Racial and ethnic disparity is pervasive in the U.S. criminal justice system (Nembhard and Robin, 2021). However, little attention has been focused on disparate treatment and outcomes among the nearly 3,745,000 individuals on probation or parole supervision as of the end of 2021 (Kaeble, 2023). Individuals on supervision are required to refrain from criminal activity, and they must also comply with rules pertaining to behaviors that are not criminal per se. (For example, they must report to their supervising officer, attend treatment, and secure employment.) Noncompliance with these rules is often referred to as a technical violation of supervision. System actors exercise considerable discretion in how they respond to these behaviors, and, if interventions are deemed unsuccessful, they may choose to initiate violation-of-supervision proceedings, seek revocation of parole or probation, and decide to incarcerate. Evidence suggests that, in some jurisdictions, disparities at this critical decision point disadvantage supervisees of color. Although technical violations have declined in recent years, they still account for about one-fifth of state prison admissions, and inequities at this stage exacerbate existing disparities in incarceration (Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2021).

To explore the challenges and opportunities associated with reducing racial and ethnic disparities at the technical violation decision point, the University of Denver and the RAND Corporation, on behalf of the National Institute of Justice, hosted a virtual workshop in October 2022. The workshop brought together a group of probation and parole administrators, researchers, judges, and policy experts to identify and prioritize the needs that, if addressed, would have the greatest impact on reducing disparities where they exist.

Ultimately, 33 needs were identified and prioritized. The needs were sorted using the following categories (some needs fall into multiple categories):

- organizational issues (e.g., strategies to support the examination of potential disparities, development and implementation of technology, and best practices)
- improving working relationships (e.g., research into supervisee perceptions of legitimacy along racial and ethnic lines and the impact of these perceptions on compliance and outcomes)
- research and evaluation (e.g., study jurisdictions that have reduced disparities to better understand the dynamics associated with successful outcomes and to develop an evidence base of effective strategies)
- data and analysis (e.g., development of management tools to track disparity metrics in near real-time)
- policy and practice (e.g., reinforce supervision practices in which staff actively engage in barrier-reduction strategies to "meet supervisees where they are" in terms of appropriate accommodations and service delivery that do not compromise public safety)
tation of sustainable mitigation initiatives, staffing and training issues, establishment of research partnerships

• policy and practice (e.g., working with stakeholders to ensure that policy and practices are aligned with the evidence, are applied equitably, and do not disadvantage supervisees of color)

• inequitable access to resources (e.g., strategies to educate stakeholders on the impacts that inequitable access to resources can have on outcomes, approaches to mitigating these impacts)

• improving working relationships (e.g., a better understanding of barriers to quality working relationships with supervisees, strategies to improve these relationships)

• data and analysis (e.g., identifying, collecting, and analyzing appropriate quantitative and qualitative metrics to identify drivers of disparities; information systems and management tools)

• research and evaluation (e.g., efforts to produce evidence on the scope and drivers of disparities and on effective mitigation strategies).

WHAT WE FOUND

Workshop participants identified and prioritized 33 needs. Twelve needs were ranked as high-priority, and the following themes emerged:

• The working relationship between an officer and a supervisee is critical to successful outcomes. A lack of diversity or cultural sensitivity among officers and supervisee perceptions of justice system illegitimacy can be barriers to forming relationships of trust. Research is needed to determine the impacts of these factors on supervisee violation behaviors, responses to these behaviors, and disparities.

Best practices (e.g., use of credible messenger mentors) are required to help overcome these barriers.

• Supervisees of color often have inequitable access to resources (e.g., employment, transportation, mental health and/or substance use treatment), which can be a barrier to the successful completion of supervision and a contributing factor in disparate outcomes. Justice system stakeholders should be educated on the impacts of such disadvantages on success, and agencies should reinforce core correctional practices that “meet the individual where they are” without compromising public safety. The impact of technological innovations (e.g., remote supervision, electronic reminders, virtual treatment) on removing barriers to compliance should be explored along racial and ethnic lines. Best practices are needed for community supervision agencies to provide (directly or indirectly through partners) such resources as food pantries, transit vouchers, and even monetary assistance, in some cases, to those in need.

• Evidence on disparities in community supervision is relatively sparse. Research and evaluation are needed to better understand the extent of disparities in supervisee violation behaviors and responses to these behaviors, as well as the drivers of these disparities. The lack of research on sources of disparities contributes to a lack of known approaches for responding to them. Furthermore, research is needed to identify whether any strategies are effective and to identify best practices to reduce disparities where they exist.

• Information management tools are needed to increase transparency about and accountability for disparities. Jurisdictions would benefit from developing data dashboards to help track, analyze, and display key metrics so that progress may be measured—and corrective actions taken as needed—at the officer level (e.g., coaching) and the agency level (e.g., policy change).

Evidence on disparities in community supervision is relatively sparse. Research and evaluation are needed to better understand the extent of disparities in supervisee violation behaviors and responses to these behaviors, as well as the drivers of these disparities.
INTRODUCTION

Whether the result of systemic racism, explicit bias, or implicit bias, racial and ethnic disparity is pervasive in the U.S. criminal justice system (Ghandnoosh, 2015; Holbrook, Dunbar, and Miller, 2022). Certain laws and policies disproportionately affect people of color, and justice system actors often exercise broad discretion, which can introduce bias that leads to differential treatment based on race (Hinton, Henderson, and Reed, 2018). As a result, disparities can exist at each decision point in the criminal justice process, from contact with the police through disposition, sentencing, and correctional control. Furthermore, disparities at early decision points (such as traffic stops) can affect subsequent decision points, compounding the negative outcomes experienced by justice-involved people of color (Nembhard and Robin, 2021).

While there is evidence that the disparity rate is narrowing in some areas (such as incarceration), the problem persists and remains significant overall (Sabol and Johnson, 2022). For example, research suggests that people of color are significantly more likely than White people to be stopped by law enforcement and searched (Baumgartner et al., 2017; Lofstrom et al., 2021; Pierson et al., 2020; Seguino, Brooks, and Autilio, 2020). They are also more likely to be arrested, particularly for nonviolent crimes (Garcia, 2015; Sabol and Johnson, 2022; Schleiden et al., 2020).

Once arrested, people of color are more likely to be assigned monetary bail, more likely to be assigned bail in greater amounts, less likely to be able to afford bail, and, therefore, more likely to be detained in jail (Arnold, Dobbie, and Yang, 2017; Nembhard and Robin, 2021; Sawyer, 2019; Skeem, Montoya, and Lowenkamp, 2023). Evidence indicates that people of color are, overall, more likely than similarly situated White people to be stopped by law enforcement and searched (Hinton, Henderson, and Reed, 2018). Furthermore, people of color tend to be overcharged for similar crimes, be convicted at greater rates, and receive harsher sentences than White people (Barber and McCormack, 2022; Hinton, Henderson, and Reed, 2018; Schmitt, Reedt, and Blackwell, 2017). Black people remain roughly five times as likely as White people to be imprisoned and three-and-a-half times as likely to be in jail (Carson, 2021; Minton and Zeng, 2021).

Most individuals under correctional control—nearly 3,745,000—are supervised in the community on probation or parole (Kaeble, 2023). Given the upstream disparities discussed above, it is not surprising that racial and ethnic disparities exist in this arena as well. For example, Black people represent approximately 13 percent of the U.S. general population; however, this group makes up about 30 percent of the probation population and about 38 percent of the parole population (Bradner et al., 2020). Black people are more than two-and-a-half times as likely as White people to be on probation and almost four times as likely to be on parole. Still, these numbers overlook another key fact, which is that Black people are less likely than White people to be granted probation and parole. When they are granted probation or parole, they often have more conditions of release than their White counterparts do (Echols and Rodriguez, 2022; Huebner and Bynum, 2008; Phelps, 2018a).

Although the data show that Hispanic people experience supervision rates similar to those of White people, these individuals are likely underreported, as most states publish data on racial categories as opposed to ethnicity (Eppler-Epstein, Gurvis, and King, 2016). Together, people who identify as American Indian or Alaska Native account for approximately 1.1 percent of the overall population; however, they are almost 50 percent more likely than White people to be on probation and more than 75 percent more likely to be on parole (Bradner et al., 2020).

Although racial and ethnic minority groups are overrepresented in community supervision, relatively little attention has been focused on the disparate treatment and outcomes of these groups while they are on supervision (Bradner et al., 2020; Steinmetz and Henderson, 2016). To help fill this research gap, the University of Denver and the RAND Corporation, on behalf of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), hosted a virtual workshop titled “Reducing Racial and Ethnic Dispari-
Technical violations involve noncompliance with conditions of supervision and are not criminal.

The spectrum of responses to technical misconduct can range from a warning to an informal intervention to administrative sanctions and all the way up to a formal violation petition and recommendation to revoke supervision. Some agencies may provide a sanctions grid to assist officers with making these determinations, but these grids are typically used as guides. As Blasko and Taxman (2018) put it, “discretion is at the heart of the behavior of the supervision officer.” Discretion is often positive, allowing for tailored approaches based on individual needs, but it can lead to differential treatment if biases, whether implicit or explicit, influence the officer’s decisionmaking process (Davis, Houston, and Rudes, 2021).

Technical Violations as a Driver of Incarceration

The decision to file a formal petition to revoke supervision is highly consequential and usually requires supervisor review and approval (Daly et al., 2021). If charges are upheld and supervision is revoked, the supervisee’s liberty is at stake and the sentencing authority (e.g., a court or a parole board) can remand the individual to a correctional institution. Although probation and parole are intended to be alternatives to incarceration, evidence suggests that technical violations of probation and parole are an important driver of incarceration (Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2021). Technical violations account for roughly one-fifth of all state prison admissions, and
the annual cost to incarcerate these individuals is an estimated $2.8 billion (Council of State Governments Justice Center and Arnold Ventures, 2019; Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2021). The actual impact is even greater, as these figures do not include the time supervisees spend in local jails or the associated costs. Supervisees accused of technical violations may be detained in jail for weeks while waiting for a hearing (Roth, Kajeepeta, and Boldin, 2021). For those found to have violated their supervision, a stay in jail is a common sanction. Data are limited, but a review of seven jurisdictions found that an average of 6 percent (ranging from 0.9 percent to 13.6 percent) of the average jail population are individuals held on technical probation violations (Roth, Kajeepeta, and Boldin, 2021). Ultimately, disparities in how technical violations are handled exacerbate and perpetuate existing disparities in incarceration and may further undermine the legitimacy of the justice system.

Disparities in Community Supervision
Research in several probation agencies found that people in racial and ethnic minority groups often disproportionately receive violations and/or revocations (for new crimes or technical violations) compared with White people (Arnold Ventures and CUNY ISLG, 2021; Bohmert et al., 2021; Daly et al., 2021; Freeman et al., 2021; Hammer et al., 2021; Jannetta et al., 2014; Mitchell, Hanrath, and Harbinson, 2021; Steinmetz and Henderson, 2016; University of Wyoming Criminal Justice and Sociology Department and Denver Adult Probation Department, 2021). In most cases, Black people experienced the greatest disparities; however, because of demographics and other factors, the group that experiences the greatest disparities may vary by jurisdiction. In some cases, Hispanic people and Native American people experienced the greatest disparities relative to White people (Daly et al., 2021). Similarly, studies reveal that Black people are between 50 percent and over 100 percent more likely to be charged with a parole violation (Bradner et al., 2020).

Research is scarce on disparities in the handling of cases in which technical violations are the sole type of violation, largely because of insufficient data collection by violation type and by race and ethnicity (Jannetta et al., 2014). That said, there is some evidence of differential treatment. For example, Bradner and colleagues (2020) found that in New York state, Black people were incarcerated for technical violations of parole five times as often as White people. The researchers also found that “Latinx people are 30% more likely than white people to be in a state prison for a technical parole violation” (Bradner et al., 2020, p. 12). In Denver County, Colorado, Black people were significantly more likely than White people and Hispanic people to have their supervision revoked for a technical violation (University of Wyoming Criminal Justice and Sociology Department and Denver Adult Probation Department, 2021). Although little is known about the specific drivers of disparities in technical violations, they could be related, in part, to those attributed to the criminal justice system as a whole: discriminatory laws, policies, and practices; socioeconomic inequities that limit access to opportunities and resources; overpolicing of impoverished neighborhoods; and explicit or implicit biases on the part of decisionmakers (Ghandnoosh, 2015; Hinton, Henderson, and Reed, 2018; Wright et al., 2013). That said, efforts to understand disparities in technical violations are significantly hampered by several factors. The following subsection outlines some major challenges identified by the workshop participants. Participant comments are presented in gray quote bubbles.

General Challenges to Understanding Disparities in Technical Violations
The participants noted that many jurisdictions are not rigorously exploring the existence and extent of racial and ethnic disparities in technical violations. Common barriers mentioned include inertia of current practices, lack of incentives, and lack of public accountability relative to other sectors of the justice system (e.g., law enforcement, juvenile justice). In some cases, jurisdictions might not view disparities as a high-priority...
problem in community supervision, or they might attribute any existence of disparities to upstream inequities in the justice system and/or to societal issues. In a study of four jurisdictions (two mixed urban and rural jurisdictions and two rural jurisdictions), judges, probation staff, and probation leadership were interviewed about their views on the role of race and ethnicity in the criminal justice system. The study’s findings suggest that many judges and probation staff believe that bias exists in other areas of the justice system but not in probation (Jannetta et al., 2014). Even for those jurisdictions that recognize that disparities may be an issue, it is often easier to avoid uncomfortable conversations about the disproportionate impacts of some policies and implicit bias.

Data and resource limitations can also represent major obstacles. According to the workshop participants, some jurisdictions do not collect or analyze technical violation data broken down by race and ethnicity, making it difficult to ascertain whether disparities exist. Some jurisdictions lack automated case management and information systems, or they use antiquated systems that are not structured to capture relevant data (i.e., systems that were developed before disparities were a meaningful consideration). Jurisdictional practices can also be impediments. For example, the type of violation might not be reliably reported, or it might be impossible to disaggregate the different elements of revocation decisions to determine whether revocation was the result of a technical violation, a new criminal offense, or a combination of the two (Curry, 2016).

Further complicating matters, in cases in which a new offense is involved, prosecutors may choose to drop the criminal case and pursue a technical violation of probation because the burden of proof and standards of evidence are lower in a violation proceeding and the potential sentence is often similar (Roth, Kajeepeta, and Boldin, 2021).

The participants noted that aggregated administrative data, if available, may capture such information as violation charges but cannot reflect the trajectory of the case (i.e., the multitude of circumstances, incidents, and individual decisions that led up to the point at which a violation petition was filed). This limitation can make it challenging to isolate the true pathway to violation because, for example, the charges listed on the petition might not be the most serious or the most recent; in some cases, the charges might simply be the easiest to prove. Furthermore, multiple allegations often stack up over time, and one violation can lead to another. For example, a supervisee who has used drugs may fail to appear for the next meeting with the officer and may eventually abscond. Critical information—such as the nature of the working relationship between the supervisee and the officer, the supervisee’s efforts to comply, and informal measures and graduated sanctions taken in response to misconduct—is typically found only in the officer’s case files, assuming that this information has been documented. Therefore, a time-intensive review of paper files is often required to understand the nuanced pathway to violation filing (Daly et al., 2021).

We don’t have the resources to hire a data analyst. We are lucky because we have relationships with local academic institutions, but the majority of agencies don’t have that luxury.

[Probation and parole agencies] need external pressure to look at these metrics. In our state, we report generic data—not broken down by race, ethnicity, etc. Absent a mandate to collect these data, most agencies won’t do it on their own.
**METHODOLOGY**

To explore the challenges and opportunities associated with reducing disparities in technical violations, project staff assembled a panel of probation and parole administrators, researchers, judges, and other policy experts. A pool of candidate participants was identified in consultation with NIJ. Candidates were identified via existing networks, focused searches for organizations and individuals with relevant experience, searches for individuals who had studied relevant topics, and referrals. Ultimately, a group of 15 experts was convened. The participants and their affiliations are shown in the box at right.

The workshop was held in September and October 2022. Because of social distancing requirements associated with the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, the workshop was held virtually, in two stages. During the initial stage, which took place from late September to early October, project staff conducted interviews with each participant via a web-conferencing application. The length of these interviews ranged between 45 and 60 minutes.

The purpose of the interviews was to gather participant insights on the issue of disparities in the technical violation process, potential contributing factors, and remedies. Project staff provided an outline of discussion points in advance of the interviews; however, participants were encouraged to speak about the issues most germane to them according to their roles and experiences. Discussion points were as follows:

- In general, do you believe racial/ethnic disparities exist in how technical violations are handled (your agency/jurisdiction, the larger field of community corrections)?
- Is this supported by data, and is this regularly monitored?
- What are the specific research/data needs in this area—e.g., what data elements need to be collected; are resources available to analyze these data; and what are the challenges associated with isolating drivers of disparities, where they exist?
- What are the most common drivers of technical violations in your agency/jurisdiction (or the larger field of community corrections)?
- Are there particular drivers that may impact certain groups more than others (e.g., conditions of supervision, length on supervision, intensity of supervision, supervision practices, responses to noncompliance, policies, law, jurisdictional philosophy)?

**PARTICIPANTS**

Kendra Bradner  
Columbia University—Justice Lab

Reagan Daly  
City University of New York—Institute for State and Local Governance

Greg Dillon  
Brazoria County Community Supervision and Corrections Department (Texas)

Troy Hatfield  
Monroe Circuit Court Probation Department (Indiana)

Corey Hazelton  
Ramsey County Probation Department (Minnesota)

Cary Heck  
Denver County Probation Department (Colorado)

Howard Henderson  
Texas Southern University

Jesse Jannetta  
Urban Institute

Mark Keating  
Kansas Department of Corrections

Sally Kreamer  
Iowa Department of Corrections

Hon. Matthew Machera  
Chelsea District Court (Massachusetts)

Ebony Ruhland  
Rutgers University

David Sanders  
Pima County Adult Probation Department (Arizona)

Hon. Duane Slone  
Fourth Judicial District Court (Tennessee)

Shane Stutzman  
State of Nebraska Judicial Branch—Probation
was provided to the participants so that they could review it in preparation for the second stage of the workshop. In this stage, project staff convened the group for three two-hour virtual meetings over two days. The purpose of these sessions was to introduce the participants to one another; identify any additional needs that had not been raised; consolidate needs that were closely related; fine-tune the wording of the needs; and prioritize the needs. The participants were led through an exercise to prioritize the final set of 33 needs. The needs in this final set were then clustered into three groups: high-, medium-, and low-priority (also referred to as Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3) needs. More details on the methods used to structure the workshop and identify and prioritize the needs are provided in the technical appendix. The following section describes the results of the prioritization exercise.

**RESULTS**

The 33 needs identified by the participants were organized into six major categories: organizational issues, policy and practice, inequitable access to resources, improving working relationships, data and analysis, and research and evaluation. See Figure 1 for the distribution of needs across the six categories. (The full list of needs is provided in Table A.2, in the technical appendix.)

The prioritization exercise, which we describe in greater detail in the technical appendix, elicited participant rankings of the problem priority, importance, and probability of success of the identified needs. These rankings were used to sort the needs into the three tiers mentioned above. Ultimately, 12 of the needs fell into Tier 1 and were categorized as high-priority needs; these needs are shown in Table 1. Figure 2 shows a breakdown of the high-priority needs by category. We discuss the high-priority needs in greater detail in the next section. As a result of the prioritization exercise, none of the needs in the organizational issues category fell into Tier 1, so this category is omitted from Table 1, Figure 2, and the discussion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem or Opportunity\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>Potential Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inequitable access to resources</strong></td>
<td>• Educate stakeholders about the impact of these disadvantages on compliance and success on supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisees may have inequitable access to resources (e.g., employment, housing, transportation, child care, substance use/mental health treatment, which may impact their ability to maintain compliance/achieve success resulting in disparate outcomes.</td>
<td>• Develop best practices around the use of technology to eliminate barriers to compliance (e.g., smartphones/apps for remote reporting/reminders; telepresence for classes, individual/group counseling). Evaluate pros, cons, and impact of these approaches (as alternative to in-person, as needed) on outcomes and disparities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop best practices and strategies to directly provide resources (e.g., food pantry, clothing, transit vouchers) to disadvantaged supervisees and/or coordinate with community resources to provide these services. Explore feasibility of monetary assistance for sustenance/emergency support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improving working relationships</strong></td>
<td>• Research is needed into supervisee perceptions of legitimacy along racial/ethnic lines and the impact of these perceptions on compliance and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some groups (particularly those historically disadvantaged) may disproportionately lack trust in the justice system, including community supervision. Perceptions of illegitimacy or unfairness may be a barrier to engagement in the supervision process and compliance/success (e.g., reporting, attending treatment).</td>
<td>• Develop best practices and strategies (e.g., building relationships of trust) designed to ameliorate the effects of these perceptions, where they exist, to achieve better outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop best practices for leveraging the use of trained, vetted credible messengers with lived experience as a complementary resource to help build relationships of trust and/or developing relationships with community support systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some agencies lack diversity in the workforce, which may impact their ability to work effectively and build relationships of trust with supervisees of color.</td>
<td>• Conduct research to determine whether the use of credible messengers improves relationships with supervisees and the impact of this practice on supervision outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research and evaluation</strong></td>
<td>• Research is needed to better understand the extent of disparities in both noncompliant behaviors (e.g., are some groups more likely to engage in certain behaviors like missing probation appointments or having police contact?) and the responses (e.g., are responses to violations handled equitably?) as well as the drivers of disparities (e.g., systemic vs. individual factors, implicit bias).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is evidence of racial/ethnic disparities in technical violation behaviors, and how they are addressed, in some jurisdictions; however, more research is needed.</td>
<td>• Research is needed to study jurisdictions that have reduced disparities to better understand the dynamics associated with successful outcomes and to develop an evidence base of effective strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little is known about the strategies/reforms that are most effective in reducing technical violation disparities without introducing other unintended consequences.</td>
<td>• Research is needed to determine the impact of more general system reforms (e.g., caps on probation sentences, reducing the number of technical violations) on disparities in technical violation behavior, responses, and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
outcomes with supervisees. As part of this shift, officers are being asked to assume the role of a change agent as opposed to a service broker (Wodahl, Mowen, and Garland, 2021). Others conceptualize the officer role as moving away from that of a “referee” who maintains neutrality, calls fouls, and keeps score and toward that of a “coach” who is meaningfully invested in the personal growth and success of the supervisee (Lovins et al., 2018). A crucial component of the behavioral change process is the working relationship between the officer and the

Table 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem or Opportunity&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Potential Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data and analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictions need to identify metrics that reflect disparities, as well as accountability tools to track progress toward eliminating disparities.</td>
<td>• Develop management tools (e.g., dashboards) to track disparity metrics, in near real time, at the agency, supervisor, and officer levels to promote transparency/accountability and identify patterns to be investigated and addressed (e.g., coachable moments for staff, policy/program review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisees may have inequitable access to resources (e.g., employment, housing, transportation, child care, substance use/mental health treatment), which may impact their ability to maintain compliance/achieve success, resulting in disparate outcomes.</td>
<td>• Reinforce supervision practices in which staff actively engage in barrier-reduction strategies to “meet supervisees where they are” in terms of appropriate accommodations/service delivery that do not compromise public safety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>A need is the combination of a problem or opportunity and a potential solution. Problems or opportunities may be repeated throughout the table because they are combined with a variety of potential solutions.

Figure 2. Breakdown of the High-Priority Needs, by Category (n = 12)

DISCUSSION
This section, which is organized by category, provides further context for the high-priority needs identified by the workshop participants.

Improving Working Relationships
Community supervision agencies are increasingly implementing evidence-based core correctional practices to achieve better outcomes with supervisees. As part of this shift, officers are being asked to assume the role of a change agent as opposed to a service broker (Wodahl, Mowen, and Garland, 2021). Others conceptualize the officer role as moving away from that of a “referee” who maintains neutrality, calls fouls, and keeps score and toward that of a “coach” who is meaningfully invested in the personal growth and success of the supervisee (Lovins et al., 2018). A crucial component of the behavioral change process is the working relationship between the officer and the
supervisee, which is sometimes referred to as the therapeutic alliance (Bourgon and Gutierrez, 2013). Evidence suggests that supervisee perceptions regarding the quality of the relationship can shape outcomes (Blasko and Taxman, 2018), and a better working relationship is predictive of increased compliance with the conditions of supervision and reduced recidivism (DeLude, Mitchell, and Barber, 2012; Sloas et al., 2020; Wodahl, Mowen, and Garland, 2021).

The participants acknowledged potential barriers to building relationships of trust with supervisees of color, which can lead to disparities in both technical violation behaviors and officer responses. Four high-priority needs were identified to address key challenges in this area.

**Understanding and Addressing Perceptions of Illegitimacy**

Procedural justice is a framework primarily concerned with how individuals experience authority (Jannetta et al., 2021). Fundamentally, when individuals perceive that they are treated fairly, honestly, and with respect, they are more likely to view the authority as procedurally just and legitimate. These perceptions can significantly shape an individual’s attitudes, feelings, and behaviors. Positive perceptions of procedural justice and legitimacy may be linked to compliance with conditions of supervision and even recidivism (Blasko and Taxman, 2018; Wright and Gifford, 2017).

Although supervisees of any race and ethnicity may believe that the criminal justice system is unjust and illegitimate, the workshop participants noted that some groups may disproportionately hold these views. For example, research indicates that Black people are far more likely than White people to view the criminal justice system as racially biased, and they tend to view the system as less legitimate than White people do (Horowitz, Brown, and Cox, 2019; Rocque, 2011). Furthermore, in a study on perceptions of the severity of different sanctions, Black probationers were significantly more likely than White probationers to choose prison over community-based alternatives because of concerns over mistreatment by staff, the ability to comply with program rules, and increased risk of revocation (Wood and May, 2003). The participants argued that these perceptions, whether based on personal or vicarious experiences, can be a significant barrier to forming quality working relationships and, therefore, must be acknowledged and addressed.

The participants recommended research to better understand supervisees’ perceptions of the legitimacy of their officers’ authority and determinants of these perceptions by racial and ethnic group. There is also a need to understand whether and how these perceptions influence the supervision relationship; supervisee compliance; officer responses to misconduct; and, ultimately, disparities in technical violations.

Insights into perceptions of procedural injustice or illegitimacy, while critically important, are not enough, according to the participants. Research is needed to inform best practices and strategies that officers can use to work through these barriers to better serve supervisees, achieve better outcomes, and reduce disparities.

**Leveraging Credible Messengers**

According to the participants, some agencies lack diversity in their workforces, or their officers may lack multicultural awareness, sensitivity, and skills, which can be a barrier to good working relationships with supervisees of color. Two high-priority needs identified by participants involve using credible messenger mentoring initiatives as a complementary resource to mitigate these deficiencies.
Credible messenger mentoring initiatives are gaining traction, particularly with respect to programming for justice-involved juveniles and young adults of color (Alcorn, 2019; Austria and Peterson, 2017; Tucker, 2022). Typically employed by community-based organizations that partner with justice system agencies (e.g., probation, parole), credible messengers provide group and one-on-one mentoring, support, and guidance to supervisees. They may be trained to use evidence-based practices, such as motivational interviewing, to equip supervisees with tools to manage their emotions and behavior so that they may complete supervision and better their lives (Austria and Peterson, 2017).

Unlike most officers, credible messengers share unique life experiences (e.g., prior justice system involvement, prior involvement with gangs, similar characteristics and backgrounds) with supervisees. Credible messengers are predominantly Black and Latino and often come from communities that are disproportionately affected by the justice system (Martinez et al., 2022). These individuals have overcome obstacles and are inspired to help others do the same. It is thought that their shared backgrounds and experiences can lead to stronger relationships with supervisees, greater trust, and improved supervision outcomes (Austria and Peterson, 2017).

While there is no formal model of the credible messenger approach (Martinez et al., 2022), workshop participants noted that the Arches program, administered by the New York City Department of Probation, is illustrative in terms of its approach and success. Arches employs trained credible messengers to mentor juveniles and young adults using an evidence-based interactive journaling curriculum. An evaluation revealed that program participants were significantly less likely than their peers to be reconvicted for a felony (Lynch et al., 2018).

Beyond recidivism reduction, the workshop participants noted that credible messengers could be effective intermediaries between supervisees and officers in cases of technical misconduct. For example, supervisees might be more willing to discuss personal problems or reasons for noncompliance with mentors as opposed to officers, and having these conversations may help resolve issues and reduce incidents of absconding or lack of engagement in treatment. Furthermore, coordination between mentors and officers can lead to a collaborative, problem-solving approach to misconduct that addresses underlying needs and reengages supervisees, perhaps avoiding the need to file a violation of supervision. The Arches evaluation demonstrated that, to varying degrees, officers will coordinate with credible messenger mentors on individual cases and may seek input before filing violations with the courts (Lynch et al., 2018). The workshop participants recommended research to determine the impact of the credible messenger approach on technical violations among supervisees of color.

The participants also recommended the development of best practices to support the implementation of credible messenger mentoring initiatives. For example, guidance is needed to establish effective partnerships with the community-based organizations that are providing credible messenger mentoring and to vet credible messengers. (E.g., does the individual have legitimacy in the community? Are they sustaining a prosocial lifestyle?) Guidance is also needed on what training, credentials, and professional development will be required; whether the curriculum is evidence based; how mentors will be supervised to mitigate potential risks; and more.

We are not aware of any research evidence examining the impact of credible messengers on disparities in technical violations. Nevertheless, Arches and other credible messenger programs are meant to address disparities in the existence of positive relationships, as well as in justice system outcomes (Lynch et al., 2018; Reidelberger et al., 2021). The use of credible messengers is a burgeoning approach in several fields in addition to corrections,2 which provides ample opportunities for future research.

**Inequitable Access to Resources**

According to the workshop participants, inadequate access to resources can be a significant barrier to success on supervision, and supervisees of color tend to be disproportionately affected. For example, in 2019, the poverty rate for Black Americans...
prompt critical review of policies through an equity lens. Better understanding of these barriers can also help galvanize support for dedicating resources to serve those in need.

**Addressing Basic Needs**

The participants noted that some types of noncompliance and disparities in noncompliance behaviors could be reduced by addressing the basic needs of supervisees. To address these concerns, many community supervision agencies are able to partner with community-based organizations to support individuals in need. Assistance can take several forms, such as emergency housing, clothing, or tokens for public transportation. Some agencies assemble care packages, operate food pantries, or both. In some cases, funds are available to help cover such expenses as treatment costs and drug-testing fees to alleviate the burden on the supervisee, according to the participants.

Not only does this type of assistance help address supervisees’ immediate needs, thereby potentially reducing barriers to success, but also the way it is provided may yield other benefits. For example, when officers are directly involved in providing assistance (such as delivering food), it can be easier for them to develop better rapport with supervisees (Wigger, 2021). The participants recommended the development of best practices and strategies to guide agencies in establishing new or bolstering existing assistance initiatives and recommended issues to consider. They also discussed the need to evaluate the feasibility of providing monetary assistance, directly or through partners, to supervisees with higher levels of need. Programs are emerging that provide cash to help stabilize justice-involved individuals, primarily those who have been recently released from prison or jail (Brown, 2022). New York City’s Arches initiative provides supervisees with cash stipends for participation and completion of programming (Lynch et al., 2018). Some participants raised concerns about establishing appro-
Remote supervision technologies are an emerging trend in community supervision, one that has been accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic (Viglione et al., 2020). Such technologies include smartphone apps that allow remote communication between officers and supervisees. Many apps support remote check-ins with GPS data points, allowing supervisees to report to their officers from anywhere. Video-call capabilities allow face-to-face meetings between supervisees and officers and treatment sessions between supervisees and providers, and automated reminders of important events may be delivered to reduce noncompliance due to missed appointments. Finally, some systems allow officers to deliver positive reinforcements to supervisees when they are progressing.

While the participants did not say that remote supervision technologies should necessarily replace all in-person contact, they agreed that these technologies are a promising approach and recommended research to understand their impacts on various aspects of supervision (such as the level of engagement in virtual treatment sessions), examine their impact on disparate technical violation outcomes, and inform best practices around their use to reduce barriers to compliance and success.

**Policy and Practice**

To remove barriers to success and reduce disparities, it is critically important, according to the participants, for agency leaders to develop a culture that emphasizes and reinforces the use of core correctional practices. For example, adherence to the risk-need-responsivity model and a focus on the supervisee’s stage of change and motivation can improve outcomes. This approach requires a mindset in which officers seek to understand, and be sensitive to, the barriers that disadvantaged supervisees face; meet them where they are; and proactively seek problem-solving strategies to work together to overcome these barriers. Better understanding of personal circumstances.

**Leveraging Technology**

The participants discussed ways in which technology may be leveraged to reduce obstacles to compliance, which might also affect disparities. For example, it can be challenging for supervisees who have limited access to transportation or are living in rural areas to attend appointments with their officers and participate in treatment sessions. They may be unable to afford to pay for child care. Furthermore, it can be difficult for supervisees to get time off from work, and, if they are granted time off, it can affect their limited incomes. According to the participants, remote supervision technologies can eliminate some of these barriers.
Although the study did not delve into the reasons for this disparity, it may be assumed that if core correctional practices are applied differentially, disparities in outcomes will likely result.

The participants noted that supervisors can play a key gatekeeping function by monitoring the supervision practices of their officers, including challenging staff to defend decisions to pursue violations and ensuring that all available options have been explored before a petition is filed.

Research and Evaluation

Understanding the Extent and Drivers of Disparities

As discussed, data limitations and related challenges pose significant obstacles to understanding the trajectory of a case and what leads to a technical violation. Challenges notwithstanding, the participants called for more research to determine the extent to which disparities exist and the drivers behind technical violation behaviors and how officers respond to these behaviors along racial and ethnic lines.

For example, it is important to know whether certain groups disproportionately struggle with certain types of conditions and, if so, why. If the barriers are better understood, mit-

may allow officers to be more flexible in their responses to misconduct, particularly when supervisees are perceived to be doing their best and when punitive responses may be ineffective (Daly et al., 2021; Clear, Harris, and Baird, 1992). Furthermore, tailoring interventions toward individuals and treating instances of noncompliance as “coachable moments” can result in fewer violation filings (Lovins et al., 2018).

The participants acknowledged that not every officer is necessarily on board with this philosophy, particularly officers who have more of a law enforcement orientation. Participants recommended best practices to vet candidates on the alignment of their personal belief systems with core correctional practices, although this was a lower-ranked need.

Core correctional practices should also be applied equitably across racial and ethnic groups, and agencies should be aware that differential treatment can occur. For example, one participant shared that a recent review of his agency revealed that officers were less likely to use their core correctional practices training with, and less likely to deliver positive reinforc-ements to, Black supervisees compared with White supervisees.

We need to address implicit bias. . . . Individual officers handle their caseloads in very different ways. Supervisors are the gatekeepers—key to ensuring that all possible interventions are explored before violation petitions are filed and that all violations are warranted.

We talk about cultural sensitivity, but do we really mean it? If we meant it, we would have different treatment approaches for different groups.

It really comes down to a simple question: All things being equal, are people in similar circumstances (e.g., positive drug test) treated the same regardless of race?
More subtly, differences in the quality of the working relationship between officers and supervisees are important to explore along racial and ethnic lines. As discussed, much of the granular information about the trajectory of a case, including routine but key decisions, is contained in officer case files and not readily accessible through information systems. However, with further research, it may be possible to identify which decision points have the most impact on disparate outcomes so that the relevant data may be collected and mitigation strategies may be implemented and tested.

Studying the Successes
Although evidence is scarce, it is reasonable to assume that the level of disparity in technical violation processing will vary considerably by jurisdiction. Understanding that jurisdictions are unique in many respects, which makes direct comparison challenging, the participants argued that it would be useful to study those jurisdictions that either do not have disparities or have successfully narrowed or eliminated disparities. The goal would be to attempt to isolate the strategies, best practices, and dynamics that were associated with positive change and produce case studies to guide the field. That said, it was understood that approaches that are successful in one jurisdiction would not necessarily work equally well in another.

Evaluating Broader Reform Efforts
The participants discussed the increasing national focus on system reforms designed to reduce the number of violation filings and/or the use of incarceration as a response to technical misconduct. Some participants questioned whether such misconduct should even warrant a formal violation petition. Through the Justice Reinvestment Initiative, more than 30 states have enacted new policies to address this issue (Pew Charitable Trusts, 2019). Examples of reforms include tailoring supervision strategies toward behavioral change for those individuals at highest risk of recidivism; promoting
Assuming that research can identify key decision points at the officer, supervisor, and agency levels that may drive technical violation disparities, participants noted the need to develop and operationalize metrics to be collected, analyzed, and tracked to determine whether progress is being made in reducing disparities.

To assist in these efforts, the participants recommended the development of management tools, such as dashboards, that display disparity indicators and rates. The availability of these data, in near real time, would serve several purposes. For example, it would send a message that the issue is a priority for the agency, that the agency is transparent about performance across relevant metrics, and that the agency holds itself and its staff accountable for reducing disparities to the extent possible.

Operationally, these tools make it easier for the agency to identify patterns to be investigated and addressed.

Disparities at the officer and supervisor levels should also be monitored because they provide opportunities to coach staff and/or deliver additional training (such as on implicit bias or cultural sensitivity) as needed. To the extent that bias is the driver of disparities, focusing on the data can drive change as much as training can, according to participants. For example, staff might not be aware of their own biases and how they affect their decisionmaking; therefore, if staff can see how their performance at key decision points compares with the performance of others, they can reflect on their processes and self-correct if needed.
The participants argued that management tools should be used in the spirit of curiosity and learning rather than as a “hammer” to punish. These tools can help management and staff understand the baseline, identify the areas that need improvement, and track progress toward reducing disparities in technical violation processing.

CONCLUSION
Racial and ethnic disparities in the processing of technical violations exacerbate upstream justice system inequities, further perpetuate disparities in incarceration, and undermine the legitimacy of community supervision agencies. To explore the challenges and opportunities associated with reducing disparities in technical violations, project staff virtually convened a panel of probation and parole administrators, researchers, judges, and other policy experts to identify key needs that, if addressed, would significantly help jurisdictions meet these challenges.

Several overarching themes emerged. First and most importantly, many jurisdictions are not rigorously examining the existence and extent of disparities at this critical decision point. Strategies and incentives are needed to overcome barriers and promote a culture and learning environment in which staff are committed to acknowledging, confronting, and reducing disparities where they may exist. Simply collecting technical violation data by race and ethnicity would be a positive step; however, research is needed to better understand the drivers of disparities in violation behaviors and officer responses to these behaviors. Such research would require access to more-granular data capturing officer behavior at key decision points leading up to the filing of a violation petition to better understand the response to misconduct and whether differential treatment is an issue. There is also a need to explore and, to the extent possible, quantify the quality of the working relationship (including the application of core correctional practices) between officers and supervisees along racial and ethnic lines to ensure that no group is disadvantaged. More-robust automated information systems, supported by management tools, are required to better use these data to assess progress toward reducing disparities and to support the development of remediation strategies as needed.

Systemic inequities should be addressed by scrutinizing policies and practices through an equity lens and modifying them to avoid a disproportionate impact on racial and ethnic minority groups. Furthermore, jurisdictions must understand that socioeconomic inequities can be a barrier to success that disproportionately affects supervisees of color; focus should be directed toward strategies to address basic needs. Finally, research is needed to identify effective strategies to reduce these disparities, and jurisdictions require guidance to effectively implement and sustain these strategies. Research could also examine how broader reform efforts, such as efforts to reduce the community supervision population, might affect disparities (Phelps, 2018b).

Community supervision agencies and jurisdictional stakeholders can do little to influence disparities at upstream justice system decision points; however, they have the ability and, indeed, the responsibility to ensure that their policies and practices with respect to technical violations do not perpetuate these inequities. Addressing the high-priority needs outlined in this report can help jurisdictions better understand and identify the issues related to racial and ethnic disparities in technical violation processing, the factors that contribute to them, and strategies to reduce them.

TECHNICAL APPENDIX
This appendix presents additional details on the workshop and our process for identifying and prioritizing research and technology needs and turning them into the research agenda that is presented in the main report. The descriptions in this appendix are drawn and adapted from previous PCJNI publications and reflect adjustments to the needs identification and prioritization process implemented at this workshop.

Workshop Scope and Participant Selection
The topics for PCJNI workshops are selected by reaching a consensus among the action officers and subject-matter experts at NIJ and research staff at the organizations that will be facilitating the workshop. Multiple topic areas, accompanied by brief scoping descriptions, are typically suggested months before the workshop by one or more of the parties involved, and staff engage in group deliberations with NIJ to reach consensus on the topic. We then engage in further scoping of the workshop to craft a discussion agenda through literature review or informal discussions with other practitioners and subject-matter experts, or both. Once the topic and scope have been determined, we recruit participants by identifying knowledgeable individuals through existing professional and social networks (e.g., LinkedIn) and by reviewing literature published on the
try to directly replicate this meeting format using virtual conferencing tools. Instead, we prepared a multistage process:

1. interviews with each participant, either individually or in small groups, for approximately an hour to build an initial picture of their views and ideas
2. a set of shorter, more focused virtual sessions to provide the group with the opportunity to react to and shape the consolidated picture that came from our synthesis of the individual interview input
3. a final voting stage, after the last interactive session, in which participants provided their final assessment of the ranking of each need.

Interviews
During the interviews, we asked practitioner participants to discuss the challenges that they or their colleagues have experienced. We asked those participants who were not justice practitioners (e.g., academics) to speak from their experiences working with practitioners. We also asked them to identify areas in which additional investment in research and development could help alleviate those challenges. During these discussions, participants suggested additional areas that were potentially worthy of research or investment. We consolidated and integrated the problems, opportunities, and potential solutions described by the participants in the separate interviews into a single summarized list. In advance of the first meeting of the virtual workshop, participants were provided with the summarized list of issues and needs.

Virtual Sessions
Once each participant had been interviewed and the needs were consolidated, we held three two-hour virtual meetings using Zoom, a virtual meeting platform. These meetings were configured such that the participants could see each other’s video feeds and individually collaborate to refine and edit the wording of the consolidated needs, which were shared from a moderator’s desktop.

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, PCJNI workshops were conducted in person in a group setting. However, under the restrictions and mitigations implemented in response to the pandemic, our participants and staff were unable to travel. Our typical in-person format involved a two-day, 14-hour in-person meeting (eight hours the first day, six hours the second day). However, drawing on several organizations’ and individuals’ experiences with running and participating in high-intensity virtual events, we determined that it would not be advisable to
phi techniques. We asked the participants to anonymously vote using a web-based polling system (the Anywhere Polling feature from Turning Technologies). Each participant was asked to score each problem and the associated solutions to address those needs using a 1–9 scale for three dimensions: problem priority, need importance, and probability of success.

For the problem priority dimension, participants were instructed to rank the priority of the identified problem on a scale from 1 to 9, where 1 indicated that a problem was a low priority to solve and 9 indicated that it was high priority. Participants were given a set of problems identified during the interviews before the workshop and were asked to review, edit, and rank them before the virtual meeting. The problem rankings were completed during the first virtual meeting, and the list of problems was sorted from the highest- to the lowest-ranked problem. Participants reviewed the potential solutions associated with the problems, in this order, in the subsequent sessions.

For the need importance dimension, participants were instructed that 1 was a low score and 9 was a high score. Participants were told to score a need’s importance with a 1 if it would have little or no impact on the problem and with a 9 if it would reduce the impact of the problem by 20 percent or more. Anchoring the scale with percentage improvements in the need’s performance is intended to help make rating values comparable from participant to participant.

For the probability of success dimension, participants were instructed to treat the 1–9 scale as a percentage chance that the need could be met and broadly implemented successfully. That is, they could assign the need’s chance of success between 10 percent (i.e., a rating of 1) and 90 percent (i.e., a rating of 9). This dimension was intended to include not only technical concerns (i.e., whether the need would be hard to meet) but also the effect of factors that might cause practitioners to not adopt the new technology, policy, or practice even if it were developed. Such factors could include, for example, cost, effect on practitioner workloads, other staffing concerns, and societal concerns.

After the participants provided their individual ratings using the web-based polling system (i.e., for problem priority, need importance, or probability of success), we displayed a histogram-style summary of participant responses within the polling system’s interface. If there was significant disagreement among the participants, then they were asked to verbally discuss or explain their votes at one end of the spectrum or the other. (The degree of disagreement was determined by our visual inspection of the histogram.) If a second round of discussion occurred, participants were given an opportunity to adjust their ratings on the same question. This process was repeated for each question and dimension at the end of each topic area.

**Post-Session Prioritization**

Once the participants had completed the rating process for all of the topic areas, we put the needs into a single prioritized list. We ordered the list by calculating a median expected value using the method outlined in Jackson et al. (2016). For each need, we multiplied the final (second-round) ratings for importance and probability of success to produce an expected value. We then calculated the median of that product across all of the participants and used that as the group’s collective expected value score for the need.

Next, we clustered the resulting expected value scores into three tiers using a hierarchical clustering algorithm. (We used the “ward.D” spherical algorithm from the “stats” library in the R statistical package, version 4.0.2.) We chose this algorithm to minimize within-cluster variance when determining the breaks between tiers. We chose to use three tiers in part to keep the methodology consistent across the set of technology workshops that we have conducted for NIJ. Also, the choice of three tiers provides a manageable system for policymakers. Specifically, the Tier 1 needs are the priorities that should be the primary policymaking focus, the Tier 2 needs should be examined closely, and the Tier 3 needs are probably not worth much attention in the short term (unless, for example, they can be addressed with existing technology or approaches that can be readily and cheaply adapted to the identified need).

Because the participants initially rated the needs one topic area at a time, we gave them an opportunity at the end of the workshop to review and weigh in on the tiered list of all identified needs. The intention of this step was to let participants see the needs in the context of the other tiered needs and allow them to consider whether there were some that appeared too high or low relative to the others. Participants were able to see all of the ranked needs collected across all of the sessions; this provided a top-level view that was complementary to the rankings provided session by session. To collect the participants’ assessments, we emailed the entire tiered list to them in a Microsoft Word document. The participants were then asked to examine where each of the needs landed on the overall tiered list and whether this ordering was appropriate or needed fine-tuning. Participants had the option to indicate whether each
Table A.1. Example of the Delphi Method Third-Round Voting Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Vote Up</th>
<th>Vote Down</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Issue:** Some agencies lack diversity in the workforce, which may impact their ability to work effectively and build relationships of trust with supervisees of color.  
**Need:** Develop best practices for leveraging the use of trained, vetted credible messengers with lived experience as a complementary resource to help build relationships of trust and/or developing relationships with community support systems. | 1 |         |           |
| **Issue:** There is evidence of racial and ethnic disparities in technical violation behaviors, and how they are addressed, in some jurisdictions; however, more research is needed.  
**Need:** Research is needed to better understand the extent of disparities in both noncompliant behaviors (e.g., are some groups more likely to engage in certain behaviors?) and the responses (e.g., are responses to violations handled equitably?) as well as the drivers of disparities (e.g., systemic vs. individual factors, implicit bias). | 1 |         |           |
| **Tier 2** |      |         |           |
| **Issue:** Many jurisdictions/governing bodies are not actively examining whether disparities (due to systemic or implicit bias) exist with respect to technical violations. Inertia and lack of transparency and accountability tend to sustain the status quo.  
**Need:** Explore the feasibility of a mandated National Community Supervision Disparity Index, which would require agencies to regularly report key supervision/violation data (or other accountability measures) by race/ethnicity. | 2 |         |           |
| **Issue:** Inadequate (or nonexistent) information systems are a fundamental barrier to understanding whether disparities exist and, if so, where and to what extent.  
**Need:** There is a need to fund agencies/jurisdictions or otherwise incentivize them to modernize their case/data management systems and/or integrate disparate data systems as needed. | 2 |         |           |
| **Tier 3** |      |         |           |
| **Issue:** Some staff and/or external service providers may lack the cultural sensitivity to work effectively with supervisees of diverse cultures.  
**Need:** Agencies need tools (e.g., supervisee surveys, contract standards) to assess external service providers’ ability to deliver services in a culturally responsive manner and/or provide culturally specific programming and to hold them accountable. | 3 |         |           |
| **Issue:** Policies and practices (e.g., length of supervision terms, conditions of supervision and total number of conditions, use of fees/tines, zero-tolerance policies) are often unexamined through the lens of equity/evidence, which may lead to unintended consequences, including disproportionate impact on some groups.  
**Need:** Stakeholders require continuous education on topics such as the state of evidence-based correctional practices and concepts, the nature of substance use recovery/relapse, and what is known about racial disparities in society/justice system so that there is common understanding. | 3 |         |           |

We then tallied the participants’ responses and applied those votes to produce a final list of prioritized and tiered needs. To adjust the expected values using the up and down votes from the third round of prioritization, we implemented a method equivalent to the one we used in previous work (Hollywood et al., 2016). Specifically, if every participant voted “up” for a need that was at the bottom of the list, then the collective effect of those votes should be to move the need to
After applying the up and down vote points to the second-round expected values, we compared the modified scores with the boundary values for the tiers to see whether the change was enough to move any needs up or down in the prioritization. (Note that there were gaps between these boundaries, so some of the modified expected values could fall in between tiers. See Figure A.1.) As with prior work, we set a higher bar for a need to move up or down two tiers (from Tier 1 to Tier 3, or vice versa) than for a need to move to the tier immediately above or below. Specifically, a need could increase by one tier if its modified expected value was higher than the highest expected value score in its initial tier. And a need could decrease by one tier if its modified expected value was lower than the lowest expected value in its initial tier. However, to increase or decrease by two tiers (which was possible only for needs that started in Tier 1 or Tier 3), the score had to increase or decrease by an amount that fully placed the need into the range two tiers away. For example, for a Tier 3 need to jump to Tier 1, its expected value score had to fall within the boundaries of Tier 1, not just within the gap between Tier 1 and Tier 2. See Figure A.1, which illustrates the greater score change required for a need to move two tiers (one need on the far right of the figure) compared with one tier (all other examples shown).

Applying these decision rules to integrate the participants’ third-round inputs into the final tiering of needs resulted in numerical separations between tiers that were less clear than the separations that resulted when we used the clustering algorithm in the initial tiering. This can occur because, for example, when the final expected value score for a need that was originally in Tier 3 falls just below the boundary value for Tier 1, that need’s final score could be higher than that of some other needs in the item’s new tier (Tier 2). See Figure A.2, which shows the distribution of the needs by expected value score after the second-round rating process and then after the third-round voting process.

As a result of the third round of voting, 33 needs did not change position, one need rose one tier, one need fell one tier, and no needs changed two tiers. (Two needs were consolidated with other needs due to their similarity.) The output from this process became the final ranking of the participants’ prioritized results. Table A.2 shows the complete list of needs by tier and category.

---

**Figure A.1. How a Need’s Increase in Expected Value Might Result in Its Movement Across Tier Boundaries**

![Diagram showing how a need’s increase in expected value might result in its movement across tier boundaries. Each example need’s original tier is shown by a circle with a solid border (the two needs starting in Tier 2 and the four needs starting in Tier 3). Each need’s new tier after the third-round score adjustment is shown by the connected circle with a dotted border.](image)
Table A.2. Complete List of Needs, by Tier and Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem or Opportunitya</th>
<th>Potential Solution</th>
<th>Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inequitable access to resources</td>
<td>• Educate stakeholders about the impact of these disadvantages on compliance and success on supervision.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop best practices around the use of technology to eliminate barriers to compliance (e.g., smartphones/apps for remote reporting/reminders; telepresence for classes, individual/group counseling). Evaluate pros, cons, and impact of these approaches (as alternative to in-person, as needed) on outcomes and disparities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop best practices and strategies to directly provide resources (e.g., food pantry, clothing, transit vouchers) to disadvantaged supervisees and/or coordinate with community resources to provide these services. Explore feasibility of monetary assistance for sustenance/emergency support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving working relationships</td>
<td>• Research is needed into supervisee perceptions of legitimacy along racial/ethnic lines and the impact of these perceptions on compliance and outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop best practices and strategies (e.g., building relationships of trust) designed to ameliorate the effects of these perceptions, where they exist, to achieve better outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop best practices for leveraging the use of trained, vetted credible messengers with lived experience as a complementary resource to help build relationships of trust and/or developing relationships with community support systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct research to determine whether the use of credible messengers improves relationships with supervisees and the impact of this practice on supervision outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure A.2. Final Distribution of the Tiered Needs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem or Opportunity&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Potential Solution</th>
<th>Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research and evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is evidence of racial/ethnic disparities in technical violation behaviors, and how they are addressed, in some jurisdictions; however, more research is needed.</td>
<td>- Research is needed to better understand the extent of disparities in both noncompliant behaviors (e.g., are some groups more likely to engage in certain behaviors?) and the responses (e.g., are responses to violations handled equitably?) as well as the drivers of disparities (e.g., systemic vs. individual factors, implicit bias).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little is known about the strategies/reforms that are most effective in reducing technical violation disparities without introducing other unintended consequences.</td>
<td>- Research is needed to study jurisdictions that have reduced disparities to better understand the dynamics associated with successful outcomes and to develop an evidence base of effective strategies. - Research is needed to determine the impact of more general system reforms (e.g., caps on probation sentences, reducing the number of technical violations) on disparities in technical violation behavior, responses, and outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data and analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictions need to identify metrics that reflect disparities, as well as accountability tools to track progress toward eliminating disparities.</td>
<td>- Develop management tools (e.g., dashboards) to track disparity metrics, in near real time, at the agency, supervisor, and officer levels to promote transparency/accountability and identify patterns to be investigated and addressed (e.g., coachable moments for staff, policy/program review).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy and practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisees may have inequitable access to resources (e.g., employment, housing, transportation, child care, substance use/mental health treatment), which may impact their ability to maintain compliance/achieve success, resulting in disparate outcomes.</td>
<td>- Reinforce supervision practices in which staff actively engage in barrier-reduction strategies to “meet supervisees where they are” in terms of appropriate accommodations/service delivery that do not compromise public safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where data are available, agencies may not have the expertise and/or sustainable capacity to conduct analyses to develop and evaluate disparity mitigation strategies.</td>
<td>- Develop best practices for creating a framework for exploring issues related to disparities. - There is a need to incentivize partnerships between academics and practitioners, particularly for smaller, rural, or less resourced agencies.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies may struggle to effectively implement and sustain strategies to address disparities for a variety of reasons (e.g., inadequate support/collaboration from leadership and stakeholders; inadequate organizational readiness for change; lack of learning environment supportive of identifying/addressing issues without assigning blame; administration changes and shifting priorities).</td>
<td>- Agencies need guidance and training to apply evidence-based practices for effective implementation (i.e., implementation science) of strategies to eliminate disparities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Problem or opportunity continued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem or Opportunity</th>
<th>Potential Solution</th>
<th>Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some agencies lack diversity in the workforce, and staff may lack cultural sensitivity, which may impact their ability to work effectively/build relationships of trust with supervisees of color.</td>
<td>• Develop best practices/strategies to attract/recruit qualified candidates (including those with lived experience) that better mirror the demographics of the supervised population; to implement inclusive hiring practices; and to vet candidates on their level of cultural sensitivity as well as alignment of their personal belief system with core correctional practices. • Evaluate the effectiveness of training (e.g., cultural sensitivity, implicit bias, microaggression) on reducing disparities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little is known about the strategies/reforms that are most effective in reducing technical violation disparities where they exist.</td>
<td>• Develop mechanisms such as a clearinghouse, knowledge base, peer-to-peer information-sharing network to highlight promising initiatives (e.g., absconder amnesty programs, layers of review/approval prior to filing violation petition), including successes in other sectors such as juvenile justice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and practice</td>
<td>Policies and practices (e.g., length of supervision terms, conditions of supervision and total number of conditions, use of fees/fines, zero-tolerance policies) are often unexamined through the lens of equity/evidence, which may lead to unintended consequences, including disproportionate impact on some groups.</td>
<td>• Develop best practices and guidance around formal racial equity impact assessments and similar processes (e.g., including persons with lived experience, surveying supervisee population) to support stakeholder review of policy/practice for potentially disparate impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many jurisdictions/governing bodies are not actively examining whether disparities (due to systemic or implicit bias) exist with respect to technical violations. Inertia and lack of transparency and accountability tend to sustain the status quo.</td>
<td>• Explore the feasibility of a mandated National Community Supervision Disparity Index, which would require agencies to regularly report key supervision/violation data (or other accountability measures) by race/ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and analysis</td>
<td>Inadequate (or nonexistent) information systems are a fundamental barrier to understanding whether disparities exist and, if so, where and to what extent.</td>
<td>• There is a need to fund agencies/jurisdictions or otherwise incentivize them to modernize their case/data management systems and/or integrate disparate data systems as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to understand the extent to which disparities are operating in technical violations is significantly hampered by data limitations (e.g., lack of violation data by race/ethnicity; poor data quality; administrative-level data in automated systems are inadequate to support in-depth analyses).</td>
<td>• Develop best practices for data governance to help ensure that the information collected is as useful as possible for analytical purposes. Guidelines and standards (e.g., common definition of a technical violation, coding multiracial supervisees) are needed to enable more meaningful comparisons within and across agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving working relationships</td>
<td>It can be challenging to evaluate the perceived quality of contacts with supervisees and the quality of the relationship. These interactions may be an overlooked decision point, which may impact disparities.</td>
<td>• Conduct research to determine what it means to have a quality contact and relationship with a supervisee, gaps between officer and supervisee perceptions, and impact on disparate outcomes (e.g., influence on noncompliance behaviors and/or officer response).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table A.2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem or Opportunity&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Potential Solution</th>
<th>Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy and practice</strong></td>
<td>• Stakeholders require continuous education on topics such as the state of evidence-based correctional practices and concepts, the nature of substance use recovery/relapse, and what is known about racial disparities in society/justice system so that there is common understanding. • Develop best practices for working with stakeholders (e.g., engage external facilitators to foster collaboration) to critically review and evaluate policy—including the conditions of supervision (e.g., fewer conditions, conditions tailored to the risk and needs of supervisees, conditions reframed as goals as opposed to absolutes)—through an equity and evidence-based lens; examine the use of fines and fees; challenge policies that require automatic technical violations; and reduce the length of supervision. • Research and best practices are needed on how risk/needs instruments are being used in the field. For example, are the supervisee’s needs addressed, or is the focus on risk level and supervision intensity; what should the role of assessment tools be in response to noncompliance given that they are designed, in part, to predict contact with law enforcement—what other factors should be considered? • Some risk/needs instruments have been shown to “overclassify” some individuals, resulting in false positives and “oversupervision,” which can lead to disparate outcomes. Research is needed to identify strategies to fine-tune instruments (e.g., eliminating certain static factors, adjusting weights) to mitigate disparities without significantly sacrificing predictive validity.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational issues</strong></td>
<td>• There is a need to educate stakeholders about the corrosive effects of unaddressed disparities and a need to be open and vulnerable to investigating whether disparities may exist and, if so, examining root causes and developing and evaluating mitigation strategies. • There is a need to explore the inhibitors (e.g., organizational culture, fear of negative exposure, resource limitations) that may deter agencies from examining disparities and identify incentives/other mechanisms to overcome resistance (e.g., grant funding for technical assistance to get started). There is a need to focus on what drives engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>a</sup> Policies and practices (e.g., length of supervision terms, conditions of supervision and total number of conditions, use of fees/fines, zero-tolerance policies) are often unexamined through the lens of equity/evidence, which may lead to unintended consequences, including disproportionate impact on some groups.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem or Opportunity&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Potential Solution</th>
<th>Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy and practice</strong></td>
<td>• Stakeholders require continuous education on topics such as the state of evidence-based correctional practices and concepts, the nature of substance use recovery/relapse, and what is known about racial disparities in society/justice system so that there is common understanding. • Develop best practices for working with stakeholders (e.g., engage external facilitators to foster collaboration) to critically review and evaluate policy—including the conditions of supervision (e.g., fewer conditions, conditions tailored to the risk and needs of supervisees, conditions reframed as goals as opposed to absolutes)—through an equity and evidence-based lens; examine the use of fines and fees; challenge policies that require automatic technical violations; and reduce the length of supervision. • Research and best practices are needed on how risk/needs instruments are being used in the field. For example, are the supervisee’s needs addressed, or is the focus on risk level and supervision intensity; what should the role of assessment tools be in response to noncompliance given that they are designed, in part, to predict contact with law enforcement—what other factors should be considered? • Some risk/needs instruments have been shown to “overclassify” some individuals, resulting in false positives and “oversupervision,” which can lead to disparate outcomes. Research is needed to identify strategies to fine-tune instruments (e.g., eliminating certain static factors, adjusting weights) to mitigate disparities without significantly sacrificing predictive validity.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational issues</strong></td>
<td>• There is a need to educate stakeholders about the corrosive effects of unaddressed disparities and a need to be open and vulnerable to investigating whether disparities may exist and, if so, examining root causes and developing and evaluating mitigation strategies. • There is a need to explore the inhibitors (e.g., organizational culture, fear of negative exposure, resource limitations) that may deter agencies from examining disparities and identify incentives/other mechanisms to overcome resistance (e.g., grant funding for technical assistance to get started). There is a need to focus on what drives engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>a</sup> Policies and practices (e.g., length of supervision terms, conditions of supervision and total number of conditions, use of fees/fines, zero-tolerance policies) are often unexamined through the lens of equity/evidence, which may lead to unintended consequences, including disproportionate impact on some groups.
It can be challenging to evaluate the perceived quality of contacts with supervisees and the quality of the relationship. These interactions may be an overlooked decision point, which may impact disparities.

- Explore the utility of approaches (e.g., body-worn cameras, direct observations by supervisors, supervisee surveys) to assess the quality of contact with supervisees and to identify potential disparities in officer/client interactions. (For example, are core correctional practices applied with fidelity and equity? Are reinforcements/incentives used equitably? Is there a focus on identifying protective factors and building on strengths? Are all individuals treated with respect?)
- Explore feasibility of operationalizing the quality of contact/relationship with supervisee and including as part of staff performance evaluations with rewards and incentives for staff displaying desired behaviors.

The ability to understand the extent to which disparities are operating in technical violations is significantly hampered by data limitations (e.g., lack of violation data by race/ethnicity; poor data quality; administrative-level data in automated systems are inadequate to support in-depth analyses).

- Develop best practices and leverage national efforts, such as Justice Counts, to help agencies identify the relevant metrics (beyond demographics) to collect in their case-management systems. Ideally, granular data (e.g., risk level, application of core correctional practices, interventions and dosage, non-compliance and staff response, violations filed and reason or motivation, revocations and reason, disposition and final exit type) should be captured at important decision or decision points during supervision through the technical violation process. Best practices should include strategies to improve data quality. (For example, the importance of these data should be demonstrated to line staff).

*A need is the combination of a problem or opportunity and a potential solution. Several of the problems or opportunities are repeated throughout the table because they are combined with a variety of potential solutions.*
Endnotes
1 In some jurisdictions or settings, credible messengers may also be known as peer navigators, peer mentors, coaches, or advocates.
2 Public health systems are also embracing the credible messenger approach to target disparities in health outcomes (see, e.g., Kreuter et al., 2014; and Mason et al., 2022).
3 For more information on smartphone apps for community supervision, see American Probation and Parole Association, 2020.
4 For more information on the Reducing Revocations Challenge, see CUNY Institute for State and Local Governance, undated.
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