

Evidence-based public policy options to reduce crime and criminal justice costs

[Law](#)



According to research, cognitive-behavioral programs often lead to positive outcomes. These positive outcomes are expected to result in a 6.9% recidivism reduction (Drake & Miller, 2009). With regard to high-risk offenders, Lipsey and Landenberger (2005) found smaller sample sizes, attendance monitoring, intervention adherence, and mental health professionals characterized the research and demonstration programs. Positive outcomes were reported. Researchers further suggest positive outcomes are depended upon the quality of the cognitive-behavioral program provided. Perhaps implementing adult treatment programs that resemble juvenile treatment programs will prove to be effective.

If you determine building additional prisons is not in the best interest of the State, how will you “sell” your recommendations to the public without appearing “soft” on crime?

First, I would receive feedback from citizens in my home state in order to get a general consensus. I would hold a town hall/community meeting in large/key jurisdictions. I would invite key players to speak including county jail and state prison officials, individuals who specialize in offender treatment programs, probation officers, correctional officers, a budget analyst, and a few rehabilitated inmates who have benefited from treatment during and after confinement. In addition, I would also invite family members of inmates to speak regarding the effectiveness of rehabilitation. Of course, this seems a bit overboard, but we are discussing an issue that affects everyone in the state. My speech:

We are all aware that crime rates fluctuate. Some research and statistical data contend crime rates have dropped. Yet some research and statistical

data contend crime rates have increased. In addition, throughout this country including this state, we have witnessed an increase in incarceration rates, without any plausible explanation only theory. Some states, including this state, have reported jail/prison overcrowding in most jurisdictions. This state spends more money to house criminals as opposed to rehabilitating them. When an offender is released from jail/prison, he/she will typically return to his/her respective community. Once that happens, you must ask yourself has this person been rehabilitated or will he/she exhibited the same criminal behavior and return to jail/prison. Jails/prisons do not house most offenders for life nor does prison confinement stop criminal behaviors, rather they take away the opportunity for an offender to commit a crime for a short time or is depended upon sentencing. So, would you rather spend money on additional jails/prisons or would you rather spend money on alternative options, which are effective in rehabilitation efforts thereby achieving the overall goal of crime reduction/control? The bottom line is whatever avenue we decide to take is going to cost, so the question becomes what is in the best interest of this state? Building more prisons is merely a temporary solution for criminal behavior prevention and/or crime control. Arguably, transforming current prisons to effectively rehabilitate criminal offenders is cost-effective. Crime control and reduction are issues, which require not only confinement but social, educational and therapeutic interventions.