



Applying Procedural Justice in Community Supervision

Technical Appendixes

Jesse Jannetta, Daniel S. Lawrence, and Travis Reginal

March 2021

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Appendix A. Officer Interactions with People on Supervision | 2 |
| Appendix B. Perceptions of People on Supervision | 8 |
| Appendix C. Supervision Outcomes | 16 |

Introduction

These appendixes document the technical steps taken for and present more detailed analytical findings supporting the report *Applying Procedural Justice in Community Supervision: Assessment of Pilot Testing in the Georgia Department of Community Supervision*: (Jannetta, Lawrence, and Reginal 2021). That report describes work undertaken by the Urban Institute, the American Probation and Parole Association, and the Center for Court Innovation to develop, pilot, and conduct a quantitative assessment of a new procedural justice training curriculum for community supervision officers in the Georgia Department of Community Supervision (DCS). These appendixes do the following:

- Appendix A details the assessment of supervision officers' interactions with people on supervision using body camera footage.
- Appendix B details findings from surveys of people under DCS supervision.
- Appendix C details results of supervision outcome models.

Appendix A. Officer Interactions with People on Supervision

The Urban research team worked to obtain consent from officers and supervisees involved in interactions with each other. We did this during the pilot training, where roughly half the officers in the training (21 of 41 nonsupervisor participants) agreed to allow researchers to review their body camera footage. To obtain consent from supervisees, we administered a pretraining baseline survey to a sample of people supervised by the officers who participated in the training. In that survey, we included a question requesting their consent to review body camera footage that they appeared in.

We then requested body camera metadata from DCS that included records of all body camera videos recorded from July 1, 2019, through November 30, 2019, by officers who participated in the training that occurred on September 10, 2019. We then identified the universe of videos for which we had obtained consent from both the officer and supervisee, producing a sample of 102 video interactions, 54 of which were recorded before the training (24 supervisees and 15 officers) and 48 of which were recorded after (19 supervisees and 12 officers). The average length of the pretraining videos was 6.5 minutes (median=5.3), and the average length of the posttraining videos was 4.9 minutes (median=4.1). These lengths made it feasible for Urban to code data from all 102 videos.

Urban also developed the data collection instrument concurrently with the sample. An advantage of conducting all the observations retrospectively was that it allowed us to develop items that tracked the skills as emphasized in the final version of the training, as well as the supporting tools provided by the faculty. After several review iterations with collaboration from CCI and APPA, and with input and feedback from Arnold Ventures, Urban finalized the data collection instrument. Response options on the procedural justice items ranged from 1 (“Never or Does not do at any point”) to 5 (“Always or Done in a very clear way”), meaning higher scores on the scales indicated greater presence of procedural justice behavior.

After finalizing the tool and the sample of videos, we provided DCS with the URLs for the videos we needed, and scheduled time to access them from the DCS central office in Atlanta. Urban randomly assigned footage cases across three reviewers, each of whom used the data collection instrument to code 68 video files. For each reviewer, each half of their video files was randomly assigned to be coded by the other two reviewers. Thus all 102 interactions were coded by two reviewers. The reviewers covered their computer screens to obscure whether interactions occurred before or after the training (although there were aspects of the discussion, such as references to the Fourth of July or Halloween, that made it clear roughly when the conversations happened).

Interactions between a DCS officer and supervisee occurred in 92 of the 102 videos; in the other 10, the officer interacted with other people during an attempted home contact, usually another member of the household when the supervisee was not home. We assessed interrater reliability across each pair of reviewers using the Krippendorff's alpha reliability estimate for the 92 videos in which there was an interaction. Results found that the Krippendorff statistic ranged from 0.72 to 0.78 depending on the pair of reviewers, indicating that agreement between reviewers was fair. As such, the codings for each interaction from the two reviewers were averaged together. We used the Cronbach's alpha statistic to assess scale reliability for items in each procedural justice domain. We removed some items from the scale because they reduced the scale alpha substantially. Scale and individual item results are reported in tables A.1 through A.5.

TABLE A.1
Change in Respect Items

| | Pre (n=54) mean (SD) | Post (n=48) mean (SD) | Significance | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|------|-------------|------------------|
| Officer refers to the supervisee in formal (e.g., Mr./Mrs.) or respectful form. | 3.71 (0.79) | 3.87 (0.73) | n.s. | | | |
| Officer tone of voice sounds engaging and unscripted. | 4.21 (0.62) | 4.46 (0.62) | $p < 0.10$ | | | |
| Officer shows respect for the supervisee's time by using phrases like 'I know your time is valuable' or 'Thank you for being on time' and apologizing for late starts. | 2.02 (1.08) | 2.20 (1.15) | n.s. | | | |
| Officer invites supervisee to flag any practices perceived as disrespectful so they can discuss. | 1.07 (0.31) | 1.11 (0.35) | n.s. | | | |
| Officer uses respectful manner of address in talking with the supervisee. | 4.28 (0.50) | 4.49 (0.53) | $p < 0.10$ | | | |
| During home visits, officer showed respect for the supervisee regarding the unscheduled and invasive nature of home visits. | 1.85 (0.81) | 1.83 (0.88) | n.s. | | | |
| Respect scale | 2.85 (0.39) | 2.99 (0.45) | n.s. | | | |
| | Scale Mean | SD | Min | Max | Skew (SE) | Cronbach's Alpha |
| | 2.92 | 0.42 | 2.17 | 4.25 | 0.65 (0.25) | 0.58 |

Source: Urban analysis of Georgia Department of Community Supervision body camera footage.

Notes: n.s. = not significant; SD = standard deviation.

Two items in the instrument were not included in the respect scale calculation. The first, "Officer uses language like 'offender' in conversation with supervisee, within earshot of supervisee, or even in

reading official documents,” was excluded because there were not interactions observed in which this occurred. The second, “Officer makes eye contact with the supervisee,” was not a practice that was possible to determine via the body camera video, an outcome the research team anticipated, but did not want to exclude from consideration before viewing the videos.

In 32 pretraining and 24 posttraining videos, officers interacted with a supervisee’s family member or another person present in the household. Two items focused on officers’ respectful treatment to those people, using similar wording as the last two items in the respect scale; however, scores did not significantly change from before to after the training.

TABLE A.2

Change in Helpfulness Items

| | Pre (n=54) mean (SD) | Post (n=48) mean (SD) | Significance | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|
| Officer discusses timetables, barriers, and priorities when setting goals or discussing supervision requirements. | 3.07 (1.12) | 3.26 (1.22) | n.s. | | |
| Officer offers individualized referrals or other resources to help with problems identified by the supervisee. | 2.07 (1.41) | 1.76 (1.05) | n.s. | | |
| Officer demonstrates familiarity with relevant local resources. | 2.23 (1.22) | 2.00 (1.18) | n.s. | | |
| Officer asks supervisee if there’s anyone they’d like present during future status meetings. | 1.03 (0.22) | 1.03 (0.22) | n.s. | | |
| Officer answers questions asked by the supervisee. | 4.23 (0.83) | 4.52 (0.97) | n.s. | | |
| Officer asks supervisee how officer can better understand supervisee’s individual needs and motivations. | 1.87 (0.70) | 1.71 (0.71) | n.s. | | |
| Helpfulness scale | 2.29 (0.81) | 2.21 (0.74) | n.s. | | |
| Scale Mean | SD | Min | Max | Skew (SE) | Cronbach’s Alpha |
| 2.25 | 0.77 | 1.00 | 4.08 | 0.17 (0.25) | .70 |

Source: Urban analysis of Georgia Department of Community Supervision body camera footage.

Notes: n.s. = not significant; SD = standard deviation.

TABLE A.3

Change in Neutral Decisionmaking Items

| | Pre (n=54) mean (SD) | Post (n=48) mean (SD) | Significance | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|------|-------------|------------------|
| Officer tells supervisee that his/her input is important and a priority for the officer. | 1.33 (0.47) | 1.38 (0.58) | n.s. | | | |
| Officer makes commentary that could be perceived as derogatory, insensitive, or biased along lines of age, race, ethnicity, gender, etc. ^a | 1.04 (0.23) | 1.00 (0.00) | n.s. | | | |
| Officer demonstrated interest in the supervisee's success/compliance. | 3.81 (0.95) | 3.87 (0.82) | n.s. | | | |
| Officer invites supervisee to provide input on the supervision plan via the PROACT matrix. ^a | 1.04 (0.29) | 1.00 (0.00) | n.s. | | | |
| Officer explains the reasoning behind any decisions made regarding the supervisee. | 2.90 (1.17) | 2.95 (1.25) | n.s. | | | |
| Officer notes which rules apply to all supervisees and when and why exceptions exist, including any add-on or individualized conditions whenever possible. | 1.81 (1.03) | 1.57 (0.95) | n.s. | | | |
| Neutral Decisionmaking Scale | 2.40 (0.71) | 2.41 (0.66) | n.s. | | | |
| | Scale Mean | SD | Min | Max | Skew (SE) | Cronbach's Alpha |
| | 2.40 | 0.68 | 1.00 | 4.13 | 0.02 (0.25) | 0.72 |

Source: Urban analysis of Georgia Department of Community Supervision body camera footage.

Notes: n.s. = not significant; SD = standard deviation.

^a Excluded from scale due to reducing alpha substantially.

There were two items not used to calculate the neutral decisionmaking scale score because of their inclusion reducing the overall scale alpha: (1) derogatory, insensitive, or biased commentary by the officer, and (2) opportunity to provide input on the supervision plan via the PROACT matrix. In both cases, these almost never occurred in the observed interactions.

TABLE A.4

Change in Understanding Items

| | Pre (n=54) mean (SD) | Post (n=48) mean (SD) | Significance | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|
| At the outset of the interaction, the officer briefly summarizes the purpose of the meeting/appointment/interaction. | 1.63 (0.76) | 1.76 (1.11) | n.s. | | |
| Officer acknowledges the use of the body worn camera. ^a | 1.00 (0.00) | 1.08 (0.52) | n.s. | | |
| Officer tells supervisee that his/her understanding is important and a priority for the officer to answer any questions. | 1.39 (0.48) | 1.63 (0.73) | $p < 0.10$ | | |
| Officer explains the commitments that the officer and DCS make to all supervisees. | 1.14 (0.36) | 1.10 (0.25) | n.s. | | |
| Officer explains any technical terms and acronyms used. ^a | 2.25 (1.03) | 1.94 (1.42) | n.s. | | |
| Officer uses plain language and avoids jargon or acronyms throughout the interaction. | 4.50 (0.68) | 4.82 (0.45) | $p < 0.01$ | | |
| Officer explains language in forms rather than simply reading them verbatim. ^a | 3.22 (1.30) | 3.17 (1.89) | n.s. | | |
| At the conclusion of the interaction, the officer summarizes decisions, expectations or next steps for the supervisee and verifies that he/she understands them. | 2.70 (1.19) | 3.28 (1.16) | $p < 0.05$ | | |
| At the conclusion of the interaction, the officer asks what questions or concerns the supervisee has about what they discussed or next steps. | 2.23 (1.01) | 2.74 (0.98) | $p < 0.05$ | | |
| Understanding scale | 2.27 (0.50) | 2.56 (0.52) | $p < 0.05$ | | |
| Scale Mean | SD | Min | Max | Skew (SE) | Cronbach's Alpha |
| 2.41 | 0.53 | 1.33 | 3.83 | 0.21 (0.25) | 0.70 |

Source: Urban analysis of Georgia Department of Community Supervision body camera footage.

Notes: n.s. = not significant; SD = standard deviation.

^a Excluded from scale due to reducing alpha substantially.

There were three items not used to calculate the understanding scale score. The officer acknowledging the use of the body-worn camera almost never occurred in the observed interactions and its inclusion in the scale substantially reduced the overall scale alpha. The officers explaining technical terms and acronyms, as well as explaining language in forms, were also rare events but were valid exclusions from the coding (i.e., responses with “n/a”) owing to the officer either not using technical terms, acronyms, or forms. As such, they were also excluded from the scale development owing to low response levels.

TABLE A.5

Change in Voice Items

| | Pre (n=54) mean (SD) | Post (n=48) mean (SD) | Significance | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|
| Officer demonstrates openness to accommodating supervisee requests. | 2.37 (1.38) | 2.20 (1.17) | n.s. | | |
| Officer invites supervisee to discuss any negative or disrespectful experience they may have had with the justice system before. | 1.19 (0.45) | 1.31 (0.46) | n.s. | | |
| Officer tells supervisee about opportunities to provide feedback or complaints about their experience. | 1.12 (0.26) | 1.17 (0.40) | n.s. | | |
| Officer allows the supervisee to ask questions. | 4.10 (1.25) | 3.89 (1.10) | n.s. | | |
| Officer invites the supervisee to ask questions. | 2.52 (1.11) | 2.96 (0.99) | $p < 0.10$ | | |
| Officer solicits questions with an open-ended request | 2.06 (0.92) | 2.33 (0.81) | n.s. | | |
| Officers allows supervisee to explain his/her actions or decisions, and to present his/her perspective on the matters under discussion. | 3.88 (1.13) | 3.69 (1.34) | n.s. | | |
| Officer invites supervisee to explain his/her actions or decisions, and to present his/her perspective on the matters under discussion. | 2.23 (0.99) | 2.26 (1.01) | n.s. | | |
| Voice Scale | 2.43 (0.61) | 2.48 (0.58) | n.s. | | |
| Scale Mean | SD | Min | Max | Skew (SE) | Cronbach's Alpha |
| 2.45 | 0.59 | 1.00 | 3.63 | -0.06 (0.25) | 0.75 |

Source: Urban analysis of Georgia Department of Community Supervision body camera footage.

Notes: n.s. = not significant; SD = standard deviation.

Appendix B. Perceptions of People on Supervision

Approximately two months before the training, DCS provided the research team with the full list of roughly 2,700 people supervised by the 43 officers selected to participate in the training whose level of supervision required them to be seen by their supervising officer at least monthly. The research team weighted the list of supervisees by their supervision level and randomly selected 750 to invite to participate in the survey. This was done via a short message service message that included a unique URL to the survey, as well as via a paper survey sent by mail. The pretraining survey was conducted in August 2019 and yielded 113 responses. The posttraining survey used the same sample frame of 750 supervisees and methodology, and was conducted in March 2020, yielding 97 responses. Fifty-two respondents responded to both survey waves. Every respondent received a \$10 gift card as an expression of appreciation. Tables B.1 and B.2 detail the sample characteristics of the two survey waves.

TABLE B.1
Survey Respondent Age

| | Mean (SD) | |
|-----|----------------|---------------|
| | Wave 1 (n=113) | Wave 2 (n=97) |
| Age | 40.34 (11.86) | 41.97 (11.99) |

Source: Urban survey of people supervised by the Georgia Department of Community Supervision.

Note: SD = standard deviation.

TABLE B.2

Survey Respondent Characteristics

| | Frequency (%) | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Wave 1 (n=113) | Wave 2 (n=97) |
| Circuit | | |
| Chattahoochee | 24 (21.24) | 29 (29.90) |
| Cherokee | 32 (28.32) | 24 (24.74) |
| Douglas | 23 (20.35) | 13 (13.40) |
| Northeastern | 25 (22.12) | 25 (25.77) |
| Tallapoosa | 9 (7.96) | 6 (6.19) |
| Supervision level | | |
| High | 4 (3.52) | 4 (4.12) |
| Specialized | 53 (46.90) | 42 (43.30) |
| Standard | 30 (26.55) | 29 (29.90) |
| Other | 26 (23.01) | 22 (22.68) |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 73 (66.97) | 69 (71.88) |
| Female | 35 (32.11) | 25 (26.04) |
| Prefer not to self-describe | 1 (0.92) | 2 (2.08) |
| Race | | |
| White | 81 (76.42) | 71 (74.74) |
| Black | 21 (19.81) | 19 (20.00) |
| Other | 4 (3.77) | 5 (5.27) |
| Educational status | | |
| Some high school or less | 18 (16.36) | 14 (14.58) |
| Graduated HS / GED | 56 (50.91) | 47 (48.96) |
| Tech or vocational school | 15 (13.64) | 14 (14.58) |
| Some college or graduated college | 21 (19.09) | 21 (21.88) |
| Employment | | |
| Not currently employed | 32 (30.19) | 32 (34.04) |
| Employed | 74 (69.81) | 62 (65.96) |
| If Employed... | | |
| Full time | 65 (89.04) | 54 (87.10) |
| Not full time | 8 (10.96) | 8 (12.90) |

Source: Urban survey of people supervised by the Georgia Department of Community Supervision.

The survey instrument included 52 questions separated into three sections: questions about the respondent's community supervision officer, questions about their community supervision agency, and questions about their demographic backgrounds. The survey was created to measure supervisees' perceptions of their interactions with community supervision officers and their community supervision agencies. The five common domains of procedural justice (i.e., neutral decisionmaking, understanding, voice, helpfulness, and respect) were assessed. In addition, we asked supervisees about their satisfaction with their community supervision officers and agencies, as well as about their willingness to obey the law. Response options across all items used a five-point Likert scale. We assessed change in the items and domains through independent and paired-sample two-tailed t-tests of the mean

difference across waves, as well as of the proportion of item responses of “4” and “5,” which corresponded with greater agreement or satisfaction.

TABLE B.3
Independent Samples Item and Scale Results (Pre n = 113, Post n = 97)

| Survey question | Scale Alpha | Mean (SD) | Significance | Percentage 4 & 5 Values | Significance |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| How satisfied are you with the way you were treated by your CSO? ^{bb} | -- | Pre: 4.43 (1.02) Post: 4.62 (0.91) | 1-tailed: p<0.10 | Pre: 87.27 Post: 92.47 | |
| How satisfied have you been with your experiences with the staff overall? ^a | -- | Pre: 4.28 (1.08) Post: 4.56 (0.82) | 2-tailed: p<0.10 1-tailed: p<0.05 | Pre: 82.08 Post: 90.24 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |
| Decisionmaking scale ^c | Pre: 0.93 Post: 0.93 | Pre: 4.34 (0.84) Post: 4.34 (0.81) | | -- | |
| CSO made decisions based on the facts | -- | Pre: 4.21 (1.04) Post: 4.33 (0.89) | | Pre: 83.04 Post: 86.60 | |
| CSO made fair decisions about what to do | -- | Pre: 4.34 (0.88) Post: 4.38 (0.81) | | Pre: 86.61 Post: 91.67 | |
| CSO held you to the right standards for supervision conditions | -- | Pre: 4.40 (0.94) Post: 4.32 (0.90) | | Pre: 87.50 Post: 90.53 | |
| CSO was fair and impartial | -- | Pre: 4.40 (0.85) Post: 4.33 (0.95) | | Pre: 87.39 Post: 91.75 | |
| Understanding scale ^c | Pre: 0.90 Post: 0.84 | Pre: 4.15 (0.93) Post: 4.23 (0.73) | | -- | |
| CSO gave me the opportunity to describe my situation before decisions were made | -- | Pre: 4.14 (1.15) Post: 4.18 (1.04) | | Pre: 79.46 Post: 83.51 | |
| CSO provided a summary of what will happen during the meeting | -- | Pre: 3.96 (1.13) Post: 4.09 (0.94) | | Pre: 69.37 Post: 80.41 | 2-tailed: p<0.10 1-tailed: p<0.05 |
| CSO explained what would happen next in the process | -- | Pre: 4.13 (1.08) Post: 4.29 (0.82) | | Pre: 77.27 Post: 89.58 | 2-tailed: p<0.10 1-tailed: p<0.05 |
| CSO confirmed that I understood what was going on with my case and expectations | -- | Pre: 4.36 (0.89) Post: 4.35 (0.75) | | Pre: 88.29 Post: 92.78 | |
| Voice scale ^c | Pre: 0.86 Post: 0.81 | Pre: 4.13 (0.88) Post: 4.24 (0.72) | | -- | |
| CSO asked more open-ended questions instead of yes/no questions | -- | Pre: 3.90 (1.15) Post: 3.97 (1.10) | | Pre: 72.07 Post: 75.79 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |
| CSO seemed to believe what I was saying. | -- | Pre: 4.18 (1.01) Post: 4.28 (0.90) | | Pre: 79.46 Post: 87.50 | |
| CSO clearly explained the reasons for his or her actions | -- | Pre: 4.17 (1.02) Post: 4.41 (0.76) | 2-tailed: p<0.10 1-tailed: p<0.05 | Pre: 78.76 Post: 93.75 | 2-tailed: p<0.01 1-tailed: p<0.01 |
| CSO allowed me to share my point of view before a decision was made | -- | Pre: 4.26 (1.02) Post: 4.28 (0.83) | | Pre: 82.30 Post: 88.42 | |

| Survey question | Scale Alpha | Mean (SD) | Significance | Percentage 4 & 5 Values | Significance |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Helpfulness scale ^c | Pre: 0.86 Post: 0.87 | Pre: 4.12 (0.87) Post: 4.17 (0.85) | | -- | |
| CSO explained the conditions of my supervision | -- | Pre: 4.39 (0.80) Post: 4.40 (0.86) | | Pre: 85.84 Post: 91.67 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |
| CSO provided reminders about future appointment dates and requirements | -- | Pre: 4.09 (1.08) Post: 4.12 (1.00) | | Pre: 79.36 Post: 80.00 | |
| CSO provided materials to help me | -- | Pre: 4.01 (1.15) Post: 4.10 (1.02) | | Pre: 70.54 Post: 78.35 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |
| CSO referred me to people or agencies that might be helpful | -- | Pre: 3.98 (1.11) Post: 4.06 (1.11) | | Pre: 68.75 Post: 73.20 | |
| Respect scale ^c | Pre: 0.96 Post: 0.92 | Pre: 4.37 (0.87) Post: 4.37 (0.79) | | -- | |
| CSO listened to what I had to say | -- | Pre: 4.32 (0.98) Post: 4.40 (0.90) | | Pre: 84.07 Post: 89.69 | |
| CSO treated me the same way as others would be treated in a similar situation | -- | Pre: 4.28 (0.95) Post: 4.29 (0.86) | | Pre: 82.57 Post: 88.54 | |
| CSO treated me with dignity and respect | -- | Pre: 4.42 (0.90) Post: 4.41 (0.88) | | Pre: 89.38 Post: 94.79 | |
| CSO treated me politely | -- | Pre: 4.46 (0.87) Post: 4.41 (0.91) | | Pre: 89.29 Post: 93.81 | |
| CSO—legitimacy | Pre: .91 Post: .90 | Pre: 4.24 (0.79) Post: 4.26 (0.80) | | -- | |
| How would you say your CSO is doing at their job? ^d | -- | Pre: 4.50 (0.91) Post: 4.67 (0.84) | 1-tailed: p<0.10 | Pre: 88.07 Post: 93.75 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |
| CSO usually acts in ways consistent with my ideas about what is right and wrong ² | -- | Pre: 4.07 (0.94) Post: 4.14 (0.95) | | Pre: 71.43 Post: 79.79 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |
| My CSO is a legitimate authority figure ² | -- | Pre: 4.44 (0.81) Post: 4.42 (0.78) | | Pre: 90.09 Post: 89.47 | |
| My CSO stands up for values that are important to me ² | -- | Pre: 4.22 (0.93) Post: 4.12 (1.04) | | Pre: 80.36 Post: 77.66 | |
| The values of my CSO are similar to my own ² | -- | Pre: 3.95 (0.99) Post: 3.93 (1.07) | | Pre: 66.36 Post: 67.37 | |
| Agency legitimacy scale ^c | Pre: 0.91 Post: 0.90 | Pre: 4.05 (0.72) Post: 4.09 (0.71) | | -- | |
| CSOs stand up for values that are important to me | -- | Pre: 4.01 (0.99) Post: 4.12 (1.00) | | Pre: 71.96 Post: 78.95 | |
| The staff in my community supervision agency talk down to me ³ | -- | Pre: 2.19 (1.33) Post: 1.95 (1.11) | 1-tailed: p<0.10 | Pre: 18.52 Post: 11.70 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |
| CSOs are legitimate authorities | -- | Pre: 4.35 (0.76) Post: 4.19 (0.84) | 1-tailed: p<0.10 | Pre: 84.91 Post: 86.02 | |
| The staff in my community supervision agency treat me with respect. | -- | Pre: 4.19 (0.89) Post: 4.23 (0.89) | | Pre: 79.82 Post: 88.42 | 2-tailed: p<0.10 1-tailed: p<0.05 |

| Survey question | Scale Alpha | Mean (SD) | Significance | Percentage 4 & 5 Values | Significance |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| CSOs often give violations to supervisees for no good reason ^a | -- | Pre:2.34 (1.32) Post:2.16 (1.12) | | Pre: 18.87 Post: 10.42 | 2-tailed: p<0.10 1-tailed: p<0.05 |
| CSOs sincerely try to help people like myself | -- | Pre:4.18 (0.89) Post:4.23 (0.89) | | Pre: 77.98 Post: 84.38 | |
| There is a good reason to believe the person did something wrong when sanctioned | -- | Pre:3.95 (0.95) Post:3.86 (1.02) | | Pre: 70.75 Post: 70.21 | |
| CSOs and I want the same thing for my community. | -- | Pre:4.06 (0.90) Post:4.11 (0.88) | | Pre: 75.23 Post: 76.04 | |
| The rules that CSOs enforce the moral values of people like myself | -- | Pre:4.18 (0.84) Post:4.02 (0.96) | | Pre: 78.70 Post: 76.29 | |
| Views of the law scale ^c | Pre: 0.87 Post: 0.83 | Pre:4.21 (0.62) Post:4.15 (0.66) | | -- | |
| Obeying the law ultimately benefits everyone in the community | -- | Pre:4.62 (0.62) Post:4.51 (0.75) | | Pre: 94.50 Post: 92.39 | |
| It is hard to break the law and keep your self-respect | -- | Pre:4.06 (1.09) Post:3.87 (1.16) | | Pre: 74.77 Post: 68.13 | |
| People should do what the law says | -- | Pre:4.51 (0.65) Post:4.41 (0.80) | | Pre: 91.67 Post: 85.71 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |
| A person who disobeys laws is a danger to others in the community | -- | Pre:4.04 (0.93) Post:4.02 (0.98) | | Pre: 70.75 Post: 70.65 | |
| All laws should be strictly obeyed | -- | Pre:4.11 (0.81) Post:4.18 (0.84) | | Pre: 76.36 Post: 76.67 | |
| Laws are generally consistent with my own thoughts about what is right and just | -- | Pre:4.07 (0.94) Post:3.96 (1.03) | | Pre: 74.07 Post: 72.04 | |
| Laws are consistent with views of my community about what is right / just | -- | Pre:4.06 (0.88) Post:4.02 (1.03) | | Pre: 74.07 Post: 76.92 | |

Notes: CSO = community supervision officer; SD = standard deviation.

^a Items reverse coded for scale creation.

^b Response options: 1 = Very Dissatisfied, 5 = Very Satisfied

^c Response options: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

^d Response options: 1 = Poor Job, 5 = Excellent Job

TABLE B.4

Paired Sample Item and Scale Results (n = 52)

| Survey question | Scale Alpha | Mean (SD) | Significance | Percentage 4 & 5 Values | Significance |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| How satisfied are you with the way you were treated by your CSO? ^b | -- | Pre: 4.67 (0.66) Post: 4.59 (0.91) | | Pre: 93.88 Post: 91.84 | |
| How satisfied have you been with your experiences with the staff overall? ^b | -- | Pre: 4.40 (0.93) Post: 4.49 (0.88) | | Pre: 86.05 Post: 90.70 | |
| Decisionmaking scale ^c | Pre: 0.88 Post: 0.82 | Pre: 4.39 (0.68) Post: 4.33 (0.84) | | -- | |
| CSO made decisions based on the facts | -- | Pre: 4.24 (0.93) Post: 4.35 (0.91) | | Pre: 88.24 Post: 88.24 | |
| CSO made fair decisions about what to do | -- | Pre: 4.42 (0.67) Post: 4.38 (0.84) | | Pre: 94.23 Post: 90.38 | |
| CSO held you to the right standards for supervision conditions | -- | Pre: 4.41 (0.80) Post: 4.27 (0.96) | | Pre: 92.16 Post: 88.24 | |
| CSO was fair and impartial | -- | Pre: 4.47 (0.67) Post: 4.29 (1.01) | | Pre: 94.12 Post: 90.20 | |
| Understanding scale ^c | Pre: 0.84 Post: 0.74 | Pre: 4.19 (0.87) Post: 4.23 (0.82) | | -- | |
| CSO gave me the opportunity to describe my situation before decisions were made | -- | Pre: 4.15 (1.07) Post: 4.17 (1.10) | | Pre: 80.77 Post: 84.62 | |
| CSO provided a summary of what will happen during the meeting | -- | Pre: 4.02 (1.06) Post: 4.06 (1.08) | | Pre: 72.00 Post: 80.00 | |
| CSO explained what would happen next in the process | -- | Pre: 4.14 (1.03) Post: 4.24 (0.96) | | Pre: 82.00 Post: 88.00 | |
| CSO confirmed that I understood what was going on with my case and expectations | -- | Pre: 4.37 (0.72) Post: 4.41 (0.73) | | Pre: 94.12 Post: 96.08 | |
| Voice scale ^c | Pre: 0.53 Post: 0.57 | Pre: 4.17 (0.76) Post: 4.25 (0.69) | | -- | |
| CSO asked more open-ended questions instead of yes/no questions | -- | Pre: 3.92 (1.11) Post: 3.84 (1.21) | | Pre: 74.51 Post: 70.59 | |
| CSO seemed to believe what I was saying. | -- | Pre: 4.25 (0.90) Post: 4.37 (0.82) | | Pre: 86.54 Post: 92.31 | |
| CSO clearly explained the reasons for his or her actions | -- | Pre: 4.19 (0.99) Post: 4.46 (0.75) | 2-tailed: p<0.10 1-tailed: p<0.05 | Pre: 80.77 Post: 94.23 | 2-tailed: p<0.10 1-tailed: p<0.05 |
| CSO allowed me to share my point of view before a decision was made | -- | Pre: 4.33 (0.86) Post: 4.33 (0.86) | | Pre: 86.54 Post: 88.46 | |
| Helpfulness scale ^c | Pre: 0.79 Post: 0.72 | Pre: 4.15 (0.84) Post: 4.14 (0.84) | | -- | |
| CSO explained the conditions of my supervision | -- | Pre: 4.35 (0.88) Post: 4.37 (0.86) | | Pre: 80.77 Post: 92.31 | 2-tailed: p<0.10 1-tailed: p<0.05 |
| CSO provided reminders about future appointment dates and requirements | -- | Pre: 4.14 (0.96) Post: 4.14 (0.98) | | Pre: 83.67 Post: 81.63 | |

| Survey question | Scale Alpha | Mean (SD) | Significance | Percentage 4 & 5 Values | Significance |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| CSO provided materials to help me | -- | Pre: 4.08 (1.06) Post: 4.04 (1.03) | | Pre: 78.85 Post: 73.08 | |
| CSO referred me to people or agencies that might be helpful | -- | Pre: 4.04 (1.03) Post: 4.00 (1.17) | | Pre: 75.00 Post: 73.08 | |
| Respect scale ^c | Pre: 0.86 Post: 0.81 | Pre: 4.39 (0.76) Post: 4.38 (0.85) | | -- | |
| CSO listened to what I had to say | -- | Pre: 4.33 (0.90) Post: 4.42 (0.89) | | Pre: 88.46 Post: 92.31 | |
| CSO treated me the same way as others would be treated in a similar situation | -- | Pre: 4.31 (0.84) Post: 4.31 (0.93) | | Pre: 88.24 Post: 88.24 | |
| CSO treated me with dignity and respect | -- | Pre: 4.46 (0.73) Post: 4.44 (0.87) | | Pre: 94.23 Post: 94.23 | |
| CSO treated me politely | -- | Pre: 4.48 (0.78) Post: 4.37 (0.97) | | Pre: 96.15 Post: 94.23 | |
| CSO—legitimacy | Pre: 0.82 Post: 0.78 | Pre: 4.32 (0.65) Post: 4.26 (0.86) | | -- | |
| How would you say your CSO is doing at their job? ^d | -- | Pre: 4.62 (0.67) Post: 4.66 (0.87) | | Pre: 94.00 Post: 94.00 | |
| CSO usually acts in ways consistent with my ideas about what is right and wrong ^c | -- | Pre: 4.14 (0.83) Post: 4.14 (1.02) | | Pre: 76.47 Post: 78.43 | |
| My CSO is a legitimate authority figure ^c | -- | Pre: 4.48 (0.71) Post: 4.38 (0.85) | | Pre: 92.00 Post: 86.00 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |
| My CSO stands up for values that are important to me ^c | -- | Pre: 4.33 (0.76) Post: 4.08 (1.12) | | Pre: 86.54 Post: 78.85 | |
| The values of my CSO are similar to my own ^c | -- | Pre: 4.02 (0.91) Post: 4.00 (1.10) | | Pre: 68.63 Post: 70.59 | |
| Agency legitimacy scale ^c | Pre: 0.84 Post: 0.79 | Pre: 4.11 (0.68) Post: 4.12 (0.74) | | -- | |
| CSOs stand up for values that are important to me | -- | Pre: 4.12 (0.82) Post: 4.01 (1.02) | | Pre: 76.47 Post: 82.35 | |
| The staff in my community supervision agency talk down to me ^a | -- | Pre: 2.04 (1.23) Post: 1.94 (1.17) | | Pre: 14.00 Post: 14.00 | |
| CSOs are legitimate authorities | -- | Pre: 4.32 (0.71) Post: 4.26 (0.83) | | Pre: 86.00 Post: 86.00 | |
| The staff in my community supervision agency treat me with respect. | -- | Pre: 4.21 (0.87) Post: 4.27 (0.87) | | Pre: 82.69 Post: 92.31 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |
| CSOs often give violations to supervisees for no good reason ^a | -- | Pre: 2.14 (1.24) Post: 2.20 (1.27) | | Pre: 14.29 Post: 16.33 | |
| CSOs sincerely try to help people like myself | -- | Pre: 4.29 (0.85) Post: 4.25 (0.90) | | Pre: 82.69 Post: 88.46 | |
| There is a good reason to believe the person did something wrong when sanctioned | -- | Pre: 4.04 (0.81) Post: 4.08 (0.99) | | Pre: 74.00 Post: 80.00 | |
| CSOs and I want the same thing for my community. | -- | Pre: 4.00 (0.89) Post: 4.23 (0.83) | 1-tailed: p<0.10 | Pre: 73.08 Post: 84.62 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |

| Survey question | Scale Alpha | Mean (SD) | Significance | Percentage 4 & 5 Values | Significance |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| The rules that CSOs enforce the moral values of people like myself | -- | Pre: 4.22 (0.81) Post: 4.08 (0.93) | | Pre: 80.39 Post: 80.39 | |
| Views of the law scale ^{2c} | Pre: 0.76 Post: 0.80 | Pre: 4.16 (0.61) Post: 4.16 (0.73) | | -- | |
| Obeying the law ultimately benefits everyone in the community | -- | Pre: 4.66 (0.52) Post: 4.50 (0.84) | | Pre: 98.00 Post: 92.00 | 1-tailed: p<0.10 |
| It is hard to break the law and keep your self-respect | -- | Pre: 3.98 (1.14) Post: 3.79 (1.25) | | Pre: 79.17 Post: 62.50 | 2-tailed: p<0.05 1-tailed: p<0.05 |
| People should do what the law says | -- | Pre: 4.37 (0.67) Post: 4.35 (0.93) | | Pre: 89.80 Post: 79.59 | 2-tailed: p<0.05 1-tailed: p<0.05 |
| A person who disobeys laws is a danger to others in the community | -- | Pre: 4.10 (0.78) Post: 4.17 (0.97) | | Pre: 79.17 Post: 75.00 | |
| All laws should be strictly obeyed | -- | Pre: 4.00 (0.78) Post: 4.28 (0.83) | 2-tailed: p<0.01 1-tailed: p<0.01 | Pre: 74.00 Post: 76.00 | |
| Laws are generally consistent with my own thoughts about what is right and just | -- | Pre: 4.14 (0.88) Post: 4.12 (1.04) | | Pre: 82.00 Post: 74.00 | |
| Laws are consistent with views of my community about what is right / just | -- | Pre: 3.96 (0.92) Post: 3.94 (1.19) | | Pre: 75.00 Post: 70.83 | |

Notes: CSO = community supervision officer; SD = standard deviation.

^aItems reverse coded for scale creation.

^bResponse options: 1 = Very Dissatisfied, 5 = Very Satisfied

^cResponse options: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

^dResponse options: 1 = Poor Job, 5 = Excellent Job

Appendix C. Supervision Outcomes

We obtained administrative data from DCS on supervisee characteristics and various supervision outcomes related to compliance with conditions for the six months before and six months after the procedural justice training, for people supervised by the officers in the five pilot circuits who did and did not participate in the training. We explored the counts of arrests, delinquent reports, warrants, revocations, and convictions, conducting negative binomial regressions that included a difference-in-differences (DID) estimator at both the supervisee and officer level unit of analysis. The DID estimator allowed us to estimate the difference between the training group's posttraining and pretraining outcomes, relative to the same difference for the control group. The supervisee-level analyses compare the mean count values of the outcomes for the supervisees, whereas the officer-level analyses use values of the supervisee outcomes summated to the officer level, and therefore compare the mean count values of the outcomes for an officer's caseload.

The balance between treatment and control groups is presented in table C.1, for both the officer-level groupings and the supervisee-level groupings. Summary results from the negative binomial regression models specific to the DID estimators are presented in table C.2. Tables C.3 through C.15 detail the full regression models for each main and sub outcome.

TABLE C.1

Treatment and Control Group Characteristics

| | Supervisee level ^a | | | | Officer Level ^b | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------|----------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------|
| | Control (n=21,760) | Training (n=16,904) | | | Control (n=50) | Training (n=43) | | |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | <i>t</i> | <i>d</i> | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | <i>t</i> | <i>d</i> |
| Race | | | | | | | | |
| White | 0.60 (0.49) | 0.59 (0.49) | 2.24 * | 0.02 | 0.62 (0.20) | 0.62 (0.16) | 0.03 | 0.01 |
| Black | 0.36 (0.48) | 0.38 (0.49) | -3.33 *** | -0.03 | 0.35 (0.21) | 0.35 (0.17) | 0.13 | 0.03 |
| Other or unknown race | 0.03 (0.18) | 0.03 (0.17) | 2.91 ** | 0.03 | 0.03 (0.02) | 0.03 (0.03) | -0.99 | -0.21 |
| Female | 0.24 (0.43) | 0.22 (0.42) | 4.13 *** | 0.04 | 0.22 (0.10) | 0.22 (0.05) | 0.20 | 0.04 |
| Age at referral | 39.38 (11.83) | 39.43 (11.77) | -0.48 | -0.00 | 39.55 (2.66) | 39.79 (2.00) | -0.47 | -0.10 |
| Marital Status | | | | | | | | |
| Currently married | 0.15 (0.36) | 0.14 (0.35) | 2.09 * | 0.02 | 0.15 (0.05) | 0.15 (0.04) | 0.25 | 0.05 |
| Currently not married | 0.67 (0.47) | 0.68 (0.47) | -2.45 * | -0.03 | 0.68 (0.10) | 0.69 (0.07) | -0.77 | -0.16 |
| Marital status unknown | 0.18 (0.38) | 0.17 (0.38) | 1.06 | 0.01 | 0.17 (0.10) | 0.16 (0.07) | 0.61 | 0.13 |
| Education | | | | | | | | |
| Grade school | 0.31 (0.46) | 0.30 (0.46) | 1.02 | 0.01 | 0.31 (0.07) | 0.31 (0.05) | 0.32 | 0.07 |
| High school degree or GED | 0.37 (0.48) | 0.37 (0.48) | 0.97 | 0.01 | 0.37 (0.06) | 0.38 (0.05) | -0.41 | -0.09 |
| Some college or greater | 0.14 (0.35) | 0.14 (0.35) | -1.33 | -0.01 | 0.14 (0.05) | 0.14 (0.03) | -0.10 | -0.02 |
| Education unknown | 0.19 (0.39) | 0.19 (0.39) | -1.20 | -0.01 | 0.18 (0.10) | 0.17 (0.07) | 0.08 | 0.02 |
| Employed | 0.54 (0.50) | 0.61 (0.49) | -14.01 *** | -0.14 | 0.52 (0.10) | 0.61 (0.09) | -4.52 *** | -0.94 |
| Risk Score | 5.20 (2.93) | 5.11 (2.93) | 3.21 ** | 0.03 | 5.39 (0.97) | 5.13 (0.57) | 1.54 | 0.32 |
| Officer average daily caseload | 458.95 (218.04) | 418.20 (193.25) | 19.15 *** | 0.20 | 335.93 (218.57) | 325.61 (183.44) | 0.24 | 0.05 |
| Outcomes | | | | | | | | |
| Count of arrests | 0.42 (1.14) | 0.57 (1.37) | -11.60 *** | -0.12 | 182.98 (112.62) | 223.49 (134.62) | -1.58 | -0.33 |
| Count of misd. arrests | 0.18 (0.62) | 0.24 (0.73) | -9.05 *** | -0.09 | 77.94 (51.26) | 94.91 (62.54) | -1.44 | -0.30 |
| Count of felony arrests | 0.24 (0.70) | 0.33 (0.84) | -10.92 *** | -0.11 | 105.04 (63.89) | 128.58 (73.33) | -1.65 | -0.34 |
| Count of delinquent reports | 0.10 (0.48) | 0.16 (0.61) | -10.35 *** | -0.11 | 42.58 (25.91) | 61.14 (33.07) | -3.03 ** | -0.63 |
| Count of prob. DRs | 0.06 (0.27) | 0.09 (0.33) | -9.93 *** | -0.10 | 24.54 (14.83) | 34.00 (19.69) | -2.64 ** | -0.55 |
| Count of parole DRs | 0.04 (0.40) | 0.07 (0.51) | -5.95 *** | -0.06 | 18.04 (16.17) | 27.14 (17.66) | -2.60 * | -0.54 |
| Count of warrants | 0.13 (0.39) | 0.16 (0.43) | -8.77 *** | -0.09 | 55.32 (33.26) | 64.40 (35.35) | -1.27 | -0.27 |
| Count of prob. warrants | 0.12 (0.37) | 0.15 (0.42) | -8.55 *** | -0.09 | 51.82 (30.94) | 60.40 (33.66) | -1.28 | -0.27 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|-------|
| Count of parole warrants | 0.01 (0.10) | 0.01 (0.11) | -1.93 ^t | -0.02 | 3.50 (4.01) | 4.00 (2.99) | -0.67 | -0.14 |
| Count of revocations | 0.07 (0.32) | 0.09 (0.38) | -7.48 ^{***} | -0.08 | 28.60 (23.31) | 36.23 (26.27) | -1.49 | -0.31 |
| Count of prob. revoc. | 0.06 (0.31) | 0.09 (0.37) | -7.03 ^{***} | -0.07 | 27.68 (22.96) | 34.65 (25.61) | -1.38 | -0.29 |
| Count of parole revoc. | 0.00 (0.05) | 0.00 (0.06) | -3.43 ^{***} | -0.04 | 0.92 (1.28) | 1.58 (1.53) | -2.27 [*] | -0.47 |
| Count of early terminations | 0.00 (0.05) | 0.00 (0.06) | -2.96 ^{**} | -0.03 | 0.90 (1.39) | 1.47 (2.09) | -1.56 | -0.32 |
| Count of total convictions | 0.10 (0.38) | 0.15 (0.45) | -10.57 ^{***} | -0.11 | 44.28 (34.65) | 57.65 (33.82) | -1.88 ^t | -0.39 |

Notes: SD = standard deviation.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white)

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white)

^t p < 0.10; * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001

TABLE C.2

Negative Binomial Regression Summaries of Difference-in-Differences Coefficients

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Arrests | | |
| <i>Count of arrests</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.04 (0.03) | -0.09 (0.09) |
| Group | 0.39 (0.03) *** | 0.18 (0.10) ^t |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.13 (0.04) ** | -0.06 (0.12) |
| <i>Count of misd. arrests</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.10 (0.03) ** | -0.11 (0.09) |
| Group | 0.37 (0.03) *** | 0.21 (0.10) * |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.12 (0.05) * | -0.07 (0.12) |
| <i>Count of felony arrests</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.01 (0.03) | -0.06 (0.08) |
| Group | 0.38 (0.03) *** | 0.18 (0.09) ^t |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.12 (0.04) ** | -0.07 (0.12) |
| Delinquent Reports | | |
| <i>Count of Delinquent Reports</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.02 (0.04) | -0.04 (0.09) |
| Group | 0.52 (0.04) *** | 0.28 (0.10) ** |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.13 (0.06) * | -0.15 (0.13) |
| <i>Count of Probation Delinquent Reports</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.05 (0.05) | -0.03 (0.10) |
| Group | 0.43 (0.04) *** | 0.20 (0.11) ^t |
| Pre/Post x Group | 0.05 (0.06) | -0.03 (0.14) |
| <i>Count of Parole Delinquent Reports</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.02 (0.10) | -0.11 (0.16) |
| Group | 0.70 (0.11) *** | 0.48 (0.18) ** |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.34 (0.15) * | -0.31 (0.23) |
| Warrants | | |
| <i>Count of warrants</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.29 (0.03) *** | -0.35 (0.09) *** |
| Group | 0.28 (0.03) *** | 0.13 (0.10) |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.12 (0.05) ** | -0.10 (0.13) |
| <i>Count of probation warrants</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.29 (0.03) *** | -0.35 (0.09) *** |
| Group | 0.28 (0.03) *** | 0.13 (0.10) |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.11 (0.05) * | -0.09 (0.13) |
| <i>Count of parole warrants</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.20 (0.13) | -0.35 (0.18) ^t |
| Group | 0.30 (0.12) * | 0.21 (0.20) |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.24 (0.19) | -0.21 (0.26) |
| Revocations | | |
| <i>Count of revocations</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.05 (0.05) | -0.06 (0.13) |
| Group | 0.40 (0.05) *** | 0.11 (0.14) |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.03 (0.07) | -0.09 (0.18) |
| <i>Count of probation revocations</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.09 (0.05) ^t | -0.09 (0.13) |
| Group | 0.39 (0.05) *** | 0.10 (0.15) |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.02 (0.07) | -0.10 (0.19) |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <i>Count of parole revocations</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | 0.72 (0.18) *** | 0.71 (0.24) ** |
| Group | 0.71 (0.19) *** | 0.61 (0.27) * |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.36 (0.24) | -0.26 (0.31) |
| Convictions | | |
| <i>Count of Convictions</i> | | |
| Pre/Post | -0.14 (0.04) *** | -0.10 (0.10) |
| Group | 0.42 (0.03) *** | 0.35 (0.12) ** |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.13 (0.05) * | -0.12 (0.15) |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^a Supervisee-level analyses included a pre-training sample of 16,904 supervisees in the training group and 21,760 supervisees in the control group, and a post-training sample of 14,852 supervisees in the training group and 19,236 supervisees in the control group. The negative binomial regressions included the following unreported covariates: race, sex, age, marital status, education level, employment, risk score, officer daily average caseload.

^b Officer-level analyses included a pre- and post-training samples of 43 officers in the training group and 50 officers in the control group. The negative binomial regressions included the following unreported covariates: proportion of caseload that is: white, Black, another race, female, currently married, not currently married, marital status unknown, grade school education level, high school/GED education level, some college or more education level, education level unknown, employed; and average daily caseload, average risk score of caseload, average supervisee age.

^t $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE C.3

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Arrests

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.04 (0.03) | -0.09 (0.09) |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.39 (0.03) *** | 0.18 (0.10) ^t |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.13 (0.04) ** | -0.06 (0.12) |
| Age | -0.02 (0.00) *** | -0.05 (0.02) * |
| Female | -0.11 (0.03) *** | 2.91 (0.54) *** |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.09 (0.02) *** | 0.46 (0.23) * |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.49 (0.06) *** | 1.40 (1.35) |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.11 (0.03) *** | 4.39 (0.91) *** |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | 0.33 (0.06) *** | 4.10 (2.33) ^t |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.01 (0.02) | 0.47 (0.78) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | -0.05 (0.03) | -0.66 (0.89) |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.25 (0.05) *** | -0.77 (2.15) |
| Employed | -0.17 (0.02) *** | 1.35 (0.41) ** |
| Risk Score | 0.14 (0.00) *** | 0.03 (0.06) |
| Supervisor's caseload | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -1.06 (0.07) *** | 0.63 (1.49) |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.02 | 0.10 |
| Chi-Square | 2720.93 *** | 235.66 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Note: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white).

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white).

^t $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE C.4

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Misdemeanor Arrests

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.10 (0.03) ** | -0.11 (0.09) |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.37 (0.03) *** | 0.21 (0.10) * |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.12 (0.05) * | -0.07 (0.12) |
| Age | -0.02 (0.00) *** | -0.08 (0.02) *** |
| Female | -0.11 (0.03) ** | 3.34 (0.56) *** |
| Black (vs. white) | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.77 (0.24) ** |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.38 (0.08) *** | 1.68 (1.39) |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.13 (0.04) ** | 4.54 (0.94) *** |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | 0.37 (0.07) *** | 5.17 (2.39) * |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | -0.02 (0.03) | -1.07 (0.73) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | -0.02 (0.04) | -2.15 (0.93) * |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.19 (0.07) ** | -2.91 (2.23) |
| Employed | -0.09 (0.03) ** | 1.49 (0.42) *** |
| Risk Score | 0.14 (0.00) *** | -0.06 (0.06) |
| Supervisor's caseload | 0.00 (0.00) * | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -2.07 (0.09) *** | 2.06 (1.48) |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.02 | 0.13 |
| Chi-Square | 1739.76 *** | 260.30 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white)

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white)

^t $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

TABLE C.5

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Felony Arrests

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.01 (0.03) | -0.06 (0.08) |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.38 (0.03) *** | 0.18 (0.09) ^t |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.12 (0.04) ** | -0.07 (0.12) |
| Age | -0.01 (0.00) *** | -0.03 (0.02) |
| Female | -0.11 (0.03) *** | 2.48 (0.51) *** |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.15 (0.02) *** | 0.23 (0.22) |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.53 (0.07) *** | 1.16 (1.31) |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.10 (0.03) ** | 4.13 (0.88) *** |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | 0.26 (0.06) *** | 3.38 (2.23) |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.03 (0.02) | 0.94 (0.73) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | -0.08 (0.03) * | -0.11 (0.85) |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.26 (0.05) *** | 0.23 (2.07) |
| Employed | -0.22 (0.02) *** | 1.17 (0.40) ** |
| Risk Score | 0.14 (0.00) *** | 0.08 (0.06) |
| Supervisor's caseload | -0.00 (0.00) *** | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -1.49 (0.07) *** | -0.69 (1.43) |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.03 | 0.11 |
| Chi-Square | 2635.36 *** | 223.23 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white).

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white).

^t $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE C.6

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Delinquent Reports

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.02 (0.04) | -0.04 (0.09) |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.52 (0.04) *** | 0.28 (0.10) ** |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.13 (0.06) * | -0.15 (0.13) |
| Age | 0.00 (0.00) * | -0.02 (0.02) |
| Female | -0.10 (0.04) ** | 1.40 (0.59) * |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.08 (0.03) * | 0.41 (0.25) |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.60 (0.11) *** | 1.66 (1.41) |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.15 (0.05) ** | 4.49 (1.01) *** |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | 0.11 (0.09) | 5.42 (2.52) * |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.20 (0.04) *** | 1.11 (0.82) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.06 (0.05) | -1.43 (0.98) |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.22 (0.08) ** | -0.74 (2.35) |
| Employed | -0.13 (0.03) *** | 1.83 (0.45) *** |
| Risk Score | 0.16 (0.01) *** | 0.07 (0.07) |
| Supervisor's caseload | -0.00 (0.00) *** | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -2.99 (0.10) *** | -2.26 (1.64) |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.03 | 0.10 |
| Chi-Square | 1560.26 *** | 173.63 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white).

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white).

^t $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE C.7

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Probation Delinquent Reports

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.05 (0.05) | -0.03 (0.10) |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.43 (0.04) *** | 0.20 (0.11) ^t |
| Pre/Post x Group | 0.05 (0.06) | -0.03 (0.14) |
| Age | -0.01 (0.00) *** | 0.00 (0.02) |
| Female | 0.00 (0.04) | 1.27 (0.62) * |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.05 (0.03) ^t | 0.93 (0.27) *** |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.96 (0.14) *** | -1.71 (1.56) |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.09 (0.05) ^t | 3.97 (1.04) *** |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | 0.31 (0.09) ** | 5.65 (2.62) * |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.05 (0.04) | 0.84 (0.83) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.07 (0.05) | -0.94 (1.05) |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.13 (0.08) | -1.05 (2.48) |
| Employed | -0.06 (0.03) ^t | 2.25 (0.46) *** |
| Risk Score | 0.15 (0.01) *** | 0.00 (0.07) |
| Supervisor's caseload | -0.00 (0.00) *** | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -3.07 (0.11) *** | -2.90 (1.71) ^t |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.03 | 0.10 |
| Chi-Square | 1287.87 *** | 153.23 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white).

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white).

^t $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE C.8

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Parole Delinquent Reports

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.02 (0.10) | -0.11 (0.16) |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.70 (0.11) *** | 0.48 (0.18) ** |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.34 (0.15) * | -0.31 (0.23) |
| Age | 0.01 (0.00) ^t | -0.06 (0.04) |
| Female | -0.25 (0.10) * | 2.16 (1.02) * |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.02 (0.08) | -0.57 (0.43) |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.04 (0.24) | 6.18 (2.53) * |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.17 (0.11) | 4.98 (1.88) ** |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | -0.65 (0.20) ** | 4.45 (4.53) |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.42 (0.09) *** | 2.05 (1.56) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.07 (0.12) | -1.71 (1.73) |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.60 (0.18) ** | 0.83 (4.17) |
| Employed | -0.19 (0.08) * | 1.05 (0.81) |
| Risk Score | 0.17 (0.01) *** | 0.23 (0.11) * |
| Supervisor's caseload | -0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -4.58 (0.26) *** | -2.99 (2.91) |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.03 | 0.07 |
| Chi-Square | 471.92 *** | 107.24 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white).

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white).

^t $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

TABLE C.9

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Warrants

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.29 (0.03) *** | -0.35 (0.09) *** |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.28 (0.03) *** | 0.13 (0.10) |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.12 (0.05) ** | -0.10 (0.13) |
| Age | -0.01 (0.00) *** | -0.03 (0.02) |
| Female | -0.06 (0.03) * | 1.97 (0.56) *** |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.28 (0.02) *** | -0.14 (0.25) |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.55 (0.08) *** | 2.10 (1.43) |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.15 (0.04) *** | 4.65 (0.98) *** |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | 0.38 (0.07) *** | 2.48 (2.41) |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.02 (0.03) | 0.49 (0.78) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | -0.11 (0.04) ** | 0.40 (0.92) |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.20 (0.06) ** | 1.06 (2.24) |
| Employed | -0.18 (0.02) *** | 0.91 (0.43) * |
| Risk Score | 0.15 (0.00) *** | 0.17 (0.06) ** |
| Supervisor's caseload | -0.00 (0.00) *** | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -2.16 (0.08) *** | -1.65 (1.54) |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.04 | 0.11 |
| Chi-Square | 2378.21 *** | 194.59 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white).

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white).

^t $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE C.10

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Probation Warrants

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.29 (0.03) *** | -0.35 (0.09) *** |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.28 (0.03) *** | 0.13 (0.10) |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.11 (0.05) * | -0.09 (0.13) |
| Age | -0.01 (0.00) *** | -0.03 (0.02) |
| Female | -0.05 (0.03) † | 2.03 (0.56) *** |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.28 (0.02) *** | -0.10 (0.25) |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.53 (0.08) *** | 1.87 (1.44) |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.13 (0.04) *** | 4.57 (0.97) *** |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | 0.40 (0.07) *** | 2.58 (2.41) |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | -0.01 (0.03) | 0.34 (0.78) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | -0.13 (0.04) ** | 0.52 (0.92) |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.19 (0.06) ** | 0.85 (2.25) |
| Employed | -0.18 (0.02) *** | 0.89 (0.43) * |
| Risk Score | 0.14 (0.00) *** | 0.16 (0.06) ** |
| Supervisor's caseload | -0.00 (0.00) *** | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -2.13 (0.08) *** | -1.53 (1.53) |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.04 | 0.11 |
| Chi-Square | 2184.82 *** | 192.73 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white).

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white).

† $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE C.11

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Parole Warrants

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.20 (0.13) | -0.35 (0.18) ^t |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.30 (0.12) * | 0.21 (0.20) |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.24 (0.19) | -0.21 (0.26) |
| Age | 0.01 (0.00) | -0.04 (0.04) |
| Female | -0.32 (0.13) * | 0.89 (1.20) |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.24 (0.10) * | -0.63 (0.51) |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.87 (0.40) * | 4.29 (2.84) |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.34 (0.14) * | 3.80 (2.03) ^t |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | -0.32 (0.34) | -0.95 (5.25) |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.44 (0.11) *** | 0.84 (1.52) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.19 (0.15) | -2.85 (2.03) |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.67 (0.32) * | 3.24 (4.86) |
| Employed | -0.22 (0.09) * | 1.34 (0.90) |
| Risk Score | 0.21 (0.02) *** | 0.40 (0.13) ** |
| Supervisor's caseload | -0.00 (0.00) * | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -6.26 (0.32) *** | -4.16 (3.16) |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.05 | 0.09 |
| Chi-Square | 328.46 *** | 80.62 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white).

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white).

^t $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE C.12

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Revocations

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.05 (0.05) | -0.06 (0.13) |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.40 (0.05) *** | 0.11 (0.14) |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.03 (0.07) | -0.09 (0.18) |
| Age | -0.01 (0.00) *** | 0.05 (0.03) ^t |
| Female | -0.03 (0.04) | 2.14 (0.81) ** |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.29 (0.04) *** | -0.30 (0.34) |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.70 (0.12) *** | -0.66 (1.96) |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.09 (0.05) ^t | 3.10 (1.33) * |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | 0.15 (0.10) | 0.45 (3.45) |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.01 (0.04) | -0.35 (1.05) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | -0.20 (0.06) ** | -0.12 (1.33) |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.22 (0.09) * | 2.16 (3.20) |
| Employed | -0.18 (0.03) *** | 1.97 (0.61) ** |
| Risk Score | 0.15 (0.01) *** | 0.22 (0.09) * |
| Supervisor's caseload | -0.00 (0.00) * | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -2.91 (0.11) *** | -4.59 (2.25) * |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.03 | 0.08 |
| Chi-Square | 1074.41 *** | 131.19 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white)

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white)

^t $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE C.13

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Probation Revocations

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.09 (0.05) ^t | -0.09 (0.13) |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.39 (0.05)*** | 0.10 (0.15) |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.02 (0.07) | -0.10 (0.19) |
| Age | -0.01 (0.00)*** | 0.05 (0.03) ^t |
| Female | -0.01 (0.04) | 2.17 (0.85)* |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.28 (0.04)*** | -0.29 (0.36) |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.70 (0.12)*** | -1.68 (2.11) |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.08 (0.05) | 3.06 (1.40)* |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | 0.15 (0.10) | -0.06 (3.62) |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | -0.02 (0.04) | -0.35 (1.11) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | -0.22 (0.06)*** | 0.30 (1.40) |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.20 (0.09)* | 2.70 (3.36) |
| Employed | -0.17 (0.04)*** | 2.02 (0.64)** |
| Risk Score | 0.15 (0.01)*** | 0.23 (0.09)* |
| Supervisor's caseload | -0.00 (0.00)* | 0.00 (0.00)*** |
| Constant | -2.89 (0.12)*** | -4.96 (2.37)* |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.03 | 0.08 |
| Chi-Square | 958.66*** | 122.68*** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white)

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white)

^t $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE C.14

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Parole Revocations

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | 0.72 (0.18) *** | 0.71 (0.24) ** |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.71 (0.19) *** | 0.61 (0.27) * |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.36 (0.24) | -0.26 (0.31) |
| Age | 0.00 (0.01) | -0.06 (0.05) |
| Female | -0.49 (0.18) ** | 1.23 (1.65) |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.42 (0.13) ** | -0.74 (0.66) |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.75 (0.51) | 8.74 (3.04) ** |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.16 (0.17) | 4.76 (2.49) ^t |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | -0.19 (0.52) | 9.51 (6.28) |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.69 (0.14) *** | -0.39 (1.60) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.30 (0.21) | -6.58 (2.55) * |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -2.16 (0.70) ** | -6.32 (5.91) |
| Employed | -0.44 (0.12) *** | 1.15 (1.09) |
| Risk Score | 0.22 (0.02) *** | -0.13 (0.17) |
| Supervisor's caseload | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -7.61 (0.42) *** | -1.70 (3.76) |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.08 | 0.12 |
| Chi-Square | 306.36 *** | 79.78 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white).

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white).

^t $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

TABLE C.15

Negative Binomial Regression Model Count of Convictions

| | Supervisee level ^a | Officer level ^b |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Coef. (SE) | Coef. (SE) |
| Pre/Post | -0.14 (0.04) *** | 1.10 (0.28) *** |
| Group (treatment = 1) | 0.42 (0.03) *** | 0.56 (0.32) ^t |
| Pre/Post x Group | -0.13 (0.05) * | -0.19 (0.38) |
| Age | -0.03 (0.00) *** | -0.13 (0.06) * |
| Female | -0.11 (0.03) ** | 6.22 (1.86) ** |
| Black (vs. white) | -0.24 (0.03) *** | 2.72 (0.77) *** |
| Other Race (vs. white) | -0.47 (0.08) *** | -1.76 (4.93) |
| Not currently married (vs. married) | 0.09 (0.04) * | -2.59 (3.10) |
| Marriage status unknown (vs. married) | 0.33 (0.07) *** | -5.33 (7.42) |
| High School or GED (vs. grade school) | 0.08 (0.03) * | -3.30 (2.56) |
| More than High School or GED (vs. grade school) | -0.03 (0.05) | -6.31 (3.11) * |
| Education unknown (vs. grade school) | -0.06 (0.07) | -0.84 (7.18) |
| Employed | -0.46 (0.03) *** | 1.67 (1.30) |
| Risk Score | -0.02 (0.00) *** | -0.55 (0.20) ** |
| Supervisor's caseload | -0.00 (0.00) ^t | 0.00 (0.00) *** |
| Constant | -0.99 (0.09) *** | 8.46 (4.89) ^t |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.02 | 0.12 |
| Chi-Square | 1135.32 *** | 81.1 *** |
| n, training-group, pre | 16,904 | 43 |
| n, control-group, pre | 21,760 | 50 |
| n, training-group, post | 14,852 | 43 |
| n, control-group, post | 19,236 | 50 |

Notes: SE = standard error.

^aSupervisee-level data are at the individual level (e.g., supervisee is white).

^bOfficer-level data are at the caseload level (e.g., 60% of officer's caseload is white).

^t $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Reference

Jannetta, Jesse, Travis Reginal, Daniel S. Lawrence, Caitlin Flood, and Emily Gold LaGratta. 2021. *Applying Procedural Justice in Community Supervision: Assessment of Pilot Testing in the Georgia Department of Community Supervision*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Acknowledgments

This report was funded by Arnold Ventures. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute’s funding principles is available at urban.org/fundingprinciples.

We are grateful to our partners at the Georgia Department of Community Supervision, without whose receptivity to trying something new, engagement in the development of the intervention, and support in carrying out the pilot, this report would not have been possible. We particularly wish to thank Commissioner Michael Nail, Sherri Bloodworth, Clarissa Dias, Bert Flewellen, Tim Housley, Scott Maurer, Nick Powell, and Maria Stephenson, as well as the Department of Community Supervision staff of the Chattahoochee, Cherokee, Douglas, Northeastern, and Tallapoosa Circuits.



500 L’Enfant Plaza SW
Washington, DC 20024

www.urban.org

ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is a leading research organization dedicated to developing evidence-based insights that improve people’s lives and strengthen communities. For 50 years, Urban has been the trusted source for rigorous analysis of complex social and economic issues; strategic advice to policymakers, philanthropists, and practitioners; and new, promising ideas that expand opportunities for all. Our work inspires effective decisions that advance fairness and enhance the well-being of people and places.

Copyright © March 2021 Urban Institute. Permission is granted for reproduction of this file, with attribution to the Urban Institute.