JUVENILE RECIDIVISM TRENDS
COMPONENTS OF RECIDIVISM ANALYSIS

- **Cohort**
  - Ex. Juveniles adjudicated to probation in FY 2009

- **Recidivism Event**
  - Ex. Arrest/Referral, Incarceration, Placement

- **Time Frame**
  - “Tracking” period – usually 1-3 years
DEFINITION OF A RECIDIVISM RATE

- The proportion of a cohort to have a recidivism event in a defined length of time, converted to a percent.

- Ex: “Of juveniles adjudicated to probation in FY 2009, 50% were re-arrested in three years.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Of juveniles adjudicated to probation in FY 2009, 50% were re-arrested in three years.
One year re-offense rates

- Deferred

- Probation

FY = Disposition Year
One year re-offense rates
- Secure Placement

Probation recidivism rates have remained steady even though juveniles with higher levels of risk and needs are staying in the community.
One year incarceration rates

- Probation

- Secure Placement

FY = Disposition Year

FY = Year of Release
Three year re-incarceration rates

- Juveniles leaving state facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Release</th>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY = Year of Release
THE primary outcome measure for the criminal justice system

- As well as a measure for program/intervention seeking to change non-criminal behavior
HOW RECIDIVISM IS USED

- Development of Risk and Needs Assessment
  - Sample of juveniles were tracked for three years to determine number of subsequent referrals/arrests
  - Analysis conducted to determine which factors (school, substance abuse, peers) were most predictive of re-offense
Risk of becoming a “chronic” offender
- Chronic = 3 or more subsequent offenses in a 3 year period

Data from the RANA confirm that high risk juveniles have a much higher recidivism rate than low risk juveniles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Re-Offense Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Risk</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Preliminary finding, does not include DPS data
Program Evaluation

- Evaluation = Effectiveness in achieving program objectives
  - Process → development, implementation, and operation of a program
  - Outcome → effect of program (i.e., recidivism)
    - Main objective of all juvenile justice programs is to reduce recidivism
If Program A has a 75% recidivism rate and Program B has a 45% recidivism rate, Program B appears to do a better job at preventing subsequent criminal behavior.

What if Program A serves serious, chronic offenders and Program B is a first offender program?
Three year Re-Arrest rates by Program Type

- Programs with highest rates → EM and Boot Camp
- Programs with lowest rates → Life Skills and Anger Mgmt
To determine the effect of a program, compare recidivism of juveniles entering a program with that of a control group.
Juveniles that enter a program recidivate at a lower rate than those that do not enter a program.

Juveniles Disposed to Deferred and Probation, FY 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Entry</th>
<th>Deferred One Year Re-Offense</th>
<th>Probation One Year Re-Offense</th>
<th>Total One Year Re-Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entered a Program</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Enter a Program</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The effect of programs is more evident when juvenile characteristics are considered.

One Year Re-Offense Rate for Juveniles Disposed to Deferred or Probation, FY 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Characteristics</th>
<th>Entered a Program</th>
<th>Did not Enter a Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 or more prior adjudications</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior violent felony adjudication</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior non-violent felony adjudication</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Should also consider program characteristics →

- Type of program (restitution, counseling, behavior) or program components
- Length of program
- Intensity of program (meets three times a week vs. three times a month)
- Integrity of program implementation
Research indicates that matching offenders with the appropriate level of supervision and services improves outcomes.

“Risk Principle”
Programs appear to be more effective for high and medium risk juveniles than for low risk juveniles.

One year Re-Offense Rates for Juveniles Disposed to Deferred or Probation, FY 2011*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Entered a Program</th>
<th>Did not Enter a Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Preliminary finding, does not include DPS data
What combination of juvenile and program characteristics work best in terms of improving outcomes?

**Juvenile Characteristics:**
- Risk Level
- Prior JJ History
- Needs

**Program Characteristics:**
- Type of program
- Intensity of program
- Length of program

= Lower Recidivism Rate vs. Control Group