

## **Purpose**

- Analysis conducted to evaluate preliminary effects of quick dips on supervision compliance
- JRA allows officers to impose two or three day periods of jail confinement in response to non-compliance
- DPS implemented the use of quick dips in July 2012
- Analysis used a matched groups design to evaluate the outcomes for offenders that received a quick dip during fiscal year 2012-2013

## **Results**

- Compared outcomes for 368 offenders who had a quick dip in response to a non-compliance to 368 matched offenders who did not have a quick dip as a response to a similar non-compliance
- Looked at outcomes at 6 and up to 12 months after sanction; through April 5, 2014
- No significant differences in subsequent quick dips, CRVs, or other sanctions imposed via delegated authority
- Offenders who received a quick dip were more likely to have positive supervision outcomes during the follow-up period
  - 314 (85.3%) quick dip offenders were active at the end of the follow-up
  - 141 (38.3%) offenders in the comparison group were active at the end of the follow-up
- Offenders who received a quick dip were less likely to be revoked during the follow-up period
  - One (0.3%) offender in the quick dip group had their supervision revoked
  - 39 (10.6%) in the comparison group had their supervision revoked
- Offenders who received a quick dip were less likely to abscond during the follow-up period
  - 29 (7.9%) offenders in the quick dip group absconded by the end of the follow-up
  - 61 (16.6%) offenders in the comparison group absconded by the end of the follow-up

## **Implications**

- Overall, these analyses suggest quick dips improved offender compliance.
  - 91.8% (338) of the offenders in the quick dip group had a positive outcome compared to only 53.3% (196) of offenders from the comparison group, who did not have a quick dip.
- Consistent and timely response appear to increase offender compliance
  - The majority (11) of the 16 offenders who received a second quick dip within twelve months of the initial violation have since complied with community supervision.
- This is a preliminary analysis and findings should be interpreted with caution; quick dips in this study were utilized during initial implementation of the tool and the sample may not be representative of utilization in the future as the sanction becomes more commonly used throughout the state
  - Rural counties were over represented in the use of quick dips during this analysis period, and urban counties were under represented; as a result two Judicial Districts were excluded.
- Because there were so few observations we were not able to examine the impact of quick dips comparing felons to misdemeanants. Though these samples were equivalent on the numbers of felons or misdemeanants in each group, there could be different outcomes for these types of offenders which were unable to observe.
- Future research will focus on the use of quick dip confinement in comparison to other delegated authority sanction and identify the types of non-compliance that result in quick dip confinement.

-----  
For more information on this analysis, including detailed methodological descriptions and statistics please contact George Pettigrew ([george.pettigrew@ncdps.gov](mailto:george.pettigrew@ncdps.gov))