

The following studies showed success at reducing recidivism after treatment for high-risk offenders but actually raising recidivism rates for offenders considered low risk who went through the same treatment programs:

- Study out of Canada: **Study of Intensive Rehabilitation Supervision in Canada (Bonta, J et al., 2000A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation of an Intensive Rehabilitation Supervision Program, Vol. 27 No 3:312-329, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*)**
- Study out of Ohio: **Lowenkamp, C. and Latessa, E. J. (2002), "Evaluation of Ohio's Community-Based Correctional Facilities and Halfway Houses", Center for Criminal Justice Research, University of Cincinnati**

Dr. Ed Latessa was a faculty member of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati since 1980, leading that program for almost 40 years, including the development of a doctoral program in Criminal Justice. He directed the Corrections Institute and published nearly 200 scholarly works, including the leading textbook on criminal corrections. He led 200+ funded research projects and served as a consultant to correctional agencies and academic programs at all levels of government and internationally in North America, Europe and Asia.

Dr. Latessa was part of a study in 2010 in Ohio that replicated the above 2002 Ohio study. The results were the same: Treatment effects were stronger if they targeted high-risk offenders but could harm low-risk offenders. Intensive treatment for low-risk offenders can often increase failure rates.

As a result of the similar studies in Ohio in 2002 and 2010, Ohio judges now have to have all offenders assessed, and low-risk offenders cannot be sent to programs designed for high-risk offenders. (***Federal Probation, a journal of correctional philosophy and practice, Vol 74 No 1, "The Creation and Validation of the Ohio Risk Assessment System, Edward J. Latessa, Richard Lemke, Matthew Makarios, Paula Smith, and Christopher T. Lowenkamp***)