

# Pre-release Termination and Post-release Recidivism Rates of Colorado's Probationers: FY 2001 Releases

A report in compliance with Footnote 139 of the 2002 Appropriations Bill, HB02-1420

November 1, 2002

Prepared by

*Division of Probation Services,  
Research and Evaluation Unit  
State Court Administrator's Office  
Colorado Judicial Branch*

**Pre-release Termination and Post-release  
Recidivism Rates of Colorado's Probationers:  
FY 2001 Releases**

*A report submitted to the General Assembly's  
Joint Budget Committee to satisfy the conditions  
of Footnote 139 of the 2002 Appropriations Bill, HB 02-1420*

November 1, 2002

Prepared by

Suzanne Pullen, Manager, Research and Evaluation Unit

Colorado Judicial Branch

Gerald A. Marroney, State Court Administrator  
Vern Fogg, Director, Division of Probation Services

## FOOTNOTE 139

This report satisfies the conditions laid out in Footnote 139 of the General Assembly's 2002 Appropriations Bill, HB 02-1420:

*The Judicial Department, Probation and Related Services -- The Judicial Department is requested to provide by November 1 of each year a report on pre release rates of recidivism and unsuccessful terminations and post-release recidivism rates among offenders in all segments of the probation population, including*

- *adult and juvenile intensive supervision,*
- *adult and juvenile minimum, medium, and maximum supervision,*
- *the female offender program, and*
- *the specialized drug offender program.*

*The department is requested to include information about the disposition of pre-release failures and post-release recidivists, including*

- *how many offenders are incarcerated (in different kinds of facilities) and*
- *how many return to probation as the result of violations.*

For the seventh consecutive year, the Judicial Branch's Division of Probation Services has met the conditions of the above footnote by preparing a report on recidivism. This report stands as an independent document intended to fulfill the requirements contained in footnote 139 of the 2002 Appropriations Bill.

***Pre-release Termination and Post-release  
Recidivism Rates of Colorado's Probationers:  
FY 2001 Releases***

## **Executive Summary**

### **Introduction**

The Judicial Branch's Division of Probation Services annually prepares a report on recidivism among probationers. This executive summary provides an overview of the findings of the full report on the pre-release failure and one-year post-release recidivism for probationers terminated during FY2001.

This report uses two definitions of recidivism: one that pertains to pre-release recidivism/failure and the second pertaining to recidivism post-release. These are defined as follows:

Pre-release recidivism/failure:

*An adjudication or conviction for a felony or misdemeanor, or a technical violation relating to a criminal offense, while under supervision in a criminal justice program.*

Post-release recidivism:

*A filing for a felony or misdemeanor within one year of termination from program placement for a criminal offense.*

### **Research Questions**

The General Assembly's footnote, requiring this study, requests the following research questions be answered.

1. What proportion of probationers were terminated from probation for the commission of a new crime (pre-release recidivism)? What proportion of probationers were terminated for a technical violation (pre-release failure)? Finally, what proportion of probationers successfully terminated?
2. What proportion of probationers had a juvenile delinquency petition or a criminal case filed within one year of termination of probation (post-release recidivism)?
3. What are the differences in pre-release and post-release recidivism rates for the following groups:
  - regular probationers in each supervision level,
  - probationers in each of the specialized probation programs (adult and juvenile intensive supervision probation, the adult female offender program, and the specialized drug offender program)?

4. What is the overall failure rate of juvenile and adult probationers? That is, when unsuccessful terminations (both new crime and technical violations) are combined with post-release recidivism, what is the overall failure rate for probationers who terminated in FY2001? Also, where are probationers placed upon failure?

## Findings

### 1. *Probation Termination: Success and Failure (pre-release recidivism/failure).*

- Successful termination rates have remained relatively stable over the last several years. Approximately three-quarters of youth (75.6%) and slightly more than two-thirds of adult probationers (70.4%) terminate successfully.
- Youth on probation terminated for technical violations of probation in 19.2% of cases and adults failed for technical violations in 25.3% of the cases.
- Similar to past years, youth terminated for the commission of a new crime in 5.2% of the cases whereas adults failed for the commission of a new crime in 4.4% of the cases.

### 2. *Probation's post-release recidivism rate, one year after termination.*

- For offenders released from regular probation supervision, 19.5% of youth and 11.3% of adults received a new filing within one year of termination from probation. These recidivism rates increased by two-and-a-half times for youth and nearly doubled for adults. Criminal justice literature supports the notion that these unprecedented high recidivism rates are likely related to the state of Colorado's economy.

### 3. Differences in pre- and post-release failure by supervision level.

- For both youth and adults, those supervised at the maximum supervision level and those classified as administrative cases (a classification category used to denote offenders who are under the jurisdiction of probation, but who may be currently supervised by other agencies, including community corrections or county jails or detention centers) were the most likely to fail both pre-release and post-release. The higher failure rate among administrative cases is not surprising, given the range of offenders included in this classification category, which includes a mixture of risk levels and supervision outside of probation. Similarly, the higher rate of failure among maximum level probationers is consistent with risk classification tools, in which high risk/maximum level supervision offenders are often more than twice as likely as those classified at lower supervision levels to commit a new crime while under supervision.
- Among the four specialized probation programs, Juvenile Intensive Supervision Probation (JISP), Adult Intensive Supervision Probation (AISP), the Specialized Drug Offender Program (SDOP) and the Female Offender Program (FOP), pre- and post-release failures are greater than on regular probation supervision, which is expected, given that the specialize programs are designed to supervise higher risk cases.

4. *Overall success and failure rates among Colorado probationers: How many offenders terminated supervision successfully and remained crime-free (measured by a new court filing) within one year of termination?*
- Slightly more than two-thirds (68.6%) of juveniles remain successful one year after release from probation.
  - Just under half of JISP terminations (49.1%) were successful.
  - Just less than two-thirds of adult probationers (64.0%) are successful one year post-release.
  - Within adult specialized programs, slightly over half of all offenders terminated from these programs were both successfully terminated from the programs and have remained successful one year after release.

## **Summary**

The findings in this report highlight the fact that probation programs are successful in helping offenders remain crime free during periods of supervision. Indeed, juvenile and adult probationers were successful (they were successfully terminated from probation and remained crime free for one year after termination) in nearly two-thirds of all cases, (60.9% of juveniles, 62.4% of adults). Both adults and juveniles classified as high risk are less likely to successfully terminate, and less likely to remain crime-free after termination than their lower-risk counterparts.

Post-termination recidivism rates increased significantly during the last year. Given the downturn in both the state and national economy, and the significant increase in the unemployment rate in Colorado during 2001 and 2002, chances are significant that these findings are related to changes in the economy.

Across specialized programs, those programs designed to divert youth and adults who would otherwise be incarcerated, overall success rates range from 44.9% for the Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program to 57.7% for the Female Offender Program. When considering only those offenders terminated from specialized probation programs altogether, success rates range from 20% - 25%. These lower rates are heavily influenced by the pre-release failure rates and the most common practice of “stepping down” offenders from specialized programs to regular probation supervision. The largest type of failure among all specialized programs is in the area of technical violations. Statewide responses to technical violations continue to be on the priority list of supervision issues to address.

The Division of Probation Services and probation departments statewide take seriously the need to protect the public’s safety and, in particular, prevent probationers from engaging in future criminal behavior. Recidivism is an important performance measure for the criminal justice system. The public expects that offenders supervised within the criminal justice system are being supervised effectively.

## INTRODUCTION

On June 30, 2002 there were 51,360 offenders on probation in Colorado, including 42,235 adult and 9,125 juvenile probationers in both regular and specialized programs. Probation officers across the state work within a range of regular and specialized probation programs, working to assess, supervise, educate and refer their probationers to a host of treatment and skill-building programs. Probation officers use validated instruments to assess offenders according to the level of risk they pose to the community, their ability to function in pro-social ways and the skills necessary to make amends to victims and communities they have harmed. Probationers are supervised within the community according to their assessed risk level, and they are referred to appropriate community-based treatment and skill-based programs, based upon their assessed needs. The most recent analysis indicates that probation officers supervising general caseloads maintain an average caseload of well over 200 for adults and 75 for juveniles, while those supervising specialized caseloads (Intensive Supervision Probation, Specialized Drug Offender Program and the Female Offender Program) are capped at 20-25 probationers per officer<sup>1</sup>.

Colorado probation's *Statement of Common Ground* emphasizes the need to maintain community safety through appropriate supervision and attention to the risk and needs of offenders *as well as* the need to identify and serve crime victims and the community at large. Embedded in this philosophy of restorative justice is the need to hold offenders accountable for their criminal behavior, and to require offenders to repair the harm caused to the victim and/or the community. Additionally, a restorative justice philosophy invites crime victims and community members to actively participate in the restoration response.

Under the framework of restorative justice, crime is believed to be a community problem, and, therefore, community involvement should be encouraged. Additionally, the presence of informal social controls, and the collaborative efforts of community agents and criminal justice agencies are believed to significantly impact crime (Fulton, 1996). Restorative justice activities implemented in Colorado probation include involving offenders in meaningful community service endeavors and other offender reparation activities.

The Division of Probation Services routinely conducts performance reviews of the activities in probation departments across the state. The reviews focus on two primary areas undertaken by probation departments: 1) investigation and assessment and 2) case management/supervision. In addition to these major probation responsibilities, recent reviews have looked at issues of data quality, workload levels and caseload distribution. Statewide performance reviews routinely indicate that, on average, Colorado's probation departments routinely perform at or above 80% of the expected compliance level. These findings indicate that probationers are supervised according to standards and guidelines.

It is important to note that all of probation's specialized programs were designed to be alternatives to incarceration. Thus, offenders placed in these programs have higher

---

<sup>1</sup> These figures were obtained from the Colorado Judicial Branch FY2002 Budget Request preparation documents, and are based upon distributions of staff expected to supervise offenders (versus preparing pre-sentence investigation reports).

levels of risk (risk is related to the probability of program failure and the commission of a new crime), and typically have higher levels of identified needs. For these reasons, program success levels are expected to be lower for offenders in specialized programs than for those on regular probation.

## **OVERVIEW**

The Colorado General Assembly first requested the Judicial Branch's Division of Probation Services (DPS) to prepare an annual report on pre- and post-release recidivism rates of offenders terminated from probation in 1996. While this mandate has not been funded, the Division of Probation Services has made every effort to produce a report that is both useful to the General Assembly and to probation departments in Colorado.

Based upon a recommendation of the State Auditor's Office in its December 1998 audit of juvenile probation, the Division of Probation Services convened a group of representatives from criminal justice agencies to develop a uniform definition of recidivism. With the use of this definition, policy makers can more easily compare outcomes across state criminal justice agencies in Colorado. The group agreed on a definition of pre-release recidivism and post-release recidivism. These definitions are as follows:

Pre-release recidivism:

*An adjudication or conviction for a felony or misdemeanor, or a technical violation relating to a criminal offense, while under supervision in a criminal justice program.*

Post-release recidivism:

*A filing for a felony or misdemeanor within one year of termination from program placement for a criminal offense.*

These definitions are consistent with the definition of recidivism used by the Division of Probation Services since 1998, thus comparisons can easily be made between the probation outcomes reported in 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001 and those reported here.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The 2002 recidivism study is based upon the population of probationers terminated from probation during the 2001 fiscal year. This design allows for one full year of follow-up to determine, *for those who successfully terminated*, what proportion received a filing for a new criminal offense within the year following their termination. In addition to recidivism findings for the 2001 cohort of probationers terminated, the current report, based upon further recommendations by the State Auditor's Office, presents disposition and placement findings for those who recidivated or failed pre-release from the current, 2001 cohort.



### *Data*

For the 2001 termination cohort, a query was written to extract a data file of all adult and juvenile probationers who terminated probation during FY2001. The data file was generated from the Judicial Branch's ICON (Integrated Colorado On-Line Network) management information system.

The termination files were combined with a file of all misdemeanor and felony criminal cases and juvenile delinquency petitions filed in Colorado's district and county courts in FY2001 and FY2002 to derive post-release recidivism rates for those probationers who successfully completed probation. The recidivism period is limited to a uniform one-year time at risk. Pre-release failure rates were derived based upon the type of termination (e.g. termination for technical violation or new crime).

### *Analysis*

To meet the request of the General Assembly, the following research questions guided the analysis.

1. What proportion of probationers were terminated from probation for the commission of a new crime (pre-release recidivism)? What proportion of probationers were terminated for a technical violation (pre-release failure)? Finally, what proportion of probationers successfully terminated?
2. What proportion of probationers had a juvenile delinquency petition or a criminal case filed within one year of termination of probation (post-release recidivism)?
3. What are the differences in pre-release and post-release recidivism rates for the following groups:
  - regular probationers in each supervision level,
  - probationers in each of the specialized probation programs (adult and juvenile intensive supervision probation, the adult female offender program, and the specialized drug offender program)?
4. What is the overall failure rate of juvenile and adult probationers? That is, when unsuccessful terminations (both new crime and technical violations) are combined with post-release recidivism, what is the overall failure rate for probationers who terminated in FY2001? Also, where are probationers placed upon failure?

To answer the research questions posed, we first disaggregated the data by offender case type (juvenile and adult). Second, placement categories were created for adult and juvenile probationers, designating their supervision level or specialized program type at termination. The data were further disaggregated by termination type (success/fail), and the failures were further analyzed to determine, for pre-release failures, where the offender was ultimately placed and, for those successfully terminated from probation, the proportion who received a criminal filing for a new crime.

New data for FY 2001 releases allow us to determine which proportion of offenders in specialized programs were terminated from probation and which offenders were. Termination data for both situations are presented in this report, to provide additional information to the reader. These data will be described in the pertinent sections.

**1. What proportion of probationers were terminated from probation for the commission of a new crime (pre-release recidivism)? What proportion of probationers were terminated for a technical violation (pre-release failure)? Finally, what proportion of probationers successfully terminated?**

Table 1 compares the termination data for juveniles and adults terminating from regular probation programs during FY2000 and FY2001. Overall, successful termination rates increased somewhat between FY2000 and FY2001. It is not unusual for termination figures to vary by one or two percentage points from year to year, however. There is no clear trend to indicate more failures or more successes. Rather, successful termination rates have remained relatively stable over the last several years. Approximately three-quarters of youth and slightly more than two-thirds of adult probationers terminate successfully.

**Table 1  
REGULAR PROBATION  
Juvenile and Adult Probation Comparison  
FY2000 and FY2001 Terminations**

TERMINATION TYPE	JUVENILE FY 2000	JUVENILE FY 2001	ADULT FY2000	ADULT FY2001
Successful	74.4% (4,402)	75.6% (4,246)	68.6% (9,932)	70.4% (10,898)
Failure: Technical	20.6% (1,217)	19.2% (1,081)	27.7% (4,005)	25.3% (3,914)
Failure: New Crime	5.0% (299)	5.2% (292)	3.7% (538)	4.3% (675)
TOTAL	100% (5,918)	100% (5,619)	100% (14,475)	100% (15,487)

**2. What proportion of probationers had a juvenile delinquency petition or a criminal case filed on them within one year of termination of probation (post-release recidivism)?**

Post-release recidivism analysis was conducted on only those probationers who terminated probation successfully. Table 2 reflects the post-release recidivism rate for all juveniles and adults, respectively.

Table 2 compares, for regular probationers who successfully terminated probation during FY2000 and FY2001, the proportion that remained crime free and the proportion that had a new juvenile delinquency petition or criminal case filed against them within one year of termination from supervision. For the first time since we have been requested to

present recidivism findings to the General Assembly, there has been a significant increase in the proportion of post-probation release recidivism. Filings for a new crime among juvenile probationers successfully terminated from probation during FY2001 significantly increased compared to those released in FY2000. Similarly, the post-release recidivism rate for adult probationers increased at a greater rate than we have ever recorded. Specifically, approximately one in five juveniles (19.5%) and one in ten adults (11.3%) received a new criminal filing within one year of termination from probation in FY2001, compared to the FY2000 release cohort, in which 7.8% of juveniles and 6.8% of adults received new criminal filings.

This increase in post release recidivism is significant enough to warrant further investigation and discussion. Criminological literature shows a strong and longstanding correlation between economy, poverty and crime. Specifically, “we do know that property crime increases in recessions...(and) we know that individuals with worse economic prospects are more likely to be involved in crime and in the criminal justice system (Piehl, 1998:303). Additionally, in a weak job market, people who have a criminal record are likely to be less employable than those without a record (Donziger, 1996; Piehl, 1998). It is no surprise then, after a relatively long period with a booming state economy and a strong job market, that post-release recidivism rates have increased as our economy has taken a downturn.

**Table 2  
REGULAR PROBATION  
Comparison of Juvenile and Adult Successful Terminations  
And Proportion with New Case Filed  
FY2000 and FY2001 Terminations**

POST-RELEASE RECIDIVISM	JUVENILES FY2000	JUVENILES FY2001	ADULTS FY2000	ADULTS FY2001
New Case Filed	7.8% (343)	19.5% (827)	6.8% (673)	11.3% (1,227)
No New Case Filed	92.2% (4,059)	80.5% (3,419)	93.2% (9259)	88.7% (9,671)
TOTAL	100% (4,402)	100% (4,246)	100% (9,932)	100% (10,898)

- 3. What are the differences in pre-release and post-release recidivism rates for the following groups:**
- **regular probationers in each supervision level,**
  - **probationers in each of the specialized probation programs (adult and juvenile intensive supervision probation, the adult female offender program, and the specialized drug offender program)?**

**Pre-release Recidivism and Failure Rates**

Probation uses the LSI (Level of Supervision Inventory) to classify adults according to risk level and the CYO-LSI (Colorado Young Offender Level of Supervision Inventory) to classify juvenile offenders. The LSI is a research-based reliable and valid risk instrument that helps predict outcome, success on supervision and recidivism. The LSI is commonly used by probation and parole officers and other correctional workers in the

United States and abroad. The CYO-LSI is based on similar research used to develop the LSI, but it was developed by Colorado criminal justice professionals and validated on a Colorado sample of juvenile offenders. Both of these classification tools result in one of three supervision levels: minimum, medium or maximum. In addition, probation uses the management classification level of “administrative” to denote those offenders who are under the jurisdiction of probation, but who may be currently supervised by other agencies, including community corrections or county jail for adults; and residential child care facilities for juveniles. The administrative classification includes offenders of all risk levels, including a high proportion assessed as high risk. Some probationers classified as administrative may also have completed all of the court requirements for probation, but still have outstanding restitution or fees to pay.

The higher rate of failure among maximum level probationers is consistent with risk classification tools, in which high risk/maximum level supervision offenders are often more than twice as likely as those classified at lower supervision levels to commit a new crime while under supervision. It is important to note that the LSI and CYO-LSI are instruments in which the probationer is scored on a number of items, the sum of which comprise a total score. The probationer is initially assigned a risk level based upon the category (minimum, medium or maximum) in his or her score falls. On average, probationers are re-assessed every six months, and supervision strategies change with the corresponding changes in the risk level score. Classification categories are determined according to policy,<sup>2</sup> which has set the scores that correspond to each risk level. It is common to revise the “cut-points” corresponding to risk levels on a regular basis.

Tables 3 and 4 reflect the termination rates for juveniles and adults, by risk/classification level. These tables compare the overall termination rates for FY2001 with those in FY2000. Overall, 75.6% of juvenile probationers terminated successfully from probation during FY2001, which is slightly higher than the 74.4% success rate reported for youth in FY2000. Of juveniles that failed on probation, 19.2% failed for violating the terms and conditions of probation (including absconding from supervision), and 5.2% failed by committing a new crime. These figures are very similar to the 20.6% technical failure and 4.0% new crime failure reported in FY2000. As has been true historically, juveniles supervised at the maximum and administrative levels on regular probation had the lowest success rates (54.0% and 53.9%, respectively). Youth classified at these two levels represented the highest proportion of offenders terminating for both technical violations and the commission of a new crime, however, those classified at the maximum supervision level were terminated for the commission of a new crime more frequently than those classified as administrative cases. It is expected that those classified at the higher risk levels would fail at a greater rate than the lower classification levels; indeed, that is the reason we develop levels of risk. Similarly, it is not surprising that youth *classified as administrative* cases fail at higher rates, given that this caseload constitutes a large number of cases that are either higher risk or are supervised by another entity in tandem with probation (such as detention or other placement facilities), or both.

---

<sup>2</sup> The policy determining risk categories is typically based on research that determines where cut-points are most appropriately set, given actual failure rates among the study group.

Table 4 indicates that JISP clients succeeded 51.6% of the time<sup>3</sup>, but failed for committing technical violations in just over one-third of the cases (37.9%). These findings are very consistent with FY2000 termination results, of 52.1% success, 35.9% technical failure and 12.0% failure for new crime. The JISP cohort failed due to the commission of a new crime 10.5% of the time. This higher failure rate among JISP probationers is not surprising, given that these juveniles are considered the most high risk offenders on probation, and often have the most severe levels of needs.<sup>4</sup> This classification of offender would also likely be committed in a Division of Youth Corrections facility in the absence of the JISP sentencing option.

**Table 3**  
**REGULAR PROBATION:**  
**Juvenile Probation Termination Type by Supervision Level – FY2001**  
**Compared with Overall Termination Type FY2000**

SUPERVISION LEVEL	JUVENILE PROBATIONERS TERMINATED			
	Success	Fail: Technical	Fail: New Crime	Total
<b>Juvenile Probationers Terminated FY2001</b>				
Regular: Administrative	53.9% (803)	38.1% (568)	8.0% (120)	100% (1,491)
Regular: Unclassified	85.9% (140)	13.5% (22)	.6% (1)	100% (163)
Regular: Minimum	92.4% (1,957)	6.3% (133)	1.3% (28)	100% (2,118)
Regular: Medium	81.0% (1,047)	14.2% (184)	4.8% (62)	100% (1,293)
Regular: Maximum	54.0% (298)	31.4% (173)	14.7% (81)	100% (552)
<b>TOTAL REGULAR PROBATION</b>	<b>75.6% (4,245)</b>	<b>19.2% (1,080)</b>	<b>5.2% (292)</b>	<b>100% (5,617)*</b>
<b>Juvenile Probationers Terminated FY2000</b>				
<b>TOTAL REGULAR PROBATION</b>	<b>74.4% (4,402)</b>	<b>20.6% (1,217)</b>	<b>5.0% (299)</b>	<b>100% (5,918)</b>

\*Missing data in some categories prohibits exact matches within certain categories. In this case, missing supervision level data in the Success and *Fail: Technical* categories result in lower totals than reported in Table 1. Missing data occurs when one piece of information is missing (was not entered by the probation officer) in an analysis requiring two or more pieces of information. For example, in this table, we might have the termination type (succeed or fail) but the supervision level may be missing. Missing data is likely to occur in various tables throughout this report.

<sup>3</sup> JISP clients successfully terminated included 25.9% who were successfully terminated from JISP and moved to regular supervision and 25.7% were successfully terminated from JISP and released from supervision.

<sup>4</sup> The Office of the State Auditor's report of findings from the 1998 audit of juvenile probation found that high risk juveniles on probation and on JISP frequently have high levels of needs as well.

**Table 4**  
**JUVENILE ISP:**  
**Termination Type – FY2001**  
**Compared with Juvenile ISP Termination Type FY2000**

PROGRAM	JUVENILE ISP PROBATIONERS TERMINATED				
	Success on JISP: Transfer to Regular Prob.	Success on JISP: Off Supervision	Fail: Technical	Fail: New Crime	Total
JISP <b>FY2001</b>	25.9% (104)	25.7% (103)	37.9% (152)	10.5% (42)	100% (401)
JISP <b>FY2000</b>	<b>52.1% (190)</b>		<b>35.9% (131)</b>	<b>12.0% (44)</b>	<b>100% (365)</b>

Table 5 reflects the pre-release termination status for regular adult offenders by supervision level. Similar to the juvenile probationers, adult probationers supervised at administrative and maximum levels<sup>5</sup> were the least likely to successfully terminate probation (53.3% and 45.5%, respectively). The higher failure rate among administrative cases is not surprising, given the range of offenders included in this classification category, which includes a mixture of risk levels and supervision outside of probation. Similarly, those classified at the maximum supervision level are considered to be at the highest risk for re-offense. Probationers who were last supervised at the administrative and maximum levels were by far the most likely to terminate due to technical violation as well as a new crime. Termination findings for FY2001 are consistent with those reported for FY2000 probation releases, in which a 68.6% success rate was reported.

---

<sup>5</sup> Higher rates of failure among those classified as administrative are expected, since this classification level comprises offenders of all risk levels, and actually denotes a supervision *classification* as opposed to *risk level*. In addition to comprising all levels of risk, these offenders were also likely to be under active supervision by another criminal justice entity, such as community corrections.

**Table 5**  
**REGULAR PROBATION:**  
**Adult Probation Termination Type by Supervision Level – FY2001**  
**Compared with Overall Termination Type FY2000**

SUPERVISION LEVEL	ADULT PROBATIONERS TERMINATED			
	Success	Fail: Technical	Fail: New Crime	Total
<b>Adult Probationers Terminated FY2001</b>				
Regular: Administrative	53.3% (3,457)	42.0% (2,725)	4.7% (301)	100% (6,483)
Regular: Unclassified	85.2% (775)	11.6% (106)	3.2% (29)	100% (910)
Regular: Minimum	92.4% (3,546)	6.1% (234)	1.5% (56)	100% (3,836)
Regular: Medium	82.9% (2,620)	13.3% (420)	3.8% (121)	100% (3,161)
Regular: Maximum	45.5% (499)	39.2% (430)	15.3% (168)	100% (1,097)
<b>TOTAL REGULAR PROBATION</b>	<b>70.4% (10,897)</b>	<b>25.3% (3,915)</b>	<b>4.4% (675)</b>	<b>100% (15,487)</b>
<b>Adult Probationers Terminated FY2000</b>				
<b>TOTAL REGULAR PROBATION</b>	<b>68.6% (9,932)</b>	<b>27.7% (4,005)</b>	<b>3.7% (538)</b>	<b>100% (14,475)</b>

**Table 6**  
**SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS:**  
**Adult Probation Termination Type by Program – FY2001**  
**Compared with Specialized Programs Termination Type FY2000**

TERMINATION TYPE	Success on Specialized Supervision: Transfer to Regular Prob.	Success on Specialized: Off Supervision	Fail: Technical Violation	Fail: New Crime	TOTAL
<b>FY2001 Specialized Programs Terminations</b>					
Adult ISP	43.5% (415)	12.3% (117)	32.4% (309)	11.8% (112)	100% (953)
Specialized Drug Offender Program	44.3% (105)	14.8% (35)	29.5% (70)	11.4% (27)	100% (237)
Female Offender Program	44.2% (49)	14.4% (16)	36.9% (41)	4.5% (5)	100% (111)
<b>FY2000 Specialized Programs Terminations</b>					
Adult ISP	56.1% (473)		32.0% (270)	11.9% (100)	100% (843)
Specialized Drug Offender Program	65.3% (145)		23.0% (51)	11.7% (26)	100% (222)
Female Offender Program	51.5% (67)		43.1% (56)	5.4% (7)	100% (130)

Table 6 presents termination data for adults supervised in specialized probation programs. The data indicate that offenders terminate successfully from specialized programs more than half of the time (to derive these figures, combine the first and second columns of figures in Table 6 which show a success rate of 55.8% for ISP, 59.1% for SDOP and 58.6% for FOP). With the exception of the Female Offender Program, success rates in specialized programs were slightly lower in FY2001 compared to FY2000.

Women offenders supervised in the Female Offender Program were the least likely group of specialized probationers to be revoked for the commission of a new crime. Women in the Female Offender Program were most likely to negatively terminate for a technical violation (36.9%), which includes those people who have absconded. The female population served in this program is, by design, a group of women who otherwise would have been sentenced to prison. Women in the criminal justice system are typically difficult to find appropriate services for, given their unique needs, including care for minor children and, often, high rates of substance abuse and victimization from domestic violence and economic needs (Donziger, 1996; Simon and Landis, 1991).

### **Post-release Recidivism Rates Among Probationers who Successfully Terminate**

To answer the second portion of question number three, we selected only those probationers who successfully terminated probation, and analyzed the data to determine what proportion had new cases filed in court. Tables 7 and 8 present the post-release recidivism findings for juveniles; Tables 9 and 10 present these findings for adults.

**Table 7**  
**REGULAR PROBATION:**  
**Juvenile Post-release Recidivism by Last Supervision Level – FY2001**  
**Compared with Overall Post-Release Recidivism Findings – FY2000**

JUVENILES WHO SUCCESSFULLY TERMINATED PROBATION			
SUPERVISION LEVEL	New Case Filed	No New Case Filed	Total
<b>FY2001 Successful Terminations</b>			
Regular: Administrative	16.9% (136)	83.1% (667)	100% (803)
Regular: Unclassified	35.7% (50)	64.3% (90)	100% (140)
Regular: Minimum	18.7% (367)	81.3% (1,591)	100% (1,958)
Regular: Medium	19.6% (205)	80.4% (842)	100% (1,047)
Regular: Maximum	23.2% (69)	76.8% (229)	100% (298)
<b>Total</b>	<b>19.5% (827)</b>	<b>80.5% (3,419)</b>	<b>100% (4,246)</b>
<b>FY2000 Successful Terminations</b>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>7.8% (343)</b>	<b>92.2% (4,059)</b>	<b>100% (4,402)</b>

Table 7 indicates that just under 20% (19.5%, n=827) of juveniles who terminated regular probation successfully went on to have a new delinquency petition filed in court within one year of termination. This is a significant change compared to post-release



behavior of youth terminated in FY2000, when less than 8% (7.8% n=343) of those successfully terminated went on to receive a new filing within one year.

Youth supervised at the unclassified and maximum supervision levels had the highest rate of recidivism (35.7% and 23.2%, respectively). Youth classified at the administrative level were the least likely to recidivate, with 16.9% obtaining a new delinquency or criminal petition within one year of termination.

**Table 8**  
**JUVENILE ISP:**  
**Post-release Recidivism by Last Supervision Level – FY2001**  
**Compared with Overall Post-Release Recidivism Findings – FY2000**

<b>JISP CLIENTS WHO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED PROBATION</b>			
PROGRAM	New Case Filed	No New Case Filed	Total
<b>JISP FY2001</b>	26.2% (27)	73.8% (76)	100% (103)
<b>JISP FY2000</b>	5.8% (11)	94.2% (179)	100% (190)

Table 8 indicates that just over one quarter (26.2%) of JISP clients who successfully terminated probation during FY2001 went on to have a new delinquency petition or criminal case filed in court within one year. This figure compares with 5.8% of those successfully terminated in FY2000. Note that, unlike in previous years' reports, this table represents only those 103 youth released from supervision are represented in this table. An additional 104 youth successfully completed the terms of JISP and were transferred to regular probation supervision during the study year. Outcome behavior for these youth will be included in the *regular supervision* population as they complete probation supervision.<sup>6</sup> If the 104 youth transferred to regular supervision were included in this analysis, they would most likely be included in the "No New Case Filed" column (making that column's n=180 and the "Total" column would equal 207), and that "New Case Filed" rate would be 13.0% (or 27/207). Despite the change in data reporting, the post-release failure rate among the Juvenile ISP population has increased significantly during the past year. As discussed earlier in this report, this change in recidivism behavior is likely influenced by changes in the state's economy.

---

<sup>6</sup> The addition of new codes in ICON now allow us to identify probationers who transfer from specialized program supervision to regular supervision. Data limitations did not allow for specific tracking of these offenders within the "regular supervision" cohort of offenders.

**Table 9**  
**REGULAR PROBATION:**  
**Adult Post-Release Recidivism by Last Supervision Level – FY2001**  
**Compared with Overall Post-Release Recidivism Findings – FY2000**

ADULTS WHO SUCCESSFULLY TERMINATED PROBATION			
SUPERVISION LEVEL	New Case Filed	No New Case Filed	Total
<b>FY2001 Successful Terminations</b>			
Regular: Administrative	11.5% (399)	88.5% (3,058)	100% (3,457)
Regular: Unclassified	11.1% (86)	88.9% (689)	100% (775)
Regular: Minimum	10.8% (383)	89.2% (3,163)	100% (3,546)
Regular: Medium	11.1% (290)	88.9% (2,330)	100% (2,620)
Regular: Maximum	13.6% (68)	86.4% (431)	100% (499)
<b>Total</b>	<b>11.3% (1,226)</b>	<b>88.7% (9,671)</b>	<b>100% (10,897)</b>
<b>FY2000 Successful Terminations</b>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>6.8% (673)</b>	<b>93.2% (9,259)</b>	<b>100% (9,932)</b>

Table 9 reflects that, overall, 11.3% of adult probationers who terminated successfully from probation during FY2001 were subsequently brought to court on new charges, compared to 6.8% of those successfully terminated in FY2000. Once again, this significant increase in post-release recidivism can likely be attributed to the state's recent change in economic conditions.

Those probationers last supervised at the maximum level were the most likely to have a new crime filed against them within one year of termination (13.6%). Among nearly 11,000 successful probation terminations, between 10% and 14% of offenders classified in each of these categories had a new filing.

Table 10 reflects, for specialized program participants who successfully terminated probation, the proportion that remained crime free and those who had a new criminal case filed against them within one year. Note that, as reported for the JISP cohort of terminated probationers, Table 10 reflects only those offenders completely terminated from specialized supervision, and not those transferred to regular probation for continued supervision, which accounts for nearly 45% of adults terminating specialized programs (see footnote 6 for an explanation of this). When the adult specialized cases that were transferred to regular probation are included as "No New Case Filed," the post-release recidivism rates for this group of offenders is reduced to 1.5% for FOP, 1.7% for AISP and 4.2% for SDOP.

**Table 10**  
**SPECIALIZED PROBATION PROGRAMS:**  
**Adult Successful Terminations and**  
**Proportion with New Case Filed – FY2001**  
**Compared with Overall Post-Release Recidivism Findings – FY2000**

POST-RELEASE RECIDIVISM	New Case Filed	No New Case Filed	TOTAL
<b>Adult Specialized Program Successful Terminations FY2001</b>			
Adult ISP	7.6% (9)	92.4% (109)	100% (118)
Specialized Drug Offender Program	16.7% (6)	83.3% (30)	100% (36)
Female Offender Program	6.3% (1)	93.7% (15)	100% (16)
<b>Adult Specialized Program Successful Terminations FY2000</b>			
Adult ISP	2.8% (13)	97.2% (460)	100% (473)
Specialized Drug Offender Program	2.8% (4)	97.2% (141)	100% (145)
Female Offender Program	0% (0)	100% (67)	100% (67)

As in previous years, (see previous recidivism findings reported in 2000 and 2001), women who terminated successfully from the Female Offender Program perform better than adult offenders released from the other specialized probation programs. Only one woman in the current study received a new filing during the one-year at-risk period. One in six offenders who successfully terminated from the specialized drug offender program received a new court filing and those terminating from the Adult Intensive Supervision Program were filed on for the commission of a new crime in less than eight percent of the cases.

**4. What is the overall failure rate of juvenile and adult probationers? That is, when unsuccessful terminations (both new crime and technical violations) are combined with post-release recidivism, what is the failure rate of probationers? Also, where are probationers placed upon failure?**

To answer the fourth question for the FY2001 termination cohort, we combined the pre-release and post-release failure categories to arrive at an overall probation failure rate by supervision level. Additionally, we combined the pre-release recidivism rate and the post-release recidivism rate to derive an overall recidivism rate. Finally, for comparison's sake, the overall figures for the FY2000 study period are presented for each study group. These findings are presented, for juveniles and adults.

**Table 11**  
**REGULAR PROBATION**  
**Overall Juvenile Program Failures and Successes – FY2001**  
**Compared with Overall Post-Release Recidivism Findings – FY2000**

SUPERVISION LEVEL	Pre-release Failure: Technical	Pre-release Failure: New Crime	Post-release Recidivism	Successful	Total
<b>Juvenile Terminations FY2001</b>					
Regular: Administrative	38.1% (568)	8.0% (120)	9.1% (136)	44.8% (667)	100% (1,491)
Regular: Unclassified	13.5% (22)	.6% (1)	30.7% (50)	55.2% (90)	100% (163)
Regular: Minimum	6.3% (133)	1.3% (28)	17.3% (367)	75.1% (1,590)	100% (2,118)
Regular: Medium	14.2% (184)	4.8% (62)	15.9% (205)	65.1% (842)	100% (1,293)
Regular: Maximum	31.3% (173)	14.6% (81)	12.5% (69)	41.6% (230)	100% (552)
<b>TOTAL REGULAR PROBATION</b>	<b>19.2% (1,080)</b>	<b>5.2% (292)</b>	<b>14.7% (827)</b>	<b>60.9% (3,419)</b>	<b>100% (5,617)</b>
<b>Juvenile Terminations FY2000</b>					
<b>TOTAL REGULAR PROBATION</b>	<b>20.6% (1,217)</b>	<b>5.0% (299)</b>	<b>5.8% (343)</b>	<b>68.6% (4,059)</b>	<b>100% (5,918)</b>

**Table 12**  
**JUVENILE ISP:**  
**Overall Program Failure and Success – FY2001**  
**Compared with Overall Post-Release Recidivism Findings – FY2000**

PROGRAM	Pre-release Failure: Technical	Pre-release Failure: New Crime	Post-release Recidivism	Success (off JISP to Regular Prob.)	Successful	Total
<b>JISP FY2001</b>	37.9% (152)	10.5% (42)	6.7% (27)	44.9% (180)		100% (401)
<b>JISP FY2001 – off supervision</b>	51.2% (152)	14.1% (42)	9.1% (27)	NA	25.6% (76)	100% (297)
<b>JSIP FY2000</b>	35.9% (131)	12.0% (44)	3.0% (11)	49.1% (179)		100% (365)

The overall success rate for juvenile probationers in FY2001 was 60.9%, compared with 68.6% in FY2000. The category with the greatest change between the two study years was the post-release recidivism category, which increased from 5.8% for FY2000 releases to 14.7% of all FY2001 releases. Not surprisingly, those youth supervised at the maximum and classified as administrative cases had the lowest success rates (41.6% and 44.7%, respectively).

Table 12 presents two ways of looking at success rates for juveniles who terminated from JISP during FY2001, and compares the success rate with youth terminated from JISP in FY2000. The first row includes in the JISP success rate those youth who successfully completed JISP and continued on supervision in the regular probation

program. The second row presents success rates for only those youth who left supervision altogether. The third row presents success data for JISP youth terminated in FY2000. When all JISP releases are considered (including those transferred to regular supervision), the program shows a 44.9% success rate, compared to 49.1% in FY2000. When only those who were terminated from all supervision at the point of leaving JISP are considered, the program's success rate is a much lower 25.6%.

It is the most common practice among probation departments statewide to "step offenders down" from the intensive level of supervision in specialized programs to less intensive levels on regular probation prior to release from supervision. Given that nearly one-quarter of youth are transferred from JISP to regular probation supervision, it is most accurate to consider those youth in the overall success rate, however it is useful to look at the data both ways. As explained earlier, lower rates of success are to be expected with higher risk cases. In the absence of a program like JISP, or without the ability to place youth under extremely close supervision conditions, these youth would likely be placed in commitment facilities with the Division of Youth Corrections. In this respect, JISP is cost-effective with these very high risk and high need youth, whereby all of these youth would likely have been placed in DYC at a cost of \$56,341 per year compared to \$3,746 on JISP<sup>7</sup>.

**Table 13**  
**JUVENILE REGULAR PROBATION and JISP**  
**Placement of Juvenile Probationers Who**  
**Terminated Probation for Technical Violations or a New Crime: FY2001**

PLACEMENT	Incarceration: Dept. of Corrections or Div. of Youth Corrections	Community Corrections	Detention/ County Jail	Supervised Probation	Fines, Fees, Comm. Service, Other (includes no sentence)	TOTAL
<b>Pre-Release Failure: Technical Violation</b>						
Juvenile Regular Probation	3.0% (32)	.3% (3)	2.7% (29)	45.0% (486)	49.0% (530)	100% (1,080)
JISP	2.6% (4)	0% (0)	.6% (1)	44.1% (67)	52.7% (80)	100% (152)
<b>Pre-Release Failure: New Crime</b>						
Juvenile Regular Probation	13.7% (40)	1.0% (3)	5.8% (17)	51.7% (151)	27.8% (81)	100% (292)
JISP	31.0% (13)	0% (0)	0% (0)	54.8% (23)	14.2% (6)	100% (42)

<sup>7</sup> Figures are from the Judicial Branch's FY2001 budget request.

**Table 14**  
**JUVENILE REGULAR PROBATIONERS and JISP**  
**Placement of Juvenile Probationers Who Successfully Completed Probation**  
**and had a New Filing Post-Release: FY2001**

PLACEMENT	Incarceration: Dept. of Corrections or Div. of Youth Corrections	Community Corrections	Detention/ County Jail	Supervised Probation	Fines, Fees, Comm. Service, Other (includes no sentence)	TOTAL
Juvenile Regular Probation	1.3% (11)	.3% (2)	1.3% (11)	63.5% (526)	33.6% (277)	100% (827)
JISP	3.7% (1)	3.7% (1)	3.7% (1)	48.2% (13)	40.7% (11)	100% (27)

The tables above indicate, for those youth who either failed their probation terms (Table 13) or who received a new filing after termination for the commission of a crime (Table 14), where they were placed as a response to the new violation. A youth must be 18 or older at the time of revocation to be sentenced to the county jail, and then the term cannot exceed 180 days. These tables indicate that most youth, are re-sentenced to probation or receive a fine, community service or other less serious outcome. Those youth who are either terminated from probation for the commission of a new crime are the most likely to be placed in an incarceration setting.

**Table 15**  
**REGULAR PROBATION**  
**Overall Adult Program Failures and Successes – FY2001**  
**Compared with Overall Post-Release Recidivism Findings – FY2000**

SUPERVISION LEVEL	Pre-release Failure: Technical	Pre-release Failure: New Crime	Post-release Recidivism	Successful	Total
<b>Adult Terminations FY2001</b>					
Regular: Administrative	42.0% (2,725)	4.6% (301)	6.2% (399)	47.2% (3,058)	100% (6,483)
Regular: Unclassified	11.6% (106)	3.2% (29)	9.5% (86)	75.7% (689)	100% (910)
Regular: Minimum	6.1% (234)	1.4% (56)	10.0% (383)	82.5% (3,163)	100% (3,836)
Regular: Medium	13.3% (420)	3.8% (121)	9.2% (290)	73.7% (2,330)	100% (3,161)
Regular: Maximum	39.2% (430)	15.3% (168)	6.2% (68)	39.3% (431)	100% (1,097)
<b>TOTAL REGULAR PROBATION</b>	<b>25.3% (3,915)</b>	<b>4.4% (675)</b>	<b>7.9% (1,226)</b>	<b>62.4% (9,671)</b>	<b>100% (15,487)</b>
<b>Adult Terminations FY2001</b>					
<b>TOTAL REGULAR PROBATION</b>	<b>27.7% (4,005)</b>	<b>3.7% (538)</b>	<b>4.6% (673)</b>	<b>64.0% (9,259)</b>	<b>100% (14,475)</b>

**Table 16**  
**SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS**  
**Overall Adult Program Failures and Successes: FY2001**  
**Compared with Overall Post-Release Recidivism Findings – FY2000**

SUPERVISION LEVEL	Pre-release Failure: Technical	Pre-release Failure: New Crime	Post-release Recidivism	Success – (off Specialized to Regular Prob.)	Successful	Total
<b>Adult Specialized Program Terminations FY2001</b>						
Adult ISP	32.4% (309)	11.7% (112)	1.0% (9)		54.9% (524)	100% (954)
Adult ISP	57.3% (309)	20.8% (112)	1.7% (9)	NA	20.2% (109)	100% (539)
Specialized Drug Offender Program	29.4% (70)	11.4% (27)	2.5% (6)		56.7% (135)	100% (238)
Specialized Drug Offender Program	52.6% (70)	20.3% (27)	4.5% (6)	NA	22.6% (30)	100% (133)
Female Offender Program	36.9% (41)	4.5% (5)	.9% (1)		57.7% (64)	100% (111)
Female Offender Program	66.1% (41)	8.1% (5)	1.6% (1)	NA	24.2% (15)	100% (62)
<b>Adult Specialized Program Terminations FY2000</b>						
Adult ISP	32.0% (270)	11.9% (100)	1.5% (13)		54.6% (460)	100% (843)
Specialized Drug Offender Program	23.0% (51)	11.7% (26)	1.8% (4)		63.5% (141)	100% (222)
Female Offender Program	43.1% (56)	5.4% (7)	0% (0)		51.5% (67)	100% (130)

Table 15 indicates the overall success rate of adult probation, defined as those offenders who successfully terminated probation *and* remained crime-free for one year post-termination is 62.4%, compared to 64.0% of FY2000 Probation terminations. As reported above for juvenile terminations, the greatest difference between the two years exists in the post-release recidivism category. Offenders supervised at the maximum supervision level had the lowest overall success rate (39.3%), and the failure was largely due to technical violations of their probation supervision (39.2%).

In the aggregate, adult offenders in specialized programs (Table 16) performed more poorly than those on regular probation, as expected. As indicated earlier, offenders placed in the female offender program had an overall success rate of 57.7% or 24.2%, depending on which group is considered (see discussion regarding Table 12 above for an explanation of the two sets of figures presented). Either way, women in the Female Offender Program show an overall improvement compared to the FY2000 overall success rate of 51.5%. Offenders in the specialized drug offender program were

successful 56.7%, or 22.6% of the time for those directly released from supervision, which is a decrease from the 63.5% success rate in FY2000. Finally, adults terminated from the Intensive Supervision program, succeeded 54.9% or 20.2% of the time, indicating very little change in overall performance from the prior year. Again, it is important to note that the specialized programs are prison-avoidant programs, and all offenders in these programs succeeded and remained crime free in over half of the cases. In the absence of these programs, these offenders quite likely would have served time in prison, at a costly sum, both in human and fiscal terms.

Data on overall success rates can be useful to probation administrators, planners, and officers in developing strategies to assist probationers in increasing success rates. Most pre-release failures are due to technical violations, which can be addressed up front with strategies to prevent probationers from engaging in technical violation behaviors.

**Table 17**  
**ALL ADULT PROBATION PROGRAMS**  
**Placement of Adult Probationers Who Terminated Probation**  
**for Technical Violations or a New Crime: FY2001**

PLACEMENT	Incarceration: Dept. of Corrections	Community Corrections	County Jail	Probation	Fines, Fees, Comm. Service, Other (includes no sentence)	TOTAL
<b>Pre-Release Failure: Technical Violation</b>						
Adult Regular Probation <sup>8</sup>	2.7% (104)	.8% (33)	4.1% (161)	39.6% (1,550)	52.8% (2,067)	100% (3,915)
Adult ISP	5.8% (18)	.3% (1)	7.5% (23)	23.9% (74)	62.5% (193)	100% (309)
Specialized Drug Offender Program	5.7% (4)	0% (0)	2.9% (2)	31.4% (22)	60.0% (42)	100% (70)
Female Offender Program	7.3% (3)	7.3% (3)	2.4% (1)	12.2% (5)	70.8% (29)	100% (41)
<b>Pre-Release Failure: New Crime</b>						
Adult Regular Probation	14.2% (96)	2.1% (14)	11.6% (78)	39.7% (268)	32.4% (219)	100% (675)
Adult ISP	22.3% (25)	3.6% (4)	8.0% (9)	24.1% (27)	42.0% (47)	100% (112)
Specialized Drug Offender Program	18.5% (5)	7.4% (2)	0% (0)	29.6% (8)	44.5% (12)	100% (27)
Female Offender Program	40.0% (2)	40.0% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20.0% (1)	100% (5)

<sup>8</sup> Note that, for regular probation, a revocation is only counted in the data base for those offenders who actually terminate probation. For this reason, we cannot, at this time, account for those offenders who are revoked and reinstated to probation.



**Table 18**  
**ALL ADULT PROBATIONERS**  
**Placement of Adult Probationers Who Successfully Terminated Probation**  
**and had a New Filing Post-Release: FY2001**

PLACEMENT	Incarceration : Dept. of Corrections	Community Corrections	County Jail	Probation	Fines, Fees, Comm. Service, Other (includes no sentence)	TOTAL
Adult Regular Probation <sup>8</sup>	1.7% (21)	2.4% (30)	3.9% (48)	33.0% (404)	59.0% (723)	100% (1,226)
Adult ISP	11.1% (1)	0% (0)	11.1% (1)	11.1% (1)	66.7% (6)	100% (9)
Specialized Drug Offender Program	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (6)	100% (6)
Female Offender Program	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	100% (1)

Table 17 depicts where adult probationers were placed upon revocation for a technical violation or a new crime, and Table 18 indicates new placements for adult probationers who successfully completed probation and were later filed on for the commission of a new crime. Upon probation failure, most probationers are likely to be placed back on probation, potentially at a higher supervision level. A high proportion of probation failures, either pre-release or post-release have not yet received sanctions, resulting in placement in the “other” category.

### **Summary: 2001 Termination Cohort**

The findings in this report highlight the fact that probation programs are successful in helping offenders remain crime free during periods of supervision. Indeed, juvenile and adult probationers were successful (they were successfully terminated from probation and remained crime free for one year after termination) in nearly two-thirds of all cases, (60.9% of juveniles, 62.4% of adults). Both adults and juveniles classified as high risk are less likely to successfully terminate, and less likely to remain crime-free after termination than their lower-risk counterparts.

Post-termination recidivism rates increased significantly during the last year. Given the downturn in both the state and national economy, and the significant increase in the unemployment rate in Colorado during 2001 and 2002, chances are significant that these findings are related to changes in the economy.

Across specialized programs, those programs designed to divert youth and adults who would otherwise be incarcerated, overall success rates range from 44.9% for the Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program to 57.7% for the Female Offender Program. When considering only those offenders terminated from specialized probation programs

altogether, success rates range from 20% - 25%. These lower rates are heavily influenced by the pre-release failure rates and the most common practice of “stepping down” offenders from specialized programs to regular probation supervision. The largest type of failure among all specialized programs is in the area of technical violations. Statewide responses to technical violations continue to be on the priority list of supervision issues to address.

The Division of Probation Services and probation departments statewide take seriously the need to protect the public’s safety and, in particular, prevent probationers from engaging in future criminal behavior. Recidivism is an important performance measure for the criminal justice system. The public expects that offenders supervised within the criminal justice system are being supervised effectively.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Donziger, Steven (Ed.), *The Real War On Crime: The Report of the National Criminal Justice Commission*, Harper Perennial, 1996

Fulton, Betsy. *Restoring Hope Through Community Partnerships: The Real Deal in Crime Control*, The American Probation and Parole Association, Lexington, Kentucky, 1996.

Office of Probation Services, *State of State Report on Pre-Sentence Investigation and Assessment Activities*, Colorado Judicial Department, Denver, Colorado, May 2000.

Piehl, Anne Morrison, *Economic Conditions, Work and Crime*, in The Handbook of Crime and Punishment, edited by Michael Tonry, Oxford University Press, 1998.

Pullen, Suzanne. *Report to the Colorado General Assembly and the Legislative Audit Committee Concerning a Consistent and Common Definition of Recidivism in the Juvenile and Criminal Justice System*, Colorado Judicial Branch, Denver, Colorado, June 1999.

Simon, Rita J. and Landis, Jean *The Crimes Women Commit: The Punishments they Receive*, Lexington Books, Lexington, Massachusetts, 1991.