

Research on Jails and Jail Alternatives Presentation Reference List

Presented at the Michigan Jails Task Force Meeting 2

Traverse City, MI

August 23, 2019

Slide 4: Doherty, E., Cwick, J., Green, K., & Ensminger, M. (2016). Examining the consequences of the 'prevalent life events' of arrest and incarceration among an urban African-American cohort. *Justice Quarterly*, 33(6) 970-999.

Slide 5: Stevenson, M. (2018). Assessing risk assessment in action. *Minnesota Law Review*, 103, 303-384.; Uggen, C., Vuolo, M., Lageson, S., Ruhland, E., & Whitham, K. (2014). The edge of stigma: An experimental audit of the effects of low-level criminal records on employment. *Criminology*, 52(4): 627-654.

Slide 6: Several scholars have researched various alternative to arrest programs and their outcomes. See, for example: Charlier, J. (2015). Want to reduce drugs in your community? You might want to deflect instead of arrest. *Police Chief Magazine*, September 2015.; Clifasefi, S. L., Lonczak, H. S., & Collins, S. E. (2017). Seattle's Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD) program: Within-subjects changes on housing, employment, and income/benefits outcomes and associations with recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency*, 63: 429-445.; Collins, S. E., Lonczak, H. S., & Clifasefi, S. L. (2015a). *LEAD Program Evaluation: Criminal Justice and Legal System Utilization and Associated Costs*. Seattle: University of Washington-Harborview Medical Center.; Collins, S. E., Lonczak, H. S., & Clifasefi, S. L. (2015b). *LEAD Program Evaluation: Recidivism Report*. Seattle: University of Washington-Harborview Medical Center.; Copp, J. E., & Bales, W. D. (2018). Jails and local justice system reform. *The Future of Children*, 28: 103-124.;Cowell, A. J., Broner, N., & Dupont, R. (2004). The cost-effectiveness of criminal justice diversion programs for people with serious mental illness co-occurring with substance abuse: Four case studies. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 20: 292-325.; Franz, S. & Borum, R. (2011). Crisis Intervention Teams may prevent arrests of people with mental illnesses. *Police Practice and Research*, 12(3): 265-272.; Johnson, B. D., Golub, A., Dunlap, E., & Sifaneck, S. J. (2007). An analysis of alternatives to New York City's current marijuana arrest and detention policy. *Policing: An International journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 31, 236-250.; Kopak, A. (2018). An initial assessment of Leon County Florida's pre-arrest adult civil citation program. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 1-9.; Roe-Sepowitz, D. E., Gallagher, J., Hickie, K. E., Loubert, M. P., & Tutelman, J. (2014). Project ROSE: An arrest alternative for victims of sex trafficking and prostitution. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 53, 57-74.; Satterberg, D., Pugel, J., Taylor, K., & Daugaard, L. (2013). Seattle LEADs on law enforcement diversion. *The-newsletter of the COPS Office*, 6(4), 1-2.; Steadman, H.J., Deane, M.W., & Borum, R. (2000). Comparing outcomes of major models of police responses to mental health emergencies. *Psychiatric Services*, 51: 645-649.; Taheri, S. A. (2016). Do Crisis Intervention Teams reduce arrests and improve officer safety? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 27: 76-96.; Todak, N., & James, L. (2018). A systematic social observation study of police de-escalation tactics. *Police Quarterly*, 21: 509-543.; Watson, A. C., Ottati, V. C., Morabito, M., Draine, J., Kerr, A. N., & Angell, B. (2010). Outcomes of police contacts with persons with mental illness: The impact of CIT. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health*, 37: 302-317.; Worden, R. E., & McLean, S. J. (2018). Discretion and diversion in Albany's LEAD program. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 29: 584-610.

Slide 8: Leslie, E., & Pope, N. G. (2017). The unintended impact of pretrial detention on case outcomes: Evidence from New York City arraignments. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 60(3), 529-557.

Slide 10: Several scholars have researched the impact of pretrial detention on economic and social outcomes. See, for example: Apel, R., & Sweeten, G. (2010). The impact of incarceration on employment during the transition to adulthood. *Social Problems*, 57(3), 448-479.; Dobbie, W., Goldin, J., & Yang, C. S. (2018). The effects of pretrial detention on conviction, future crime, and employment: Evidence from randomly assigned judges. *American Economic Review*, 108(2), 201-240 Holsinger, A. M., & Holsinger, K. (2018). Analyzing bond supervision survey data: The effects of pretrial detention on self-reported outcomes. *Federal Probation*, 82(2), 39-45.; Mueller-Smith, M. (2015). The criminal and labor market impacts of incarceration. Unpublished manuscript. University of Michigan, Department of Economics, Ann Arbor.; Western, B. (2002). The impact of incarceration on wage mobility and inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 67(4), 526-546.

Slide 11: Dobbie, W., Goldin, J., & Yang, C. S. (2018). The effects of pretrial detention on conviction, future crime, and employment: Evidence from randomly assigned judges. *American Economic Review*, 108(2), 201-240.; Stevenson, M. (2018). Distortion of justice: How the inability to pay bail affects case outcomes. *The Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 34(4), 511-542.

Slide 12: Stevenson, M. (2018). Assessing risk assessment in action. *Minnesota Law Review*, 103, 303-384.

Slide 13: Phillips, M. T. (2012). *A decade of bail research in New York City*. New York: New York Criminal Justice Agency, Inc.

Slide 14: Ouss, A., & Stevenson, M. (2019). Evaluating the impacts of eliminating prosecutorial requests for cash bail. *George Mason Legal Studies Research Paper No. LS*, 19-08.

Slide 15: Bechtel, K., Holsinger, A. M., Lowenkamp, C. T., & Warren, M. J. (2017). A meta-analytic review of pretrial research: Risk assessment, bond type, and interventions. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(2), 443-467.; Brooker, C. M. B., Jones, M. R., & Schnacke, T. R. (2014). *The Jefferson County Bail Project: Impact study found better cost effectiveness for unsecured recognizance bonds over cash and surety bonds*. Rockville, MD: Pretrial Justice Institute.; Jones, M. R. (2013). *Unsecured bonds: The as effective and most efficient pretrial release option*. Rockville, MD: Pretrial Justice Institute.

Slide 16: Brooker, C. M. B., Jones, M. R., & Schnacke, T. R. (2014). *The Jefferson County Bail Project: Impact study found better cost effectiveness for unsecured recognizance bonds over cash and surety bonds*. Rockville, MD: Pretrial Justice Institute.; Jones, M. R. (2013). *Unsecured bonds: The as effective and most efficient pretrial release option*. Rockville, MD: Pretrial Justice Institute.; Ouss, A., & Stevenson, M. (2019). Evaluating the impacts of eliminating prosecutorial requests for cash bail. *George Mason Legal Studies Research Paper No. LS*, 19-08.

Slide 18: Austin, J., Krisberg, B., & Litsky, P. (1985). The effectiveness of supervised pretrial release. *Crime & Delinquency*, 31: 519-537.; Bechtel, K., Holsinger, A. M., Lowenkamp, C. T., & Warren, M. J. (2017). A meta-analytic review of pretrial research: Risk assessment, bond type, and interventions. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(2), 443-467.; Goldkamp, J.S., & White, M.D. (2006). Restoring accountability in pretrial release: The Philadelphia pretrial release supervision experiments. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 2: 143.; Lowenkamp, C., & VanNostrand, M. (2013). *Exploring the impact of supervision on pretrial outcomes*. Laura and John T. Arnold Foundation.; Solomon, F. & Ferri, R. (2017). *Reducing unnecessary pretrial detention: CJA's Manhattan supervised release program*. New York City Criminal Justice Agency, Inc.

Slide 19: Grommon, E., Rydberg, J., & Carter, J. (2017). Does GPS supervision of intimate partner violence defendants reduce pretrial misconduct? Evidence from a quasi-experimental study. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 13: 483-504.; Wolff, K.T., Dozier, C.A., Muller, J.P., Mowry, M., Hutchinson, B. (2017). The impact of location monitoring among U.S. pretrial defendants in the district of New Jersey. *Federal Probation*, 81(3): 8-14.

Slide 20: Crozier, T. (2000). *The court hearing reminder project: If you call them they will come*. King County, Washington: Institute for Court Management Court Executive Development Program.; Herian, M., & Bornstein, B. (2010). Reducing failure to appear in Nebraska: A field study. *The Nebraska Lawyer*, 13(8): 11-14.; Jefferson County Criminal Justice Planning Unity. (2006). *Jefferson County court notification program: Six month program summary*. Jefferson County, CO.; Nice, M. (2006). *Court appearance notification system: Process and outcome evaluation*. Multnomah County, OR: Multnomah County Budget Office.; Rouse, M., & Eckert, M. (1992). *Arrestment date notification and arrestment appearance defendants released on desk appearance tickets: A summary of findings*. New York: NYC Criminal Justice Agency.; Schnacke, T. R., Jones, M.R., Wilderman, D.M. (2012). Increasing court-appearance rates and other benefits of live-caller telephone court-date reminders: The Jefferson County, Colorado, FTA pilot project and resulting court date notification program. *Court Review: The Journal of the American Judges Association*, 393: 86-95.; White, W. (2006). *Court hearing call notification project*. Unpublished manuscript. Coconino County, AZL: Criminal Justice Coordinating Council & Flagstaff Justice Court.

Slide 21: Goldkamp, J.S. & Jones, P. R. (1992). Pretrial drug-testing experiments in Milwaukee and Prince George's County: The context of implementation. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 29(4): 430-465.; Toborg, M. A., Bellasai, J. P., Yezer, A. M., & Trost, R. P. (1989). *Assessment of pretrial urine testing in the District of Columbia*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.; VanNostrand, M., & Keebler (2009). Pretrial risk assessment in the federal court. *Federal Probation*, 73(2).; VanNostrand, M., Rose, K., & Weibrect, K. (2011). *State of the science of pretrial release recommendations and supervision*. Pretrial Justice Institute.

Slide 22: For a discussion of potential flaws in pretrial risk assessments, see Minow, M., Zittrain, J., & Bowers, J. (2019). *Technical flaws of pretrial risk assessments raise grave concerns*. Harvard University: Berkman Klein Center for Internet and Society.

Slide 24: Holt, V. L., Kernic, M. A., Lumley, T., Wolf, M. E., & Rivara, F. P. (2002). Civil protection orders and risk of subsequent police-reported violence. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, (2885): 589-594.; Holt, V. L., Kernic, M. A., Wolf, M. E., & Rivara, F. P. (2003). Do protection orders affect the likelihood of future partner violence and injury? *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 24(1), 16-21.

Slide 25: DePrince, A. P., Labus, J., Belknap, J., Buckingham, S., & Glover, A. (2012). The impact of community-based outreach on psychological distress and victim safety in women exposed to intimate partner abuse. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 80(2), 211-221.; Messing, J. T., Campbell, J., Wilson, J. S., Brown, S., Patchell, B., & Shall, C. (2014). *Police departments' use of the Lethality Assessment Program: A quasi-experimental evaluation*. U.S. Department of Justice Report.; Parker, E.

M., & Gielen, A. C. (2014). Intimate partner violence and safety strategy use: Frequency of use and perceived effectiveness. *Women's Health Issues, 24*(6), 584-593

Slide 27: Caudy, M., Tillyer, M.S., & Tillyer, R. (2018). Jail versus probation: A gender specific test of differential effectiveness and moderators of sanction effects. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 45*(7): 949-968.

Slide 28: Wodahl, E. J., Boman, J. H., Garland, B. E. (2015). Responding to probation and parole violations: Are jail sanctions more effective than community-based graduated sanctions? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 43*, 242-250.; Mears, D., & Cochran, J. (2018). Progressively tougher sanctioning and recidivism: Assessing the effects of different types of sanctions. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 55*(2): 194-241.

Slide 29: Bird, M., Tafoya, S., Grattet, R., & Nguyen V. (2016). *How has proposition 47 affected California's jail population?* Public Policy Institute of California.; Bird, M., Lofstrom, M., Martin B., Raphael, S., & Nguyen, V. (2018). *The impact of Proposition 47 on crime and recidivism.* Public Policy Institute of California.; Usta, M., & Wein, L. M. (2015). Assessing risk-based policies for pretrial release and split sentencing in Los Angeles County jails. *PloS one, 10*(12), e0144967.