

CCJJ Re-Entry Committee: Incarceration Task Force

Charter Phase 1

MISSION

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

- Statutes, policies, regulations, and practices that govern incarceration in jails and prison, and confinement in community corrections facilities,
- Offender access to residential community corrections programs,
- Intake procedures,
- Assessment and reassessment of inmate risk and needs conducted in prison and jails,
- Programming and treatment consistent with inmate needs, provided by incarceration and confinement facilities,
- Efficient use of in-house programming resources (e.g., avoidance of repetitive programming),
- Preparation surrounding post-jail and post-prison placement options (e.g., probation, parole, community corrections), and
- Cost effectiveness.

The Incarceration Task Force will gather and analyze relevant information pertaining to the above issues and will address, at a minimum, the questions below about evidence-based practice. The Incarceration 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 task force on incarceration 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 over 20,000 offenders were sentenced to probation, approximately 3,000 were diversion clients in community corrections with another 2,000 in transition community corrections, and 10,626 offenders were admitted to prison. Thousands more are incarcerated every year in more than 13,000 county jail cells.

Approximately 95% of incarcerated offenders will at some point be released from prison and returned to live in communities throughout the state. All jail inmates are released into the community after spending hours, days or months confined in the facility. Likewise, all community corrections offenders eventually leave the halfway house setting. In other words, nearly all facility-based offenders will transition back to life in communities across the state.

Many inmates return to prison, jail and community corrections following subsequent problems in the community. While statewide jail data are not available in Colorado, the Department of Corrections² reports that nearly half (49.7%) of Colorado prison inmates released in 2002 returned to prison within three years of release. Further, the number of individuals returned to both jail and prison in Colorado for community supervision violations is growing. Of the inmates admitted to prison in FY 2007, 3,037 (28.6%) were individuals returned for a parole violation. An additional 9.6% (1,020 offenders) were returned for a parole violation with a new criminal conviction.³ Many of these offenders are held in county jails prior to transfer to DOC. This contributes to local jail crowding and requires DOC to reimburse jails for housing its offenders.

A large proportion of community corrections offenders also return 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.

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 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.

³ Harrison, L. (January 2008). *Draft report: The status of the parole violator problem in Colorado*. Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics.

Table 1: Community Corrections Termination Reasons, FY 2007

Offender Type	Successful		Transfer to another program		Escape/ Abscond		New Crime while in program		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.

Criminal recidivism reduction translates into increased public safety.⁴ This reduction occurs by systems prioritizing the use of evidence-based methods to prevent known offenders from committing new crimes upon release from incarceration and halfway house placement.

Most criminologists agree that successful re-entry planning begins upon entry into an incarceration facility, be it jail, prison, or community corrections. The Incarceration Task Force will review current practices by the Department of Corrections (DOC), local jails, and community corrections to identify gaps in resources, policies, and practices that can undermine the goals of reducing recidivism and maximizing cost effectiveness.

The Incarceration Task Force will focus on methods that enhance long-term success of the individual inmate. Research shows that transitioning prison inmates through community corrections reduces recidivism.⁵ Table 2 shows a list of programs that have been found to reduce recidivism.

Table 2. Examples of Adult Recidivism Reduction Programs⁶

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	6.9%

⁴ 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.

⁵ Burrell, N.H., & English, K. (2006). *Community corrections in Colorado: A study of program outcomes and recidivism, FY00-FY04*. Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics.

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

programs <i>with</i> community aftercare	
Prison-based cognitive-behavioral drug treatment	6.8%
Work release programs	5.6%
Intensive prison-based substance abuse programs <i>without</i> 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.

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 Incarceration 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 Incarceration 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 inmate success. System focused, and evidence-based 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 Incarceration Task Force has been charged with identifying the best offender management and release preparation 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 Incarceration Task Force.⁷

1. Assess inmate risk and need levels using actuarial instruments being used by DOC, jails, and community corrections.

- *What tools are in use?*
- *Does the assessment tool(s) 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 management of inmates? Are current methods adequate?*
- *How are multiple service needs addressed?*

2. Enhance offender motivation.

- *Are DOC and jail case managers 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 inmates?*
- *What is the rate of treatment compliance?*
- *How might work assignments interfere with necessary programming?*
- *Are incentives to participate in programming greater than or equal to employment incentives?*
- *What is the completion rate of programs?*
- *How are in-facility programs connected to programs in the community?*
- *How do the requirements of inmate movement impede treatment participation, progress, and completion? Is inmate movement consistent with recidivism reduction priorities?*
- *Is there a specific pre-release cellblock designated for inmates as they transition out of prison? Out of jail? Are the policies and procedures for re-entry facilities evidence-based?*

3. Target interventions.

- Act on the risk principle.

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.

- Prioritize treatment resources for higher risk inmates.
- Act on the need principle.
 - Target interventions to at least four criminogenic needs.
- Implement the responsivity principle.
 - Be responsive to each inmate's temperament, learning style, motivation, gender, and culture when assigning to programs.
- Ensure adequate program dose and duration.
 - Structure programming into 40-70% of high-risk inmates' day.
- Implement the treatment principle.
 - Integrate treatment into the full sentence/sanction requirements.
- *How are inmates managed 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 offender case plans?*
- *How are offenders matched to treatment resources?*
- *How structured are case plans for inmates and community corrections clients?*
- *What coordination is in place to assure that in-facility assessments and services are linked to community based services?*
- *How is staff held accountable for using assessment information to develop a case plan and then subsequently using that case plan to manage an inmate?*
- 4. Provide skill training for staff and monitor their delivery of services.**
 - *What job classifications are responsible for service delivery (e.g., intake officers, case managers, correctional officers, mental health staff, etc.)?*
 - *Is the goal of adequate service delivery clear to all DOC, jail, 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 DOC, jail and community corrections staff?*
 - *How do DOC, jail 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 these 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.**
 - *Do DOC, jail and community corrections staff model positive reinforcement techniques in their day-to-day interactions with co-workers?*
 - *Do DOC and jail policies and procedures support the use of positive reinforcements for inmates?*
 - *Are DOC, jail and community corrections case managers and staff trained to provide positive reinforcement to inmates?*
 - *Do DOC, jail and community corrections staff record and document positive and negative reinforcements to provide feedback to themselves and supervisors about the ratio of negative to positive?*
 - *Do DOC, jail and community corrections staff understand and use the four-to-one theory in their interactions with inmates (four positive for every one negative reinforcements)?*
- 6. Engage ongoing support in natural communities.**
 - *How are community supports (e.g., family visits) incorporated as a regular part of case planning?*
 - *Is the current practice sufficient?*
 - *How is community networking measured as it relates to inmates?*

7. Measure relevant processes and practices.

- *What data is collected regarding inmate assessment and case management?*
- *Is the information reliable?*
- *Is the information easily retrievable so DOC, jail and community corrections case managers can review their efforts?*
- *How is incremental offender change measured while they are incarcerated?*
- *What outcomes are measured and how are they tracked?*
- *How is staff performance measured? What data is used? How is that data collected? How is it used to provide feedback to the DOC, jail and community corrections staff member?*

8. Provide measurement feedback.

- *How is information regarding inmate change and outcomes shared with facility staff? With inmates?*
- *With whom is information regarding outcome measures shared?*
- *How is staff performance data used in the performance evaluation process?*
- *Are parole board/judicial expectations, requirements, and decisions clearly conveyed and evidence-based?*

Issue

The mission of the Incarceration Task Force is to identify for the Commission the gaps in practice and activities, barriers to implementation, and critical issues surrounding an inmate's time spent in jail or prison preparing for success upon release from incarceration. The Incarceration Task Force will also make recommendations aimed at increasing successful re-entry and in turn reducing recidivism.

Additional Information

- As of November 2007, the number of offenders incarcerated was 22,796. It is projected that by 2014 the prison population will increase to 29,434.⁸
- 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.
- Program completion can reduce recidivism. Research shows that prison-based educational and vocational programs result in lower recidivism rates for program participants after their release from prison. Specifically, inmates who earned a GED were less likely to recidivate than those who did not complete an educational program.⁹
- Incarceration employment preparation programs are likely to increase inmate success due to the fact employed offenders were more than three times as likely to succeed in a

⁸ Harrison, L. (December, 2007). *Population projections for adult prison and parole, community corrections, and juvenile commitment and parole*. Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics.

⁹ Pryzybylski, R. (2008). *What works: Effective recidivism reduction and risk-focused prevention programs. A compendium of evidence-based options for preventing new and persistent criminal behavior*. Denver, CO: Office of Research and Statistics, Division of Criminal Justice.

transitional community corrections program in comparison to those who were unemployed (71.9% in comparison to 20.0%).¹⁰

- Recent research shows that longer prison stays are not necessarily associated with decreased recidivism. In fact, it was also found that compared to community based sanctions incarceration actually increased recidivism.¹¹
- The Level of Service Inventory (LSI)¹² 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 the non-recidivists.¹³
- 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

Source: 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 2006. The total of 663 cases reflects missing data on the majority of cases in this analysis. See attached glossary for definitions of terms.

¹⁰ Burrell, N.H., & English, K. (2006). *Community corrections in Colorado: A study of program outcomes and recidivism, FY00-FY04*. Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics.

¹¹ Gendreau, P., Goggin, C. & Cullen, F. (1999). *The effects of prison sentences on recidivism*. A Report to the Corrections Research and Development and Aboriginal Policy Branch, Solicitor General of Canada. Ottawa, Canada. Also, Smith, P., Goggin, C., & Gendreau, P. (2002). *The effects of prison sanctions on recidivism: General effects and individual differences*. Public Works and Government Services Canada. Available at www.sgc.gc.ca.

¹² Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1995). *The Level of Service Inventory – Revised*. Toronto, Quebec: Multi-Health Systems.

¹³ 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

Nearly all inmates confined in prison, jail and community corrections will eventually be released back into the community. Preparation for successful release begins at intake into the facility, and is critical in preventing recidivism and ensuring cost-effective use of correctional resources. The Incarceration Task Force will make recommendations to the Re-Entry Oversight Committee. The 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 Incarceration Task Force will make recommendations to the Re-Entry Oversight Committee, which will, in turn, make recommendations to the Commission.
- The Incarceration Task Force shall comprise a representative sampling of the stakeholders and the community.
- The Incarceration Task Force chair will be a Commission member.
- The Task Force shall consist of no more than fifteen (15) formal 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.
 - The Task Force Leader (TFL) has specific expertise and represents the voice of the community. The TFL participates on the Oversight Committee.
- 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 area. Satellite video conferencing will be used when possible to connect with 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-intensive 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 will 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
- A focus on significant recidivism
- 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 will not result in...

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

DOCUMENTS TO REVIEW

- State legislation that directs local jails
 - Mission
 - Offender assessment, classification, and management
 - Programming
 - Work
 - Visitation
 - Transition planning
 - Coordination with DOC
- State legislation that directs prison
 - Mission
 - Offender assessment, classification, and management
 - Programming
 - Work
 - Visitation
 - Transition planning
 - Placement in community corrections
 - Coordination with local jails
- State legislation and administrative regulations that direct community corrections
- Local community corrections admissions policies and criteria
- Agency administrative rules and regulations
- Agency policies
- Community Corrections Risk Factor Analysis Report (2007)
- *What Works* report by Roger Przybylski

- Tab 9 of CCJJ Binder: *Evidence Based Practices*
- National Research Council recommendations for community integration
- *Confronting confinement: A report by the Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons*, Vera Institute.
- "Employ Behavioral Contracting for 'Earned Discharge' Parole" by Joan Petersilia (*Criminology and Public Policy*, Nov. 2007)
- Materials at reentrypolicy.org
- Other material as determined

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:
Time:
Location:

Date:
Time:
Location:

Date:
Time:
Location:

MEMBERS:

TASK FORCE CHAIRPERSON: Grayson Robinson

TASK FORCE LEADER: Michelle Sykes

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 3

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 A
Summary of Recidivism Findings

Study Population	Follow-up period	Measure of Recidivism	Recidivism Rate (%)	Notes
Juvenile Probation¹⁴				
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 Probation¹⁵				
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 ¹⁶	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 ¹⁷	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

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ 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.

¹⁷ Ibid.

Division of Youth Corrections¹⁸

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

Department of Corrections¹⁹

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 Corrections²⁰

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.

¹⁸ 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.

¹⁹ 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>.

²⁰ 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.