

# Report of Findings

## Comparison of Intensive Supervision Probation and Community Corrections Clientele

May 1996

### *Authors*

Kim English  
Suzanne Pullen  
Susan Colling-Chadwick

*Prepared by the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice*

Kim English, Research Director  
Bill Woodward, Division Director  
Patrick A. Ahlstrom, Director, Department of Public Safety

*This project was funded with 75% federal funds from the Drug Control and System Improvement Formula Grant #95-DB-19-12-1 to the State of Colorado, Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, and 25% Long Bill funds.*



# Acknowledgments

We would like to thank those who assisted us in this research effort. Vern Fogg, Larry Linke, Gary Corbett, and Bill Woodward helped us keep the research questions relevant to policy, administration, and program operations. We appreciate Peg Ackerman for assisting us with data collection on very short notice. Ed Wensuc from Judicial worked closely with us and identified the offenders who terminated ISP in 1993, and this was no small task: thank you. Thanks to Angela Erker for the 1993 community corrections database. We are very grateful for the work of staff at all the probation offices and halfway houses who pulled more than 1600 offender files for us. Linda Swolfs tracked the electronic rap sheets of each offender and logged each new crime committed by those who terminated ISP and community corrections in 1993. Without the hard and fast work of DCJ's Joan Crouch and her data collection team of Sharon Thomas, Anthony Getzberg, Julie Ann May, Sydney Cooley-Towell, Diane Pasini-Hill, and David Graham, the offender profile and program termination data necessary to address the Legislature's questions would never have been compiled in time. And thanks to Pat Ransome and Mona Fitzmaurice for managing the fiscal portion of this project along with the temporary personnel processes and paperwork.



# Table of Contents

7	<b><i>Preface</i></b>
9	<b><i>Executive Summary</i></b>
13	<b><i>Chapter One</i></b> Introduction
19	<b><i>Chapter Two</i></b> Colorado's Offender Population: An Overview
23	<b><i>Chapter Three</i></b> Study Findings: How Do ISP and Community Corrections Populations Differ?
31	<b><i>Chapter Four</i></b> ISP and Community Corrections: Gender Differences
39	<b><i>Chapter Five</i></b> Program Variation and Judicial District
43	<b><i>Chapter Six</i></b> Recommendations
45	<b><i>Bibliography</i></b>
47	<b><i>Appendix A</i></b> Research Methods
51	<b><i>Appendix B</i></b> Juvenile and Adult Criminal History Elements Ranked by Sentence Placement
53	<b><i>Appendix C</i></b> Conviction Crime Type Ranked by Sentence Placement
55	<b><i>Appendix D</i></b> Additional Client Descriptions: Community Corrections
57	<b><i>Appendix E</i></b> ISP / Community Corrections Program Successes Tracked for Reoffense

59	<b>Appendix F</b>
	Community Corrections Program Variation by Judicial District
65	<b>Appendix G</b>
	ISP Program Variation by Judicial District
69	<b>Appendix H</b>
	Recidivism Rates for New Felonies After 12 Months
71	<b>Appendix I</b>
	Field and Client Termination Data Collection Forms

# Preface

This study addresses questions about the types of offenders placed in intensive supervision probation and community corrections in Colorado. The report does not answer questions about *appropriate* placements, however, because this can only be discussed in light of specific and explicit placement criteria.

Resource constraints in the criminal justice system, and in government generally, have spurred the recent development and evaluation of correctional programs that seek to match offender risk and need characteristics with targeted interventions. Corrections officials believe this approach will give policy makers "the most bang for the buck." To this end, correctional assessment tools have become an important component in criminal justice system improvement efforts. In Colorado, recent work by criminal justice officials mandated to implement the statewide substance abuse assessment protocol pursuant to House Bill 91-1173 (Article 11.5) reflect the intent of the General Assembly to incorporate what Canadian researchers refer to as the Risk Principle in supervision and treatment decisions (Andrews and Bonta, 1994).

The Risk Principle is based on dozens of studies (see Andrews and Bonta, 1994) that empirically support a systematic, empirically-based assessment/intervention approach to corrections. The premise of the Risk Principle is that most criminal behavior can be predicted. In addition, effective supervision starts with an intervention that *matches* an offender's level of risk of criminal behavior with the level of services provided during correctional intervention. According to the Risk Principle, high risk behavior is linked to criminogenic needs. Criminogenic needs--areas in an offender's life that are problems which lead to a criminal lifestyle or behavior---are dynamic and sometimes changeable. Delivering treatment in a manner that is consistent with the offender's criminogenic needs, plus his or her cognitive ability and learning style, will enhance risk management and reduce the likelihood that the offender will engage in future crime.

Colorado's recently developed substance abuse treatment protocol requires the system-wide use of the LSI (Level of Supervision Inventory). The LSI generates 11 subscales that inform the case manager about areas in the offender's life that need management and treatment. The LSI is a tool to be re-administered every six months to capture offender change in the areas of interest. The implementation of the intent of H.B. 91-1173 via the LSI instrument and the other tools in the substance abuse assessment battery reflects the state's attempt to codify the Risk Principle in Colorado.

In 1993 and 1994, however, when offenders in this study were released from ISP and community corrections and tracked for 12 months to determine rearrest rates, comprehensive assessment data were not uniformly available for collection and analysis. The data in the current report reflect traditional decision making criteria--criminal history, current offense, and extremely general and nonstandardized, but reliable, measures of "need" (stability, employment, substance abuse, etc.). We

look forward to incorporating LSI and other assessment data in future research efforts because such data will significantly enhance our ability to describe the populations of interest.



# Executive Summary

## Background of the Study

In 1995, the Colorado General Assembly funded the Division of Criminal Justice to conduct a study that would analyze the differences between offenders sentenced to Intensive Supervision Probation and community corrections. The focus of the research was to study offender failures and successes in these two programs and to determine what proportion of successful completions remained crime-free after 12 months.

## ISP and Community Corrections Population

### Characteristics

- # The population of offenders placed on ISP and community corrections differ ( $p < .05$ ) in the following ways:
  - P ISP clients in 1993 were more likely than community corrections placements to have the following characteristics:
    - P *Current* probation revocation
    - P Violent juvenile *arrest* history
    - P Current violent offense
    - P Women, perhaps with children
    - P Average Criminal History Score of 1.47
    - P Behavior at arrest: Some physical or verbal aggression
  - P Community corrections clients in 1993 were more likely than ISP placements to have the following characteristics:
    - P *Prior* adult probation revocation
    - P Juvenile *adjudication* history
    - P Property or drug crime
    - P Alcohol problem
    - P Mental health problem
    - P Two or more prior felony convictions
    - P Average Criminal History Score of 1.80
  
- # Offender population profiles, program outcome, and rearrest rates vary considerably across judicial districts.
  
- # Approximately half of the women in both ISP and community corrections had serious financial problems.
  
- # Gender differences in both the ISP and community corrections populations, described in the report, reflect the importance of developing a wide range of programming for both men and women.

## **Program Completion and Recidivism Rates**

- # Program completion rates in 1993 were slightly higher for community corrections clients than for ISP clients: 54.7% of community corrections clients were successful; 49.4% of ISP clients were successful.
  
- # After one year, the majority of those who succeeded in the program remained crime-free:
  - P 81.4% of ISP clients remained crime-free.
  - P 73.3% of community corrections clients remained crime-free.
  - P 5.4% of ISP offenders were rearrested for a new violent felony.
  - P 4.3% of community corrections clients were rearrested for a new violent felony.

## **ISP and Community Corrections Failures**

- # Nearly half of ISP and one-third of community corrections clients had failed regular probation supervision, either on a prior crime or for the current crime.
  
- # Many offenders with original probation placement failures went on to fail, either failing the current ISP or community corrections placement or by getting rearrested during the 12 months following program termination.
  
- # In ISP, the presence of serious alcohol problems was statistically related to both program failure and rearrest rates after successful program completion.
  
- # In community corrections, program failure was significantly related to unemployment.
  
- # Offenders who failed either program or who were rearrested 12 months later--compared to those who succeeded and remained crime-free---were, on average, younger individuals with a juvenile and an adult criminal record.
  
- # Offenders convicted of violent offenses and placed in either program were significantly more likely to successfully complete the program and to remain crime-free for the following 12 months.
  
- # Many of the offenders who were processed through both ISP and community corrections in 1993 had serious problems that could interfere with the ability to function in the community, including residential instability, employment problems (approximately half were unemployed at arrest), alcohol or drug addictions, and problems with their families.





# Introduction

## Background of the Study

In 1995, the Colorado General Assembly funded the Division of Criminal Justice to conduct a study that would analyze the differences between offenders sentenced to Intensive Supervision Probation and community corrections. The focus of the research was to study offender failures and successes in these two programs and to determine what proportion of successful completions remained crime-free after 12 months. These two programs represent the State's major supervised intermediate sanctions on a placement continuum between probation and prison, but the programs are structured very differently and the daily cost to the state per offender ranges between \$9.04 for ISP and \$32.38 for community corrections placements. Given these differences, the General Assembly was interested in characteristics and outcomes of offenders placed in these two programs.

The request for this study followed the results of a similar probe conducted of offenders who terminated from ISP and community corrections in 1990. The 1990 data reflected that community corrections clients were slightly, although not statistically significantly,  $p=.745$ , less serious than ISP offenders in terms of the average Criminal History Score<sup>1</sup> (the average score of ISP offenders in 1990 was 1.8, on a scale of 0 to 4, compared to 1.5 for community corrections clients). This variation became noteworthy when the earlier study found that, of those who successfully completed the program, a higher proportion of community corrections clients compared to ISP clients committed a new crime (misdemeanor or felony) within 12 months of program termination.

To answer the General Assembly's questions regarding program clientele, program terminations, and recidivism differences, a description of the differences between community corrections and ISP is warranted. While both community corrections and ISP are considered to be intermediate sanctions along a continuum of criminal justice placements in Colorado, important differences between the programs exist.

***The focus of the research was to study offender failures and successes in ISP and community corrections and to determine what proportion of successful completions remained crime-free after 12 months.***

***While both community corrections and ISP are considered to be intermediate sanctions along a continuum of criminal justice placements in Colorado, important differences between the programs exist.***

---

<sup>1</sup> The Colorado Criminal History Score, developed by M. Mande in the mid-1980's, is an index derived from a weighted combination of the following data items (weights shown in parentheses): number of juvenile adjudications (x.5); number of juvenile placements in secure institutions (x1.0); number of prior adult felony convictions (x1.0); number of prior adult violent felony convictions (x1.5); number of adult probation revocations (x.75); and number of adult parole revocations (x2.0). Scores are added and then collapsed to form a five-point scale ranging from 0-4, with 0 being the lowest and 4 being the highest. Scores are collapsed into the following categories: 0=0, .001-1.25= 1, 1.26-2.25= 2, 2.26-3.25= 3, 3.26-high= 4, giving the CH score a range of 0-4.

## Program Differences

Community corrections in Colorado is a system of more than 20 residential halfway houses. Offenders live in a structured, controlled environment while participating in programming, working, and paying restitution. Because this is a residential placement, program staff have daily contact with all community corrections clients. Comparatively, intensive supervision probation is a nonresidential program with strict, frequent probation officer contact standards (one telephone contact daily and four to eight face-to-face contacts monthly), curfew requirements, and often court-ordered special conditions (commonly including treatment requirements) that structure an offender's supervision period. ISP offenders are also expected to participate in programming, to work, and to pay restitution. Community corrections is a residential placement, ISP is not, and the state pays accordingly. The General Assembly's per diem rate for community corrections is \$32.38<sup>2</sup> per client compared to \$9.04 for intensive supervision probation.

## Program Expansion

Given the differential outcomes of the two community sanctions reported by DCJ after studying offenders who terminated from these programs in 1990 (described above), and the continuing growth of the overall correctional population in Colorado, questions concerning the expansion of these programs have been raised by a variety of policy makers. Because the information presented in the 1990 study was dated, and since ISP was then a relatively new program (expanding statewide in 1988), expansion decisions required more recent data. Imbedded in such a decision are a host of fiscal concerns, political issues, and philosophical approaches about the mission and structure of the justice system generally and about punishment in particular. Another important consideration is the value of discretion and an understanding of net widening as a function of this discretion.

Research cannot answer expansion questions, but it can inform the decision making process. For example, as this study reflects, research can produce empirical data describing the types of offenders placed in these community programs and profiling the groups of offenders who tend to fail and succeed during and after participating in the sanction. In fact, a substantial amount of research has been conducted, in Colorado and elsewhere, on offender risk, case management, and public safety (see, for example, Mande and English, 1988; English and Patzman, 1993; Bogue, 1993; Clear, 1988; Andrews and Bonta, 1994; Bonta, Parkinson, Pang and Barkwell, 1994; Bonta, 1996). In the current report, the analysis is limited to general offender profiles and recidivism. These studies highlight public safety by focusing on offender risk factors and the value of targeting specific types of offenders for needs-based treatment and community placement.

***Questions concerning the expansion of ISP and community corrections have been raised by a variety of policy makers. The decision to expand or modify any component of the criminal justice system is, ultimately, a policy choice that can be informed by careful research.***

## A Word About Net-widening and Correctional Options

---

<sup>2</sup> The programs may charge residential clients an additional per diem cost not to exceed \$10.00. The state's per diem cost for nonresidential community corrections is \$5.12 and clients may be charged up to \$1.00 of this daily cost.

Net-widening refers to the practice of placing offenders in more restrictive, and so more costly, correctional settings than is necessary for purposes of public safety and correction philosophy (punishment, deterrence, retribution, rehabilitation). Discussions of offender profiles and correctional sanctions often raise questions about net-widening: Is community corrections managing offenders who ought to be on probation? Is ISP? Are there offenders in prison who should be sanctioned in a less expensive community setting? Can community placements play a role in managing and reducing an offender's risk by imposing specific correctional interventions? Who should serve time where?

DCJ's statistical analysis of a sample of felony cases reaching disposition and sentencing in 1993 reflects that 20% of the offender population that most resembles the profile of prisoners received sentences to community placements, i.e., probation, ISP and diversion community corrections.<sup>3</sup> This finding may suggest that intermediate sanctions like ISP and community corrections provide an important option for certain offenders otherwise bound for prison, but the finding could also suggest net widening---depending on the *explicit* criteria used to make placement decisions. Along the same vein, 20% of offenders whose characteristics looked (statistically) most like probationers according to criminal history, employment status, and current offense data were sentenced to ISP, community corrections, or prison.<sup>4</sup> This may also be considered net-widening or, as discussed above, the use of judicial discretion that reflects local values that may vary across jurisdiction. The question becomes: How was the placement decision made? Was it based on placement criteria that include offender risk/needs data (such as addiction problems) combined with the availability---or lack of availability---of intervention approaches that might contain, manage or even reduce, the offender's risk of reoffense?

Professor Alan Harland (1996:6-7) has summarized a range of correctional interventions (see Figure 1.1) that he describes as "typically contemplated, if not present, in most jurisdictions, and illustrates the sizable number of alternatives that may be in competition for the decision maker's attention in any given case" (1996:5-6).

***The question becomes: How was the placement decision made? Was it based on placement criteria that include offender risk/needs data (such as addiction problems) combined with the availability---or lack of availability---of intervention approaches that might contain, manage or even reduce, the offender's risk of reoffense?***

---

3 Discriminant analysis was used to compare characteristics of a sample of prisoners and non-prisoners (n= 2,378) sentenced in nine of Colorado's judicial districts in 1993. The analysis reflects that 80.28% of the prisoners are "correctly classified" to prison (R= 31.8). This means that 19.72% of offenders who resemble prisoners were, in fact, sentenced to either probation, ISP, jail, or community corrections. The two groups of offenders were similar to each other on the following characteristics: high criminal history score; current conviction was for multiple counts; unemployed at the time of arrest; offense involved a gun; on parole or in community corrections at the time of arrest; involved in a gang. Note that LSI data measuring an offender's need level as it relates to public risk has recently been incorporated into presentence investigation reports (the primary data source for this research) and was not available for this analysis.

4 A discriminant analysis correctly classified 80.66% of the probation sample; the remaining 19.34% received more restrictive sanctions (R= 34.6%) than might be warranted by consideration of criminal history, current crime, and employment history.

**Figure 1.1**  
**Summary Listing of Major Correctional Options**

WARNING MEASURES (Notice of consequences of subsequent wrongdoing)	Admonishment / Cautioning (administrative, judicial) Suspended execution or imposition of sentence	
INJUNCTIVE MEASURES (Banning legal conduct)	Travel (e.g., from jurisdiction, to specific criminogenic spots) Association (e.g., with other offenders) Driving Possession of weapons Use of alcohol Professional activity (e.g., disbarment)	
ECONOMIC MEASURES	Restitution Costs Fees Forfeitures Support payments Fines (standard, day fines)	
WORK-RELATED MEASURES	Community service (individual placement, work crew) Paid-employment requirements	
EDUCATION-RELATED MEASURES	Academic (e.g., basic literacy, GED) Vocational training Life skills training	
PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH TREATMENT MEASURES	Psychological / psychiatric Chemical (e.g., methadone, psychoactive drugs) Surgical (e.g., acupuncture, drug treatment)	
PHYSICAL CONFINEMENT MEASURES	Partial or intermittent confinement	Home curfew Day treatment center Halfway houses Restitution center Weekend detention facility / jail Outpatient treatment facility (e.g., drug / mental health)
	Full / continuous confinement	Full home / house arrest Mental hospital Other residential treatment facility (e.g., drug / alcohol) Boot camp Detention facility Jail Prison
MONITORING / COMPLIANCE MEASURES (May be attached to all other sanctions)	Required of the offender	Mail reporting Electronic monitoring (telephone check-in, active electronic monitoring device) Face-to-face reporting Urine analysis (random, routine)
	Required of the monitoring agent	Criminal records checks Sentence compliance checks (e.g., on payment of \$ sanctions; attendance / performance at treatment, work, or educational sites) Third-party checks (family, employer, surety, service / treatment provider), via mail, telephone, in person Direct surveillance / observation (random / routine visits, and possibly search, at home, work, institution, or elsewhere) Electronic monitoring (regular phone checks and/or passive monitoring device---currently used with home curfew or house arrest, but could track movement more widely as technology develops)

Source: Harland, Alan T. (ed.) (1996). *Choosing Correctional Options That Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 6-7.



The list of Harland's correctional options, coupled with discussions of net widening, begs the following question: How should correctional placements be decided? Research can provide outcome comparisons and statistical profiles of offender program populations, but it cannot clearly determine whether and how net-widening occurs. Research is limited in this regard because decision makers throughout the criminal justice system are given the discretion necessary to make placement decisions based on information that includes criminal history, current offense and, with the recent implementation of the General Assembly's H.B. 91-1173 mandates, data from 11 subscales derived from the empirically validated LSI (Level of Supervision Inventory). In fact, according to the Legislature's H.B. 91-1173 mandate, the LSI information is intended to drive supervision decisions in accordance with the instrument's ability to define an offender's needs, as these relate to public risk.

***According to the Legislature's H.B. 91-1173 mandate, the LSI information is intended to drive supervision decisions in accordance with the instrument's ability to define an offender's needs, as these relate to public risk.***

Today, LSI assessment data are included in all presentence reports, but this information was not available to DCJ researchers targeting offenders released during 1993, the sampling frame for the current recidivism study.

Policy makers and planners can anticipate "who goes where" only if specific selection criteria for directing the use of each correctional placement are agreed upon by stakeholders. Research would still be required to objectively track decision making, but unless explicit criteria identify the expectations of administrators, an empirical *evaluation* of placement decisions (via profiling offenders) is not possible. The purest way for the General Assembly to control the use (and therefore the cost to the State) of each correctional option is to definitively legislate criteria for placement, using validated risk/needs assessment scores (such as the LSI subscale scores), criminal history, current offense, or some combination of these. Empirical evidence suggests that mandates for placement criteria will, indeed, help to define a correctional population: Nearly three times as many offenders sentenced to community corrections, compared to ISP, have two prior felony convictions. These offenders are not probation-eligible, according to 16-11-201(2) (C.R.S.). However, the statute allows judges, on the recommendation of the district attorney, to waive this rule for certain offenders. Although some offenders with two prior felony convictions may still receive probation sentences, the statute has, in effect, clearly directed these offenders to halfway house or prison placements.

***Today, LSI assessment data are included in all presentence reports, but this information was not available to DCJ researchers targeting offenders released during 1993, the sampling frame for the current study.***

However, the imposition of objective criteria on criminal justice placement decisions will negate the ability of judges to use their discretion in ways they may believe best represent their community's sentiments and sentencing philosophies. Also, there may be additional elements that enter into sentencing decisions that have not been captured by analysts but may be extremely relevant to the judge's placement decisions.

## **The Focus of This Report**

This report presents the findings from a study of offenders terminating from ISP and community corrections in 1993, including rearrest information obtained during a 12-month follow-up period (please see Appendix A for a description of the research methods and offender samples). First, a profile of all offenders sentenced in 1990, 1992 and 1993 is presented in Chapter Two.<sup>5</sup> Chapter Three reports the research findings, Chapter Four discusses gender differences, and Chapter Five analyzes program differences. Chapter Six includes recommendations based on the research findings.

---

<sup>5</sup> This chapter uses DCJ's court database to compare offenders across sentencing placements and across time to indicate the changing nature of offender populations. Data in other chapters reflect case file information on offenders who terminated either ISP or community corrections in 1993. The data between these two samples of offenders will vary, so please refer to table notes that identify the data source.

# Colorado's Offender Population: An Overview

To understand the ISP and community corrections populations in 1993, it is useful to review the profiles of a sample of all offenders sentenced in Colorado in the early 1990s. For this chapter, DCJ's existing court database (see Appendix A for description of this database) was used to compare the characteristics of offenders sentenced to five correctional placements in 1990, 1992, and 1993: Probation, probation with a jail sentence, ISP, community corrections, and prison.

*Colorado's offender population tends to be male, young (age 28 to 30), single, and unemployed.*

As Table 2.1 reflects, Colorado's offender population tends to be male, young (age 28 to 30), single, and unemployed. These characteristics remained fairly stable over time, with a few exceptions. For example, the proportion of women in the criminal justice system increased slightly between 1990 and 1993 from 17.0% to 18.4%. Also, the proportion of the offender population that is single increased (from 49.0% to 53.5%), as did the proportion of offenders that are employed full time at the point of arrest (32.8% to 41.4%).

**Table 2.1**  
**Demographic Information: 1990, 1992, 1993**  
**A Sample of Offenders Sentenced Across Placement Types in Colorado**

Demographic Characteristic	PROBATION			PROBATION + JAIL			ISP			COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS			PRISON			TOTAL		
	90 %	92 %	93 %	90 %	92 %	93 %	90 %	92 %	93 %	90 %	92 %	93 %	90 %	92 %	93 %	90 %	92 %	93 %
Gender:																		
Male	74.7	74.6	74.0	88.2	87.3	88.1	85.0	79.6	80.0	86.1	87.3	90.7	91.5	93.9	94.1	83.0	81.5	81.6
Female	25.3	25.4	26.0	11.8	12.7	11.9	15.0	20.4	20.0	13.9	12.7	9.3	8.5	6.1	5.9	17.0	18.5	18.4
Mean age:	29.5	29.9	30.1	29.1	29.4	29.5	28.2	28.5	28.4	29.4	30.5	30.2	30.1	30.4	30.2	29.6	30.0	30.1
Marital status:																		
Single	49.4	51.3	54.4	48.7	49.9	51.1	41.0	57.4	42.9	52.3	49.2	53.4	47.9	52.3	52.7	49.0	51.4	53.5
Married	18.6	21.0	22.8	20.8	19.6	23.0	17.0	17.0	31.0	15.3	19.1	20.6	17.6	19.0	18.0	17.7	20.1	21.4
Sep\Div	23.9	22.8	18.5	21.7	24.6	18.7	25.0	17.0	19.0	22.4	23.3	21.8	24.9	19.5	21.3	24.1	21.8	19.7
Widowed	.8	.4	.9	.2	1.4	.3	1.0	0	0	1.3	.8	0	.8	0	.4	.9	.4	.6
Common Law	7.3	4.5	3.4	8.6	4.5	6.9	16.0	8.6	7.1	8.7	7.6	4.2	8.8	9.2	7.6	8.3	6.3	4.8
Employment:																		
Full-time	40.9	45.2	49.2	41.9	48.2	51.7	33.3	50.0	39.5	33.6	30.4	43.9	23.2	27.9	26.4	32.8	38.5	41.4
Part-time	9.8	3.9	4.6	9.7	4.3	3.7	10.1	2.2	11.6	8.2	6.1	1.8	7.5	4.5	2.7	8.7	4.3	3.9
Unemployed	44.6	47.1	42.4	41.7	43.2	40.3	49.5	41.3	41.9	48.9	57.4	48.8	62.2	60.4	62.7	52.1	52.1	49.2
Sporadic	4.7	3.8	3.8	6.7	4.3	4.3	7.1	6.5	7.0	9.3	6.1	5.5	7.1	7.2	8.2	6.4	5.1	5.5

Source: Division of Criminal Justice, court database (see Appendix A).

The offender's prior experience with the criminal justice system is reflected in Table 2.2. When looking at a sample of offenders sentenced in 1990, 1992, and 1993, it appears that a slightly larger proportion of offenders were more likely, in

1993, to have a juvenile delinquency history and an adult criminal history record. Overall, the differences were quite small but the direction of the trend is generally consistent.

**Table 2.2**  
**Juvenile and Adult Criminal History for a Sample of Offenders**  
**Sentenced in 1990, 1992, 1993**

Criminal History Element	PROBATION			PROBATION + JAIL			ISP			DIVERSION COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS			PRISON			TOTAL		
	90	92	93	90	92	93	90	92	93	90	92	93	90	92	93	90	92	93
Prior juvenile non-violent arrests (%)	21.1	18.7	16.4	24.2	25.6	28.3	42.1	45.7	28.9	34.7	31.8	33.1	37.7	38.4	40.5	26.6	27.0	26.3
Prior juvenile violent arrests (%)	3.7	6.1	5.5	4.5	8.7	9.6	9.5	17.4	15.8	7.5	8.2	6.8	10.5	12.6	12.0	5.8	8.7	8.5
Prior juvenile felony adjudications (%)	6.9	7.6	8.3	10.1	9.2	12.6	21.1	17.4	13.2	19.6	17.9	19.3	22.5	24.3	27.3	12.4	13.5	15.0
Prior adult non-violent arrests (%)	53.1	67.9	60.7	58.1	76.4	74.3	80.9	78.3	82.9	80.3	88.2	83.9	79.5	83.9	86.3	63.1	76.0	72.4
Prior adult violent arrests (%)	15.1	25.8	23.9	24.1	33.2	28.2	42.1	23.9	43.6	29.5	35.7	41.6	41.7	47.2	49.4	24.1	33.7	33.5
Prior adult felony convictions (%)	12.7	17.7	15.8	17.9	21.9	21.0	50.5	45.7	43.2	49.4	68.5	57.8	57.0	65.7	67.9	27.6	37.8	35.2

Please see Appendix B for a rank order of these criminal justice elements by year and placement type.

Source: Division of Criminal Justice, court database.

Table 2.3 reflects four categories of conviction crimes. The total column at the far right of Table 2.3 reflects a remarkably stable distribution of offenses between 1990 and 1993, but placements have changed somewhat. In particular, fewer property/fraud offenders received prison sentences in 1993 compared to 1990. Offenders convicted of drug crimes in 1990 and 1992 were most likely to be sentenced to ISP, whereas in 1993 these offenders were most likely to be placed on probation or in community corrections. Overall, significantly fewer offenders convicted of violent crimes (according to 16-11-309 C.R.S.) received direct probation sentences in 1990 compared to 1993. Between 1990 and 1993, the proportion of violent offenders increased in ISP (from 11.0% to 13.8%), community corrections (from 5.4% to 9.8%), and prison (from 26.8% to 38.4%), while the overall proportion of violent offenders remained fairly stable at 14.7% in 1990 and 15.4% in 1993. This pattern reflects, in general, an increase in the proportion of violent offenders in more restrictive settings since placements of these offenders are decreasing in regular probation supervision. However, between ISP and community corrections, the supervised living environment of a halfway house is considerably more restrictive, yet in 1993 13.8% of ISP placements were violent compared to 9.8% sentenced to community corrections.

***The proportion of violent offenders placed in ISP, community corrections, and prison increased in 1993.***

***The supervised living environment of a halfway house is considerably more restrictive than ISP, yet in 1993 13.8% of ISP placements were violent compared to 9.8% sentenced to community corrections.***

This finding may be the result of local community correction boards' rejection of court decisions to place violent offenders in halfway houses.

**Table 2.3**  
**Conviction Crime Type by Sentence Placement for a Sample of Offenders**  
**Sentenced in 1990, 1992, and 1993**

Crime Type	PROBATION			PROBATION + JAIL			ISP			DIVERSION COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS			PRISON			TOTAL		
	90 %	92 %	93 %	90 %	92 %	93 %	90 %	92 %	93 %	90 %	92 %	93 %	90 %	92 %	93 %	90 %	92 %	93 %
Property/ Fraud crimes	64.9	68.8	68.2	53.9	71.5	66.0	52.0	63.3	60.0	71.7	69.2	63.9	54.5	53.6	44.3	60.4	65.6	61.3
Drug crimes	25.0	21.8	24.1	30.4	16.6	18.8	33.0	22.4	22.2	21.5	18.2	23.5	17.0	12.9	16.3	22.8	18.6	21.3
Violent crimes*	7.7	6.3	5.4	13.2	10.0	12.8	11.0	14.3	13.8	5.4	10.7	9.8	26.8	31.8	38.4	14.7	13.4	15.4
Other crimes	2.5	3.1	2.2	2.5	1.8	2.4	4.0	0.00	4.4	1.4	2.0	2.7	1.6	1.7	1.0	2.1	2.4	2.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

\*For the purposes of this table, violent crimes are defined according to 16-11-309 C.R.S.

Please see Appendix C for a rank order of these criminal justice elements by year and placement type.

Source: Division of Criminal Justice, court database.

In sum, the offender population has remained fairly stable in terms of current conviction crime, but a slightly larger proportion of the group was more serious in 1993 compared to 1990, as measured by the likelihood of having logged a juvenile or adult criminal history. The 1993 population was slightly more likely to be unemployed and to be single at the time of the current arrest. Finally, sentencing patterns appear to have shifted somewhat during that time period, with fewer property and fraud offenders receiving ISP sentences rather than direct prison sentences and a larger proportion of violent offenders receiving a prison disposition.

These changes are extremely important. As we present in Chapter 3, the least successful offenders in the 1993 sample tended to have a juvenile delinquency or criminal background, be single, unemployed, and currently convicted of a property crime. Although violent offenders were more likely in 1993 than in 1990 to receive a prison sentence overall, when they were placed in the community, they were significantly more likely than non-violent offenders in the community to succeed. Further, violent offenders were less likely than nonviolent offenders to commit a new crime within 12 months of successful program completion.

***A slightly larger proportion of the group were more serious criminals in 1993 compared to 1990, as measured by the likelihood of having logged a juvenile or adult criminal history. These changes are extremely important. As we present in Chapter 3, the least successful offenders in the 1993 sample tended to have a juvenile delinquency or criminal background, be single, unemployed, and currently convicted of a property crime.***



## Study Findings: How Do ISP and Community Corrections Populations Differ?

To describe the differences between community corrections and ISP offenders, we posed the following questions:

- # How do ISP clients compare to community corrections clients in terms of successful program completion, and
- # Of those who successfully completed the two programs, how did they fare after 12 months?

Unless the two offender populations are exactly alike, the outcome comparisons are difficult to interpret. Therefore, it is important to understand the composition of the original populations prior to evaluating program completion and the 12-month outcome. That is the focus of this chapter.

### How Do ISP and Community Corrections Populations Differ?

To obtain the most complete information, data were collected directly from client files stored at halfway house facilities and probation agencies across the state.<sup>6</sup> Data obtained from cross-tabulation analyses and t-tests indicate that the groups are different from each other on some, but not all characteristics. The findings have been summarized in Table 3.1.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Appendix D for additional descriptions of ISP and community corrections clients.

**Table 3.1**  
**Comparisons of Selected Characteristics of a 1993 Sample of ISP and Community Corrections Terminations**

Characteristic	ISP (n= 261)	COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS (1,348)	p VALUE (df= 1)
Average Criminal History Score (Scale is 0-4)	1.47	1.80	.826
Average age at sentencing	27.7 years	28.9 years	.912
Some verbal/physical aggression involved in current crime	24.5%	15.9%	.001 *
Female clients	15.4%	15.7%	.889
Juvenile adjudication	15.9%	24.4%	.004 *
Ever married	49.0%	52.0%	.381
Current probation revocation	41.4%	30.2%	.001 *
Current violent offense	11.5%	7.6%	.034 *
One or more adult felony convictions	39.0%	56.1%	.001 *
Two or more adult felony convictions	13.5%	30.6%	.001 *
Prior probation revocation	16.6%	43.5%	.001 *
Alcohol problems	45.4%	59.3%	.001 *
Family problems	35.2%	42.2%	.042 *
Mental health problems	14.3%	18.8%	.089
Drug problems	55.6%	61.8%	.077

\* Indicates a statistically significant difference (p < .05).

Source: Case file data for offenders terminating ISP and community corrections in 1993.

The differences in the ISP and community corrections populations fall in the areas of criminal history, current crime, and the problems the offender brings with him or her to the placement. In terms of criminal history, the community corrections clientele appear to have had greater experience with the criminal justice system: They were nearly 50% more likely than ISP clients to have had at least one adult felony conviction, more than twice as likely to have had two or more adult felony convictions, more likely to have had a history of juvenile adjudications, and at least one prior probation failure. ISP, on the other hand, was more likely to receive offenders sentenced for a violent current crime. Data clearly show that ISP serves as a sanction for offenders who fail regular probation. While significantly more community corrections clients have alcohol, family, mental health, or drug problems, both programs serve many clients with these problems.

### **What Are the Program Success Rates for Community Corrections and ISP?**

A program success rate refers to the proportion of offenders that terminated the program in good standing and did not fail the program by committing a new crime, a technical violation, or absconding/escaping. An offender's program success does not translate into "program graduation." He or she may or may not

have achieved anything, but rather did not get into further trouble, either with the law (a new arrest or absconsion) or within the program (a technical violation).

***The differences in the ISP and community corrections populations fall in the areas of criminal history, current crime, and the problems the offender brings with him or her to the placement. Community corrections clientele were nearly 50% more likely than ISP clients to have had at least one adult felony conviction and at least one prior probation failure. ISP, on the other hand, was more likely to receive offenders sentenced for a violent current crime.***



In 1993, a larger proportion of community corrections clients successfully completed the program compared to ISP: 55.1% completed community corrections compared to 49.4% of ISP clients. However, the difference is not significant ( $p=.094$ ,  $df=1$ ), meaning that the finding of five percentage points difference in the success rates has a 9.4% likelihood of being due to chance. The information is summarized in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2**  
**ISP and Community Corrections Program Completion Rates:**  
**Offenders Terminating in 1993**

Program Outcome	ISP (n= 261)	COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS (n= 1340)	p VALUE (df= 1)
Successful outcome	49.4%	55.1%	.094
New crime	10.0%	3.0%	.001*
Technical violation	31.8%	22.4%	.001*
Escape/Abscond**	8.8%	19.6%	.001*
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	NA

\*Indicates a statistically significant difference ( $p < .05$ ).

\*\*According to program administrators, probation immediately issues a warrant for escape and holds the case on active status for 90 days during which time the offender could return and remain on active supervision status or be recommended for revocation for absconsion. If the offender does not return within 90 days, the case is terminated as an absconsion. Community corrections facilities typically issue a warrant within 24 hours of a client's absence.

Source: Case file data for offenders terminating ISP and community corrections in 1993.

Apart from the successful outcome rates, "failure" categories are statistically different, with ISP logging a 10% new crime rate compared to 3% for community corrections (this difference is statistically significant;  $p=.001$ ,  $df=1$ ). However, community corrections data indicated more than twice the escape/absconsion rate of ISP (19.6% compared to 8.8%, respectively). Differences in the failure categories could be related to differing definitions of the offender's behavior recorded in the file. For example, an escape or absconsion is a felony and could be recorded in a file as either an escape or as a new crime. While we are fairly certain what the successful outcome measure reflects, differences in recording practices make it difficult to interpret the information in the failure categories.

***In 1993, a larger proportion of community corrections clients successfully completed the program compared to ISP: 55.1% completed community corrections compared to 49.4% of ISP clients. However, the difference is not significant ( $p=.094$ ,  $df= 1$ ).***

## How Do the Community Corrections Program Failures and Successes Compare? What About ISP Program Failures and Successes?

**Table 3.3**  
**Selected Offender Characteristics:**  
**ISP Successes and Failures (n= 261)**

Offender Characteristic	ISP SUCCESSES (n= 129)	ISP FAILURES (n= 132)	p VALUE
Criminal History Score is 0	47.3%	30.4%	.042*
Current crime is violent	14.7%	8.3%	.005*
Current probation failure	36.4%	46.2%	.105
History of juvenile adjudications	11.0%	20.7%	.109
Over the age of 25	57.8%	51.2%	.284
Has high school diploma (not GED)	56.0%	44.9%	.078
Has alcohol problem	37.7%	52.8	.017*
Has mental health problem	17.9%	10.9%	.111
Moved 3+ times in last year	9.6%	20.7%	.029*

\* Indicates a statistically significant difference (p < .05).

Source: Case file data for offenders terminating ISP in 1993.

Criminal history was related to program outcome, as presented in Table 3.3. But individuals on ISP currently convicted of a violent crime were significantly more likely to succeed, as were those ISP offenders who did not have an alcohol problem, or had not moved three or more times in the year prior to their arrest.

The failure rate in community corrections, like ISP, appears to be driven by juvenile and adult criminal history. Other factors affect failure, however, such as gender. Women have an unexpectedly high failure rate in community corrections. This may be related to the fact that compared to men, women in community corrections are twice as likely to have financial problems (see Table 4.5), however, this gender difference occurs equally in ISP and community corrections (data not presented). Table 3.4 presents the characteristics that differentiated the community corrections clientele who failed from those who succeeded in 1993.

***Women have an unexpectedly high failure rate in community corrections.***

**Table 3.4**  
**Selected Offender Characteristics: Community Corrections**  
**Successes and Failures (n= 1340)**

Offender Characteristics	COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROGRAM SUCCESSES (n= 703)	COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROGRAM FAILURES (n= 588)	p VALUE (df= 1)
Current offense is violent	8.8%	6.1%	.001 *
Criminal History Score is 4	17.0%	56.4%	.001 *
History of juvenile adjudications	19.8%	30.2%	.001 *
History of juvenile commitment	9.1%	17.8%	.001 *
Prior adult probation revocation	39.2%	58.8%	.001 *
Is over 25 years old	70.4%	56.6%	.058
Is a woman	13.0%	18.2%	.001 *
High school diploma (not GED)	62.8%	56.8%	.024 *
Mental health problem	16.7%	21.3%	.001 *
Family problem	39.3%	45.6%	.038 *
Full time job at termination	90.8%	54.1%	.058

\* Indicates a statistically significant difference (p < .05).

Source: Case file data for offenders terminating community corrections in 1993.

As we have found in past research,<sup>7</sup> employment is related to community corrections program outcome. Program failures, compared to the overall halfway house population, were significantly less likely to be employed while the reverse was true for those who succeeded. Employment alone probably did not ensure success (those who succeeded were 40% more likely than the failures to have jobs), but unemployment was definitely a poor prognosis for program outcome. Those who failed in community corrections were nearly seven times more likely to be unemployed compared with those who succeeded (Table 3.5).

*Those who failed in community corrections were nearly seven times more likely to be unemployed compared with those who succeeded.*

**Table 3.5**  
**Employment Status at Program Termination Compared**  
**with Program Outcome: 1993 Community Corrections**  
**Clients**

Employment at Termination	POSITIVE PROGRAM TERMINATION (n= 703)	NEGATIVE PROGRAM TERMINATION (n= 588)	p VALUE (df= 1)
Full time job or student	90.8%	54.1%	.001 *
Part time	2.7%	5.6%	.008 *
Unemployed/Sporadic	6.5%	40.3%	.001 *

\* Indicates a statistically significant difference (p < .05).

Source: Case file data for offenders terminating community corrections in 1993.

Unemployment may reflect other, possibly unmeasured, offender characteristics

*Employment, or unemployment, and whatever it may be measuring, is an important factor for program administrators to understand.*

<sup>7</sup> Two previous studies by DCJ have linked unemployment and failure: *Who Fails and Who Succeeds in Community Corrections?*, by English and Mande (1990), and *Report of Findings: Colorado's Intensive Supervision Probation*, by English, Chadwick and Pullen (1994).

such as attitude, skill level, work habits, general functional ability, and community labor conditions. As noted above, employment alone did not ensure success since half of those who failed were, in fact, employed. We can infer, however, that employment, or unemployment, and whatever it may be measuring, is an important factor for program administrators to understand.

For ISP, the differences between those who successfully completed the program and those who did not were not statistically linked to employment (see Table 3.6) although those who failed were slightly more likely to be unemployed (59.0% compared to an overall unemployment rate of 54.5% and a 50.0% rate for those who succeeded). Rather, ISP failures, compared to successes, were more likely to have an alcohol problem and a slightly more serious criminal history (see Table 3.3). Those who succeeded were more likely to have been currently convicted of a violent crime and were over age 25.

**Table 3.6  
Employment Status at Program Termination Compared  
with Program Outcome: 1993 ISP Clients**

Employment at Termination	POSITIVE PROGRAM TERMINATION (n= 122)	NEGATIVE PROGRAM TERMINATION (n= 122)	p VALUE
Full time job or student	42.6	36.1	.294
Part time	7.4	4.9	.424
Unemployed/Sporadic	50.0	59.0	.157

Source: Case file data for offenders terminating ISP in 1993.

### **How Do ISP Program Successes/Failures Compare to Community Corrections Program Successes/Failures?**

In both programs in 1993, a greater proportion of offenders convicted of a violent offense successfully completed the program. Aging seems to help the success rate: Older offenders tend to succeed more frequently. Having a high school diploma, but not a GED, bodes well for offenders in these programs, but it is not clear if this variable measures education or a complex set of factors related to high school graduation such as the ability to complete something, not dropping out, bonding with school or teacher, or perhaps, success at school.

In both programs, failure is related to criminal history and recent poor program behavior. ISP and community corrections program failures are likely to have just failed regular probation. An important difference is that 18.6% of the ISP offenders went on to commit a new crime in the 12 months following program completion compared to 26.7% of the community corrections successes. This issue is discussed below.

*Aging seems to help the success rate: Older offenders tend to succeed more frequently.*

*In both programs, failure is related to criminal history and recent poor program behavior.*

## What Was the Rearrest Rate After 12 Months for Those Offenders Who Successfully Completed ISP and Community Corrections?

Program success did not ensure that offenders would remain crime-free in the 12 months that followed program termination. Nearly one of every five successful ISP terminations (18.6%) was rearrested for a felony or a misdemeanor during the 12-month follow-up period compared to one in four successful community corrections terminations (26.7%). Both groups committed an equal proportion of violent crimes (approximately 5%). The higher failure rate by community corrections clients may be related to the fact that these offenders had more serious criminal histories and were more likely to have failed in prior community placements.

*Those who remained crime-free in both the ISP and community corrections groups were likely to be first time offenders.*

Based on the characteristics analyzed, those who committed new crimes after successfully completing ISP or community corrections were different from those who remained crime-free in a few important ways. ISP arrestees were significantly more likely to have an alcohol problem and not have a high school diploma. This group tended to be two years younger than the group that remained crime free. Community corrections clients who committed a new crime were also unlikely to have a high school diploma. A slightly more "criminal" profile emerged in this group. The proportion of burglars in the rearrest group was 50% higher compared to the overall community corrections population, and a higher proportion of offenders with two or more prior felonies were rearrested compared to the overall community corrections group. Differences are summarized below. For both ISP and community corrections, the new crime was typically committed between five and six months following successful program termination (data not presented).

Those who remained crime-free in both the ISP and community corrections groups were likely to be first time offenders. The ISP crime-free group accomplished this despite the fact that they had a higher probability, compared to the ISP group in general, to have financial problems. Community corrections clients who remained crime-free were more likely than the overall community corrections group to have a high school diploma.

**Table 3.7**  
**Descriptions of Those Who Were Rearrested for a New Crime Within 12 Months**

ISP Arrestees	Community Corrections Arrestees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Likely to have an alcohol problem</li> <li>-Unlikely to have graduated from high school</li> <li>-Two years younger, on average, than those who remained crime-free.</li> <li>-Likely to have had prior adult felony convictions</li> <li>-Likely to have had a prior probation failure (not this crime)</li> <li>-Likely to have been adjudicated as a juvenile</li> <li>-Average time to rearrest: 5.5 months</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Likely to have a prior probation failure (not this crime)</li> <li>-Likely to have been adjudicated as a juvenile</li> <li>-More likely to have a burglary as the current conviction</li> <li>-Likely to have 2+ prior felony convictions</li> <li>-Unlikely to have graduated from high school</li> <li>-Average time to rearrest: 5.7 months</li> </ul>

Supporting statistical data for this table may be found in Appendix E.

Source: Case file data for offenders terminating ISP and community corrections in 1993.

In sum, offenders who did poorly in both ISP and community corrections in 1993 tended to have previously failed probation supervision and tended to have acquired an adult criminal record, juvenile delinquency record, or both. This crime-prone group is a difficult population to manage. However, maturity level seems to be a factor in the failure rates as indicated by the fact that this group of problem offenders tended to be younger, on average, by two years than those who did well.

Characteristics linked to problem outcomes, such as alcohol and drug problems, financial problems, and employment problems, can be addressed by correctional intervention programs. Addressing offenders' criminogenic needs is particularly important when offenders' criminal behavior, both during the program and after program completion, is an important component of their success in the community.

***Characteristics linked to problem outcomes, such as alcohol and drug problems, financial problems, and employment problems, can be addressed by correctional intervention programs. Addressing offenders' criminogenic needs is particularly important when offenders' criminal behavior, both during the program and after program completion, is an important component of their success in the community.***

# ISP and Community Corrections: Gender Differences

## How Do Men and Women Differ?

Men and women in the criminal justice system generally differ on a number of important characteristics, including criminal history, age, type of problems, addictions, and employment. These differences have implications for program outcome (the focus of this report) but also for program development and implementation and other types of resources of interest to policy makers and program administrators. For these reasons, it is important to understand gender differences in the criminal justice population.

*It is important to understand gender differences in the criminal justice population.*

Tables 4.1 through 4.3 provide information on men and women as they are processed through the district court system in Colorado. The Division of Criminal Justice annually collects data from district court files in nine jurisdictions (representing over 75% of the state's population). This data base contains information about case processing trends, including sentencing dispositions. Information about gender differences in the current study of ISP and community corrections clients follows the presentation of data from DCJ's court database.

**Table 4.1**  
**Court Disposition by Gender, 1993: A Sample of Colorado Offenders (n= 3140)**

Disposition	MEN (n= 2600)	WOMEN (n= 540)	p VALUE (df= 1)
Deferred judgment	10.3%	19.3%	.001 *
Guilty/No contest pleas	72.3	63.7	.001 *
Trial conviction	1.2	.4	.090
Deferred prosecution	.3	.2	.724
Not guilty by jury	.6	.6	.952
Case dismissed	11.6	13.9	.162
Dismissed for plea in another case	2.1	1.9	.279
Other	.9	.2	.050 *
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	NA

\* Indicates a statistically significant difference (p < .05).

Source: DCJ's 1993 court database.

Table 4.1 reflects gender differences between offenders receiving deferred judgment dispositions. Nearly twice (19.3%) the proportion of the women in the sample received deferred judgments compared to men (10.3%). Further analyses of these data reflect that women in this sample were significantly more likely than men to receive deferred judgments even when the analysis controlled for Criminal History Score (data not presented).

**Table 4.2**  
**For Those Convicted, Gender Differences in Case Disposition, 1993: A Sample of Colorado Offenders (n = 3140)**

Disposition	MEN (n= 2600)	WOMEN (n= 540)	p VALUE (df= 1)
Guilty as charged	31.0%	33.7%	.225
Guilty to a lesser felony	36.3	32.8	.115
Guilty to a misdemeanor	16.3	16.9	.739
Dismissed/Incompetent	16.4	16.6	.910
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	NA

Source: DCJ's 1993 court database.

Dispositions, for those convicted, varied little by gender. A slightly higher proportion of women compared to men were convicted of the original crime charged (33.7% and 31.0%, respectively). This difference is likely related to the increased proportion of women receiving deferred judgments.

Table 4.3 reflects differences in placement by gender but this variation is linked to criminal history. Men have a higher Criminal History Score (an average of 2.08 compared to 1.51 for women, data not presented).

***Nearly twice (19.3%) the proportion of the women in the sample received deferred judgments compared to men (10.3%). Dispositions varied little by gender.***



**Table 4.3**  
**Criminal Justice Placement and Gender:**  
**A 1993 Sample of Colorado Offenders (n = 3140)**

Placement	MEN (n= 2600)	WOMEN (n= 540)	p VALUE (df= 1)
Probation supervision	34.3%	57.4%	.001***
Probation with jail time	11.2	7.2	.007***
Adult diversion program	.2	.7	.030***
Intensive supervision probation	1.4	1.7	.616
Probation with community corrections	.4	0*	.130
Direct to community corrections	6.0	3.1	.009***
Jail (alone, with fine, or work release)	5.0	2.0**	.002***
Prison	21.6	6.5	.001***
Prison and probation (rule 35-B reconsideration of sentence)	.3	.2	.546
Suspended prison sentence	2.6	3.1	.488
Fine or restitution only	.7	1.3	.151
Case dismissed	16.3	16.7	.837
Total	100.0%	100.0%	NA

\* The lack of cases in this category may be due to sampling variation.

\*\* Many work release programs do not include women.

\*\*\* Indicates a statistically significant difference ( $p < .05$ ).

Source: DCJ's 1993 court database.

Significantly more women receive probation sentences, and conversely, significantly more men are sent to prison. This pattern holds constant even when controlling for the Criminal History Score (data not presented). It also may be linked to child care duties. Women are more likely to have sole custody of their children, and judges may be reluctant to separate the children from their mother.

With this background about gender differences in case processing, we return to the data set that has been the focus of this report: Cases terminating ISP and community corrections in 1993. Table 4.4 reflects gender differences in the most serious crime at conviction for offenders terminating from ISP and community corrections.

***Significantly more women receive probation sentences and, conversely, significantly more men are sent to prison.***

**Table 4.4  
Gender Differences Among Most Serious Conviction  
Crime: ISP and Community Corrections Cases  
Terminated in 1993**

Conviction Crime	ISP			Community Corrections		
	MEN (n= 220)	WOMEN (n= 40)	p VALUE (df= 1)	MEN (n= 1128)	WOMEN (n= 206)	p VALUE (df= 1)
Homicide	.9%	2.5%	.386	1.1%	1.0%	.904
Assault	13.6	2.5	.046*	6.2	5.3	.632
Sexual Assault	5.9	0.00	.047*	3.9	.5	.012*
Burglary	7.7	2.5	.115	14.0	5.3	.001*
Robbery	1.8	2.5	.231	3.5	.5	.019*
Theft	13.2	25.0	.773	15.6	18.0	.395
Auto Theft	12.3	5.0	.054	11.8	4.9	.003*
Forgery/Fraud	4.5	32.5	.179	9.0	20.4	.001*
Drugs	29.5	27.5	.001*	23.9	38.8	.001*
Traffic	3.2	0.00	.794	5.2	2.4	.044*
Other	7.3	0.00	.253	5.2	2.9	.169
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	.078	100.0	100.0	NA

\* Indicates a statistically significant difference (p < .05).

Source: ISP and community corrections case files for 1993 terminations.

Conviction crime patterns varied considerably across gender and somewhat across programs. A larger proportion of men in ISP are convicted of assault: 13.6%, compared to 2.5% of women in ISP, and 6.2% and 5.3% of men and women, respectively, in community corrections. This assault distribution also reflects the greater likelihood of women convicted of assault to receive community corrections sentences. By far, the largest proportion of conviction crimes, across programs and genders, is drugs. Between one-fourth and one-third of each population logged drugs as their most serious conviction crime. Forgery and fraud were frequent conviction crimes for women, whereas men were more likely to be convicted of burglary and auto theft.

Gender differences in offender characteristics were also apparent across programs, according to data presented in Table 4.5. Men in both ISP and community corrections were more likely to have serious alcohol problems (nearly half of the men in ISP and 60% of the men in community corrections). Women in both programs were significantly more likely than the men to have a serious drug problem, financial problems, and/or family problems. Women were also more likely to have moved three or more times in the past 12 months. In ISP, twice the proportion of women compared to men had two prior felony convictions, indicating gender differences in waiving the statutory prohibition against placing offenders with two or more felonies on probation. In community corrections, no gender variation exists on this characteristic: Nearly one-third of both men and women had criminal histories that prohibited them from receiving a probation

***By far, the largest proportion of conviction crimes, across programs and genders, is drugs. Between one-fourth and one-third of each population logged drugs as their most serious conviction crime.***

***In ISP, twice the proportion of women compared to men had two prior felony convictions, indicating gender differences in waiving the statutory prohibition against placing offenders with two or more felonies on probation.***

sentence. Finally, men in both programs were more likely to be employed at the time of program termination, and the gender difference in community corrections is statistically significant.

**Table 4.5  
Offender Characteristics and Gender: ISP and Community Corrections Cases Terminated in 1993**

Offender Characteristic	ISP			Community Corrections		
	MEN (n= 220)	WOMEN (n= 40)	p VALUE (df= 1)	MEN (n= 1129)	WOMEN (n= 211)	p VALUE (df= 1)
2+ prior felony convictions	11.8%	23.7%	.049*	30.6%	30.4%	.962
Alcohol problems	49.3%	21.6%	.002*	60.6%	52.3%	.032*
Drug problems	53.2%	67.6%	.118	59.4%	74.5%	0.01*
Mental health problems	16.0%	5.1%	.074	18.2%	21.8%	.235
Financial problems	17.1%	43.6%	0.00*	21.4%	47.7%	0.01*
Family/relationship problems	33.5%	45.0%	.163	40.4%	51.9%	.004*
Residence problems	12.8%	25.8%	.062	14.1%	20.0%	.061
Employed full time at termination	41.2%	30.8%	.223	75.5%	66.2%	.005*
Ever married	46.4%	75.0%	.001*	47.8%	49.1%	.737
Criminal History Score: Average	1.48	1.36	.436	1.84	1.65	.421
Earned HS diploma	50.7%	50.0%	.934	61.1%	54.5%	.074
Placement is result of probation failure	40.5%	47.5%	.406	28.0%	42.0%	0.01*
Average age at sentence	27.5	28.2	.159	28.8	30.0	.009*

\* Indicates a statistically significant difference (p < .05).

Source: ISP and community corrections case files for 1993 terminations.

Clear differences in offender characteristics were reflected in the groups of offenders terminating in 1993 from both ISP and community corrections, particularly in these areas of addiction and life adjustment problems. Programming in both placements must reflect these differences if the objective is to help offenders successfully complete the program. Table 4.6 presents program outcome by gender. The most striking finding in this table is the difference in how men and women fare in community corrections. Men are significantly more likely to successfully terminate from community corrections programs than women (56.4% and 47.9%, respectively). Women are significantly more likely to abscond from halfway houses than are men (29.8% and 17.6% respectively). This may be due to the gender distribution within halfway houses (more men than women), fewer programs focused on women, issues with dependents, or some other factor that we cannot account for with the data available for this analysis.

***Men are significantly more likely to successfully terminate from community corrections programs than women. Women are significantly more likely to abscond from halfway houses than men.***

**Table 4.6**  
**Gender Differences in Program Outcome, 1993**

Program Outcome	ISP			Community Corrections		
	MEN (n= 220)	WOMEN (n= 40)	p VALUE (df= 1)	MEN (n= 1129)	WOMEN (n= 211)	p VALUE (df= 1)
Successful termination	49.5%	47.5%	.812	56.1%	47.6%	.029
Technical violation	31.8%	32.5%	.932	23.5%	19.4%	.197
Abscond/Escape	9.5%	5.0%	.352	17.5%	29.7%	.001*
New crime	9.1%	15.0%	.252	2.9%	3.3%	.360
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	NA	100.0%	100.0%	NA

\* Indicates a statistically significant difference (p < .05).

Source: ISP and community corrections case files for 1993 terminations.

As reflected in Table 4.7, offenders' problems may be related to program success and failure. According to the information presented below, men in community corrections with alcohol problems were significantly more likely to succeed while women with drug problems were more likely to succeed (further analysis, however, revealed that the offenders in the two "successful" groups just described had extraordinarily high probabilities of getting rearrested after 12 months (data not presented). Men with financial problems tended to fail the community corrections program. This finding is likely linked to unemployment, as discussed earlier in this report. Men who moved three or more times in the year prior to arrest were likely to fail, in contrast with the women, who were twice as likely to have moved three or more times, but this activity did not affect program outcome for women.

***Men who moved three or more times in the year prior to arrest were likely to fail, in contrast with the women, who were twice as likely to have moved three or more times, but this activity did not affect program outcome for women.***

**Table 4.7**  
**Gender Differences, Serious Problems and Community Corrections Program**  
**Outcome: Clients Terminating in 1993<sup>8</sup>**

Problem Type	Overall			Program Failures			Program Successes		
	MEN (n= 1129)	WOMEN (n= 211)	p VALUE (df= 1)	MEN (n= 492)	WOMEN (n= 110)	p VALUE (df= 1)	MEN (n= 637)	WOMEN (n= 101)	p VALUE (df= 1)
Serious alcohol needs	60.6%	52.6%	.038	57.7%	51.5%	.254	62.7%	53.8%	.103
Serious drug needs	59.5	74.3	.001*	59.6	68.6	.091	59.4	81.4	.001*
Serious financial needs	21.4	47.5	.001*	24.1	45.3	.001*	19.3	50.0	.001*
Serious family needs	40.6	51.9	.004*	44.2	54.2	.077	37.7	49.4	.035*
Serious MH needs	18.3	21.9	.226	20.8	24.0	.469	16.3	19.6	.431
Moved 3+ in last year	14.1	20.1	.060	17.0	23.0	.316	12.0	18.3	.142

\* Indicates a statistically significant difference (p < .05).

Source: Community corrections case files for 1993 terminations.

In sum, significant gender differences exist in both ISP and community corrections. Whatever factors contribute to these differences exist in other aspects of case processing, as shown in Tables 4.1 and 4.2. These differences may be related to issues of child custody, although the data analyzed for this study did not include information about children. Gender differences throughout the criminal justice system, and especially in community placements, must be recognized and addressed by corrections programs. Service delivery must be targeted accordingly.

<sup>8</sup> The number of cases in the ISP study group, after disaggregating by gender (women, n= 40), was too small to conduct an analysis of program outcome. For both ISP and Community corrections, rearrest information is not analyzed by gender because there are too few offenders who committed new crimes after 12 months.



## Program Variation and Judicial District

Whether there are differences among clients across judicial districts is an important question. Differences in case processing, service availability, and program outcome are likely to vary accordingly. In the case of community corrections, differences are particularly likely to exist when each jurisdiction has a different selection process and policy making board, different types of offenders, and different community problems. The size (number of beds) of a halfway house may affect client outcomes, and this factor often varies according to the population density in the district. Staff training, client-to-staff ratios, program philosophy, and even the facility itself may affect program processes and client outcomes.

In Colorado, local control is a commonly held value. District variation is therefore expected. When the data for the current project were analyzed by judicial district, considerable differences in the average Criminal History Score, client problems and program outcomes emerged. Tables 5.1 and 5.2 describe, by judicial district, some of the basic factors discussed in this report.<sup>9</sup>

Local differences complicate the findings of any study based on a statewide analysis. First, any statewide average is dominated by activity in the most highly populated area, Denver in this case.<sup>10</sup> In the sample of community corrections clients who terminated in 1993, 29% of the cases (n=440) are from the 2nd judicial district (the City and County of Denver). This jurisdiction has the third lowest successful program termination rate (50.4%), a fact that not only pulls down the statewide average but underscores the necessity of considering how Denver may be different in other ways from other programs. For example, three out of four community corrections clients in Denver have serious drug problems (compared to 46.8% in El Paso County, 60.0% in Larimer County, 65.9% in Arapahoe County, 69.4% in Adams County, and 61.4% in Jefferson County). Over 40% of the Denver clients (42.0%) have two or more prior felony convictions on their record, three times the proportion of Jefferson County (14.1%), Durango (16.0%), and Adams County (13.1%), but slightly less than Larimer County (45.5%).

***Over 40% of the Denver clients (42.0%) have two or more prior felony convictions on their record, three times the proportion of Jefferson County (14.1%), Durango (16.0%), and Adams County (13.1%), but slightly less than Larimer County (45.5%).***

---

<sup>9</sup> Only districts with more than nine offenders terminating during 1993 were included in this study.

<sup>10</sup> In the case of ISP, Denver submitted fewer terminations during 1993, so Colorado Springs data dominate the ISP sample.

**Table 5.1  
Community Corrections Offender Characteristics by Jurisdiction:  
1993 Terminations**

County	Mean Criminal History Score	On Bond at Arrest	Alcohol Problems	Drug Problems	Mental Health Problems	% of Women	Probation Failure (This Crime)	Unemployed at Program Termination	New Crime After 12 Months for Those Who Terminated Successfully
Jefferson (79)	1.47	1.4%	65.8%	61.4%	36.2%	20.3%	43.0%	21.3%	33.3%
Denver (393)	2.18	8.0	55.0	75.9	20.1	22.6	29.3	33.3	32.3
El Paso (169)	1.8	6.0	56.9	46.8	17.6	13.6	20.7	18.0	27.3
Durango (26)	1.05	4.0	68.0	58.3	23.1	7.7	26.9	7.7	6.7
Larimer (40)	2.37	2.6	62.2	60.0	17.5	7.5	50.0	7.9	16.1
Pueblo (81)	1.53	2.5	68.8	52.9	23.3	14.8	27.2	20.8	26.1
Alamosa (25)	1.04	0.00	68.0	29.2	9.1	0.00	20.0	20.0	25.0
Routt (29)	1.40	3.6	55.2	27.6	14.8	17.2	37.9	19.0	0.00
Adams (126)	1.30	6.4	63.9	69.4	11.1	9.5	27.8	17.5	28.2
Arapahoe (166)	2.09	1.5	50.3	65.9	21.2	12.0	28.9	20.1	27.69
Weld (86)	1.44	8.2	67.1	51.9	13.3	12.8	43.0	10.5	26.32
Boulder (92)	1.82	2.7	69.2	64.3	31.2	15.2	30.4	16.5	25.0
Mesa (26)	1.19	8.6	50.0	34.3	20.6	13.9	27.8	13.9	7.4
Statewide (1338)	1.80	5.4	59.3	61.8	18.8	15.7	30.2	21.9	26.7

Source: Community corrections case files for 1993 terminations. Data collected by DCJ staff.

Larimer and Mesa counties had the lowest program failure rate (22.5% and 25%, respectively) and are among the three counties with the lowest 12-month recidivism rate (6.7% and 7%, respectively; Routt County had no rearrests), despite dissimilar average Criminal History Scores (2.37 and 1.19, respectively). Half of the placements (50.0%) in Larimer County were probation failures compared to 27.8% in Mesa County. Only 10.3% of the Larimer County community corrections clients had problems with their living arrangements compared to 20.6% in Mesa County. Regarding employment status at arrest, 35.7% of the Larimer County clients were unemployed compared to 34.3% of Mesa County clients (see Appendix F for these data). At termination, 7.9% were unemployed in Larimer County and 13.9% were unemployed in Mesa County.

Differences in the ISP population are also apparent, as indicated in Table 5.2. For example, in five of the nine ISP jurisdictions included in this study, between 3.8% and 12.5% were on bond at the time of the arrest for the current offense (El Paso, Pueblo, Adams, Arapahoe, and Boulder Counties). Four of the jurisdictions did not have any ISP clients who were on bond at the time of their arrest (Jefferson, Denver, Larimer, and Weld Counties). Three-fourths (73.3%) of the Jefferson County ISP clients had alcohol problems compared to only 11.1% in Denver. Nearly two-thirds of the clients in Pueblo, Adams, and Arapahoe Counties had serious drug problems, compared to one-third in Weld County and slightly more than that in Denver County. The percentage of women in ISP

***Three-fourths (73.3%) of the Jefferson County ISP clients had alcohol problems compared to only 11.1% in Denver. Nearly two-thirds of the clients in Pueblo, Adams, and Arapahoe Counties had serious drug problems, compared to one-third in Weld County and slightly more than that in Denver County.***



programs varies considerably across jurisdictions, from 6.7% in Jefferson County to 27.3% in Weld County.

**Table 5.2**  
**ISP Offender Characteristics by Jurisdiction: 1993 Terminations**

County	Mean Criminal History Score	On Bond at Arrest	Alcohol Problems	Drug Problems	Mental Health Problems	% of Women*	Probation Failure (This Crime)	Unemployed at Program Termination	New Crime After 12 Months for Those Who Successfully Terminated ISP
Jefferson (15)	1.86	0.00%	73.3%	50.0%	20.0%	6.7%	33.3%	46.7%	0.00%
Denver (9)	1.33	0.00	11.1	37.5	11.1	22.2	44.4	55.6	50.0
El Paso (56)	1.15	10.7	40.4	58.3	14.5	19.6	35.7	67.3	16.7
Larimer (23)	1.20	0.00	34.8	47.8	21.7	18.2	39.1	47.8	18.8
Pueblo (10)	1.30	12.5	55.6	62.5	30.0	20.0	40.0	50.0	28.6
Adams (47)	1.29	4.4	51.1	62.5	13.3	2.1	48.9	51.2	17.4
Arapahoe (52)	1.83	3.9	44.7	62.5	8.3	11.5	36.5	63.0	20.0
Weld (22)	1.47	0.00	40.0	33.3	4.8	27.3	50.0	45.0	17.6
Boulder (27)	1.86	3.8	51.9	57.7	19.2	25.9	48.1	38.5	20.0
Statewide** (261)	1.47	4.8	45.4	55.6	14.3	15.4	41.4	54.5	18.6

\*The proportion of women in the Denver metro area counties and El Paso County may be smaller than expected due to the state Office of Probation Service's specialized Female Offender Program.

\*\*Statewide averages may be skewed downward because data were unavailable on an unknown number of Denver's ISP cases. Since Denver typically draws from a more serious population, we would expect the data to underrepresent indicators of offender seriousness.

Source: ISP case files for 1993 terminations

In sum, important differences in ISP and community corrections client profiles exist across jurisdictions. These differences reflect variation in local demographic characteristics (reflected in the characteristics of the offender population), case processing policies, and program philosophies. Studies such as the one presented here typically aggregate jurisdictional data into one statewide group to develop a snapshot perspective of offender characteristics and program practices. Clearly, meaningful, program-specific information is masked with this approach. For this reason, Appendix F and G contain jurisdiction specific information on the major variables we analyzed for this report.

***In sum, important differences in ISP and community corrections client profiles exist across jurisdictions.***



## Recommendations

1. Offenders with an adult criminal history and an alcohol problem tended to fail in ISP. ISP may need more intense substance abuse programming for this type of offender, or this type of offender may need a more structured living environment and may be more suitable for community corrections.
2. Female offenders seem to fare poorly in community corrections, particularly since they are nearly twice as likely as men to abscond. This may be due to a variety of unmeasured factors, but without additional information, it suggests the need for gender-specific programming, especially drug programs since 40% of community corrections women come in with a drug conviction. Also, women may not adapt well to the halfway house living arrangement. ISP may be a better placement match for some women. Whatever the placement for women, programming must target financial problems, employment, and family issues.
3. Violent offenders in both ISP and community corrections had better than expected outcomes in the current study. These offenders may be benefitting from increased services and surveillance offered by these placements. Further research should be conducted on this group to better understand their needs and the risk they pose to the public.
4. Local decision makers, including judges, probation administrators, and community corrections board members may want to revisit the finding that, in 1993, 13.8% of ISP clients were convicted of a violent instant offense compared to 9.8% of community corrections direct sentences (Table 2.3). ISP is a less restrictive placement compared to residential community corrections, yet a larger proportion of offenders---compared to halfway house placements---were sentenced to ISP in 1993.
5. To adequately address the needs of specific jurisdictions and special offender populations, the Judicial Department and the Division of Criminal Justice might jointly develop resource allocation plans for ISP and community corrections programs. Such plans would be particularly useful in rural districts where correctional populations may not warrant the development of both ISP and residential community corrections programs.
6. The need to effectively assess offenders' characteristics and problems, to ensure their appropriate correctional placement requires reliable, accessible, and timely information. The development of an automated database, such as that supported by SB 96-221 should continue so that criminal justice officials and program managers can track offenders placed on probation and community corrections (and other criminal justice placements). The database would allow for analysts to prepare ongoing descriptions of offender

characteristics and placement decisions. In particular, such a database could maintain information on offender demographics, criminal history, current offense data, and assessment data including LSI scores. Further, this database could be used to study how profiles of DOC commitments compare to community corrections and ISP offender profiles by judicial district.

7. Policy makers may consider the commitment of resources to regularly examine offender assessment and placement data to monitor the application of the Risk Principle (see Preface). In this fashion, the criminal justice system can build on the General Assembly's intent, expressed in H.B. 91-1173, to identify offender risk, match offender needs with appropriate treatment, and thereby reduce the probability of recidivism.
8. Questions concerning the natural tension between local control versus State control over correctional decision making need to be addressed by criminal justice policy makers. Local decision making reflects the values and norms of the community, however, many of these decisions are paid for by State-allocated funds. For example, judicial discretion (local control) can be constrained by the use of placement guidelines (State control), but the cost of these decisions is of concern to State budget analysts and policy makers. A clear philosophy jointly developed by local and State leaders regarding the use of intermediate sanctions and other correctional resources will facilitate appropriate resource allocation.
9. Local ISP and community corrections programs may want to use the data presented in this report, or more recent information generated by their own data, to identify specific needs among their populations and develop programs that address the needs of most offenders. Additionally, programs may want to use assessment information to direct clients to the programs that will positively impact offenders' chances of program completion and remaining crime-free after termination. Such programs that impact these outcomes include employment programs, financial management programs, drug and alcohol programs, and, perhaps, child care and parenting programs.
10. District-specific variation, discussed in Chapter Five, should be analyzed by program administrators and local policy makers for the purpose of better understanding and improving locally administrated case processing and intermediate sanctions.

# Bibliography

- Andrews, D. A., and Bonta, J. (1994). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, Anderson Publishing Company, Cincinnati, OH.
- Bogue, B. (1993). Memorandum to the Criminal Justice Commission Treatment Subcommittee to Implement H.B. 1173, First Report of the Pilot Site Evaluation of Substance Abuse Assessment Instruments, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Department of Public Safety, Denver, CO.
- Bonta, J. (1996). Risk-needs assessment and treatment. In Harland, A. (ed.), *Choosing Correctional Options That Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating Supply*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Bonta, J., Parkinson, R., Pang, B., and Barkwell, L. (1994). *Toward a Revised Manitoba Classification System*, Ministry Secretariat, Solicitor General Canada, Ottawa, Ontario. As cited in Harland, A. (ed.) (1996), *Choosing Correctional Options That Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating Supply*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Clear, T. (1988). Statistical prediction in corrections. *Research in Corrections* 1(1), National Institute of Corrections, Washington, D.C.
- English, K., Patzman, J., and Costantino, M. (1993). *The Parole Guidelines Handbook, Revised*, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Department of Public Safety, Denver, CO.
- Harland, A. (ed.) (1996). *Choosing Correctional Options That Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating Supply*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Mande, M., and English, K. (1988). *The Parole Guidelines Handbook*, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Department of Public Safety, Denver, CO.



## Research Methods

### The Sample

To answer questions regarding program clientele and program terminations, a sample of offenders who terminated ISP and community corrections during calendar year 1993 was drawn. Using a 1993 termination sample allowed enough time for a 12-month follow-up period to study recidivism rates. The community corrections sample was drawn from the Division of Criminal Justice's Office of Community Corrections termination database. This database, maintained since 1986, contains demographic, criminal history, and case management information on all offenders who terminate community corrections programs. The original database contained 1585 names of diversion clients who terminated in 1993. Of those, 1348 case files were located in the field.

The sample of ISP terminations was selected in a variety of ways. First, a partial list of 1993 ISP program terminations was obtained from the Judicial Branch's Office of Probation Services (OPS) within the State Court Administrator's Office. Due to a technical problem that caused their computer system to crash in 1993, however, they could not assure that their database included all 1993 terminations. To supplement the list obtained from OPS, a DCJ researcher telephoned the chief probation officer in each of the state's 22 judicial districts to obtain a list of offenders who terminated ISP in calendar year 1993. This effort produced more names. Finally, further exploration by the OPS produced a list of names that contained some duplicates of the original list as well as some additional names of ISP terminations. Of all of these names, 261 case files were located for data collection. Jurisdictions in which ten or fewer ISP cases terminated were eliminated from the sample for reasons of cost effectiveness and lack of ability to statistically speak for those jurisdictions.

To determine the differences in recidivism rates, we collected rearrest data that covered a 12-month period beginning with the program termination date for each offender. Recidivating events were measured by new arrests posted electronically on rap sheets documented by the Colorado Crime Information Center, located at the Colorado Bureau of Investigation.

To determine the differences among groups of offenders sentenced to five different criminal justice sanctions, the Division of Criminal Justice's 1993 court database was used. This is a 20 percent sample of felony filings in nine Colorado judicial districts.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> The nine judicial districts in this sample include the 1st (Jefferson County), 2nd (Denver County), 4th (El Paso County), 8th (Larimer County), 10th (Pueblo County), 17th (Adams County), 18th (Arapahoe County), 19th (Weld County), and 21st (Mesa County). This sample represents approximately 76% of the statewide total of felony filings each year.

## The Data

*Case Management Data:* Case management data were obtained from two sources. Community corrections data were obtained from a client termination database maintained by the Office of Community Corrections at the Division of Criminal Justice and were supplemented by field data collected from case files at halfway houses throughout the state. Data on ISP clients were obtained strictly from case files maintained at probation departments throughout the state. Forms used to collect field data and community corrections client termination forms are attached as Appendix I.

*Recidivism Data:* Recidivism data were collected on each individual offender. Every offender's name for whom field data were collected was submitted to a criminal history search. The search was conducted by entering the offender's name, date of birth, gender, ethnicity, state identification number and FBI number (if available). If no arrests had been logged for the offender in question during the twelve-months following program termination, the offender was considered to have no recidivating event. If an arrest had been logged during the twelve month period in question, the level of crime (technical violation, petty, traffic, DUI, misdemeanor, felony, or violent felony), and the number of instances was recorded. In addition, the actual offense type was recorded (murder, robbery, assault, burglary, drug offense, etc.). Finally, the dates of the first recidivating event and the most serious recidivating event (often this was the same date) were documented.

*Court Data:* DCJ has collected and maintained data on felony filings since 1980, with only one lapse, which was during 1991. Though the sampling frame has varied over the years, the data base has generally been reflective of felony case filing trends and case processing patterns during that time. Each year, a team of DCJ researchers travels to district courts within the nine judicial districts included in the sample and collect case processing data on every fifth case filed. Data include basic demographic information, the number and type of offenses charged and convicted, arrest, case filing, and conviction dates, employment information, weapon information, juvenile delinquency and criminal history, and sentencing information.

## The Analysis

Analysis for this study was primarily bivariate and descriptive. Frequencies, cross tabulations, means tests, and t-tests were the principal measures used. To determine differences among and between correctional placements, multivariate tests including discriminant analysis and correlations were employed. Where appropriate, statistical significance is recorded in the text in terms of the p value<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> The p value represents the level of significance of a particular statistical test. Generally in the social sciences, a p value of .05 or less is considered significant, meaning that the finding would have occurred by chance 5% of the time.



(for t-tests and cross tabulations) and the R value<sup>13</sup> for discriminant analysis findings.

---

<sup>13</sup> The R value refers to the variance accounted for by the statistical test. For example, when R= 35.0, then 35.0% of the question at hand can be explained by the data accounted for in the statistical test. In the criminal justice field R values of 20 to 30 are considered acceptable for statistical modeling purposes.



## Juvenile and Adult Criminal History Elements Ranked by Sentence Placement

**Juvenile and Adult Criminal History Elements for a Sample of Offenders Sentenced in 1990, 1992, and 1993, Ranked Most (1) to Least (5) by Sentence Placement**

Criminal History Elements	PROBATION			PROBATION + JAIL			ISP			DIVERSION COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS			PRISON		
	90	92	93	90	92	93	90	92	93	90	92	93	90	92	93
Prior juvenile nonviolent arrests	5	5	5	4	4	4	1	1	3	2	3	2	2	2	1
Prior juvenile violent arrests	5	5	5	4	3	3	2	1	1	1	4	4	1	2	2
Prior juvenile felony adjudications	5	5	5	4	4	4	2	3	3	1	2	2	1	1	1
Prior adult nonviolent arrests	5	5	5	4	4	4	1	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	1
Prior adult violent arrests	5	4	5	4	3	4	1	5	2	2	2	3	2	1	1
Prior adult felony convictions	5	5	5	4	4	4	2	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	1



## Conviction Crime Type Ranked by Sentence Placement

Conviction Crime Type by Sentence Placement for a Sample of Offenders Sentenced in 1990, 1992, and 1993, Ranked Most (1) to Least (5) by Sentence Placement

Crime Type	PROBATION			PROBATION + JAIL			ISP			DIVERSION COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS			PRISON			TOTAL		
	1990 % (3214)	1992 % (1291)	1993 % (1212)	1990 % (1120)	1992 % (349)	1993 % (329)	1990 % (200)	1992 % (49)	1993 % (45)	1990 % (933)	1992 % (253)	1993 % (183)	1990 % (782)	1992 % (604)	1993 % (609)	1990 % (6249)	1992 % (2576)	1993 % (2378)
Property/ Fraud crimes RANK	64.9 2	68.8 3	68.2 1	53.9 4	71.5 1	66.0 2	52.0 5	63.3 4	60.0 4	71.7 1	69.2 2	63.9 3	54.5 3	53.6 5	44.3 5	60.4 na	65.6 na	61.3 na
Drug crimes RANK	25.0 3	21.8 2	24.1 1	30.4 2	16.6 4	18.8 4	33.0 1	22.4 1	22.2 3	21.5 4	18.2 3	23.5 2	17.0 5	12.9 5	16.3 5	22.8 na	18.6 na	21.3 na
Violent crimes* RANK	7.7 4	6.3 5	5.4 5	13.2 2	10.0 4	12.8 3	11.0 3	14.3 2	13.8 2	5.4 5	10.7 3	9.8 4	26.8 1	31.8 1	38.4 1	14.7 na	13.4 na	15.4 na
Other crimes RANK	2.5 2-3	3.1 1	2.2 4	2.5 2-3	1.8 3	2.4 3	4.0 1	0.00 5	4.4 1	1.4 5	2.0 2	2.7 2	1.6 4	1.7 4	1.0 5	2.1 na	2.4 na	2.0 na
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

\*For the purposes of this table, violent crimes are defined according to 16-11-309 C.R.S.

Source: Division of Criminal Justice, court database.



## **Additional Client Descriptions: Community Corrections**

### **What do we know about community corrections clients with two or more prior felonies?**

In 1993, offenders sentenced to community corrections with 2+ prior felonies were more likely to have:

- # A current forgery or fraud conviction
- # Less than a high school diploma
- # A drug problem
- # A criminal history score of 3 or 4 (on a scale of 0 [low] to 4 [high])
- # A nonviolent current conviction
- # A nonviolent new crime after 12 months
- # One prior probation failure

### **What do we know about community corrections program *failures* whose original sentence was to probation?**

In 1993, probation failures who later failed community corrections were more likely than probation failures who successfully terminated community corrections to:

- # Have two or more prior felony convictions
- # Have financial problems
- # Have family problems
- # Not be a high school graduate
- # Moved 3+ times in the last year
- # Be unemployed
- # Have a criminal history score of 4

### **What do we know about community corrections program *failures* whose original sentence was to ISP?**

In 1993, ISP failures who continued on to community corrections and then failed in community corrections were more likely than ISP failures who successfully terminated community corrections to:

- # Have alcohol problems
- # Have mental health problems
- # Not be a high school graduate
- # Never been married

**What do we know about ISP program *failures* whose original sentence was to probation?**

In 1993, those who were revoked on regular probation and then failed---versus succeeded---on ISP were more likely to:

- # Have alcohol problems
- # Not to have financial problems
- # Be employed full time



# ISP / Community Corrections Program Successes Tracked for Reoffense

## ISP Program Successes

### That Did and Did Not Commit A New Crime 12 Months After Termination

Offender Characteristic	COMMITTED NEW CRIME	DID NOT COMMIT NEW CRIME	p VALUE (df= 1)
1+ juvenile adjudications	28.6%	7.2%	.005
1+ juvenile commitments to state institutions	20.0%	7.1%	.071
2+ prior adult felony convictions	30.4%	13.6%	.072
1+ prior adult probation revocations	25.0%	11.8%	.118
Financial problems	8.7%	25.0%	.089
Alcohol problems	56.5%	33.3%	.039
No HS diploma	56.5%	41.2%	.181
First time felon	43.5%	67.0%	.035

## Community Corrections Program Successes

### That Did and Did Not Commit A New Crime 12 Months After Termination

Offender Characteristic	COMMITTED NEW CRIME	DID NOT COMMIT NEW CRIME	p VALUE (df= 1)
1+ juvenile adjudications	26.7%	17.3%	.007
1+ prior adult probation revocation	49.5%	35.6%	.001
2+ prior adult felony convictions	34.2%	26.2%	.036
First time felon	36.9%	49.4%	.003
Violent current offense	7.1%	11.6%	.074



Appendix F

# Community Corrections Program Variation by Judicial District

Community Corrections Program Variation by Judicial District															
Judicial District	TERMINATION TYPE		ANY NEW CRIME---for those who terminated successfully		NEW FELONY		PRIOR FELONY CONVICTION			CRIMINAL HISTORY SCORE					
	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	NO	YES	NO	YES	0.00	1	2+	MEAN	0.00	1	2	3	4
JEFFCO	57.0%	43.0%	66.7%	33.3%	53.2%	46.8%	60.5%	27.6%	11.8%	1.46%	31.3%	26.6%	18.8%	10.9%	12.5%
DENVER	50.9	49.1	67.7	32.3	54.0	46.0	33.5	23.3	43.1	2.2	19.0	20.1	15.2	13.0	32.7
EL PASO	52.1	47.9	72.7	27.3	52.1	47.9	41.6	23.5	34.9	2.0	22.4	18.8	21.8	12.7	24.2
LARIMER	77.5	22.5	83.9	16.1	80.0	20.0	25.6	25.6	48.7	2.4	13.2	10.5	28.9	21.1	26.3
PUEBLO	57.5	42.5	73.9	26.1	57.5	42.5	44.7	32.9	22.4	1.5	35.6	16.9	20.3	13.6	13.6
ADAMS	57.3	42.7	71.8	28.2	57.3	42.7	61.0	25.2	13.8	1.3	41.6	20.4	13.3	14.2	10.6
ARAPAHOE	52.7	47.3	72.4	27.6	51.5	49.5	32.3	32.3	35.4	2.1	20.1	19.4	19.4	14.2	26.9
WELD	66.3	33.7	73.7	26.3	60.5	39.5	54.2	26.5	19.3	1.4	31.9	31.9	12.5	6.9	16.7
BOULDER	51.6	48.4	75.0	25.0	62.6	37.4	44.8	25.3	29.9	1.8	32.0	12.0	25.3	5.3	25.3
ALAMOSA	64.0	36.0	75.0	25.0	68.0	32.0	68.0	16.0	16.0	1.0	47.8	26.0	4.3	17.4	4.3
ROUTT	44.8	55.2	100.0	0.00	65.5	34.5	61.5	7.7	30.8	1.4	40.0	25.0	10.0	5.0	20.0
DURANGO	57.7	42.3	93.3	6.7	69.2	30.8	58.3	25.0	16.7	1.1	42.1	31.6	10.5	10.5	5.3
MESA	75.0	25.0	92.6	7.4	75.0	25.0	63.9	22.2	13.9	1.2	38.9	27.8	13.9	13.9	5.6

**Community Corrections Program Variation by Judicial District (Continued)**

Judicial District	CONVICTION TYPE		GENDER		MARITAL STATUS				ORIGINAL PLACEMENT				
	NON-VIOLENT	VIOLENT	MALE	FEMALE	SINGLE	MARRIED	COMMON LAW	DIV/ SEP/ WIDOWED	PROB	PROB+ JAIL	ISP	COMCOR	PRISON (35b)
JEFFCO	94.9%	5.1%	79.7%	20.3%	53.2%	8.9%	8.9%	29.1%	41.8%	1.3%	1.3%	51.9%	3.8%
DENVER	97.7	2.3	77.6	22.4	55.4	14.2	5.7	24.6	28.3	1.0	3.9	61.2	2.0
EL PASO	86.4	13.6	86.4	13.6	43.9	28.7	10.4	17.1	20.1	0.6	1.2	59.8	18.4
LARIMER	92.5	7.5	92.5	7.5	55.0	12.5	0.00	32.5	50.0	0.00	0.00	42.5	7.5
PUEBLO	95.0	5.0	85.0	15.0	37.5	28.8	8.8	25.0	26.3	1.3	1.3	70.0	1.3
ADAMS	85.5	14.5	90.3	9.7	51.6	16.1	11.3	21.0	24.6	4.1	3.3	62.3	5.7
ARAPAHOE	89.1	10.9	87.9	12.1	47.3	15.8	8.5	28.5	28.9	1.3	1.9	64.8	3.1
WELD	96.5	3.5	87.2	12.8	53.5	18.6	10.5	17.4	38.8	4.7	1.2	53.5	1.2
BOULDER	90.1	9.9	84.6	15.4	58.2	16.5	6.6	18.7	32.6	2.5	2.5	58.8	3.8
ALAMOSA	92.0	8.0	100	0.00	60.0	8.0	16.0	16.0	20.0	0.00	0.00	80.0	0.00
ROUTT	100	0.00	82.8	17.2	79.3	6.9	0.00	13.8	37.9	0.00	0.00	55.2	6.9
DURANGO	88.5	11.5	92.3	7.7	65.4	15.4	7.7	11.5	19.2	7.7	0.00	73.1	0.00
MESA	88.9	11.1	86.1	13.9	55.6	13.9	2.8	27.8	27.8	0.00	0.00	63.9	8.3

**Community Corrections Program Variation by Judicial District (Continued)**

Judicial District	EMPLOYED AT TERMINATION			STATUS AT ARREST					
	FULL TIME	PART TIME	UNEMP/ SPORADIC	NO CJ STATUS	BOND	PROB/ DJ	COMCOR	PAROLE	PRISON/ JAIL
JEFFCO	76.0%	2.7%	21.3%	73.2%	1.4%	21.1%	0.00%	4.2%	0.00%
DENVER	63.1	3.7	33.2	61.5	8.2	26.5	1.3	2.1	0.3
EL PASO	78.0	4.0	18.0	60.2	6.0	31.9	1.2	0.6	0.00
LARIMER	89.5	2.6	7.9	66.7	2.6	30.8	0.00	0.00	0.00
PUEBLO	73.2	5.6	21.1	60.8	2.5	35.4	0.00	1.3	0.00
ADAMS	79.0	4.0	16.9	67.5	6.5	22.0	1.6	1.6	0.8
ARAPAHOE	76.1	3.7	20.2	71.3	1.5	21.3	2.9	2.9	0.00
WELD	89.5	10.5	0.00	65.9	8.2	24.7	0.00	1.2	0.00
BOULDER	82.2	1.1	16.7	68.1	2.8	25.0	0.00	1.4	2.8
ALAMOSA	76.0	4.0	20.0	66.7	0.00	29.2	0.00	4.2	0.00
ROUTT	76.2	4.8	19.0	82.1	3.6	10.7	0.00	3.6	0.00
DURANGO	88.5	3.8	7.7	80.0	4.0	12.0	0.00	4.0	0.00
MESA	58.3	27.8	13.9	71.4	8.6	20.0	0.00	0.00	0.00

**Community Corrections Program Variation by Judicial District (Continued)**

Judicial District	PRIOR PROBATION PLACEMENTS			PRIOR PROBATION REVOCATIONS			EDUCATION				RESTITUTION ORDERED?	RESTITUTION PAID?	AVG AGE AT TERM	AVG LENGTH OF STAY
	0.00	1	2+	0.00	1	2+	< HS DIPLOMA	GED	HS DIPLOMA	SOME COLLEGE				
JEFFCO	56.2%	37.0%	6.8%	61.1%	37.5%	1.3%	33.8%	1.3%	23.4%	41.6%	36.0%	11.1%	29.0%	18.8%
DENVER	33.0	42.8	24.2	51.4	40.2	8.4	46.0	2.6	18.8	32.6	32.8	8.2	31.7	13.4
EL PASO	30.8	46.7	22.5	52.1	41.4	6.5	28.4	2.4	29.6	39.6	50.9	11.8	30.7	16.4
LARIMER	30.0	42.5	27.5	42.5	40.0	17.5	35.9	0.00	17.9	46.2	57.5	30.4	29.3	22.4
PUEBLO	38.0	41.8	20.2	60.8	34.2	5.0	42.3	2.6	19.2	35.9	50.0	20.0	31.6	18.8
ADAMS	62.6	30.1	7.3	73.0	23.8	3.3	58.1	0.00	14.5	27.4	54.8	23.5	28.1	16.4
ARAPAHOE	31.7	53.4	14.9	47.5	47.5	5.0	27.4	3.0	39.6	29.9	48.7	17.7	31.2	18.7
WELD	40.5	44.0	15.5	54.1	36.5	9.5	42.9	0.00	29.8	27.4	63.1	30.2	29.3	19.3
BOULDER	43.2	38.6	18.2	57.0	34.9	8.1	34.8	1.1	33.7	30.3	54.7	19.5	29.9	16.5
ALAMOSA	60.0	28.0	12.0	75.0	25.0	0.00	52.0	4.0	12.0	32.0	56.0	35.7	28.2	10.7
ROUTT	46.4	42.9	10.7	48.1	44.4	7.4	24.1	0.00	37.9	37.9	69.0	5.0	28.3	18.0
DURANGO	56.5	26.1	17.3	81.0	19.0	0.00	46.2	0.00	42.3	11.5	88.0	27.3	26.1	11.2
MESA	63.9	27.8	8.3	86.1	13.9	0.00	47.2	0.00	25.0	27.8	55.6	35.0	28.1	16.8

<b>Community Corrections Program Variation by Judicial District (Continued)</b>						
Judicial District	ALCOHOL NEEDS	MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS	DRUG NEEDS	FAMILY PROBLEMS	FINANCIAL PROBLEMS	RESIDENCE PROBLEMS
JEFFCO	65.8%	36.2%	61.4%	49.2%	33.3%	22.4%
DENVER	55.3	12.6	75.9	37.3	23.9	12.1
EL PASO	56.9	25.1	46.8	44.0	21.4	16.4
LARIMER	62.2	17.5	60.0	35.0	28.9	8.6
PUEBLO	69.6	23.6	53.7	41.3	23.1	15.5
ADAMS	63.3	11.3	70.0	22.8	22.0	17.6
ARAPAHOE	50.0	21.3	65.7	45.0	25.5	9.1
WELD	67.1	13.3	51.9	60.5	37.0	15.0
BOULDER	70.1	31.6	65.2	65.7	34.7	22.2
ALAMOSA	68.0	9.1	29.2	27.8	20.0	16.7
ROUTT	55.2	14.8	27.6	45.0	25.0	22.7
DURANGO	68.0	3.1	58.3	60.0	24.0	20.8
MESA	50.0	20.6	34.3	41.2	20.0	20.6





Appendix G

## ISP Program Variation by Judicial District

ISP Program Variation by Judicial District															
Judicial District	TERMINATION TYPE		ANY NEW CRIME -for those who terminated successfully		NEW FELONY		PRIOR FELONY CONVICTION			CRIMINAL HISTORY SCORE					
	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	NO	YES	NO	YES	0.00	1	2+	MEAN	0.00	1	2	3	4
JEFFCO	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%	0.00%	93.3%	6.7%	60.0%	26.7%	13.3%	1.9%	28.6%	14.3%	21.4%	14.3%	21.4%
DENVER	22.2	77.8	50.0	50.0	44.4	55.6	88.9	11.1	0.00	1.3	33.3	11.1	44.4	11.1	0.00
EL PASO	42.9	57.1	83.3	16.7	85.7	14.2	58.8	23.5	17.6	1.1	44.7	23.4	10.6	14.9	6.4
LARIMER	69.6	30.4	81.3	18.8	100.0	0.00	47.8	43.5	8.7	1.2	40.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
PUEBLO	70.0	30.0	71.4	28.6	80.0	20.0	70.0	20.0	10.0	1.3	50.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	10.0
ADAMS	48.9	51.1	82.6	17.4	74.5	25.5	71.7	21.7	6.5	1.3	51.2	12.2	4.9	19.5	12.2
ARAPAHOE	38.5	61.5	80.0	20.0	69.2	30.7	60.8	31.4	7.8	1.8	27.7	21.3	12.8	17.0	21.3
WELD	77.3	22.7	82.4	17.6	86.4	13.6	60.0	15.0	25.0	1.5	35.3	17.6	23.5	11.8	11.8
BOULDER	55.6	44.4	80.0	20.0	70.4	29.6	46.2	23.1	30.8	1.9	31.8	13.6	18.2	9.7	27.3

ISP Program Variation by Judicial District (Continued)													
Judicial District	CONVICTION TYPE		GENDER		MARITAL STATUS				ORIGINAL PLACEMENT				
	NON-VIOLENT	VIOLENT	MALE	FEMALE	SINGLE	MARRIED	COMMON LAW	DIV/ SEP/ WIDOWED	PROB	PROB+ JAIL	ISP	COMCOR	PRISON (35b)
JEFFCO	93.3%	6.7%	93.3%	6.7%	60.1%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	26.7%	6.7%	60.0%	0.00%	6.7%
DENVER	66.7	33.3	77.8	22.2	33.3	33.3	0.00	33.3	44.4	0.00	55.6	0.00	0.00
EL PASO	91.1	8.9	80.4	19.6	44.4	27.8	1.9	25.9	32.1	3.6	41.1	3.6	19.7
LARIMER	95.7	4.3	81.8	18.2	45.0	30.0	0.00	25.0	39.1	0.00	52.2	0.00	8.7
PUEBLO	100.0	0.00	80.0	20.0	70.0	10.0	0.00	20.0	30.0	10.0	30.0	20.0	10.0
ADAMS	80.9	19.1	97.9	2.1	54.3	26.1	0.00	19.6	32.6	17.4	43.5	2.2	4.4
ARAPAHOE	86.5	13.5	88.5	11.5	61.7	17.0	8.5	12.8	32.7	3.8	51.9	5.8	5.8
WELD	90.9	9.1	72.7	27.3	50.0	0.00	18.8	31.3	40.9	9.1	31.8	9.1	9.1
BOULDER	92.6	7.4	74.1	25.9	57.7	19.2	0.00	23.1	40.7	7.4	44.4	7.4	0.00

ISP Program Variation by Judicial District (Continued)													
Judicial District	EMPLOYED AT TERMINATION			STATUS AT ARREST						RESTITUTION ORDERED-YES	RESTITUTION PAID-YES	AVE AGE AT TERM	AVG LENGTH OF STAY
	FULL TIME	PART TIME	UNEMP/ SPORADIC	NO CJ STATUS	BOND	PROB/ DJ	COMCOR	PAROLE	PRISON/ JAIL				
JEFFCO	53.3%	0.00%	46.7%	66.7%	0.00%	26.7%	6.7%	0.00%	0.00%	14.3%	0.00%	27.3 yrs	18.9 mos
DENVER	33.3	11.1	55.6	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.0	0.00	24.9	16.7
EL PASO	28.8	3.8	67.3	69.6	10.7	17.9	0.00	1.8	0.00	47.3	11.5	29.2	24.9
LARIMER	34.8	17.4	47.8	76.2	0.00	23.8	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.4	12.5	36.6	20.1
PUEBLO	40.0	10.0	50.0	75.0	12.5	12.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.1	0.00	29.2	23.6
ADAMS	46.5	2.3	51.2	77.8	4.4	15.6	0.00	0.00	2.2	28.6	0.00	28.1	20.1
ARAPAHOE	30.4	6.5	63.0	68.6	3.9	25.5	2.0	0.00	0.00	56.9	13.8	28.4	18.6
WELD	50.0	5.0	45.0	75.0	25.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	57.1	8.3	29.7	33.0
BOULDER	53.8	7.7	38.5	57.7	3.8	26.9	3.8	7.7	0.00	59.3	6.3	28.8	19.5

<b>ISP Program Variation by Judicial District (Continued)</b>										
Judicial District	PRIOR PROBATION PLACEMENTS			PRIOR PROBATION REVOCATIONS			EDUCATION			
	0.00	1	2+	0.00	1	2+	< HS DIPLOMA	GED	HS DIPLOMA	SOME COLLEGE
JEFFCO	33.3%	46.7%	20.1%	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%	60.0%	20.3%	6.7%	13.3%
DENVER	66.7	33.3	0.00	88.9	11.1	0.00	88.9	11.1	0.00	0.00
EL PASO	50.9	35.8	13.2	94.3	5.7	0.00	48.1	0.00	22.2	29.6
LARIMER	61.9	33.3	4.8	81.0	14.3	4.8	26.1	8.7	26.1	39.1
PUEBLO	60.0	20.0	20.0	80.0	0.00	20.0	50.0	0.00	30.0	20.0
ADAMS	53.3	28.9	17.7	84.4	13.3	2.2	58.1	2.3	20.9	18.6
ARAPAHOE	49.0	16.3	34.7	80.0	8.0	12.0	47.9	2.1	25.0	25.0
WELD	55.0	35.0	10.0	85.0	10.0	5.0	45.0	0.00	15.0	40.0
BOULDER	34.6	38.5	26.9	72.0	24.0	4.0	54.9	0.00	25.9	22.2

<b>ISP Program Variation by Judicial District (Continued)</b>						
Judicial District	ALCOHOL NEEDS	MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS	DRUG NEEDS	FAMILY PROBLEMS	FINANCIAL PROBLEMS	RESIDENCE PROBLEMS
JEFFCO	73.3%	20.0%	50.0%	73.3%	0.00%	7.1%
DENVER	11.1	11.1	37.5	44.4	11.1	11.1
EL PASO	40.4	14.5	58.3	41.8	18.5	23.1
LARIMER	34.8	21.7	47.8	22.7	31.8	10.0
PUEBLO	55.6	30.0	62.5	40.0	50.0	16.7
ADAMS	51.1	13.3	62.5	34.1	8.7	12.9
ARAPAHOE	44.7	8.3	62.5	28.6	27.1	16.7
WELD	40.0	4.8	33.3	15.0	35.0	11.1
BOULDER	51.9	19.2	57.7	34.6	25.9	13.0



Appendix H

## Recidivism Rates for New Felonies After 12 Months

### ISP and Community Corrections Recidivism Rates After 12 Months, 1993

PROGRAM in 1993	ANY ARREST AFTER 12 MONTHS	NO ARREST IN 12 MONTHS	TOTAL
ISP (n= 129)	18.6%	80.6%	100.0%
COMCOR (n= 738)	26.7%	73.3%	100.0%

PROGRAM in 1993	VIOLENT FELONY ARREST WITHIN 12 MONTHS	NONVIOLENT FELONY ARREST WITHIN 12 MONTHS	TOTAL
ISP (n= 129)	5.4%	7.8%	13.2%
COMCOR (n= 738)	4.3%	18.2%	22.5%



*Appendix I*

## **Field and Client Termination Data Collection Forms**

