



FY20 State Responsible (SR) Releases - Intensive Re-entry Program (IRP) Evaluation

Research - Evaluation Unit

March 2026

Introduction

VADOC's Intensive Re-entry Program (IRP) is an institution-based cognitive community program which eligible inmates participate in during the last seven months of their state responsible (SR) incarceration to prepare for successful release by focusing on re-entry and post-release services. Recidivism outcomes were examined by IRP participation status to determine their effectiveness. To evaluate recidivism outcomes, FY20 SR releases were divided into categories to distinguish releases who completed at least one phase of an IRP and those who did not. A control group was used to determine the impact of completing at least one phase of an IRP. Characteristics and COMPAS scores were also examined and compared by IRP participant and completion status. New eligibility criteria for IRP participation went into effect July 1, 2021. Therefore, the program as evaluated in this study may not be directly comparable to the participants released in FY20.¹ IRPs have two separate phases and it is possible to only complete one phase but not the other.

Characteristics by IRP Participant Status

There were 7,371 SR releases from VADOC facilities in FY20. Of the 7,371 releases, 3,792 (51%) did not participate in an IRP, 2,942 (40%) completed at least one phase of an IRP, and 637 (9%) participated but did not complete a program. There was a similar percentage of releases who were black (48%) and white (49%) who did not participate in an IRP. The largest percentage of those who participated but did not complete an IRP (54%) and those who completed at least one phase of an IRP (52%) were black. The largest percentage of all three groups had a violent crime type for their release term, with those who completed at least one

Characteristics by IRP Participant Status				
Race	No Participation	Participated but Did Not Complete	Completed At Least One Phase	Total
White	1,866 (49%)	287 (45%)	1,372 (47%)	3,525 (48%)
Black	1,812 (48%)	344 (54%)	1,525 (52%)	3,681 (50%)
Hispanic	96 (3%)	4 (1%)	31 (1%)	131 (2%)
Other	18 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	14 (<1%)	34 (<1%)
Crime Type				
Violent	1,431 (38%)	270 (42%)	1,482 (50%)	3,183 (43%)
Non-Violent	1,348 (36%)	248 (39%)	946 (32%)	2,542 (34%)
Drugs	1,013 (27%)	119 (19%)	514 (17%)	1,646 (22%)
DOC Length of Stay*				
Less than 1 Year	872 (23%)	99 (16%)	364 (12%)	1,335 (18%)
1 to 3 Years	1,544 (41%)	342 (54%)	1,475 (50%)	3,361 (46%)
3 to 5 Years	530 (14%)	64 (10%)	361 (12%)	955 (13%)
5 to 10 Years	483 (13%)	55 (9%)	340 (12%)	878 (12%)
Over 10 Years	363 (10%)	77 (2%)	402 (11%)	842 (11%)
Previous SR Terms				
No Previous SR Terms	1,997 (53%)	296 (46%)	1,529 (52%)	3,822 (52%)
1 Previous SR Term	877 (23%)	167 (26%)	701 (24%)	1,745 (24%)
2 Previous SR Terms	456 (12%)	84 (13%)	358 (12%)	898 (12%)
3 Previous SR Terms	239 (6%)	48 (8%)	170 (6%)	457 (6%)
4 Previous SR Terms	134 (4%)	27 (1%)	102 (3%)	263 (4%)
5+ Previous SR Terms	89 (2%)	15 (<1%)	82 (2%)	186 (3%)
Last Mental Health Code				
Not Reported	9 (<1%)	0 (0%)	1 (<1%)	10 (<1%)
No Evidence of Impairment	2,637 (70%)	401 (63%)	1,842 (63%)	4,880 (66%)
Appropriate for Field Unit/Work Center	1,099 (29%)	218 (34%)	1,088 (37%)	2,405 (33%)
Evidence of Impairment	47 (1%)	18 (3%)	11 (<1%)	76 (1%)
Total	3,792	637	2,942	7,371

* The DOC length of stay (LOS) categories are rounded to the nearest month. The category "Less than 1 Year" includes those with a DOC LOS of 11 months or less, "1 to 3 Years" includes those with an LOS of 12 to 36 months, "3 to 5 Years" includes those with an LOS of 37 to 60 months, "5 to 10 Years" includes those with an LOS of 61 to 120 months, and "Over 10 Years" includes those with an LOS greater than 120 months.

¹ The new IRP eligibility criteria dictates that for an SR inmate to be eligible they must have a 'Medium' or 'High' score on the COMPAS Risk of General Recidivism Scale and must have had a security level of 2 or 3 for a normal security IRP or a security level of 4, 5, or 6 for a high security IRP. For more information on IRP eligibility, see [OP 820.2](#).

phase of an IRP having the largest percentage (50%). The largest percentage of all three groups also had a length of stay in a VADOC facility of one to three years, no SR terms prior to the release term, and no evidence of a mental health impairment.

COMPAS by IRP Participant Status

FY20 releases who scored 'Medium' on the COMPAS Risk of General Recidivism Scale comprised the majority of those with no participation in an IRP (35%). The largest percentage of those who participated in but did not complete an IRP scored 'High' (37%) on the COMPAS Risk of General Recidivism Scale, while the largest percentage of those who completed at least one phase of an IRP scored 'Low' (36%). The largest percentage of all three groups scored 'Low' on the COMPAS Risk of Violent Recidivism Scale and 'Highly Probable' on the COMPAS Substance Abuse Needs Scale. The largest percentage of all three groups scored 'Unlikely' on the COMPAS Cognitive Behavioral Needs Scale.

COMPAS Scores by IRP Participant Status				
Risk of General Recidivism	No Participation	Participated but Did Not Complete	Completed At Least One Phase	Total
Not Reported	16 (<1%)	0 (0%)	2 (<1%)	18
Low	1,151 (30%)	184 (29%)	1,053 (36%)	2,388
Medium	1,321 (35%)	220 (35%)	899 (31%)	2,440
High	1,304 (34%)	233 (37%)	988 (34%)	2,525
Risk of Violent Recidivism				
Not Reported	16 (<1%)	0 (0%)	2 (<1%)	18
Low	1,702 (45%)	242 (38%)	1,291 (44%)	3,235
Medium	1,197 (32%)	228 (36%)	950 (32%)	2,375
High	877 (23%)	167 (26%)	699 (24%)	1,743
Substance Abuse Needs				
Not Reported	15 (<1%)	0 (0%)	2 (<1%)	17
Unlikely	815 (21%)	161 (25%)	804 (27%)	1,780
Probable	863 (23%)	157 (25%)	711 (24%)	1,731
Highly Probable	2,099 (55%)	319 (50%)	1,425 (48%)	3,843
Cognitive Behavioral Needs				
Not Reported	331 (9%)	51 (8%)	149 (5%)	531
Unlikely	1,582 (42%)	230 (36%)	1,369 (47%)	3,181
Probable	1,042 (27%)	202 (32%)	866 (29%)	2,110
Highly Probable	837 (22%)	154 (24%)	558 (19%)	1,549
Total	3,792	637	2,942	7,371

Recidivism by IRP Participant Status

The recidivism rate for FY20 SR releases from a VADOC facility was 15.0%. FY20 SR releases who participated but did not complete at least one phase of an IRP had the highest recidivism rate of the participant categories examined (17.4%). Those with no participation in an IRP had a higher recidivism rate (15.6%) than those who completed at least one phase of an IRP. Releases who completed only phase two of an IRP had the lowest recidivism rate (13.5%).

Recidivism Rates By IRP Completion Status		
	Number of Releases	Recidivism Rate
No Participation	3,792 (51%)	15.6%
Participated, but Did Not Complete	637 (9%)	17.4%
Phase 1 Completion Only	677 (9%)	13.9%
Phase 2 Completion Only	1,068 (14%)	13.5%
Phase 1 and 2 Completion	1,197 (16%)	13.9%
Overall	7,371	15.0%

Recidivism by IRP Eligibility and Security Type

In order to analyze the differences in recidivism between those who were IRP eligible, those who participated, and those with at least one exclusion,² FY20 releases were divided into six groups. The highest recidivism rate (22.3%) was seen with those who were IRP eligible, participated in an IRP, but had at least one exclusion and those who were IRP eligible but did not participate. The lowest recidivism rate was seen with those who were not eligible for an IRP but participated in it (8.5%). Those who were not IRP eligible and did not participate had the second lowest recidivism rate with 11.4%. Overall, those who were IRP eligible had higher recidivism rates than those who were not eligible.

Recidivism By IRP Participant Categories		
	Number of Releases	Recidivism Rate
IRP Eligible and Participated	1,108 (15%)	18.0%
Not IRP Eligible, but Participated	1,704 (23%)	8.5%
IRP Eligible, Participated, but Has At Least One Exclusion	767 (10%)	22.3%
IRP Eligible, but Did Not Participate	614 (8%)	22.3%
Not IRP Eligible and Did Not Participate	2,236 (30%)	11.4%
IRP Eligible With At Least One Exclusion at Release	942 (13%)	21.2%
Overall	7,371	15.0%

IRP eligible males had the highest recidivism rate of the groups examined (21.2%), which was significantly higher than the recidivism rate for IRP ineligible males (10.3%). IRP eligible females also had a significantly higher recidivism rate than ineligible females (15.1% and 9.8%, respectively). The overall recidivism rate for those eligible was significantly higher than those ineligible (20.6% and 10.2%, respectively).³

Recidivism by IRP Eligibility		
	Number of Releases	Recidivism Rate
IRP Eligible		
Male	3,129	21.2%
Female	292	15.1%
Overall	3,431	20.6%
IRP Ineligible		
Male	3,082	10.3%*
Female	858	9.8%*
Overall	3,940	10.2%*
Overall	7,371	15.0%

* Chi-square was significant (p<.02).

IRPs are classified as normal security or high security based on the security level of the inmate. Inmates with a security level of two or three should have been put into a normal security program, while those with a security level of four or higher should have been put into a high security program at either Sussex I State Prison or Sussex II State Prison. Inmates in a normal security IRP had lower recidivism rates than those at a high security IRP, except for females which there is no data for at a high security IRP.

Recidivism of IRP Participants by IRP Security Type		
	Number of Releases	Recidivism Rate
Normal Security		
Male	2,874	15.2%
Female	637	9.9%
Overall	3,511	14.2%
High Security		
Male	68	22.1%
Female	--	--
Overall	68	22.1%
Overall	3,579	14.4%

² Criteria which would exclude an inmate from participating in an IRP even if they are eligible includes having an active Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detainer, a DOC length of stay (LOS) of less than five months, or any of the following in the ten months preceding release: restorative housing internal status, infirmary bed type, Sex Offender Residential Treatment (SORT) bed type, Shared Allied Management (SAM) pod, therapeutic community participation, work release, or enrollment in a career and technical education (CTE) or college course. The criteria for exclusions went into effect July 1, 2021 so, as a result, the results involving exclusions are exploratory and are not indicative that they were wrongly put into an IRP when they should have been excluded.

³ Chi-square was significant (p<.02).

Case Matched Recidivism Comparison

A case matched comparison was applied to those who completed at least one phase of an IRP.⁴ Males who completed either phase one (13.8%) or phase two (15.7%), or phase one and phase two (14.7%) had significantly lower recidivism rates than males who did not complete phase one (25.9%) or phase two (25.5%), or phase one and phase two (23.2%) of an IRP.⁵ Females who completed phase one had a higher recidivism rate than females who did not complete phase one (15.9% and 11.0%, respectively). Females who completed phase two of an IRP had a significantly lower recidivism rate than females who did not complete phase two (3.9% and 15.1%, respectively).⁶ Females who completed phase one and phase two had a lower recidivism rate than females who did not complete phase one and phase two, but the difference was not significant (11.3% and 17.9%, respectively). Overall, those who completed phase one or phase two, or phase one and phase two had significantly lower recidivism rates than those who did not complete the same phase or phases.⁷

Matched Recidivism Comparison by IRP Completion Status			
IRP Completion	Number of Releases	Study Rate	Comparison Rate
Phase 1 Completion Only			
Male	556	13.8%*	25.9%
Female	82	15.9%	11.0%
Overall	638	14.1%*	24.0%
Phase 2 Completion Only			
Male	828	15.7%*	24.5%
Female	152	3.9%*	15.1%
Overall	980	13.9%*	23.1%
Phase 1 and 2 Completion			
Male	936	14.7%*	23.2%
Female	168	11.3%	17.9%
Overall	1,104	14.2%*	22.4%
Total	2,722	14.1%	23.0%

* Chi-square was significant (p<.01).

Conclusion

FY20 releases who completed at least one phase of an IRP had lower recidivism rates than releases who did not participate or releases who participated in an IRP but did not complete at least one phase, with the lowest recidivism rate seen in those who completed phase two only. Those who were eligible for an IRP had significantly higher recidivism rates than those who weren't eligible. Males who completed any phase or both phases of an IRP and females who completed only phase two had significantly lower recidivism rates than males and females who did not complete the respective phases.

4 Cases were matched on gender, crime type, previous SR incarcerations (± 1), level of mental health impairment, release age (± 5), and history of positive drug tests for opioids and/or cocaine. One hundred and eighty cases were removed from this portion of the analysis due to the inability to find an appropriate match.

5 Chi-square was significant (p<.001).

6 Chi-square was significant (p<.01).

7 Chi-square was significant (p<.001).