/Columbus (N=2)									
			x				AA/NA		
			x	x			AA + NA		
0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2		
Non-SSAS Officer 53—Pierce/Madison (N=2)									
	x		x	x			AA		
	x		x			Community Support	AA + NA		
0	2	0	2	1	0	1	2		
Non-SSAS Officer 54—Holt (N=1)									
	x		x	x			AA + NA	SubAbuseEval	
0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 55—Douglas/North (N=1)									
			x	x					
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 56—Lancaster (N=1)									
			x				30 mtngs in 30 days—any 12-step		
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 57— (N=)									
			x				NA		
			x				NA		
0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2		

Appendix 4: Non-SSAS Probationers (N=88)—"Programs Referred to and Participated in"

Moral Recon Training	*Mental Health Svcs*	*Reporting Centers*	*Drug Testing*	*SubAbuse Treatment*	*Thinking for a Change*	*Life Skills Training*	*12-Step Program*	*Other 1*	*Other 2*
Non-SSAS Officer 58—Douglas/South (N=1)									
			x				AA + CA+ NA		
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 59—Otoe (N=1)									
			x					50 hrs Crt-Ordered CommService	
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Non-SSAS Officer 60—Douglas (probationer from Washington County) (N=1)									
			x				AA		
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 61—Douglas/North (N=1)									
			x		x		AA		
0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 62—Madison/Norfolk (N=3)									
			x	x short-term res IOP AfterCare		Community Support Svcs	AA + NA		
	Indiv Counseling Family Counseling		x	x			AA + NA	SubAbuseEval	
	x		x	x IOP		Community Support Svcs	AA + NA		
0	2	0	3	3	0	2	3		
Non-SSAS Officer 63—Hall (N=1)									
			x	x			AA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		
Non-SSAS Officer 64—Washington (N=1)									
			x	x			AA		
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		

Appendix 5: Technical Violations that Resulted in Incarceration*				
Non-SSAS Probationer	***Sent to Jail***	***Sent to Prison***	***Duration of Incarceration***	***Serving time for†:***
Person 1 PO #1	X		264 days	Failed to complete
Person 2 PO #2	X		180 days	Failed to complete
Person 3 PO #3	X		180 days	Failed to provide change of address
Person 4 PO #4		X	20-36 months prison, w/ credit for 253 days	Frequented places & assoc w criminals;Admitted drug use; Failed to attend counseling
Person 5 PO #5	X		180 days	Failed to complete
Person 6 PO #6	X		180 days	Failed to complete
Person 7 PO #7		X	1 year	Failed to complete
SSAS Probationer	***Sent to Jail***	***Sent to Prison***	***Duration of Incarceration***	***Serving time for†:***
Person 1 SSAS PO #1	X		180 days	Probationer absconded
Person 2 SSAS PO #1	X		270 days	Hijacking in another's urine
Person 3 SSAS PO #2		X	20 mos-5 yrs	Probationer absconded
Person 4 SSAS PO #2		X	36-48 months	Failed to complete
Person 5 SSAS PO #3	X		150 days	Probationer absconded
Person 6 SSAS PO #3		X	20-36 months	Probationer absconded

*These probationers only have technical violations. (i.e,, they did not also have law violations)
†"Failure to complete participation in program" was sometimes reported as "absconded" and vice versa.

Appendix 6: Law Violations in First Six Months						
Non-SSAS Probationer	***Misdemeanor***	***Felony***	***Sent to Jail***	***Sent to Prison***	***Duration of Incarceration***	***Serving time for:***
Person 1 PO #1	X		X		45 days+	Domestic assault
Person 2 PO #2	X				None	
Person 3 PO #3	X		X		120 days	Giving false info; unlawful acts; credit card fraud
Person 4 PO #4	X		Still pending			Disturbing peace
Person 5 PO #5	X					Driving under suspension
Person 6 PO #6	X					Trespassing
Person 7 PO #7	X		X		30 days	Making false statements
Person 8 PO #8	X		X		7 days*	Giving false report; unlawful acts
Person 9 PO #9	X			X	20-30 months	Simple assault
Person 10 PO #10	Other					DUI
Person 11 PO #11		X	X		90 days^	Assault on a police officer
SSAS Probationer	***Misdemeanor***	***Felony***	***Sent to Jail***	***Sent to Prison***	***Duration of Incarceration***	***Serving time for:***
Person 1 SSAS PO #1	X			X	1-2 years	Giving false info; forgery
Person 2 SSAS PO #1		X		X	1-2 years	Delivery of cocaine
Person 3 SSAS PO #2	X	X	X		135 days	Contribute to delinquency of minor; meth possession
Person 4 SSAS PO #3	X					Driving under suspension
Person 5 SSAS PO #3		X	X		2-3 days^	Meth possession
Person 6 SSAS PO #3		X		X	2-5 years	Possess,deliver controlled substance

*served before 6 month date
+served after 6 month date
^unclear if served before or after 6 month date

Appendix 7: Characteristics of SSAS Parolees (N=9)	*N (%)*
Primary Drug of Abuse	
Marijuana	1 (11)
Methamphetamine	7 (78)
Cocaine	1 (11)
Supervision Practices	
Traditional	9 (100)
CBT	4 (44)
Incentives	5 (56)
Positive reinforcement	8 (89)
Motivational interview	8 (89))
Programs Referred to and Participated in	
Moral recognition training	0
Mental health services	1 (11)
Reporting centers	5 (56)
Drug testing	9 (100)
Substance abuse treatment	6 (67)
Thinking for a change	3 (33)
Life skills training	2 (22)
Other	1 (11)
Alcoholics anonymous	7 (78)
Cocaine anonymous	0
Narcotics anonymous	5 (56)
Crystal meth anonymous	2 (22)
Gamblers anonymous	0
AA/NA combination	1 (11)
Other 12 step	0
English as First Language	8 (89)
Physically Disabled	2 (22)
Mental Retardation	9 (100)
Mental Illness	1 (11)
Employed at Start of 6-month Timeframe	1 (11)
Employed full time	1 (11)
Employed at End of 6-month timeframe	5 (56)
Employed full time	3
Employed part time	1
Unknown	1
Education/Vocational Rehab during 6- month Timeframe	3 (33)

(Appendix 7 Continued)

Enrolled in Education/Vocational Rehab at end of 6-month Timeframe	2 (22)
Volunteered at End of 6-month Timeframe	2 (22)
Violations of Parole during 6-month Timeframe	2 (22)
Technical Violations	
Failure to report	0
Positive urine screen	1
Failure to complete program	0
Failure to obtain evaluation	0
Other technical violation	0
Failure to report	0
Result of Technical Violations	
Revocation filed; charges dismissed; back to prison	1
Status at End of 6-month Timeframe	
Still on parole	6 (67)
Prison	1 (11)
Discharged from parole	2 (22)
Current Status	
Successful	4 (44)
Unknown	5 (56)