

# Overview of Swift Certain Fair—Principles, Practices, and Innovations

Sandy F. Mullins, JD

Marron Institute of Urban Management

New York University



NYU

# Swift Certain Fair Resource Center



## Swift Certain Fair Resource Center

Supporting innovation in community supervision.

# Background

- 7 million+ adults in the US on community supervision
- Sizable share are drug involved
- Little guidance as to what strategies work
- Failure rates are high
- Inefficient application of confinement sanctions

# Problem

Large caseloads—limited supervision, treatment

Rules unclear and violations go undetected

*Message: probability of sanction low*

If detected, violations not sanctioned

*Message: probability of sanction even lower*

Unpunished strings of violations

*Message: violating is OK*


If detected and sanctioned, response slow

*Message: punishment is arbitrary, unfair*

**Does not tie behavior to consequence**

# What is “Swift Certain Fair”?

**SCF implementations differ in operational details, but share:**

- Close monitoring
  - Swift and certain responses
  - Modest sanctions
- 
- Legitimacy

# SCF Model

- Clearly articulated rules
- Credible threats
- Formal orientation
- Supervision conditions closely monitored, actually enforced
- Regular random drug testing, as appropriate
- Every violation met with an immediate, modest sanction
- Incentives and rewards to reinforce compliance

# What Is the Evidence Behind SCF?

# Hawaii's HOPE

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>HOPE</b>	<b>Control</b>
No-shows for probation appointments (average of appointments per probationer)	9%	23%
Positive urine tests (average of tests per probationer)	13%	46%
Revocation rate (probationers revoked)	7%	15%
Incarceration (days sentenced)	<b>138 days</b>	<b>267 days</b>



# HOPE RCT Outcomes (7-Year Followup)

- 50% reduction in drug charges
- Small changes in other charges
- 50% reductions in returns to prison
- Tracked all (~100) early-terminations—no new CJ encounter
- No difference in implementation or outcomes by race/ethnicity

# SCF Expansion

- Adapted to different jurisdictions, different CJ populations
  - High-risk, violent parolees (Seattle)
  - High-risk juveniles (two counties in Arizona)
  - Pre-trial supervision (Honolulu)
  - Prison (Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington)
- Now in at least 30 states and an Indian nation
- Statewide rollouts (Washington), pilots (Alaska, NY, Michigan, Oklahoma, Illinois)
- Federal and international interest

# HOPE Demonstration Field Experiment

- Counties in AR, MA, OR, TX
- Randomized controlled trial of replication of HOPE
- Findings: Replications of HOPE in other jurisdictions do not appear to be any more effective and can be more costly than supervision as usual
- What does that mean for SCF as a model?

# SCF Applied through Deliberate Corrections

Washington

Ohio

New York

# Graduated Reintegration

BROOKINGS

CITIES & REGIONS GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS U.S. ECONOMY U.S. POLITICS & GOVERNMENT MORE

TRENDING CAMPAIGNS & ELECTIONS U.S. POLITICS & GOVERNMENT CITIES & REGIONS



REPORT

## Graduated reintegration: Smoothing the transition from prison to community

Angela Hawken and Mark A.R. Kleiman · Friday, October 21, 2016

# Graduated Reintegration: The Model

- Release inmates early into a tightly supervised community setting with appropriate conditions
- Provide housing, appropriate services and employment/education/training opportunities; and
- Gradually relax supervision requirements (step-down) as a reward for compliance and achievement.

# For More Information

See the USDOJ-supported SCF Resource Center

[scfcenter.org](http://scfcenter.org)