

elements of change

highlighting trends and issues in the criminal justice system



vol. 3 / no. 2

Colorado's Prison Population Expected to Grow 57% in Six Years


■ Colorado's jurisdictional prison population grew to 12,988 on October 31, 1997, an increase of 8.2% between 1996 and 1997.

■ The male prison population grew by 7.8% between 1996 and 1997.

■ The female prison population increased by 14% between 1996 and 1997.



■ Projections indicate that the state's prison population will reach 20,446 on January 1, 2004, a 57.4% increase over the October 31, 1997 prison population.



In this issue:

- Fall 1997 Prison Population Projections
- Sex Offender Issues -- Sex Offender Treatment Board, the Polygraph, and Lifetime Supervision
- Heavy Drinking -- Fraternity & Sorority Involvement



Happy Birthday!


elements of change

We are two years old.

The Division of Criminal Justice Fall 1997 Prison Population Projections

Date	Men	Women	Total Population
Jan 1998	12307	957	13264
Jan 1999	13438	1089	14527
Jan 2000	14663	1212	15875
Jan 2001	15664	1333	16997
Jan 2002	16651	1443	18094
Jan 2003	17676	1552	19228
Jan 2004	18756	1690	20446
Six Year Growth	+ 52%	+ 76%	+ 54%*

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice Fall 1997 Prison and Parole Projections.
*** Note:** Six year prison population growth figure on this page (54%) is calculated between January 1998 and January 2004. Six year growth figure on the front page of *Elements of Change* (57%) is calculated between October 1997 and January 2004.



Projected Length of Stay (LOS) For New Admissions to Prison* **LOS Has Doubled from 1980 to 1998**

Year	Projected LOS
FY 1979-80	19.9 Months
FY 1980-81	22.2
FY 1981-82	23.4
FY 1982-83	23.4
FY 1983-84	25.4
FY 1984-85	31.7
FY 1985-86	34.7
FY 1986-87	43.2
FY 1987-88	53.3
FY 1988-89	57.0
FY 1989-90	42.0
FY 1990-91	39.5
FY 1991-92	40.7
FY 1992-93	37.6
FY 1993-94	40.7
FY 1994-95	43.1
FY 1995-96	40.2
FY 1996-97	41.5
FY 1997-98	39.6

Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice Fall 1997 Prison and Parole Projections.

* Average LOS reflects the amount of time offenders who were admitted during the representative year were expected to serve.



What Are the Factors Behind the Increase in the Colorado Prison Population?

Most of the growth in the prison population can be attributed to a slight increase in prison commitments during the last two years. During fiscal year 1995-96, admissions to the Department of Corrections increased by 14.9% percent over the previous year. Prior to that, the average increase in the number of offenders admitted to prison was much less.

Included in these admission numbers are those offenders returned for committing a new crime while under parole supervision. Between FY1995-96 and FY1996-97, prison commitments in this category (parolee new crime returns) increased by 67%. The number of offenders returning to prison from parole, for both technical violations and the commission of a new crime, can be expected to continue to grow as the parole population increases because of mandatory parole provisions established in 1993.

At the same time, the proportion of releases from prison, as a percentage of the prison population, have remained steady. Given increased commitments and stabilized releases, the prison system has experienced faster prison population growth than was expected in past projections.

**Colorado Prison Population vs. Colorado Adult Population (Yearly % Increase):
Colorado Prison Population Growing Faster
than General Adult Population**



Source: Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics.
Note: Prison population figures for 1980 through 1984 reflect average daily attendance.



Sex Offender Treatment Board Has Approved Final Revisions to the Standards & Guidelines

The Colorado Sex Offender Treatment Board (SOTB) has just approved final revisions to the *Standards and Guidelines for the Assessment, Evaluation, Treatment, and Behavioral Monitoring of Adult Sex Offenders* (hereafter Standards).

The decision to revise the Standards, originally published in January 1996, was based on identifying weaknesses in the existing Standards as a result of the implementation process and the growing body of risk assessment research. The revisions process has included trainings, reviews of the research, extensive discussion with service providers and community members involved in working with sex offenders, and formal public hearings. A partial list of the revisions follows:

- ▣ A new **guiding principle**: children who have been sexually abused within their families have rights to safety and protection that supercede family or parental rights.
- ▣ The addition of a requirement that a **measure of sexual arousal or interest** be included in sex offense-specific mental health evaluations.
- ▣ An increase in the initial **specialized training** requirements for evaluators and treatment providers from 40 to 80 hours.
- ▣ A requirement that applicants wishing to become **evaluators** must initially qualify as treatment providers as well.
- ▣ More specific requirements regarding the **types of polygraph examinations** that can be used to qualify as experience to meet the clinical polygraph examiner requirements.
- ▣ Specific requirements for the components to be included in all **polygraph examination reports**.
- ▣ Specific reasons the SOTB may deny an applicant placement on the **provider list**.

and...

The pending Concerning Sex Offenders Bill (HB98-1177) will clarify and strengthen laws addressing sex offenders in Colorado, including changing the name of the Sex Offender **Treatment** Board to the Sex Offender **Management** Board.

What Is the Sex Offender Treatment Board? Where Did It Come From?

In 1992, the Colorado General Assembly passed legislation that created a Sex Offender Treatment Board (SOTB) in the Division of Criminal Justice. The SOTB was charged to develop standards and guidelines for the evaluation, treatment, and behavioral monitoring of sex offenders. Currently, the SOTB consists of personnel representing the following domains: the Department of Corrections, the Judicial Department, law enforcement, the Public Defenders Office, clinical polygraph examiners, the Department of Public Safety, district attorneys, Department of Human Services, licensed mental health professionals with expertise in treating sex offenders, the victim services community, and Community Corrections.

What Are the Standards and Guidelines?

The combined efforts of the Sex Offender Treatment Board members are focused toward developing a basis for systematic management and treatment of sex offenders. Hence, the Standards and Guidelines for the Assessment, Evaluation, Treatment, and Behavioral Monitoring of Adult Sex Offenders were created. The primary goal of this document is to improve community safety and protect citizens. The standards are based on the best practices known today for managing and treating sex offenders. The following are the main points of the standards and guidelines:

- *Guiding principles outlining the philosophy of the SOTB standards*
- *Guidelines for presentence investigations*
- *Standards for mental health sex offense specific evaluations*
- *Standards of practice for treatment providers*
- *Qualifications of treatment providers/evaluators*
- *Standards and guidelines for management of sex offenders on probation, parole, and community corrections*
- *Standards for polygraphy*
- *Standards for plethysmography*
- *Standards for continuity of information*
- *Recommendations for management and information sharing on alleged sex offenders prior to conviction*

For further information, please call Jean McAllister at (303) 239-4447. If you would like a copy of the Standards and Guidelines, call Carole Henderson at (303) 239-4694.

The Polygraph -- A Powerful Tool for the Management & Containment of Sex Offenders

Sex offenders tend to be extremely secretive and reluctant to disclose the full extent of their offending behavior. Sex offenders also tend to commit crimes at very high frequencies. Disarming this volatile mix of behaviors requires specialized and powerful interventions.

One such intervention is the polygraph. In 1973, Stan Abrams, a clinical psychologist and forensic psychophysicist in Oregon, and his colleague Dr. Ernest Ogard, reported that probationers convicted of burglary, substance abuse, and sex assault were nearly three times less likely to reoffend (compared to a control group) when the polygraph was incorporated into the supervision program. Other studies by treatment providers reported an increase in sexual assault disclosures when the polygraph was used. The Office of Research and Statistics is working with the Department of Corrections on a study of polygraph disclosures. Some of the findings to date are presented in the tables below.

Number of Sex Offenses and Victims Known to Authorities or Disclosed by the Sex Offender *

	Pre-Sentence Investigation Report **	Polygraph
Median Number of Offenses	1	14
Median Number of Victims	1	6

Source: Evaluation Report: Integration of Polygraph Testing with Adult Sex Offenders, Colorado Department of Corrections, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, February 1998.
* This sample was drawn from sex offenders in prison or on parole (n = 115).
** 17 offenders (out of 115) had either no PSIR or no sex offense information in their PSIR.

Lack of full disclosure by a sex offender can lead to misdiagnosis or underdiagnosis of deviant sexual interests and, consequently, implementation of an inadequate management and containment plan. The polygraph demands full disclosure from a sex offender, achieving greater accountability and more complete risk management information.

Multiple Paraphilia/Types of Victim Revealed by Polygraph: Percent of Sample Reporting Participation in These Paraphilia

72.5% of the sex offenders in the sample participated in two or more paraphilia

Paraphilia/ Target Victim	*Percent of Sample	Paraphilia/ Target Victim	*Percent of Sample
Male Child	24.0%	Obscene Phone Calling	14.2%
Female Child	62.8%	Voyeurism	48.7%
Male Adult	15.9%	Exhibitionism	23.0%
Female Adult	55.8%	Frottage	31.0%
Theft of Undergarments	13.3%	Prod./Sale of Pornography	8.3%

Source: Evaluation Report: Integration of Polygraph Testing with Adult Sex Offenders, Colorado Department of Corrections, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, February, 1998.
* Since 72.5% of the sample reported two or more paraphilia, numbers do not total 100% (n = 108).
For more information, please call Kim English at (303) 239-4442.

Pending Legislation: Lifetime Supervision for Sex Offenders Will Plea Bargaining Increase with Lifetime Supervision?

A bill currently pending in the Colorado Legislature (HB 981156) proposes lifetime supervision (on probation or parole) for certain sex offenders. Sex offenders meeting the criteria of lifetime supervision (felony 2-4) could be sanctioned with an indefinite risk-based period of supervision (a period extending as long as necessary to remove them as a threat to the community).

Lifetime supervision, if enacted, will have a substantial impact on many areas of the criminal justice system, including increased cost of supervision and increased probation/parole caseload demands. Another potential area of impact will be plea bargaining. The threat of lifetime supervision as a sanction may change plea bargaining patterns in Colorado.

The Division of Criminal Justice collects court data annually and will be watching for any new trends regarding the charging and conviction of sex offenders. The graphic below reflects the current practices.

Sex Offenses: 1995 Charges & Convictions by Felony Class


- ▣ Felony 2 charges resulted in no convictions
- ▣ Many felony 3 charges were reduced
- ▣ Felony 6's, misdemeanors, and non-sex offenses appeared only as convictions (27.1%) -- making up 0% of charges

Felony Class	Charge (n = 162)	Conviction (n = 162)
Felony 2	4.3%	0%
Felony 3	67.9%	16.7%
Felony 4	26.6%	44.5%
Felony 5	1.2%	11.7%
Felony 6	0%	0.6%
Misd.	0%	12.3%
None	0%	14.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Source: DCJ 1995 court database.
For more information, please call Linda Swolls at (303) 239-4458.

Fraternity and Sorority Leaders -- Role Models for Heavy Drinking?

Average Number of Drinks per Week Among Male and Female College Students by Level of Fraternity/Sorority Involvement (n=25,411)



Elements of Change prepared & distributed by:

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND STATISTICS
 Kim English, Research Director
 (kenglis8@aol.com)

DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
 William R. Woodward, Director
 (wwoodwar@safety.state.co.us)

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
 Patrick C. Ahlstrom, Executive Director
 (pahlstro@safety.state.co.us)

http://www.state.co.us/gov_dir/cdps/dcj/dcjinfo.htm

We gratefully acknowledge the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, for its assistance to the state Statistical Analysis Centers (SAC) (the DCJ Office of Research & Statistics is the SAC in Colorado).

Graphic design by John Patzman

<Note: A drink was defined as the "consumption of a bottle of beer, a glass of wine, a wine cooler, a shot glass of spirits, or a mixed drink."

<Source: CESAR Fax, Center for Substance Abuse Research, University of Maryland, College Park, Vol. 7, Issue 9. Adapted by CESAR from data from Jeffrey Cashin, Cheryl Presley, and Philip Meilman, "Alcohol Use in the Greek System: Follow the Leader?" *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 59:63-70, January 1998.



Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
 Office of Research and Statistics
 700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
 Denver Colorado 80215
 (M460000730)

Bulk Rate
 U.S. Postage
 PAID
 Permit No. 738
 Denver, CO