

# PROBATION IN MAINE: *SETTING THE BASELINE*

AUTHORS:  
*MARK RUBIN*  
*JENNIFER DODGE*

University of Southern Maine  
Muskie School of Public Service

PROJECT TECHNICAL REPORT FOR THE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

JULY 2009

This technical report was developed under the auspices of a cooperative agreement (#05C43GJG4) between the University of Southern Maine and National Institute of Corrections. Funding for this report was provided by the National Institute of Corrections and data was collected through a collaborative agreement with the Maine Department of Corrections. The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of the US Department of Justice or the Maine Department of Corrections.

ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MAINE (USM)  
MUSKIE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE

The USM Muskie School of Public Service educates leaders, informs public policy, and strengthens civic life through its graduate degree programs, research institutes and public outreach activities. By making the essential connection between research, practice, and informed public policy, the School is dedicated to improving the lives of people of all ages, in every county in Maine and every state in the nation.

AUTHORS:

*Mark Rubin, USM Muskie School of Public Service*  
*Jennifer Dodge, USM Muskie School of Public Service*

EDITOR:

*Carmen Dorsey, USM Muskie School of Public Service*

LAYOUT:

*Sheri Moulton, Muskie School of Public Service*

July, 2009

*This report is available on the Justice Policy Program Website:*  
<http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch>

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	1
Summary	1
Introduction	2
Purpose of Study	3
Findings	5
Table 1 – Characteristics of Maine Probationer Sample, 2004-2006	5
Table 2 – Risk Level by Year Entering Probation	6
Table 3 – One-year Recidivism Rates by Risk Category and Cohort	6
Table 4 – Characteristics of One-year Recidivists	7
Table 5 – Recidivism within One Year (0=No, 1=Yes)	9
Table 6 – Risk Level & LSI Predictors	10
Discussion	11
Conclusion	13
References	14

## ABSTRACT

In 2005, the Maine Department of Corrections (MDOC), with support from the National Institute of Corrections, began implementing a series of evidence-based principles in community corrections with the goal of improving the effectiveness of offender management in the community. This study was conducted to determine the types, extent, and frequencies of adult probation recidivism in Maine before and during the implementation period. The study finds that recidivism rates of offenders who entered probation in 2004, 2005, or 2006 did not change significantly across annual cohorts, but lower risk offenders appeared to have improved outcomes in 2006. Higher risk probationers performed worse over the three year period, as they faced greater supervision and case planning requirements. The study concludes that without sufficient cognitive based therapy services, management's increased focus on higher risk offenders will only mean increased supervision, and could lead to higher recidivism outcomes.

## SUMMARY

The Maine Department of Corrections was selected by the National Institute of Corrections to adopt evidence-based practices in its adult probation services. The Maine Justice Policy Center (MJPC), which served as the state research partner to the initiative, analyzed three cohorts of individuals entering probation in 2004, 2005, and 2006 to set a baseline for probation recidivism measurement, and to determine whether recidivism had declined as a result of changing practices.

This research is the first study to examine the characteristics and predictors of recidivism of probationers in Maine. For this study, recidivism is defined as the *arrest of a probationer for a new crime within one year of entering probation*.

The research presented here follows a one-year recidivism time frame, and measures independent variables to determine which are predictive of recidivism. Researchers analyzed a sample of 11,954 offenders entered probation between January 2004 and December 2006. More than four-fifths (82.5%) were male, and the majority (57.8%) were single.

The one-year recidivism rate rose overall, from 21.3% in the 2004 cohort to 24.8% in the 2006 cohort. The one-year recidivism rate for administrative and low risk offenders declined 14.9% and 30.4%, respectively. Moderate, high and maximum offenders' one-year recidivism rates increased 9.5%, 29.3% and 9.3%, respectively.

Male probationers were significantly more likely than female probationers to recidivate within one year, as were unmarried probationers, probationers with less than a high school degree, and probationers not employed on a full-time basis. These findings are consistent with previous research on probationer recidivism. .

Initial findings show promising results for lower risk probationers, but also show recidivism increases among higher risk offenders. During the study period, MDOC implemented several policy and practice

changes to incorporate EBP in community corrections. Several of the changes were made to intensify the focus on Maine’s highest risk probationers. This report suggests that more intensive case management of higher risk probationers will only prove successful if the state has a sufficient level of high quality services, such as cognitive based therapy to guide positive offender behavioral change. Without these resources, management’s increased focus on higher risk offenders helps to serve an immediate public safety goal, but does not fully address the longer term behavioral change needs of probationers in Maine communities.

## INTRODUCTION

In 2005, Maine was one of two states<sup>1</sup> chosen to begin implementing a series of evidence-based principles in community corrections as part of a National Institute of Corrections’ (NIC) pilot project to improve the effectiveness of correctional management of offenders in the community. The Maine Department of Corrections led the initiative, and the Maine Justice Policy Center (MJPC) served as state research partner.

Evidence-based principles (EBP) are a set of rehabilitation program components and characteristics that, when incorporated effectively, help to reduce the criminogenic attitudes, associations and behaviors of offenders. The eight principles of EBP are (Gendreau, 1996):

1. Assess Actuarial Risk/Needs
2. Enhance Intrinsic Motivation
3. Target Interventions
  - a. *Risk Principle*: Prioritize supervision and treatment resources for higher risk offenders.
  - b. *Need Principle*: Target interventions to criminogenic needs.
  - c. *Responsivity Principle*: Be responsive to temperament, learning style, motivation, culture, and gender when assigning programs.
  - d. *Dosage*: Structure 40-70% of high-risk offenders’ time for 3-9 months.
  - e. *Treatment*: Integrate treatment into the full sentence/sanction requirements.
4. Skill Train with Directed Practice (use Cognitive Behavioral treatment methods)
5. Increase Positive Reinforcement
6. Engage Ongoing Support in Natural Communities
7. Measure Relevant Processes/Practices
8. Provide Measurement Feedback (Immerse the offender in an environment where pro-social activities predominate.)

According to Gendreau, community corrections programs that incorporate these principles into practice will experience recidivism reductions of 25% to 60% over time. MJPC analyzed three cohorts of individuals entering probation in 2004, 2005, and 2006 to determine whether recidivism declined as a result of changing practices.

---

<sup>1</sup> The other state was Illinois

## PURPOSE OF STUDY

The study analyzes data on offenders committed to probation in Maine in 2004, 2005 and 2006; and addresses the following research questions:

- What are the characteristics of offenders committed to probation in Maine in 2004, 2005, and 2006?
- What are the types, extent and frequencies of probation recidivism in Maine?
- What are the likely correlates (predictors) of probationer recidivism in Maine?

The aims of the study are to assess the extent of probation recidivism in Maine and to provide recommendations on future evidence-based strategies to reduce probationer recidivism rates.

## SUMMARY OF LITERATURE

Although a few studies have attempted to improve understanding of probationer recidivism, none have examined probationers in Maine. Recidivism can be defined as the reversion or relapse to criminal acts of an offender who has been subject to punitive sanctions or rehabilitative treatment for previous conduct (Maltz, 1984). Based on varying definitions of recidivism, rates have been reported from a high of 65% re-arrest rate of probationers in California (Petersilia, 1985) to a lower estimate such as that reported by Vito (1987) of an 18% reconviction rate among probationers in Kentucky. Notably, these studies differ in many respects, particularly on specific definitions of recidivism (i.e., arrests, incarceration, convictions), and, the amount of time the probationers are followed-up.

More recently, Maxwell (1999) studied a sample of 1,500 probationers in Michigan, and found that a probationer's education, ethnicity, type of offense, prior record, history of substance abuse, requirement of drug/alcohol testing, and initial supervision level were predictive of probation violations.

Joseph (2001) analyzed a group of 200 probationers in Tennessee; she found that age, prior misdemeanor arrests, and offender category have significant correlations to recidivism.

Kubrin and Stewart (2006) studied 4,600 probationers in Oregon, and found that at the individual offender level, prior arrests, being on non-probation supervision, prior offending, and receiving a new sanction correlated highly with recidivism.

Finally, Cox (2008) analyzed 531 probationer records in Connecticut to evaluate the effects of a probation transition program on probationer technical violations and new arrests within one year. He found that the most predictive variables of probationer arrests were race, age, Level of Service Inventory – Revised (LSI-R) score, and marital status.

## VARIABLES/MEASURES

The definition of recidivism for the purposes of this research is drawn from the definition used in Kubrin and Stewart's study (2006) as the *arrest of a probationer for a new crime (felony or misdemeanor) within one year of entering probation*. As Kubrin and Stewart point out, using arrests instead of new convictions circumvents judicial and correctional system data issues.

The analysis provides recidivism outcomes and compares them with demographic characteristics of probationers, cohort (year entering probation), and LSI-R risk level upon entering probation.

The Level of Service Inventory – Revised (LSI-R) is used to assess the level of risk of recidivism of an offender. The LSI-R score is comprised of 10 categories, or domains: Criminal History, Education/Employment, Finances, Family/Marital, Accommodations, Leisure/Recreation, Companions, Alcohol/Drug, Emotional/Personal, and Attitude/Orientation. The total LSI-R score can range from 0 to 54, with lower numbers indicating less likelihood of recidivating than higher numbers. Many LSI-R domains are *dynamic* (can be changed) and are important for case planning and case management, as probation officers and treatment providers work with a probationer to effect positive behavior changes. Others, such as Criminal History, are *static* and cannot be changed.

### **METHODOLOGY**

Researchers conducted three levels of analysis: (1) basic descriptive statistics, which provide an overview of the population; (2) bivariate analysis, to determine the characteristics of one-year recidivists and non-recidivists; and (3) binary logistic regression, to determine the characteristics that influence probationers' likelihood of violating probation, recidivating within one year, and recidivating within two years.

### **LIMITATIONS**

As with any research using secondary data sources, completeness and accuracy of the data is an issue. A portion of each cohort lacked the LSI-R scores used to determine risk levels. LSI-R scores were missing for 16.4% of probationers in the 2004 cohort, 19.0% in the 2005 cohort, and 11.9% in the 2006 cohort.

Policy and practice changes also impacted the probation system, which likely had different effects on cohorts, depending upon timing of the change. For example, in late 2004, new law and policy changes restricted probation to felonies and a limited number of misdemeanors. In 2006, the re-calibration of Maine's probationer risk levels, intended to better identify the higher risk probationers for case management and probation supervision, also made direct comparisons of cohorts more difficult.

In addition, although probation officers are trained to administer the LSI-R, there may be a degree of inconsistency in scoring. For example, scoring individual domains differently may lead to inconsistent findings for that domain and for the overall LSI-R score.

The findings of this study are limited to Maine probationers who entered probation in 2004, 2005, or 2006. Findings may not necessarily be applied to probationers in other states, or those entering probation during another period of time. However, study findings establish a baseline probation recidivism rate, and begin a trend line useful for state policy makers. The study will also appeal to a national audience interested in state community corrections performance measurement, and the highlights of a study conducted in an environment characterized by policy and practice changes incorporating evidence-based practices.

## FINDINGS

### Demographics

Researchers analyzed a sample of 11,954 offenders who entered probation between January 2004 and December 2006. More than four-fifths (82.5%) were male, and whites accounted for 94.0% of the sample. The majority (57.8%) were single, with 23.7% divorced, separated, or widowed, and 18.5% married. Male probationers (59.6%) were more likely to be single than females (49.2%). The mean age of probationers in the sample was 33, with a median of 31. The mean age of probationers at first arrest was 21, and the median was 18. At the time of first arrest, the women in the sample (mean age of 24) were slightly older than the men (mean age of 20 at first arrest). Those with some college or more accounted for only 6.1% of the sample, while nearly half (47.3%) had completed high school or a GED. Nearly half of the sample (46.6%) had less than a HS diploma.

**TABLE 1 - CHARACTERISTICS OF MAINE PROBATIONER SAMPLE, 2004-2006**

	Men		Women		Total	
<b>Sex</b>					N	%
Male					9858	82.5%
Female					2092	17.5%
<b>Race</b>	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	9033	93.7%	1957	95.4%	10991	94.0%
Non-White	607	6.3%	94	4.6%	701	6.0%
<b>Marital Status</b>	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single	5183	59.6%	883	49.2%	6067	57.8%
Married	1570	18.0%	370	20.6%	1940	18.5%
Divorced/separated/widowed	1949	22.4%	540	30.1%	2489	23.7%
<b>Age</b>						
Mean		33		32		33
Median		31		31		31
<b>Highest Grade Completed</b>	N	%	N	%	N	%
Up to 11th grade	3279	47.5%	558	41.8%	3838	46.6%
12th grade / GED	3239	46.9%	657	49.2%	3896	47.3%
Some college or more	383	5.5%	120	9.0%	503	6.1%
<b>Age at First Arrest</b>						
Mean		20		24		21
Median		18		21		18

### Risk Levels

Due to policy changes in late 2004 restricting probation to felonies and selected statutorily-defined misdemeanors, the administrative risk level category decreased from nearly one in five probationers



(17.2%) in the 2004 cohort to 11.5% in the 2006 cohort. The low risk category, introduced in 2006, comprised 16.2% of the 2006 cohort. Moderate risk level offenders decreased from 57.1% in the 2004 cohort to less than half (46.2%) in the 2006 cohort. This decline was due to the introduction of the low risk category and the expansion of the high risk category in 2006. Before 2006, moderate risk offenders could have an LSI-R score anywhere between 14 and 31. In 2006, the moderate risk range was substantially narrowed, to 21-25. As a result, the share of high risk level offenders increased from 8.4% in 2004 to 12.4% in the 2006. Finally, the maximum risk level category also increased, from 0.8% of the 2004 cohort to 1.9% in 2006. The average probationer score increased slightly over the three years, from a score of 17.9 in 2004, to 18.8 in 2005, and 19.6 in 2006.

**TABLE 2 – RISK LEVEL BY YEAR ENTERING PROBATION**

Risk Level (risk score 04-05)	2004	2005	2006*
Administrative (0-13)	17.2%	13.3%	11.5%
Low			16.2%
Moderate (14-31)	57.1%	57.2%	46.2%
High (32-40)	8.4%	9.0%	12.4%
Maximum (40-54)	0.8%	1.4%	1.9%
No score	16.4%	19.0%	11.9%
Average score	17.9	18.8	19.6

\*Admin=0-13, Low 14-20 Moderate=21-25, High=26-35, Maximum=36-54

### One-year Recidivism Rates

To avoid distortion in comparison of recidivism rates due to different lengths of time spent on probation, researchers compared 1-year recidivism rates for each cohort.

**TABLE 3 – ONE-YEAR RECIDIVISM RATES BY RISK CATEGORY AND COHORT**

Risk Level	2004		2005		2006		CHANGE 2004-2006
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Administrative	85	10.1%	51	10.5%	34	8.6%	-14.9%
Low	48	29.3%	45	22.5%	114	20.4%	-30.4%
Moderate	574	22.0%	437	23.2%	385	24.1%	9.5%
High	139	33.8%	121	36.7%	187	43.7%	29.3%
Maximum	18	48.6%	25	48.1%	34	53.1%	9.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>864</b>	<b>21.3%</b>	<b>679</b>	<b>23.0%</b>	<b>754</b>	<b>24.8%</b>	<b>16.4%</b>

The one-year recidivism rate rose slightly each year, from 21.3% of the 2004 cohort to 24.8% of the 2006 cohort. Administrative risk probationers experienced a decline of 14.9%, while Low risk probationers experienced a 30.4% decline in one-year recidivism. Moderate, High and Maximum risk probationers experienced increases in one-year recidivism of 9.5%, 29.3% and 9.3%, respectively.

These initial trends reflect policy changes by MDOC to implement various aspects of evidence-based practice over the study period. For example, in 2006, MDOC “banked” Administrative cases, to supervise these very low to no risk probationers far less intensively than in the past.<sup>2</sup>

The recidivism decline of Low risk probationers is due to the reclassification of many Moderate risk offenders in 2006. Moderate probationers’ LSI-R scores through 2005 ranged from 14 to 31. In 2006, Moderates who scored 14-20 were reclassified as “Low,” 21-25 remained a “Moderate” and 26 and higher were deemed “High” risk. As a result of another policy change, in 2006 probationers in the Moderate, High and Maximum categories were required to have a case plan that addressed the risk factors that could lead to a re-arrest for a new crime.

Bivariate Analyses

Using chi-square analyses, this study identifies differences among probationers. When gender and other probationer characteristics are compared in the bivariate analyses, a number of differences become evident. One substantial finding is that male probationers in the sample (24.4%) were significantly more likely than female probationers (19.4%) to recidivate within one year.<sup>3</sup>

**TABLE 4 – CHARACTERISTICS OF ONE-YEAR RECIDIVISTS**

	1-year Non-Recidivists		1-year Recidivists		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Cohort</b>	<b><math>\chi^2=16.42, 2 df, p\leq.001</math></b>					
2004	3803	78.3%	1055	21.7%	4858	100.0%
2005	2761	75.9%	877	24.1%	3638	100.0%
2006	2579	74.6%	879	25.4%	3458	100.0%
<b>Gender</b>	<b><math>\chi^2=23.79, 1 df, p\leq.001</math></b>					
Male	7454	75.6%	2404	24.4%	9858	100.0%
Female	1686	80.6%	406	19.4%	2092	100.0%
<b>Marital Status</b>	<b><math>\chi^2=28.28, 1 df, p\leq.001</math></b>					
Married	1563	80.6%	377	19.4%	8556	100.0%
Not married	6404	74.8%	2152	25.2%	1940	100.0%
<b>Highest Grade Completed</b>	<b><math>\chi^2=25.44, 2 df, p\leq.001</math></b>					
Up to 11th grade	2787	72.6%	1051	27.4%	3838	100.0%
12th grade / GED	2945	75.6%	951	24.4%	3896	100.0%
Some college or more	394	82.3%	84	17.7%	478	100.0%
<b>Employment</b>	<b><math>\chi^2=21.95, 1 df, p\leq.001</math></b>					
Full-time	3495	80.5%	847	19.5%	4342	100.0%
Other	3269	76.3%	1013	23.7%	4282	100.0%
<b>Mean Age</b>	<b>33.8 years</b>		<b>30 years</b>		<b>32.9 years</b>	
<b>Mean Age at First Arrest</b>	<b>21.6 years</b>				<b>20.9 years</b>	

<sup>2</sup>Contact with the probation officer is minimal and occasional "reporting in" is all that is required.

<sup>3</sup>Significant at the .001 level

Unmarried probationers (19.4%), those with less than a high school degree (27.4%), and those not employed on a full-time basis (23.7%) were significantly more likely to recidivate within one year. In all cases, Chi square tests found this difference to be significant at the .001 level.

Probationers who recidivated within one year were younger (mean age 30) than the rest of the sample (mean age 33.8). They were also younger at the time of first arrest (mean 19 years) than the rest of the sample (mean 22 years).

### Logistic Regression

Binary logistic regression was used to determine the strength of each variable's influence on a probationer's likelihood of recidivating within one year. As the model below shows, seven variables are significant factors explaining a probationer's recidivism: Probationer's age, the number of prior arrests, accommodations (referring to the probationer's housing situation), financial (income level), gender, type of offense the probationer was convicted of, and whether the probationer was employed full-time.<sup>4</sup>

Males were 38% more likely than females to recidivate within one year. In addition, all probationers with a higher LSI-R score for the Accommodations domain were 23% more likely to recidivate within one year, and probationers who were not employed full-time were 22% more likely to recidivate within one year.

---

<sup>4</sup>Nearly three-quarters (73.3%) of cases were accurately classified by the model with respect to recidivism within one year, however the model produced a weak Cox & Snell pseudo R<sup>2</sup> of .056 and a weak Nagelkerke pseudo R<sup>2</sup> of .081. Of the variables that were found to have an influence on recidivism, age and prior arrests were significant at the .001 level, accommodations at the .01 level and financial, gender, type of offense and full-time employment at the .05 level.

**TABLE 5 – RECIDIVISM WITHIN ONE YEAR (0 = NO, 1 = YES)**

Dependent Variable	Recidivism within 1 year (0 = No, 1 = Yes)		
	B	Wald	Odds Ratio
Age (years)	-.045	55.475	.956***
Prior Arrests (n)	.042	15.982	1.042***
Accommodations LSI-R score	.204	9.733	1.226**
Financial LSI-R score	.144	4.111	1.155*
Companions LSI-R score	.040	.791	1.041
Alcohol/drug abuse LSI-R score	.012	.273	1.012
Age at first arrest (years)	-.002	.058	.998
Gender 0 = Female 1 = Male	.321	4.399	1.379*
Type of offense 0 = Not a felony 1 = Felony	-.209	3.925	.811*
Type of Sentence 0 = Split Sentence 1 = Straight Probation	-.117	1.055	.889
Full-time Employment 0 = No 1 = Yes	-.245	5.345	.783*
Marital Status 0 = Not married 1 = Married	.056	.159	1.058
Education 1 = Up to 11 <sup>th</sup> grade 2 = HS Diploma/GED 3 = Some college +	.039	.193	1.040
Constant	-.108	.095	.898
Percentage of Cases Accurately Classified	73.3%		
Cox & Snell	.056		
Nagelkerke	.081		

+  $p \leq .10$ , \*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Criminogenic Risk and Recidivism

Researchers finally examined the association between criminogenic risk, as calculated by the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) and one year recidivism. Although not robust and thus not definitive, the findings are intriguing and help to shed light on case management needs for probationers with different risk levels. Except for maximum cases, criminal history was a significant predictor of recidivating within one year across all risk levels.

**TABLE 6 – RISK LEVEL AND LSI PREDICTORS**

Risk Level	LSI Subscale	N	R <sup>2</sup>
Administrative	Criminal History** Accommodations*	1,150	.035
Low	Criminal History** Education/Employment** Family/Marital*	831	.048
Moderate	Criminal History** Education/Employment** Accommodations**	4,452	.040
High	Criminal History* Education/Employment** Leisure/Recreation**	954	.059
Maximum		141	.087
* p < .05 ** p < .01			

Aside from criminal history, Administrative risk level probationers who had recidivated within one year were most strongly correlated ( $R^2=.035$ ,  $n=1,150$ ,  $p < .05$ ) to new criminal activity in the risk area of *accommodations*. The LSI-R subscales with the strongest predictive value of one year recidivism for Low risk probationers were *education/employment and family/marital*. Moderate risk probationers who had recidivated within one-year were most strongly correlated to criminal history and two other risk subscales – *education/employment and accommodations*, ( $R^2=.040$ ,  $n=4,452$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and the risk of recidivism. High risk probationers who had recidivated within one year were most strongly associated with the risk areas of *education/employment and leisure/recreation* ( $R^2=.059$ ,  $n=954$ ,  $p < .01$ ) in relation to the risk of new criminal behavior. No LSI-R subscale correlated significantly with one-year recidivism for Maximum cases.

## DISCUSSION

This study helps to shed light on the implementation of a series of evidence-based practices in Maine's community corrections system, by analyzing a sample of 11,954 offenders who entered probation between January 2004 and December 2006. The study found that recidivism rates did not change significantly across the 2004, 2005 and 2006 cohorts, but that lower risk offenders in the 2006 cohort had better outcomes than their counterparts. These initial trends reflect policy changes effected by MDOC to incorporate evidence-based principles into probation supervision practice over the study period. During the study period, MDOC 'banked' Administrative cases and supervised Low risk probationers far less intensively than in the past.

Higher risk probationers performed worse over the three year period, as they faced greater supervision and case planning requirements. In view of the literature on evidence-based practices in community corrections, the worsening performance of higher risk probationers is likely due to increased supervision, without adequate service provision aimed at changing offending attitudes and behaviors. In order to successfully address this higher risk population and achieve real reductions in recidivism rates, research suggests smaller caseloads, and the placement of offenders into sufficiently intensive cognitive-behavioral interventions that target their specific criminogenic needs. These criminogenic needs are dynamic risk factors that, when addressed or changed, can positively affect the offender's risk for recidivism.<sup>5</sup> Based on an assessment of the offender, these criminogenic needs can be prioritized to focus services on the greatest criminogenic needs.

This study has been challenged by the lack of program data to determine whether higher risk probationers in the study sample are receiving adequate, focused programming. Anecdotally and from the study researchers' work in the field, there is a growing awareness of the lack of cognitive behavioral therapy in many parts of the state to adequately address the anti-social, behavioral issues of higher risk offenders. The shortage of evidence-based programming to improve offender outcomes across Maine is likely to play a large role in the ongoing challenge to reduce recidivism rates among higher risk offenders.

This report identified significant factors that increased the chances of reoffending for probationers in the sample. Gender was a factor: Males were significantly more likely than females to recidivate within one year. Marital status, education, and employment were all factors: unmarried probationers, those with less than a high school degree, and those not employed full-time basis were more likely to recidivate within one year. These findings are consistent with previous research on probationer recidivism, and are highlighted in the literature summary.

Finally, binary logistic regression identified a number of variables as having a significant effect on recidivism outcomes. These included static factors such as gender, probationer age and number of prior

---

<sup>5</sup>Examples of criminogenic needs are: criminal personality; antisocial attitudes; criminal peers; substance abuse; and family.

arrests, and dynamic factors such as the LSI-R domains of Accommodations, Financial, and full-time employment.

This report is an initial inquiry of offenders entering probation in Maine. Future research on Maine probationers will examine sentencing policy and management strategies that may have an influence on recidivism outcomes. Although not included in this report, preliminary analyses show probationers in the sample who entered probation directly from prison or jail (split sentence) had worse outcomes than probationers with a probation-only sentence. In addition, actions taken by probation officers after an initial violation appear to influence the future behavior of the offender. These questions are worth examining more closely, as they may contribute to our understanding of recidivism behavior and help identify potential causes.

## CONCLUSIONS

The study of the evidence-based pilot project in Maine produced promising results for lower risk probationers. The pilot project was able to reduce recidivism rates, while shifting resources to higher risk probationers. While this success can be attributed to policy changes and a collaborative management approach, all in keeping with evidence-based principles and practices, it bears noting that the recidivism rates among higher risk offenders increased during the study period.

MDOC made two primary changes to the management of higher risk offenders during the study period. These were: (1) lowering the LSI-R threshold scores for Moderate, High and Maximum risk offenders; and (2) requiring a case plan for each higher risk offender. This report suggests that more intensive case management of higher risk probationers will only prove successful if the state has an adequate level of high quality services, such as cognitive based therapy to guide positive offender behavioral change. Without these resources, management's increased focus on higher risk offenders helps to serve an immediate public safety goal, but does not sufficiently address the longer term behavioral change needs of probationers in Maine communities. As research has shown, increased supervision alone will lead to increased recidivism (MacKenzie, 2000).



## REFERENCES

- Cox, Stephen and Bantley, Kathleen. (2008). The Effects of Connecticut's Probation Transition Program on Reducing Technical Violations. *Justice Research and Policy*. 10, 1-20.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works! *Criminology*, 34, 575-607.
- Joseph, Jennifer. (May 2001). *Characteristics of Recidivism Among Regular and Intensive Probationers*. East Tennessee State University.
- Kubrin, Charis, and Stewart, Eric. (February 2006). Predicting Who Reoffends: the Neglected Role of Neighborhood Context in Recidivism Studies. *Criminology*, 44, 165 – 195.
- MacKenzie, Doris. (October 2000). Evidence-based Correction: Identifying What Works. *Crime and Delinquency*, 46 (4), 457-471.
- Maltz, Michael. (1984). *Recidivism*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Maxwell, Sheila, Gray, M. Kevin, and Bynum, Timothy. (August 1999). *Probationer Recidivism in Michigan: A Collaborative Study Between the School of Criminal Justice and the Michigan Department of Corrections*. School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University.
- Petersilia, Joan. (1985). *Granting felons probation: public risks and alternatives*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Vito, G. F. (1987). *Felony probation and recidivism: Replication and response*. *Federal Probation*, 50, 17-25.

## **Justice Policy Program**

University of Southern Maine  
Muskie School of Public Service  
PO Box 9300  
34 Bedford Street  
Portland, Maine 04014

<http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch>

