



## The Multi-site Evaluation of the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative

### Characteristics of Prisoner Reentry Programs

By Laura Winterfield, *Urban Institute*, and Christine Lindquist, *RTI International*

July 2005

In 2003, the US DOJ, DOL, ED, DHUD, and DHHS funded 69 state agencies to implement reentry programs for prisoners. The SVORI funding is supporting 89 programs nationwide that are currently being evaluated by RTI International and the Urban Institute.

In this *Reentry Research in Action* brief, we describe the SVORI programs along various dimensions that characterize their areas of emphasis. Findings are based on data gathered from a June 2005 survey of the SVORI program directors.

The Federal SVORI funding consortium believed that individual states were better positioned than the Federal government to determine the particular elements of a reentry initiative that would most appropriately fit their individual offender needs and organizational resources. Thus, the various state-level activities being operated under SVORI funding are not intended to be viewed as a traditional treatment “program” with specific components dictated by an a priori model. This report describes the SVORI programs along various dimensions that

characterize their areas of emphasis, based on data gathered from a June 2005 survey of the SVORI program directors for all 89 programs<sup>1</sup>. Table 1 summarizes the SVORI programs along key organizational characteristics.

As shown in the table, most (64%) program directors reported that the post-release phase of reentry programming is run primarily by a government agency rather than a private one, although staff from both types of agencies are likely to be involved. Additionally, most program directors reported using program funds to “fill service gaps” or “expand an existing program” rather than to “develop new programming.”

**Table 1. Characteristics of SVORI Programs**

| Characteristic  | Programs |       |
|---|----------|-------|
|   | n        | %     |
| <b>Main Post-release Agency Type</b>                    |          |       |
| Government agency                                       | 57       | 64.0% |
| Private agency  | 25       | 28.1% |
| <b>Primary Use of SVORI Funds</b>                       |          |       |
| Starting a new program                                  | 21       | 23.6% |
| Expanding an existing program                           | 25       | 28.1% |
| Filling service gaps                                    | 36       | 40.4% |
| <b>Phase Emphasis</b>                                   |          |       |
| Pre-release   | 3        | 3.4%  |
| Post-release  | 20       | 22.5% |
| Both  | 60       | 67.4% |
| <b>Pre-release Geographic Targeting</b>                 |          |       |
| All facilities  | 36       | 40.4% |
| Select facilities only                                  | 46       | 51.7% |
| <b>Post-release Geographic Targeting</b>                |          |       |
| All communities (statewide)                             | 8        | 9.0%  |
| Select communities only                                 | 75       | 84.3% |
| <b>Offender Needs Targeting</b>                         |          |       |
| General “serious and violent” population                | 71       | 79.8% |
| Subset of offenders with specific service needs         | 10       | 11.2% |
| Other   | 2        | 2.2%  |
| <b>Service Targeting</b>                                |          |       |
| Attempt to provide all needed services for participants | 73       | 82.0% |
| Focus on a specific type of service or set of services  | 10       | 11.2% |

Note: Percentages reported in this table are percentages of all (89) SVORI programs and do not sum to 100 because of missing data.

<sup>1</sup> The 69 SVORI grantees are operating a total of 89 distinct programs. The multi-site evaluation describes characteristics at the program level rather than the grantee level.

Consistent with the intent of SVORI to develop services and programming within the institution and the community to span three phases—institutional, supervised post-release, and post-supervision—most of the program directors reported that their programs did not focus primarily on either the institutional or the community phase but emphasized both.

An important characteristic of the SVORI programs is the extent to which each program chose to target pre-release resources on individuals in a few or all institutions and post-release programming on those returning to a few or all communities statewide. Most grantees reported that their SVORI program is geographically restricted. Slightly more than half have implemented SVORI in selected correctional institutions, and most have targeted specific communities of return.

Regarding the target population for SVORI services, program directors reported that, in general, they serve the serious and violent offender population as a whole as opposed to serving a subset of offenders with specific service needs. Additionally, rather than focusing service provision on a particular set of offender needs, they mostly reported attempting to provide all needed services.

The three service-need areas most often ranked as the number one priority were employment, community integration, and family support/unification (see Table 2). Other services that were frequently ranked in the top three include substance abuse treatment and education/skills building. Given that the literature supports the importance of work, integration into family and community, and decreased substance use as key factors influencing successful reentry, the programmatic foci seem not only appropriate but encouraging.

**Top service-need areas:**

- Employment
- Community integration
- Family support/unification

**Table 2. Primary Focus of SVORI Programs**

| Service Type               | All Programs |       |          |       |      |
|----------------------------|--------------|-------|----------|-------|------|
|                            | Any Rank     |       | Top Rank |       | Mean |
|                            | n            | %     | n        | %     |      |
| Employment/vocation        | 57           | 64.0% | 24       | 27.0% | 2.12 |
| Community integration      | 44           | 49.4% | 24       | 27.0% | 2.25 |
| Substance abuse            | 43           | 48.0% | 9        | 10.0% | 1.88 |
| Education/skills building  | 36           | 40.4% | 6        | 6.7%  | 1.78 |
| Mental health              | 23           | 25.8% | 6        | 6.7%  | 1.87 |
| Family support/unification | 25           | 28.0% | 10       | 11.0% | 2.12 |
| Other                      | 15           | 17.0% | 2        | 2.2%  | 1.67 |
| Physical health            | 0            | n/a   | 0        | n/a   | n/a  |

Note: This table shows the results of a question asking program directors to rank the top three areas on which they are focusing their programs and services. Results are based on the 83 returned surveys. “Any Rank” means service was included in programs’ list of top three services. “Top Rank” means service was identified as programs’ top priority. “Mean” is the mean rank score for each service type (with “3” ranked highest)—a higher score indicates a larger number of high rankings.

**Multi-site Evaluation of SVORI Principal Investigators**

**Pamela K. Lattimore, Ph.D.**  
 RTI International  
 Center for Crime, Violence, and Justice Research  
 3040 Cornwallis Road  
 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709  
 Phone: 803-754-5965  
 Fax: 919-485-7700

**Christy A. Visher, Ph.D.**  
 Urban Institute  
 Justice Policy Center  
 2100 M Street, NW  
 Washington, DC 20037  
 Phone: 202-261-5593  
 Fax: 202-659-8985



[www.svori-evaluation.org](http://www.svori-evaluation.org)

