



# **Eligibility and Selection Criteria Evaluation for the National Criminal Justice Reform Project (Phase III)**

Authors:  
Raven Simonds, M.S.  
Jacob T.N. Young, Ph.D.

Center for Correctional Solutions

Arizona State University  
School of Criminology and Criminal Justice  
411 N. Central Ave., St. 600  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

12/07/2020

## **Eligibility and Selection Criteria Evaluation Overview**

This document describes the eligibility and selection criteria evaluation for the NCJRP Phase III Evaluation of the Second Chance Center at the Arizona State Prison Complex Lewis, Eagle Point Unit (hereafter, SCCL or “the center”). This document has three goals: 1) describe the eligibility and selection criteria for participation into the center, 2) analyze whether the eligibility and selection criteria were met, and 3) outline what additional information would need to be collected to fully examine the extent to which center participants meet the outlined eligibility and selection criteria.

## **Eligibility and Selection Criteria**

Prior to the stop of individuals entering the center due to COVID-19, individuals would be invited to move to the center as space was available. The Arizona Correctional Information System (ACIS) generates a weekly report identifying the eligible individuals who meet the Center inclusion criteria. This report is then sent to all Correctional Officer IIIs (COIIIs) in the state. While COIIIs notify individuals of their eligibility, the eligibility list is automated and controlled by the number of beds and whether or not the individual meets the criteria. After the individual is notified of their eligibility, they are asked if they would like to participate. The eligibility criteria for selection into the center are as follows:

1. Approximately 80 days from release.
2. Minimum and medium custody inmates (who are eligible for an override to minimum).
3. Housed in General Population.
4. No felony detainers or felony holds.
5. No more than 90 days to release.
6. Not assigned to a fire Crew, Treatment counseling program, ACI or career and technology education program.
7. No pending disciplinary violations.

While not outlined explicitly in the criteria above, another overarching goal of the center is to provide this programming to individuals that are of medium to high risk for recidivism. To this end, we include risk scores as a criterion for center selection.

## **Data and Methods**

Two research questions guide this report: 1) do the people that go into the center meet the criteria? and 2) are there differences in the adherence to the selection criteria over time? These questions are answered using data from 24,407 individuals that were released from the Arizona Department of Corrections, Rehabilitation and Reentry between October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017 and September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2019. Information on individual custody level, community risk general score, and community risk violence score are the only eligibility criteria variables available in these data.

A series of basic descriptive statistics are run to examine whether Eagle Point participants adhere to the outlined selection and eligibility criteria, as well as whether there are any observed differences across quarterly periods.

## Results

### *Custody Level*

- All individuals that participated in the center were either minimum or medium custody. This indicates that all those that have participated in the center met the custody level criteria (see table 1 in Appendix).
- Since all participants in the center, across every time period, were either minimum or medium custody, no changes were observed across quarterly periods.

### *Risk Score*

- Center participants had an average community risk general score of 8.50, with scores ranging from 2 to 14. Center participants had an average community risk violence score of 6.38, with scores ranging from 1-12.
- Average scores for both the community risk general score and the community risk violence score declined over time (see table 2 in Appendix).

## Additional Variables Needed

Several additional variables are needed to fully examine the extent to which the eligibility and selection criteria are being followed. Several variables are not present in the current dataset while others need to be expanded or clarified to fully understand the whether the criteria are being met.

### *1. Custody override eligibility.*

The analyses presented here simply collapse the minimum and medium custody levels together into a single category. However, the outlined eligibility and selection criteria specify that medium custody inmates must be eligible to override to minimum to qualify. Information on individual's custody override eligibility would allow for more specific analysis into the adherence to the criteria.

### *2. Housed in general population.*

No information is available on where individuals were housed.

### *3. Felony detainees or felony holds.*

No information is available on current felony detainees or holds.

### *4. Assigned to Fire Crew, Treatment counseling program, ACI or career and technology education program.*

No information is available on whether or not individuals are assigned to Fire Crew, Treatment counseling program, ACI or career and technology program.

### *5. Current or pending disciplinary violations.*

While the total number of disciplinary violations is available in these data, there is no information about whether or not any are current or pending.

Additionally, specifically identifying the range of risk (i.e., low, medium, high) within these measures would be helpful moving forward.

### **Eligibility and Selection Criteria Evaluation Summary**

The overarching purpose of the center is to assist individuals in preparing for release from prison by providing them with programs and classes that will help with job attainment, securing housing, and accessing services within the community. Knowledge on the extent to which the intended population is being reached with these services is essential to understanding the efficacy and implementation of the program. To this end, this analysis has sought to identify whether or not the eligibility and selection criteria for the centers are being met. The additional information needed to perform a more complete analysis of this criteria was also identified. We believe this additional information will provide us with more detail on how selection into the center occurs (i.e., do individuals need to meet all of the criteria to be invited to participate or are all the criteria evaluated in tandem?) and the extent to which the standards are being met.

## Appendix

**Table 1.**

*Descriptive Statistics for All Eagle Point Participants (October 2017 - September 2019)*

	Freq or Mean (SD)	Range
Minimum or Medium Custody	1,879	-
Community Risk General Score	8.50 (2.88)	2 - 14
Community Risk Violence Score	6.38 (2.04)	1 - 12

**Table 2**

*Frequency of Participation in Eagle Point by Risk Scores and Yearly Quarter*

	Mean (SD)	Range
October - December 2017		
Community Risk General Score	9.47 (2.39)	4 - 14
Community Risk Violence Score	6.98 (1.77)	2 - 12
January - March 2018		
Community Risk General Score	9.78 (2.40)	4 - 14
Community Risk Violence Score	7.25 (1.79)	4 - 12
April - June 2018		
Community Risk General Score	8.89 (2.61)	2 - 13
Community Risk Violence Score	6.69 (1.86)	1 - 12
July - September 2018		
Community Risk General Score	8.40 (3.04)	2 - 14
Community Risk Violence Score	6.20 (2.20)	1 - 12
October - December 2018		
Community Risk General Score	8.28 (2.82)	2 - 14
Community Risk Violence Score	6.30 (1.98)	1 - 12
January - March 2019		
Community Risk General Score	8.42 (2.90)	2 - 14
Community Risk Violence Score	6.32 (2.07)	1 - 12
April - June 2019		
Community Risk General Score	8.19 (2.97)	2 - 13
Community Risk Violence Score	6.24 (2.03)	1 - 12
July - September 2019		
Community Risk General Score	7.92 (2.03)	2 - 13
Community Risk Violence Score	5.98 (2.13)	1 - 12