

CCJJ Committee on Re-Entry: Post-Incarceration Supervision Task Force

Charter

Phase 1

MISSION

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

- Statutes, policies, regulations, and practices that govern post-incarceration supervision,
- Parolees and community corrections transition offenders,
- Payment of restitution and other fees,
- Efficient use of programming resources (e.g., avoidance of repetitive programming),
- Ongoing assessments,
- Technical violations,
- Access to residential community corrections to stabilize offenders,
- Cost effectiveness, and
- Reduction of parole sentence when the offender is compliant with supervision conditions.

The Post-Incarceration Supervision 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 in turn 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 post-incarceration supervision would be formed.

Introduction

In Colorado over 90,000 adult offenders were under some form of supervision as of December 31, 2007.¹ During FY 2007, 20,000 offenders were sentenced to probation and 10,626 offenders were admitted to prison. Another 2600 were placed in transition community corrections. Thousands more are incarcerated every year in county jails.

Approximately 95% of incarcerated offenders will at some point be released from facilities and returned to live in communities throughout the state. According to the Department of Corrections,² nearly half (49.7%) of Colorado inmates that were released in 2002 returned to prison within three years of release. The number of individuals returned to prison in Colorado for parole 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

Recidivism reduction translates into increased public safety.⁴ This occurs by systems prioritizing the use of evidence-based methods to prevent known offenders from committing new crimes upon release from incarceration. Many criminologists agree that parole authorities and administrators of post-release programs should redesign their activities and redirect their resources to provide major support to parolees and other releasees in the initial days, weeks, and months following re-entry. Such programs include: intensive post-release counseling and supervision, assistance in finding work, immediate enrollment in drug and alcohol treatment programs, mentorship programs, assistance with obtaining basic needs (i.e., identification cards, clothes, housing and other immediate needs) along with longer term cognitive-behavioral treatment approaches.⁵

A large proportion of community corrections offenders are resentenced to full incarceration in jail or prison, but few (1.5%) are arrested for committing a new crime while in the program. As

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.

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 National Research Council. (2008). *Parole, desistance from crime, and community integration*. Washington, D.C: The National Academics Press.

shown in Table 1 below, 1,110 offenders were terminated from community corrections for technical violations in FY 2007 and another 634 absconded/escaped, resulting in a warrant for their arrest. 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.

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.

Post-incarceration supervision focuses on the long-term success of the individual. Table 2 below lists 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 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 programs <i>with</i> community aftercare	6.9%
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%

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.

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 Post-Incarceration Supervision 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 a systematic and comprehensive review of practices and data that reflects such practices; 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 Post-Incarceration Supervision Task Force will make recommendations to the Oversight Committee on Re-Entry, which will in turn make recommendations to the CCJJ. The Commission has identified a number of key areas that are related to successful offender outcomes. Focused, 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 identified as evidence-based practice.

The Post-Incarceration Supervision Task Force has been charged with identifying the best post-incarceration supervision and community corrections (transition) 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 behavioral health problems, gender, and other special populations.

The following eight evidence-based principles will guide the work of the Post-Incarceration Supervision Task Force.⁷

1. Assess offender risk and need levels using actuarial instruments being used by parole and community corrections.

- *What tools are being used?*
- *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 supervision of offenders? Are current methods adequate?*
- *How are multiple service needs addressed?*

2. Enhance offender motivation.

- *Are parole officers and community corrections case managers 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 offenders?*
- *What is the rate of treatment compliance?*
- *How do work requirements for releasees interfere with necessary treatment?*
- *Furthermore, how do releasees manage the often-times conflicting requirements of supervision, work and treatment?*
- *What is the completion rate of programs?*

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' time for the initial 3-9 months.
- Implement the treatment principle.
 - Integrate treatment into the full sentence/sanction requirements.
- *Are supervision and treatment resources for higher risk offenders prioritized?*
- *Are interventions targeting at least four criminogenic needs?*

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.

- *Are programs responsive to each offender's temperament, learning style, motivation, gender and culture?*
 - *Are adequate program dose and duration provided?*
 - *Is treatment integrated into sentence and sanction requirements?*
 - *How are offenders 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 offenders, especially during the initial three to nine month period in the community after leaving an institution?*
 - *How are supervising officers and case managers held accountable for using assessment information to develop a case plan and then subsequently using that case plan to manage an offender?*
- 4. Provide skill training for staff and monitor their delivery of services.**
- *How are social learning techniques incorporated into the programs delivered by supervising officers and case managers?*
 - *How does DOC and community corrections ensure that contracted service providers are delivering community 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.**
- *Are positive reinforcement techniques modeled by supervising officers and case managers in their day-to-day interactions with co-workers?*
 - *Do policies and procedures support the use of positive reinforcements for offenders?*
 - *Are supervising officers and case managers trained in providing positive reinforcement for offenders?*
 - *Do supervising officers and case managers 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 is community support for offenders used as a regular part of case planning?*
 - *Is the current practice sufficient?*
 - *How is community network contact measured as it relates to offenders?*
 - *How is it ensured that this support is meaningful and valuable to the offender?*
- 7. Measure relevant processes and practices.**
- *What data are collected regarding offender assessment and case management?*
 - *Is the information reliable?*
 - *Is the information easily retrievable so that managing staff can review their efforts?*
 - *How are incremental offender changes measured while they are under supervision?*
 - *What are the outcome measures and how are they tracked?*
 - *How is staff performance measured? What data are used? How are these data collected? How are data used to provide feedback to the supervising officer or case manager?*

8. Provide measurement feedback.

- *How is information regarding offender change and outcomes shared with supervision staff? With offenders?*
- *Who receives the information regarding outcome measures?*
- *How is staff performance data used in the performance evaluation process?*

Issue

The mission of the On-Going Supervision Task Force is to identify for the Commission the barriers and issues surrounding the long-term successful reintegration of the offender into the community after the first six months of supervision and intensive services. The Task Force will make recommendations aimed at increasing successful supervision and, in turn, reducing recidivism.

Additional Information

- 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.
- As of December 2007, the number of offenders on parole in Colorado was 8,508. It is projected that the parole population will increase to 12,496 by 2014.⁸
- Research shows that community supervision that is service-oriented rather than surveillance-oriented can reduce recidivism⁹.
- Educational, vocational, substance-abuse treatment, mental health, and cognitive-behavioral programs reduce recidivism and are cost-effective.¹⁰
- The data show that the majority of individuals that regress to DOC are returned for technical violations. A parolee is about three times more likely to return to prison for a technical violation than for a new crime.¹¹
- It has been found that the rates of committing a new crime or violating the terms of parole are highest within the first six months after release.¹² Thus, the time period

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.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ 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.

¹² Ibid.

immediately following release from prison is the riskiest for the offender and for the public.

- The cost-effectiveness and savings of an offender successfully completing parole rather than returning to prison is significant. According to DOC, the supervision of four offenders on intensive supervision parole (ISP) is less expensive than incarcerating one inmate for one year.¹³
- Offenders who participate in family services, education programs, and/or mental health programs had greater success rates in comparison to those who did not participate in such programs.¹⁴
- Research shows that recidivism rates are decreased if parolees participate in work, education, and substance abuse programs.¹⁵
- The Level of Service Inventory (LSI)¹⁶ 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.¹⁷
- The average LSI score varies by placement, therefore needs for offender services vary by placement (see Table 3).

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

¹³ 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.

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ Lipsey, M., & Cullen, F.T. (2007). *The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: A review of systematic reviews*. Annual Review of Law and Social Science.

¹⁶ Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1995). *The Level of Service Inventory – Revised*. Toronto, Quebec: Multi-Health Systems.

¹⁷ 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.

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 glossary for definitions of terms.

Concluding Statement

The increased rate of recidivism is the leading reason why Colorado’s prison population and correctional costs are rising.¹⁸ Successful reintegration into society is critical in reversing this trend. The Post-Incarceration Supervision 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 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 task force members are meant to represent the voice of the community and are not representative of government agencies. They serve to ensure a community voice by 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. Videoconferencing via satellite will be used when possible to include stakeholders statewide.
- The task force 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

¹⁸ 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.

- 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 in policy, procedures, services and staff training
- A short- and long-term strategy to address the gaps
- A focus on significant recidivism reduction
- The first set of recommendations are presented to Re-Entry Committee on August 20, 2008
 - Recommendations will include those that can take effect immediately (within one month), in the short term (within six 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 significantly decrease--or have no effect on--the overall recidivism rate
- Any recommendation that fails to recognize the cost savings of community supervision and community corrections over prison
- Any recommendation that would clearly compromise public safety

DOCUMENTS TO REVIEW

- State legislation that directs community supervision from prison and jail
- State administrative rules and regulations that direct community reintegration from prison and jail
- DOC and jail policies regarding transition
- Conditions of community supervision
- Regional DOC policies regarding transition, transition planning, and programming
- Community Corrections: board, facility acceptance, rejection, and termination criteria
- 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
- *Evidence Based Practices*, found under Tab 9 of CCJJ binder
- National Research Council recommendations for community integration
- "Employ Behavioral Contracting for 'Earned Discharge' Parole" by Joan Petersilia (*Criminology and Public Policy*, Nov. 2007)
- Material at reentrypolicy.org
- Other materials as they are 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:
Time:
Location:

Date:
Time:
Location:

Date:
Time:
Location:

MEMBERS:

TASK FORCE CHAIRPERSON: David Kaplan

TASK FORCE LEADER: Christie Donner

FACILITATOR: Germaine Miera/Christine Adams

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 serve time 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 Probation¹⁹				
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 Probation²⁰				
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 ²¹	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 ²²	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

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.

¹⁹ 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.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ 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.

²² Ibid.

Division of Youth Corrections²³

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

Department of Corrections²⁴

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 Corrections²⁵

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

²³ 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.

²⁴ 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>.

²⁵ 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.