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Washington State Offender Accountability Act of 1999

Goal: “reduce the risk of reoffending by offenders in the community”

Legislation calls for Department of Corrections to:

- Classify supervised individuals based on risk of reoffending and severity of prior criminal offending
- Shift resources toward higher-risk persons
Washington Recidivism Rates

Source: Washington State Institute for Public Policy
Establishing Metrics for Success and Assessing Results

Why measure correctional performance?

• Understand the outcomes of funding and policy decisions
• Assess the effectiveness of justice agencies at reducing reoffending
• Provide the best return on taxpayer investments
Most Common Correctional Performance Measure: Recidivism

The Good:

• Correctional interventions (prison, community supervision) are supposed to reduce reoffending, so recidivism is a natural metric for success

The Bad:

• Frequently a single-indicator, which doesn’t allow for policy-relevant comparisons across groups
• Irregularly collected
• Presented absent context
Four Steps to Make Recidivism a Meaningful Performance Measure

Define
Collect
Analyze
Disseminate
Definition
Use Multiple Measures of Success

Desistance
Time to failure
Behavior Change
Severity
Time to Failure (Delaware)

Percent Rearrested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months from prison release</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collection
Develop Protocols to Ensure Data Are Consistent, Accurate, and Timely

Assign unique identifiers
Develop long-term records
Collect contextual information
Update change in status
Breaking Recidivism Down by Policy-Relevant Factors (Colorado)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release type</th>
<th>3-year return to prison rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary parole</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory parole</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence discharge</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-year return to prison rates for 2010 release cohort
Analysis
Account for Underlying Composition of the Prison Population
Remember that Washington Story from Earlier . . .

Felony Recidivism

Source: Washington State Institute for Public Policy
Turns Out that Controlling for Risk Changed the Outcomes

Felony Recidivism

- Actual Felony Recidivism
- Simulated Felony Recidivism

Pre-OAA | OAA

Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar story in NJ . . .

Return to custody rates for prison releases in New Jersey
Underlying Profile Matters

Return to custody rates for prison releases in New Jersey
Dissemination
Package Findings to Maximize Impact and Get Results into Hands of Decisionmakers
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Performance measurement—establishing metrics for success and assessing results—is a crucial first step in making informed decisions in all areas of government, including criminal justice policy. Understanding the outcomes of funding and policy decisions is critical to improving government performance and providing the best return on taxpayer investments.

Yet, compared with other functions of government, the sentencing and corrections policy debate frequently lacks meaningful performance measures. Too often, policymakers are forced to rely on anecdotes and system-level trends when adopting, implementing, and evaluating policies or programs. This is particularly true for assessing the effectiveness of justice agencies at improving public safety.

A number of states, however, have begun to change the way they approach criminal justice policy development and adoption. States participating in the Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI) engage in a data-driven process that targets the drivers of the correctional population and prison costs. As a result, more than 20 states have enacted reforms to reduce correctional spending so that a portion of the savings can be reallocated to programs that improve public safety.1

To ensure these policy changes produce their intended effect and sustain those impacts over time, states must incorporate ongoing performance measurement into their implementation strategies. Data-driven decisionmaking should not occur ad-hoc, and it is the responsibility of all three branches of government to oversee the criminal justice system. Many JRI states have responded by creating bipartisan, interbranch commissions charged with regularly reviewing data and making recommendations for improvement (LaVigne et al. 2014).
Enhancing Bureau of Justice Statistics data to improve the measurement of recidivism
BJS Criminal History Record Research Program

- In 2008, BJS recognized by the FBI as a criminal justice agency and assigned an ORI number to access the FBI’s Interstate Identification Index (III).
  - The FBI’s III is an automated pointer system that allows authorized agencies to determine whether any state repository has criminal history records on an individual.

- Data sharing agreement with FBI and Nlets* allows BJS to obtain criminal history information for research purposes.

*Nlets is a computer-based system that links together state, local and federal criminal justice agencies for the purpose of information exchange.
Rap sheet parsing programs

BJS partnered with Nlets to develop -

- A secure, automated system to retrieve large sets of criminal records on study cohorts.
  - States respond automatically to III record requests over the Nlets network.

- Software programs parse key data elements from rap sheets in every state.
  - Collates the multi-state records into a uniform structure and produces a relational database.
  - Parsing process leverages the standardized XML format used by some states to transmit rap sheets.
Rap sheet fields in the uniform record layout

Subject segment
• BJS case number
• Name
• State identification number (SID)
• FBI identification number
• Date of birth
• Gender
• Race
• Social security number

Court/Sentencing segment
• Court disposition date
• Court name and ORI
• Statute number
• NCIC code
• Offense description
• Type of court disposition
• Sentences (prison, fine, etc.)

Arrest segment
• Date of offense
• Date of arrest
• Arresting agency name and ORI
• Statute number
• NCIC code
• Charge description
• Charge severity
• Arrest disposition
• Arrest disposition date

Supervision segment
• Supervision date (admission, release, etc.)
• Agency name and ORI
• Supervision description
Software to convert state and federal rap sheets into research databases with common codes

- BJS and NORC developed software to convert the criminal history data on the released prisoners into research databases with nationally standardized codes

- Primary component of conversion software includes:
  - State-to-state crosswalk tables to convert state-specific rap sheet fields into a uniform coding structure.
    - Thousands of state statutes and offense descriptions mapped into about 100 BJS offense codes.
    - Thousands of state court disposition descriptions mapped into about 25 BJS court disposition codes.
Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 30 States in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010

Matthew R. Durose, Alexa D. Cooper, Ph.D., and Howard N. Snyder, Ph.D., BJS Statistics

Overall, 67.8% of the 8,046,338 state prisoners released in 2005 in 30 states were arrested within 3 years of release, and 76.6% were arrested within 5 years of release (figure 1). Among prisoners released in 2005 in 23 states with available data on inmates returned to prison, 49.7% had either a parole or probation violation or an arrest for a new offense within 5 years that led to imprisonment, and 55.1% had a parole or probation violation or an arrest that led to imprisonment within 5 years.

While prior Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) prisoner recidivism reports tracked inmates for 3 years following release, this report uses a 5-year follow-up period. The longer window provides supplementary information for policymakers and practitioners on the officially recognized criminal behavior of released prisoners. While 20.5% of released prisoners not arrested within 2 years of release were arrested in the third year, the percentage fell to 13.3% among those who had not been arrested within 4 years. The longer recidivism period also provides a more complete assessment of the number and types of crimes committed by released persons in the years following their release.

Available at: www.bjs.gov

Search for: recidivism
External validity checks on criminal history records

- Demographic data in NCRP records used to verify correct criminal history records received on sampled prisoners
  - 98.9% match on date of birth
  - 99.9% match on gender
  - 99.9% match on race

- BJS attempted to identify the NCRP state-specific incarceration sentence within each prisoner’s criminal history dated prior to his or her prison admission date. Overall, 93% of the cases had a criminal history record that met these criteria.
Findings from the most recent BJS recidivism study of 405,000 persons released from state prison

- 68% were arrested for a new crime within 3 years
- 77% were arrested for a new crime within 5 years
- 16% of released prisoners responsible for 48% of new arrests in this cohort within 5 years
- 25% had a prior arrest in another state
- 11% had an out-of-state arrest following release
National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP)

- 1983 – current
- Inmate-level administrative data

Separate files for:
- Prison admissions ("A")
- Prison releases ("B")
- Releases from parole ("C")
- Yearend prison census ("D") (1999-current)
- Entries to post-custody community supervision ("E") (2012-current)
- Exits from post-custody community supervision ("F") (2012-current)

Variables
- Dates of birth, admission, release
- Demographic, offense, and sentencing information
- Unique state (and federal) ID numbers, names
NCRP term record construction (2000-current)

Prison term 1

1/1/00

Admission (A Record)

Custody (D Records)

Prison term 2

12/31/13

Release (B Record)
Recidivism as measured in the NCRP term records

- Allows for the standard release cohort/cross-section measurement of recidivism

  **State X:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Returned in 3 yrs</th>
<th>Recidivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>28,129</td>
<td>11,528</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>24,572</td>
<td>10,322</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25,126</td>
<td>10,387</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Also allows us to look at recidivism of individual offenders over a period of time

  **State X:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Released</th>
<th>Unique Offenders Returned in 3 yrs</th>
<th>Recidivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between 2000-2009</td>
<td>174,312</td>
<td>47,148 unique</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recidivism as measured in the NCRP term records, cont.

- Why are there differences?

The cross-section/release cohort method counts persons who cycle through prison multiple times, while the unique offender method counts them only once.

Assume that there are an equal proportion of high and low risk offenders, and:

**HIGH RISK OFFENDERS** return to prison 50% of the time
**LOW RISK OFFENDERS** return to prison 0% of the time

\[
\text{RECIDIVISM} = \frac{1}{2}(50\%) + \frac{1}{2}(0\%) = 25\%
\]
Recidivism as measured in the NCRP term records, cont.

Under a standard release cohort/cross section model:

Prisoners released in 2000:

Under a longitudinal/unique offender-based model:

Prisoners released in 2005:

Prisoners released in 2009:
Recidivism as measured in the NCRP term records, cont.

Which recidivism statistic is correct?

It depends on the question.

- For questions that look at a dose-response or time-dependent policy, the release cohort/cross section model may be more appropriate:
  - *What was the effect of pre-release job training programs on post-prison employment among those who received it?*
  - *When are prisoners released onto different types of community supervision at the greatest risk of recidivating?*

- For other questions that are not tied to a specific policy, program, or year, the longitudinal/unique offender method may be appropriate:
  - *Of all offenders going to prison, how many will ever return?*
Thanks to:
- Matt Durose and Alexia Cooper, BJS
- Jeremy Luallen, Abt Associates
- NCRP state data providers
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Overview

A Bold Claim:
Recidivism is among THE MOST important performance measures of any corrections system

The Challenge:
If recidivism is among our most important performance measures, then it is imperative that we think carefully through how we calculate and report recidivism
Overview

Ambitious Goals for the 2013 PA Recidivism Report:

1. Transparent and honest analysis
2. Comprehensive and multi-faceted analysis
3. Rigorous methods
4. Accessible results
5. Policy relevant results
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT of CORRECTIONS PRESENTS A 2013 REPORT.

RECIDIVISM IN PENNSYLVANIA
Meeting the Challenge of the New Normal

recidivism (pron.) - the return to crime or to prison of former inmates, typically measured by rearrest, reconviction, or reincarceration
Act 196 of 2012:

Reinvestment funding streams include:

- Sentencing Commission for developing sentencing risk assessment tool
- Grant program for effective policing practices
- Grant program for effective county probation practices
- Reimbursement for county diversion of "short mins"

The Big Picture:

- One in two hundred adult Pennsylvanians is currently incarcerated in a Pennsylvania State Correctional Institution.
- 90% of state prisoners will eventually be released.
- 6 in 10 released inmates are rearrested or reincarcerated within 3 years of release—most within the first year.
- 60% of all reincarcerations within 3 years are for technical parole violations.

Reasons for Rearrest:

- 10% of all police arrests in PA involve released inmates.
- 22% of rearrests involve property crimes.
- 17% of rearrests involve violence.
- 29% of rearrests involve drug crimes.
- 32% of rearrests involve public order/other crimes.

Profile of Returning Inmates:

- Rearrest rates are higher in urban areas.
- Reincarceration rates are higher in rural areas.

Returning to Prison (2008 Data):

- 43% of inmates released were reincarcerated within 3 years.
- 50% of inmates were rearrested within 3 years.
- 75% of ex-inmates who return to prison will do so within 19 months.

Young and Old:

- Released inmates under 21 are 2x more likely to recidivate within 3 years than released inmates over the age of 50.

Violent Offenders:

- Per capita arrest rates for violent crimes are 14x higher among released inmates compared to the general public.
PA Recidivism Report In A Nutshell:

- Recidivism rates of PA DOC inmates are quite high when measured comprehensively.

- Recidivism rates have remained flat and virtually unchanged over at least the past decade, when measured comprehensively.
Overview

What To Do With A Report Like This:

• Bury it; pretend it doesn’t exist
• Never waste an opportunity to improve

What Is Our Response:

• This is our baseline for measuring success going forward w/ changes enacted under “Justice Reinvestment” reforms (the “new normal”)
• This starts a serious discussion on the hard work of recidivism reduction
How is Recidivism Measured:

1. Rearrest
2. Reincarceration
3. Overall Recidivism (first incident of either rearrest or reincarceration)

Note: Recidivism measures can capture both offender behavior and system responses to that behavior; multiple measures should be used in order to parse out offender behavior from system responses.
Figure 11: 3-Year Overall Recidivism Rates by County in Pennsylvania

Overall Recidivism Rate

- Less than 48%
- 48% - 52%
- 53% - 56%
- 57% - 61%
- More than 61%
# Recidivism Report

## Table 12: 3-Year Recidivism Rates by Commitment Crime Type for 2008 Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>3-Year Rearrests</th>
<th>3-Year Reincarcerations</th>
<th>3-Year Overall Recidivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder/Manslaughter</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Rape</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft/Larceny</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: Part I</strong></td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>2,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assault</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Property</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sexual Offenses</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offenses</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Breach</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II Other</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: Part II</strong></td>
<td>3,914</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>3,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>6,631</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>5,656</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recidivism Report

Figure 19: 3-Year Rearrest Rates as a Percent of Total Rearrests

- Public Order/Other: 32%
- Violent: 17%
- Property: 22%
- Drugs: 29%
## Table 15: 3-Year Rearrest by Commitment and Rearrest Crime Types (2008 Releases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type for Original Commitment</th>
<th>Rearrest Crime Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>Public Order/Other</td>
<td>No Rearrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order/Other</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Recidivism Report

## Table 19: 2010 Pennsylvania Crime Types by Released Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrests of Released Inmates in 2010</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>4,661</td>
<td>5,087</td>
<td>12,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Arrests in 2010</td>
<td>20,275</td>
<td>48,739</td>
<td>51,443</td>
<td>120,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Arrests Attributable to Released Inmates</td>
<td><strong>12.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 20: 2010 Pennsylvania Crime Types by Released Offenders As a Ratio of General Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest Rate for Released Inmates in 2010</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>5,403</td>
<td>5,896</td>
<td>14,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest Rate for General Population in 2010</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio (Released Inmate/General Public)</td>
<td><strong>14-to-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>11-to-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>11-to-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>12-to-1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 21: Cost Savings by Reduction in 1-Year Recidivism Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Year Reincarceration Rate</th>
<th>Annual Bed Days</th>
<th>Annual Cost Savings (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced by 1 Percentage Points</td>
<td>48,768</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced by 5 Percentage Points</td>
<td>234,930</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced by 10 Percentage Points</td>
<td>475,035</td>
<td>$44.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Corrections

Historical Backdrop:

• PA DOC spends more than $100 million/year on its community corrections system

• 14 state run Centers, and more than 40 contract Centers

• A 2009 evaluation by University of Cincinnati found poor results - parolees going through a Center did worse in terms of recidivism than if they would have just gone straight home after prison
Two Methodological Considerations to Address:

1. Selection bias in decision of who to send to community corrections
   - Method: Only examined “Parole To Approved Home Plan”; considered robust set of “control” variables
   - Results: Didn’t make a difference

2. Closer Monitoring in Centers vs. Street
   - Method: Only looked at recidivism after successful Center discharge, but this leads to a separate selection problem (i.e., successful discharges a select group)
   - Results: Mixed; made somewhat of a difference
## Community Corrections

### Table 26: Modeled Overall Recidivism Rates by Parole Release Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release Year</th>
<th>6-Month Overall Recidivism</th>
<th>1-Year Overall Recidivism</th>
<th>3-Year Overall Recidivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parole to Street</td>
<td>Parole to Center</td>
<td>Parole to Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 Releases</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 Releases</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 Releases</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 27: Modeled Overall Recidivism Rates by Six Month Survival Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole Type</th>
<th>Overall Recidivism Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole To Center</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 Month</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to &lt;3 Months</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to &lt;6 Months</td>
<td>15.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole To Street</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Parole To Center 3 to <6 Months 1-Year Overall Recidivism rate is significantly different from Parole To Street at p < .05.
Measuring Performance

- “Performance Contracting” for contract Community Corrections Centers

- Under new contracts, Centers are required to maintain a baseline recidivism rate
  - Centers that reduce their recidivism rate below the baseline will be paid extra $$ per offender (1% increase in per diem rate)
  - Centers that increase their recidivism rate above the baseline will receive a warning in the first 6-month period, and will have their contract canceled in the second consecutive 6-month period above baseline
Measuring Performance

Considerations:

- The baseline is a range (+/- 1 standard deviation)
- Program Completion Rates considered in tandem
- Consideration of risk level composition of Center (based on LSI-R); three risk composition groups
- “Overall recidivism” measure used
- Only recidivism after successful discharge
- 6 month follow-up
Measuring Performance

Results from the first “marking period”:

- The overall recidivism rate went down 16%
- 11 of the 46 Centers (24%) significantly reduced their recidivism below baseline, and received the 1% incentive
- Only 1 of the 46 Centers received a warning for increasing their recidivism above baseline
- The recidivism drop for the contract Centers during this time period was nearly 4 times that of the State run Centers
- It is estimated that perhaps as many as 58 criminal victimizations in PA were prevented in just a short 3-month period as a result
- Seems to be early evidence that contractors are responding to incentives and that incentives might work to reduce recidivism
Webinar: Improving Recidivism as a Performance Measure

Ohio and Recidivism—Context, Evaluation, and Performance
Ohio Dept. of Rehab. & Correction

- DRC Vision—To reduce crime in Ohio
- DRC Mission—To reduce recidivism among those we touch
Ohio DRC and recidivism:
1. Create a climate where reduction of recidivism is one of the key concerns of every staff member and many other parts of the criminal justice system.
2. Use recidivism, controlling for risk, to measure quality of actual performance.
3. Develop ways of using recidivism as a prison performance measure.
Ohio DRC and recidivism

To make recidivism a real emphasis, an agency needs to have recidivism available. DRC has worked to develop recidivism information for several different aspects of corrections that touch DRC.
Ohio DRC & recidivism– an emphasis

• Basic report for Exits from Prison (3 year, back to Ohio prison)
• Exits from prison sorted by commitment county
• % of exits from “parole” to prison for parole unit
• % of persons in funded community alternatives who end up coming to prison
• % admissions from each county that are technical probation violators
Ohio DRC & recidivism— an emphasis

Comments on current reports:
-- Rates are not comparable between most reports, especially pre- and post prison.
-- The underlying databases are useful for broader studies and program evaluations.
-- These reports are not used to “judge” operating units. They do not include “risk.” They help point toward issues to consider.
The University of Cincinnati worked with DRC to evaluate funded community programs in 2002 and 2007 (published 2010). These studies did take risk into account. Programs which showed no or minimal improvement over the two periods (and other measures) saw funding end. The second of those studies is on the web at http://www.drc.ohio.gov/Public/UC%20Report.pdf
DRC & recidivism– prison performance

For decades the assumption has been that what goes on in a prison doesn’t really affect an inmate’s pattern of offending after prison. So why develop a recidivism rate for each prison?

Recent evidence suggests that an inmate’s prison time does make a difference. This is not just program activity.
DRC & recidivism– prison performance

Building a prison performance recidivism indicator

-- From what prison did the inmate exit?
-- How long was the prisoner at that prison?
-- How short a time in prison overall?

In its pilot Ohio used the last prison; only inmates with at least 6 months in prison were used. Stays had to be at least 70% of term in the exit prison. (85% also used as a cutoff.)
DRC & recidivism– prison performance

How do you control for risk?
If you are trying to measure institutional impact, you don’t want to include aspects under the prison’s control as part of the statistical control.
Ohio is using:
-- age & sex of those released.
-- validated risk scores.
-- security levels.
-- under supervision?
## DRC & recidivism– prison performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Level 2 Male Prisons-- Recidivism by Prison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example-- Recidivism by Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAP risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCI</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCF</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCI</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECI</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCI</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICI</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCI</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAEC I</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Positive numbers better than expected.  
Negative numbers worse than expected.
## Table 2

### Level 2 Male Prisons—Recidivism by Prison

### Example—Recidivism by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Recidivism</th>
<th>Actual Recidivism</th>
<th>3 Year Age</th>
<th>Recidivism (5 year smoothed)</th>
<th>Difference*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>40.83</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCI</td>
<td>39.03</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>41.43</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCF</td>
<td>65.23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI</td>
<td>42.29</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCI</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECI</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCI</td>
<td>32.34</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICI</td>
<td>31.42</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCI</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAECI</td>
<td>34.51</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Positive numbers better than expected.

Negative numbers worse than expected.
# DRC & recidivism— prison performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison</th>
<th>%-age</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Recidivism</th>
<th>Difference*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCI</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCF</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCI</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECI</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCI</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICI</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCI</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAECI</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Positive numbers better than expected.
Negative numbers worse than expected.
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recidivism</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Security Level</th>
<th>Lvl. 1A</th>
<th>Lvl. 1B</th>
<th>Lvl. 2</th>
<th>Lvl. 3</th>
<th>Lvl. 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCI</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCF</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACI</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCI</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECI</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCI</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICI</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCI</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAECI</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Positive numbers better than expected.
Negative numbers worse than expected.
DRC & recidivism—prison performance
DRC & recidivism—prison performance

The global measure—(draft previous page)
-- Sorting procedures borrowed from FL DOC.
-- Assisted by Dr. Anirudh Ruhil of Ohio University.
-- Similar to value-added analysis from education.
-- 2011 one year results. Multi-variate controls.
-- Yes or no outcome (logistic regression used).
-- Odds ratio. Higher than 1.0 means worse than expected; lower than 1.0 is better than expected.
DRC & recidivism– prison performance

Why will it be difficult to turn this research into a routine performance measure?

Flaws:

-- Only portion of all releases (2008 numbers: 70 percent cutoff– 44 %; 85 percent cutoff– 35 %);
-- The system isn’t intuitive (not obvious to users);
-- Even two years is a long time for feedback loop;
-- There are still many factors uncontrolled.

Testing is still going on.