CCJJ Committee on Re-Entry: Probation Task Force

Charter
Phase 1

MISSION

The Probation Task Force will identify, review, analyze, assess, and compare evidence-based recidivism reduction practices related to:

- Statutes, policies, regulations, and practices that govern probation,
- Probation supervision,
- Programming for offenders,
- Jail programs for those on probation,
- ISP and special programs,
- Community corrections diversion programs, and
- Cost effectiveness.

The Probation Task Force will gather and analyze relevant information pertaining to the above and address, at a minimum, the questions below about evidence-based practice. The Task Force will make specific recommendations to the Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice (CCJJ) Oversight Committee on Re-Entry, which will make recommendations to the CCJJ.

SPONSOR Re-Entry Oversight Committee of the Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice

BACKGROUND

The CCJJ Oversight Committee on Re-Entry is providing a practical framework and recommendations for stakeholder agencies to promote common interests, integrate services and improve the overall offender transition process. Stakeholders of various agencies participated in a monthly Commission meeting concerning offender transition on April 11, 2008. At that time it was decided that the CCJJ Oversight Committee on Re-Entry and a Probation Task Force would be formed.

Introduction

In Colorado, over 90,000 adult offenders were under some form of supervision as of December 31, 2007.[1] In FY 2007, 20,000 adults were sentenced to probation in Colorado, and about 60% will successfully complete that sentence. Of those revoked, 29% are likely to receive a prison sentence.[2]

During FY 2007 10,626 offenders were admitted to prison, and a large proportion of these were revoked from probation and community corrections. Nevertheless, this population will eventually return to the community. Approximately 95% of incarcerated offenders will at some point be released from prison and return to live in communities throughout the state. According to the Department of Corrections (DOC),[3] nearly half (49.7%) of the Colorado inmates that were released in 2002 returned to prison within three years of release. Furthermore, the number of individuals returned to prison in Colorado specifically for parole violations is growing: 3,037 were returned for a parole violation (28.6% of those admitted). An additional 1,020 offenders were returned for a parole violation with a new criminal conviction (9.6% of those admitted in FY 2007).[4]

A large proportion of community corrections offenders are sentenced to full incarceration in jail or prison, but few (1.5%) are arrested for committing a new crime while in the program. As shown in Table 1 below, 1,110 offenders were terminated from community corrections for technical violations in FY 2007 and another 634 absconded/escaped, meaning that a warrant for their arrest was issued. Many will be charged with felony escape and sent to jail or prison.

For additional recidivism rates, please see Appendix A at the end of this document.

Criminal recidivism reduction translates into increased public safety.[5] This occurs when justice systems prioritize the use of evidence-based methods to help offenders successfully complete their probation and community corrections sentence.

---

[1] Population Report for December 2007 available at http://www.doc.state.co.us/Statistics/MonthReport/Dec2007.pdf. Including probation, community corrections, incarceration, or juvenile placement. See the Division of Criminal Justice Quarterly Population Report for the period ending on 12/31/07 available at http://dcj.state.co.us/ors/pdf/correctional%20populations/CORCOP%20123107%20revised.pdf; Division of Youth Corrections Monthly Population report for December 2007 available at http://www.cdhs.state.co.us/dyc/PDFs/MPR1207.pdf; Department of Corrections Monthly

[2] Office of Research and Statistics, Division of Criminal Justice, analysis of a sample of 2,626 criminal cases from ten judicial districts sentenced in calendar year 2007.

[3] Rosten, K., Barr, B., & Mersman, K. (2006). *Recidivism and cumulative return rates, Calendar Years 1997-2004.* Colorado Springs, CO: Office of Planning and Analysis, Colorado Department of Corrections.

[4] Harrison, L. (January 2008). *Draft report: The status of the parole violator in Colorado.* Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics.

[5] Rosenfeld, R., Wallman, J., & Fornago, R. (2005). The contribution of ex-prisoners to crime rates. In *Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America.* J. Travis and C. Visher (Eds.). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Table 1. Community Corrections Termination Rates and Reasons: FY 2007

Offender Type	Successful		Transfer		Escape		New Crime		Old warrant		Technical violation		Other	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Diversion	1491	55.2	155	5.73	341	12.6	48	1.8	32	1.2	607	22.5	27	.09
Transition	1618	62.1	85	3.26	293	11.2	26	1.0	45	1.7	503	19.3	36	1.38
Overall	3109	58.9	240	4.50	634	11.9	74	1.4	77	1.5	1110	20.9	63	1.18

Source: Special analysis of community corrections client termination forms conducted by Christine Schmidt, January 2008. Office of Community Corrections, Division of Criminal Justice, Denver, CO.

Probation supervision focuses on the long-term success of the individual. Table 2 shows programs that were found in a comprehensive study by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy to reduce recidivism.

Table 2. Examples of Adult Recidivism Reduction Programs[6]

Program	Recidivism* Reduced By
Community-based cognitive-behavioral sex offender treatment	31.2%
Prison-based cognitive-behavioral sex offender treatment	14.9%
Prison-based vocational education	12.6%
Community-based drug treatment	12.4%
Prison-based cognitive-behavioral programs (general and specific)	8.2%
Prison-based correctional industries programs	7.8%
Intensive prison-based substance abuse programs *with* community aftercare	6.9%
Prison-based cognitive-behavioral drug treatment	6.8%
Work release programs	5.6%
Intensive prison-based substance abuse programs *without* community aftercare	5.3%
Prison-based basic adult education	5.1%
Community-based employment training and job assistance	4.8%
Educational/Cognitive-behavioral domestic violence programs	0%

*Recidivism is defined in various ways, depending on the study. Table 2 reflects findings from a meta-analysis of hundreds of program evaluations of offenders on probation, jail and prison. Typically, recidivism is defined as new arrest or conviction in a specific period of time.

---

[6] Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (2006). *Evidence-based adult corrections programs: What works and what does not.* Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Success-oriented offender management strategies require a context where the following priorities are grounded in legislation, policies, agency regulations, and organizational practice:

- The needs and risk assessment process(es),
- Behavioral interventions,
- Staff-offender interactions,
- Case management, and
- Success-driven supervision.

The work of the Probation Task Force will be conducted in three phases. In each phase, barriers to implementing evidence-based correctional practice will be identified along with strategies to remove the barriers.

Phase 1: **Review and compare best practices with existing legislation, agency policies and regulations, and general practice; make recommendations to maximize offender success.**

Phase 2: **Implement recommendations from Phase 1; undertake systematic and comprehensive review of practice and data that reflects practice; make recommendations to maximize offender success.**

Phase 3: **Implement and monitor new policies and practices; development of measures and monitoring practices to continually provide feedback on implementation success.**

The Probation Task Force will make recommendations to the Oversight Committee on Re-Entry which will, in turn, make recommendations to the CCJJ to ensure cohesion of all aspects of the re-entry process. The Commission has identified a number of key areas that are related to successful offender outcomes. Focused strategies must be developed around each of the key areas to improve offender outcomes and enhance public safety.

Evidence-Based Correctional Practices

Each Phase requires assessing and comparing current practice against what the research literature has found to be evidence-based practice.

The Probation Task Force has been charged with identifying the best supervision and community corrections (diversion) practices by systematically reviewing and analyzing evidence-based correctional practices and comparing those with current legislation, policies, regulations, and practices in Colorado. This includes how these may be related to disproportionate minority representation, individuals with mental illness or behavioral health problems, gender and other special populations.

The following eight evidence-based principles will guide the work of the Probation Task Force.[7]

1. **Assess offender risk and need levels using actuarial instruments being used by Probation and Community Corrections.**
   - *What tools are being used?*
   - *Do the assessment tools measure criminogenic risk and need?*
   - *Who is trained to conduct the assessment interview? Is this training adequate? How often does re-training occur?*
   - *What quality control measures are in place to ensure that assessments are conducted appropriately?*
   - *How is the assessment information captured and used in the supervision of probationers? Are current methods adequate?*
   - *How are multiple service needs addressed?*

2. **Enhance offender motivation.**
   - *Are probation officers and program staff trained in motivational interviewing techniques?*
   - *What quality assurance is in place?*
   - *Is staff held accountable for using motivational interviewing techniques in their day-to-day interactions with probationers?*
   - *What is the rate of treatment/supervision compliance?*

3. **Target interventions.**
   - Act on the risk principle.
     - Prioritize supervision and treatment resources for higher risk offenders.
   - Act on the need principle.
     - Target interventions to at least four criminogenic needs.
   - Implement the responsivity principle.
     - Be responsive to each offender's temperament, learning style, motivation, gender, and culture when assigning to programs.
   - Ensure adequate program dose and duration.
     - Structure 40-70% of high-risk offenders' for 3-9 months.
   - Implement the treatment principle.
     - Integrate treatment into the full sentence/sanction requirements.
   - *How are probationers and diversion clients supervised who are assessed as low risk to re-offend?*
   - *Do assessment tools assess for criminogenic need?*
   - *How is criminogenic risk and need information incorporated into probationer and community corrections case plans?*
   - *How are probationers and community corrections diversion clients matched to treatment resources?*
   - *How structured are case plans for probationers and community corrections clients?*

---

[7] Adapted from: Crime and Justice Institute. (2004). *Implementing evidence-based practice in community corrections: The principles of effective intervention.* Department of Justice: National Institute of Corrections; Office of Research and Statistics (2007). *Evidence based correctional practices.* Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics.

- *How are probation officers and case managers held accountable for using assessment information to develop a case plan and subsequently using that case plan to supervise a probationer?*

4. **Provide skill training for staff and monitor their delivery of services.**
   - *What job classifications are responsible for service delivery (e.g., probation officers, case managers, mental health workers, etc.)?*
   - *Is the goal of adequate service delivery clear to all probation and community corrections staff?*
   - *Do staff performance evaluations reflect the expectation that evidence-based services and practices are critical to reducing recidivism?*
   - *How are social learning techniques incorporated into the programs delivered by probation?*
   - *How does probation and community corrections ensure that contracted service providers are delivering services in alignment with social learning theory?*
   - *Are the programs delivered and contracted for based on scientific evidence of recidivism reduction?*
   - *How are those programs evaluated?*
   - *How often is staff trained, and how often do they receive booster training?*
   - *Is staff evaluated on their use of information received from training?*

5. **Increase positive reinforcement.**
   - *Are positive reinforcement techniques modeled in probation and community corrections staffs' day-to-day interactions with co-workers?*
   - *Do policies and procedures support the use of positive reinforcements for offenders?*
   - *Are supervising officers trained in providing positive reinforcement for offenders?*
   - *Do staff record and document positive and negative reinforcements to provide feedback to themselves and supervisors about the ratio of negative to positive?*
   - *Does staff understand and use the four-to-one theory in their interactions with offenders (four positive for every one negative reinforcement)?*

6. **Engage ongoing support in natural communities.**
   - *How can Probation and Community Corrections engage community supports for probationers as a regular part of case planning?*
   - *Is the current practice sufficient?*
   - *How does Probation and Community Corrections measure community network contacts as they relate to a probationer?*
   - *How does Probation and Community Corrections ensure that this support is meaningful and valuable to the probationer?*

7. **Measure relevant processes and practices.**
   - *What data is collected regarding offender assessment and case management?*
   - *Is the information reliable?*
   - *Is the information easily retrievable so probation officers can review their efforts?*
   - *How does Probation and Community Corrections measure incremental probationer change while they are under supervision?*
   - *What are Probation's and Community Correction's outcome measures and how are they tracked?*
   - *How does Probation and Community Corrections measure staff performance? What data is used? How is that data collected? How is it used to provide feedback to the probation officer?*

8. **Provide measurement feedback.**

- *How is information regarding probationer change and outcomes shared with officers? With probationers and diversion clients?*
- *With whom is information shared regarding outcome measures?*
- *How is staff performance data used in the performance evaluation process?*

<u>Issue</u>

The mission of the Probation Task Force is to identify for the Commission the gaps in practice and activities, barriers to implementation, and critical issues surrounding an offender's time spent on probation and in community corrections diversion programs. The Task Force will also make recommendations aimed at decreasing recidivism and avoiding further penetration into the criminal justice system.

<u>Additional Information</u>

- The cost of building a new prison is approximately $40,000 per bed for minimum-security and nearly $90,000 per bed for maximum-security.

- The cost of Colorado State Penitentiary II, a 948 beds facility, will exceed $100 million for construction alone, according to the Joint Budget Committee.

- As of December 31, 2007, 2,999 probation offenders were in residential community corrections programs, and another 1,153 were on non-residential status.[8]

- In FY 2005 61% of Colorado probationers successfully completed their sentences.[9]

- Of the adults who successfully completed probation in 2005, 8% committed a new crime within one year.[10]

- Thirty-three percent of probationers in 2005 failed due to a technical violation and 6% committed a new crime.[11]

- In FY 2007, 55.2% of diversion offenders in community corrections successfully discharged from the halfway house system.[12]

---

[8] Office of Research and Statistics. (March 31, 2008). *Detail report: Colorado Correctional Populations.* Denver: Officer of Research and Statistics, Division of Criminal Justice.
[9] Schlessinger, K. (January 15, 2007). *Pre-release termination and post-release recidivism rates of Colorado's Probationers: FY2005 Releases.* Research and Evaluation Unit, Division of Probation Services, Colorado Judicial Department.
[10] Colorado Judicial Branch. (2007). *Annual Statistical Report Fiscal Year 2007.* Research and Evaluation Unit, Division of Probation Services, Colorado Judicial Department.
[11] Schlessinger, K. (January 15, 2007). *Pre-release termination and post-release recidivism rates of Colorado's Probationers: FY2005 Releases.* Research and Evaluation Unit, Division of Probation Services, Colorado Judicial Department.

- In FY 2007, 22.3% of diversion offenders in community corrections were terminated for **technical violations** and 12.6% **escaped** from the program.[13]

  - In FY 2004 more than one-third of the **technical violations** were drug-related, and half of these were linked to alcohol or marijuana.
  - **Escape rates** were nearly 30% higher for non-whites compared to whites in FY 2004.[14]

- The Level of Service Inventory (LSI)[15] is one of the most common classification tools used across the country with adult offenders, including in Colorado. This instrument not only predicts recidivism but also provides critical information pertaining to offender needs.

- LSI sub-scores for all domains (e.g., education, criminal history, financial, etc.) tend to be higher for the recidivists than for then non-recidivists, reflecting the need for services.[16]

- The average LSI score varies by placement; therefore, needs for services vary by placement (see Table 2).

Table 3: Average LSI scores by court placement, CY 2006

Placement	Average Score	Number of cases
Probation	25.39	147
Probation and jail	25.89	55
Probation and community corrections	31.45	38
Technical violation/to probation	26.35	43
Technical violation/ to jail	31.00	9
Technical violation/ to community corrections	28.00	11
Technical violation to DOC	33.02	40
DOC	31.48	320
Total	29.53	663

---

[12] Office of Community Corrections, Division of Criminal Justice, analysis of program termination forms.

[13] Personal communication with Christine Schmidt, Office of Community Corrections, January 2008.

[14] Burrell, N. and English, K. (2006). *Community Corrections in Colorado: A study of Program Outcomes and Recidivism, FY00-FY04.* Office of Research and Statistics, Division of Criminal Justice. Denver, Co. Available at: http://www.dcj.state.co.us/ors/pdf/docs/Comm_Corr_05_06.pdf

[15] Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1995). *The Level of Service Inventory – Revised.* Toronto, Quebec: Multi-Health Systems.

[16] Lowden, K., English, K., Harrison, L., Pasini-Hill, D., & Lounders, P. (2007). *Crime and Justice in Colorado: 2006.* Denver: Officer of Research and Statistics, Division of Criminal Justice.

Concluding Statement

Probationers have the highest success rates among offenders in all criminal placements, yet the expectation of the Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice is that these rates improve. Successful completion of probation and diversion community corrections is critical to preventing further penetration into the criminal justice system. The Probation Task Force recommendations will link to the principles of evidence-based correctional practice, minority over-representation, individuals with behavioral health problems, gender, special populations, and community corrections.

STRUCTURE

- ➤ The Task Force will make recommendations to the Re-Entry Oversight Committee, which will, in turn, make recommendations to the Commission.
- ➤ The Task Force shall comprise a representative sampling of the stakeholders and the community.
- ➤ The Task Force chair will be a Commission member.
- ➤ The Task Force shall consist of no more than fifteen (15) formal (voting) members identified by the CCJJ chair, vice-chair and Re-Entry Oversight Committee chair.
- ➤ Non Task Force participants, as opposed to members, will be encouraged to provide input as directed by the Task Force chair.
- ➤ The Task Force Leader will assist in the planning of the Task Force.
  - ➤ These are task force members with specific expertise who represent the voice of the community and are not representative of government agencies
- ➤ The Re-Entry Oversight Committee chair will chair the Task Force when the chair is unavailable.
- ➤ The meetings will be held in the Denver Metro. Satellite video conferencing will be used when possible to connect to stakeholders across the state.
- ➤ The team will implement "ground rules" to facilitate effective interaction.
- ➤ Research staff from the DCJ Office of Research and Statistics will
  - ➤ Work with the chair to organize meetings and prepare the meeting agenda
  - ➤ Facilitate meetings to free the chair to lead the discussions
  - ➤ At the request of the Task Force will,
    - ➤ Provide information on existing knowledge and research
    - ➤ Identify local data sources
    - ➤ Analyze local data sources when feasible
    - ➤ Work with researchers from other agencies to obtain relevant information.

- ➢ **DATA**
  - ➢ DCJ staff will respond to requests for information and data. Because gathering information and analyzing data is a resource-intense activity, requests for additional information and data analysis will require the following considerations:
    - ➢ **What specific question are you trying to answer?**
    - ➢ **How will having this information affect the discussion?**
    - ➢ **How will having the information improve decision-making?**

DESIRED OUTCOME: A successful project <u>will</u> result in…

- Identified gaps and barriers in legislation, policy, regulation, practice, offender services and staff training that negatively affect offender successful re-entry
- Development of a short- and long-term strategy to address gaps and barriers
- Recommendations that focus on significant recidivism reduction
- The first set of recommendations are presented to Re-Entry Committee on August 20, 2008
  - Recommendations that can take effect immediately (within one month), in the short term (within six-10 months), and in the long term (may require statutory changes and implementation phases)
  - Reinvestment of cost savings

UNDESIRED OUTCOME: A successful project <u>will not</u> result in…

- Missed deadlines
- Any recommendation that fails to significantly decrease--or have no effect on--the overall recidivism rate
- Any recommendation that fails to recognize the cost savings of probation, intermediate sanctions, and community corrections over prison
- Any recommendation that would clearly compromise public safety

DOCUMENTS TO REVIEW (Phase 1)

- Drug Court Review, Special Research Edition (2006). pp 1- 151.
- Clark, M.C. (1999). *Strength-Based Practice: The ABC's of Working With Adolescents Who Don't Want To Work With You.*
  - o Also available -- Research in Brief: Strength-Based Practice
- Latessa, E.J. *From Theory to Practice: What Works in Reducing Recidivism.*
- Johnson, S., Hubbard, D.J., & Latessa, E.J. (2000). Drug courts and treatment: Lessons to be learned from the "What Works" literature. *Corrections Management Quarterly, 4,* 70-77.
- The American College of Mental Health Administration. (2003). *Turning knowledge into practice.*

- Walters, S.T., Clark, M.D., Gingerich, R., & Meltzer, M.L. (2007). *A guide to probation and parole: Motivating offenders to change.*
- Family Justice. (2006). *Tapping social networks: A resource for probation and parole officers to improve supervision.*
- Burrell, B. (2006). *Caseload standards for probation and parole.*
- Warren, R. (2008). *Evidence-based practices to reduce recidivism: Implications for state judiciaries.*
- Bonta, J., & Andrews, D.A. (2007). *Risk-need-responsivity model for offender assessment and rehabilitation 2007-06.*
- Taxman, F.S., Shepardson, E.S., Byrne, J.M., Gelb, A., & Gornik, M. *Tools of the Trade: A guide to incorporating science into practice.*
- Bogue, B., Diebel, J., & O'Conner, T. (2008). *Combining officer supervision skills: A new model for increasing success in community corrections.*
- State legislation that directs Probation and Community Corrections
- State administrative rules and regulations that direct Probation and Community Corrections
- State agency policies
- Local district probation agency policies, as needed
- Conditions of probation supervision
- Community Corrections policies regarding board decision making, facility acceptance, rejection, termination criteria
- *Probation State of the State, 2007* (Office of the State Court Administrator)
- Community Corrections *Risk Factor Analysis Report* (2007)
- *Community Corrections in Colorado: A Study of Program Outcomes and Recidivism, FY00-FY04* by Burrell and English (2006)
- *What Works* report by Roger Przybylski
- Tab 9 of CCJJ Binder: *Evidence Based Practices*
- Material at reentry.org
- Material from the Center for Court Innovation:
  - http://www.courtinnovation.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Document.viewDocument&documentID=600&documentTopicID=39&documentTypeID=10
- Other material as identified

ESTIMATED DATE FOR COMPLETION:
- August 20, 2008 → Task Force must report recommendations to the Committee.
- September 2008 → Committee must make formal recommendation to the Commission.
- October 2008 → Commission must approve recommendations at October meeting, providing two weeks for ORS staff to write up the final report for these initial decisions.

MEETING FREQUENCY & DURATION:

Date: Wednesday, May 22
Time: 3:30 – 5:30pm
Location: CDPS Complex, 710 Kipling

Date: Wednesday, June 5
Time: 3:30 – 5:30pm
Location: CDPS Complex, 700 Kipling

Date: Wednesday, June 19
Time: 3:30 – 5:30pm
Location: CDPS Complex, 710 Kipling

Date: Wednesday, July 3
Time: 3:30 – 5:30pm
Location: CDPS Complex, 710 Kipling

Date: Wednesday, July 17
Time: 3:30 – 5:30pm
Location: CDPS Complex, 710 Kipling

Date: Wednesday, July 31
Time: 3:30 – 5:30pm
Location: CDPS Complex, 710 Kipling

Date: Wednesday, August 14
Time: 3:30 – 5:30pm
Location: CDPS Complex, 710 Kipling

MEMBERS:
  Bill Kilpatrick
  Steve Siegel
  Sherri Hufford
  Ann Terry
  Charles Garcia
  Greg Mauro
  Ken Plotz
  Mary Claire
  Mulligan
  Kevin McGreevy

TASK FORCE CHAIRPERSON*:* Judge Gilbert Martinez

TASK FORCE LEADER: Mike Riede

FACILITATOR*:* Christine Adams/Germaine Miera

RECORD KEEPER*:* The responsibility of taking minutes will rotate among Task Force members.

LEGAL COUNSEL: To be determined if and when needed

GLOSSARY for Table 2

Probation: The sentence of a court whereby an individual is put under the supervision of a probation officer.

Probation and jail: As a condition of probation, the court may sentence an offender to a term in jail.

Community corrections: Public or privately operated community-based halfway houses holding offenders in the community while providing them opportunities to work and/or attend school, get treatment, and perform community services. A judge may refer an offender convicted of a felony to a community correction program; however, the offender must be approved by the local community corrections board and the halfway house administrators before acceptance into the program.

Probation and community corrections: The court can sentence an offender to community corrections for up to 30 days as a condition of probation.

Department of Corrections: Persons convicted of felony offenses are subject to a penalty of imprisonment for a length of time that is specified in statute corresponding to the felony class for which the offender was convicted.

Technical violation/to probation: Offender has not complied with the terms and conditions of the sentence, so the sentence was revoked and he/she was resentenced to probation.

Technical violation/to jail work release: Offender has not complied with the terms and conditions of the sentence, so the sentence was revoked and he/she was resentenced to jail/work release.

Technical violation/to community corrections: Offender has not complied with the terms and conditions of the sentence, so the sentence was revoked and he/she was resentenced to community corrections.

Technical violation/to DOC: Offender has not complied with the terms and conditions of the sentence, so the sentence was revoked and the offender was resentenced to the Department of Corrections.

Charged with escape: Case included a charge for escape.

Appendix
Summary of Recidivism Findings

Study Population	Follow-up period	Measure of Recidivism	Recidivism Rate (%)	Notes
Juvenile Probation[17]				
Regular Probation	During Supervision	Technical Violation	25.7	
		New adjudication	6.2	1
	1 Year post-termination	New adjudication	16.6	
Intensive Supervision Probation	During Supervision	Technical Violation	39.1	
		New adjudication	12.2	1
	1 Year post-termination	New adjudication	10	1
Adult Probation[18]				
Regular Probation	During Supervision	Technical Violation	32.6	
		New misd/felony conviction	6.1	2
	1 Year post-termination	New misd/felony filing	8	2
Intensive Supervision Probation	During Supervision	Technical Violation	34.4	
		New misd/felony conviction	13.6	2
	1 Year post-termination	New misd/felony filing	1.4	2,4
Female Offender Program	During Supervision	Technical Violation	31.6	
		New misd/felony conviction	10.5	2
	1 Year post-termination	New misd/felony filing	0	2,5
Women on Probation[19]	1 year post-sentencing	New felony filing	10.9	6
	2 years post-sentencing	New felony filing	16.1	6
	3 years post-sentencing	New felony filing	19.3	6
Drug Offenders on Probation[20]	1 year post-sentencing	New felony filing	12	6
	2 years post-sentencing	New felony filing	17.9	6
	3 years post-sentencing	New felony filing	21.2	6

---

[17] Schlessinger, K. (January 15, 2007). *Pre-release termination and post-release recidivism rates of Colorado's Probationers: FY2005 Releasees.* Colorado Division of Probation Services, Research and Evaluation Unit, Denver, Colorado.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics. Special analysis conducted for this publication on specific populations sentenced to probation between January 1, 2000 and June 30, 2005.
[20] Ibid.

Division of Youth Corrections[21]

Commitments	During commitment	New misd/felony filing	39.1	2,3
	1 Year post-termination	New misd/felony filing	37.9	

Department of Corrections[22]

All Releases	1 year post-discharge	Return to prison	40.8	7
	3 years post-release	Return to Prison	49.7	7
Mandatory Parole	3 years post- release	Technical Violation	49.6	
		New felony conviction	15.4	8
Discretionary Parole	3 years post-release	Technical Violation	39.6	
		New felony conviction	13	8
Sentence Discharges	3 years post-release	New felony conviction	24.3	8

Community Corrections[23]

Diversion	During program	Technical Violation	25.3	
		New misd/felony filing	1.6	2
	2 years post-discharge	New misd/felony filing	23.8	2
Transition	During program	Technical Violation	23.4	
		New misd/felony filing	1.3	2
	2 years post-discharge	New misd/felony filing	25.5	2

From: *Crime and Justice, 2006*, prepared by the Office of Research and Statistics, Division of Criminal Justice, Colorado Department of Public Safety. Table 5.16 on page 129.

---

[21] Division of Youth Corrections (2007). *Recidivism Evaluation of Committed Youth Discharged in Fiscal Year 2004-05.* Colorado Department of Human Services, Office of Children, Youth and Family Services. Denver, Colorado.

[22] Rosten, K., Barr, B., and Mersman, K. (2006). Recidivism *and cumulative return rates, Calendar Years 1997-2004.* Office of Planning and Analysis, Colorado Department of Corrections. Colorado Springs, CO. The report is available at http://www.doc.state.co.us/Statistics/pdfs/Recidivism/2006RecidBulletin.pdf.

[23] Hetz-Burrell, N. and English, K. (2006*). Community Corrections in Colorado: A Study of Program Outcomes and Recidivism, FY00-04.* Office of Research and Statistics, Division of Criminal Justice, Department of Public Safety. Denver, Colorado.