

*Interagency Council on Intermediate Sanctions*

# Scorecard Report

Dashboard Indicators  
and Trends

Fiscal Years 2009-2013

**Final**

**Timothy Wong**  
ICIS Research Analyst















Research and Statistics Branch  
Crime Prevention and Justice Assistance Division  
Department of the Attorney General

*July, 2015*




# ICIS Scorecard

## Dashboard Indicators

The Scorecard Report presents annually-updated trend analyses of Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) indicators, as identified by the Interagency Council on Intermediate Sanctions (ICIS) and implemented by corrections agencies throughout the State of Hawaii. It is not designed to report on individual agencies, circuits, or specific offender treatment outcomes and program services. The data come from records on offenders who were sentenced to probation, released to parole, and "maxed-out" (maximum term release) from prison in Fiscal Years 2009-2013. The data sources include criminal history records from the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS), and the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) criminogenic risk-assessment instrument. This scorecard report provides a year-to-year scan of fourteen indicators depicted in the table below. The trends examined throughout this report provide statistical information on pertinent indicators on the impact of EBPs in Hawaii's criminal justice system. Of the fourteen indicators analyzed, six (42.9%) have green circles, which represent a desirable trend; two (14.3%) have red triangles, which reflect an undesirable trend; and six (42.9%) have gold rectangles, which signify a mixed trend.

<b>DASHBOARD INDICATORS (FYs 2009-2013 reporting periods)</b>	<b>Trends</b>
1. Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release ("maxed-out") Offenders who Recidivated, by Risk Levels.	
2. Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release ("maxed-out") Offenders who were Rearrested for Law Violations, by Risk Levels.	
3 Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release ("maxed-out") Offenders who were Charged for Criminal Contempt of Court, by Risk Levels.	
4. Probation Revocation and Parole Violation Rates, by Risk Levels.	
5. Time to Recidivism, in Months, from Start of Follow-up to Recidivism Event, by Initial Conviction Type.	
6. Sentenced Offenders with Current Drug and Alcohol Problems, as Determined by LSI-R Reassessments.	
7. Sentenced Offenders with Employment, Prosocial Peers, and Housing Needs, as Determined by LSI-R Reassessments	
8. Sentenced Offenders with Higher LSI-R Risk Scores After Reassessment, by Risk Levels.	
9. Sentenced Offenders with Lower LSI-R Protect Scores After Reassessment, by Risk Levels.	
10. Average Program Completion Rates and Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) Scores, from Non-Profit Agencies.	
11. Percentage of Staff Trained in Evidence-Based Practices, such as Motivational Interviewing (MI), Cognitive Behavior Treatment (CBT), and Administering the LSI-R.	
12. Drug Offenders Rearrested for Drug-Related and Non-Drug-Related Crimes.	
13. Domestic Violence (DV) Offenders Rearrested for DV and Non-DV Crimes.	
14. Sex Offenders Rearrested for Sex Offenses and Non-Sex Offenses.	

### Legend

Red triangle represents an undesirable trend.	
Green circle represents a desirable trend.	
Gold rectangle represents a mixed trend.	


# Indicator #1

## Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release (“maxed-out”) Offenders who Recidivated, by Risk Levels



The total recidivism rate declined by 2.2 percentage points in FY 2013.


**Recidivism Rates, FYs 2009-2013**



Year-to-year changes in total recidivism rates are not statistically significant.

Note: Recidivism is defined as rearrest, revocation, or criminal contempt of court, tracked over a 36-month period.

**Recidivism Rates, by LSI-R\* Risk Levels, FYs 2009-2013**



\*Compiled from the most recent LSI-R assessments

Note: Recidivism is defined as rearrest, revocation, or criminal contempt of court, tracked over a 36-month period.

2<sup>nd</sup> Note: The year-to-year change in recidivism rates are statistically insignificant across all risk levels except for the Banked-Admin level.

**Key Findings:** From FYs 2009-2013, there were statistically significant declines in recidivism rates for all offender risk levels, except for the Low-Medium level.

# Indicator #1 (cont.)

## *Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release (“maxed-out”) Offenders who Recidivated, by Risk Levels*

### *Fiscal Year 2009*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Offenders Recidivated</b>	<b>Percent Recidivated</b>
Banked-Administrative	983	412	41.9%
Low-Medium	411	267	65.0%
High-Surveillance	392	310	79.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,786</b>	<b>989</b>	<b>55.4%</b>

$\phi(1,786) = .314; p < .001$

### *Fiscal Year 2010*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Offenders Recidivated</b>	<b>Percent Recidivated</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,314	497	37.8%
Low-Medium	447	316	70.7%
High-Surveillance	382	323	84.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,143</b>	<b>1,136</b>	<b>53.0%</b>

$\phi(2,143) = .393; p < .001$

### *Fiscal Year 2011*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Offenders Recidivated</b>	<b>Percent Recidivated</b>
Banked-Administrative	794	340	42.8%
Low-Medium	476	302	63.4%
High-Surveillance	375	293	78.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,645</b>	<b>935</b>	<b>56.8%</b>

$\phi(1,645) = .293; p < .001$

### *Fiscal Year 2012*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Offenders Recidivated</b>	<b>Percent Recidivated</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,032	394	38.2%
Low-Medium	577	374	64.8%
High-Surveillance	572	472	82.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,181</b>	<b>1,240</b>	<b>56.9%</b>

$\phi(2,181) = .380; p < .001$

### *Fiscal Year 2013*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Offenders Recidivated</b>	<b>Percent Recidivated</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,281	473	36.9%
Low-Medium	671	441	65.7%
High-Surveillance	688	530	77.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,640</b>	<b>1,444</b>	<b>54.7%</b>

$\phi(2,640) = .356; p < .001$

\*Compiled from the most recent LSI-R assessments.

Note: Recidivism is defined as rearrest, revocation, or criminal contempt of court, tracked over a 36-month period.


# Indicator #2

*Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release (“maxed-out”) Offenders who were Rearrested for Law Violations, by Risk Levels*




The recidivism rate for new law violations declined 3.7 percentage points in FY 2013.

**Rearrest Rates for Law Violations, FYs 2009-2013**



Year-to-year changes in new law violations rates are statistically significant ( $\phi(10,395)=-.183, p<.001$ ).  
 Note: Recidivism is defined as all rearrests, revocations, and criminal contempt of court, tracked over a 36-month period.

**Rearrest Rates for Law Violations, by LSI-R\* Risk Levels, FYs 2009-2013**



\*Compiled from the most recent LSI-R assessments.  $p<.001$  for all risk levels.

Note: The year-to-year change in law violations rates are statistically insignificant across all risk levels except for offenders at the High-Surveillance level.

**Key Findings:** From FYs 2009-2013, there were statistically significant declines in rearrest rates for new law violations across all offender risk levels.

# Indicator #2 (cont.)

## *Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release (“maxed-out”) Offenders who were Rearrested for Law Violations, by Risk Levels*

### *Fiscal Year 2009*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
Banked-Administrative	983	224	22.8%
Low-Medium	411	146	35.5%
High-Surveillance	392	159	40.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,786</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>29.6%</b>

$\phi(1,786)=.170; p<.001$

### *Fiscal Year 2010*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,314	195	14.8%
Low-Medium	447	82	18.3%
High-Surveillance	382	85	22.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,143</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>16.9%</b>

$\phi(2,143)=.076; p<.01$

### *Fiscal Year 2011*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
Banked-Administrative	794	185	23.3%
Low-Medium	476	161	33.8%
High-Surveillance	375	168	44.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,645</b>	<b>514</b>	<b>31.2%</b>

$\phi(1,645)=.186; p<.001$

### *Fiscal Year 2012*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,032	225	21.8%
Low-Medium	577	207	35.9%
High-Surveillance	572	280	49.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,181</b>	<b>712</b>	<b>32.6%</b>

$\phi(2,181)=.241; p<.001$

### *Fiscal Year 2013*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,281	267	20.8%
Low-Medium	671	230	34.3%
High-Surveillance	688	266	38.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,640</b>	<b>763</b>	<b>28.9%</b>

$\phi(2,640)=.176; p<.001$

\*Compiled from the most recent LSI-R assessments.


Note: Criminal charges are defined as felonies, misdemeanors, and petty misdemeanors, excluding charges for criminal contempt of court. The rearrest rate for criminal charges was tracked over a 36-month period.

# Indicator #3

## Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release (“maxed-out”) Offenders who were Charged for Criminal Contempt of Court, by Risk Levels




New Criminal Contempt of Court violations decreased by 1.3 percentage points in FY 2013.



Year-to-year changes in new Criminal Contempt of Court rates are statistically significant ( $\phi(10,395)=-.094, p<.001$ ).

Note: Recidivism is defined as all rearrests, revocations, and criminal contempt of court, tracked over a 36-month period.

### Rearrest Rates for Criminal Contempt of Court, by LSI-R\* Risk Levels, FYs 2009-2013



\*Compiled from the most recent LSI-R assessments.

Note: The year-to-year change in Criminal Contempt of Court rates are statistically insignificant at all offender risk levels.

**Key Findings:** From FYs 2009-2013, there were statistically significant declines in rearrest rates for Criminal Contempt of Court violations across all offender risk levels, except for Banked-Admin cases.

# Indicator #3 (cont.)

## *Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release (“maxed-out”) Offenders who were Charged for Criminal Contempt of Court, by Risk Levels*

### *Fiscal Year 2009*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Rerrested for Criminal Contempt of Court</b>	<b>Percent Recidivated</b>
Banked-Administrative	983	105	10.7%
Low-Medium	411	61	14.8%
High-Surveillance	392	84	21.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,786</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>14.0%</b>

$\phi(1,786)=-.123; p<.001$

### *Fiscal Year 2010*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Rerrested for Criminal Contempt of Court</b>	<b>Percent Recidivated</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,314	107	8.1%
Low-Medium	447	39	8.7%
High-Surveillance	382	27	7.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,143</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>8.1%</b>

not signif.

### *Fiscal Year 2011*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Rerrested for Criminal Contempt of Court</b>	<b>Percent Recidivated</b>
Banked-Administrative	794	91	11.5%
Low-Medium	476	85	17.9%
High-Surveillance	375	61	16.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,645</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>14.4%</b>

$\phi(1,645)=.083; p<.01$

### *Fiscal Year 2012*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Rerrested for Criminal Contempt of Court</b>	<b>Percent Recidivated</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,032	96	9.3%
Low-Medium	577	91	15.8%
High-Surveillance	572	106	18.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,181</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>13.4%</b>

$\phi(2,181)=-.119; p<.001$

### *Fiscal Year 2013*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Rerrested for Criminal Contempt of Court</b>	<b>Percent Recidivated</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,281	119	9.3%
Low-Medium	671	105	15.6%
High-Surveillance	688	123	17.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,640</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>13.1%</b>

$\phi(2,640)=-.113; p<.001$

\*Compiled from the most recent LSI-R assessments.

Note: Criminal Contempt of Court is defined as a failure to appear in court, or a failure to follow court orders. The rearrest rate for Criminal Contempt of Court was tracked over a 36-month period.




# Indicator #4

## Probation Revocation and Parole Violation Rates, by Risk Levels




In sum, probation revocations and parole violations increased by 1.8 percentage points in FY 2013.

### Probation Revocation and Parole Violation Rates, FYs 2009-2013




Year-to-year changes in the probation revocation and parole violation rates are statistically significant ( $\phi(10,395) = .186, p < .001$ ).

#### Probation Revocation Rates, by Risk Levels, FYs 2009-2013



\*Compiled from the most recent LSI-R assessments.

#### Parole Violations Rates, by Risk Levels, FYs 2009-2013



\*Compiled from the most recent LSI-R assessments.

2nd Note: The year-to-year change in revocation rates are statistically significant at all offender risk levels.

Note: Probation revocations and parole violations were tracked over a 36-month period. Probation revocations include modifications reported in CJIS only, and stem from charges specific to probation violations or summons arrest. Parole violations relate to rules, regulations, and procedures that were serious enough to warrant inclusion in the State's criminal history records (CJIS).

**Key Findings:** From FY 2009-2013, there were statistically significant increases in probation revocations and parole violations across all offender risk levels.

# Indicator #4 (cont.)

## *Probation Revocation and Parole Violation Rates, by Risk Levels*

*Fiscal Year 2009*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Probation Revocations</b>	<b>Percent Revoked</b>	<b>Parole Violations</b>	<b>Percent Violations</b>
Banked-Administrative	983	39	4.0%	44	4.5%
Low-Medium	411	20	4.9%	40	9.7%
High-Surveillance	392	31	7.9%	36	9.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,786</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>6.7%</b>

$\phi(1,786)=-.125; p<.001$

*Fiscal Year 2010*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Probation Revocations</b>	<b>Percent Revoked</b>	<b>Parole Violations</b>	<b>Percent Violations</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,314	119	9.1%	76	5.8%
Low-Medium	447	115	25.7%	80	17.9%
High-Surveillance	382	124	32.5%	87	22.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,143</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>11.3%</b>

$\phi(2,143)=-.348; p<.001$

*Fiscal Year 2011*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Probation Revocations</b>	<b>Percent Revoked</b>	<b>Parole Violations</b>	<b>Percent Violations</b>
Banked-Administrative	794	29	3.7%	35	4.4%
Low-Medium	476	25	5.3%	31	6.5%
High-Surveillance	375	34	9.1%	30	8.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,645</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>5.8%</b>

$\phi(1,645)=-.102; p<.001$

*Fiscal Year 2012*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Probation Revocations</b>	<b>Percent Revoked</b>	<b>Parole Violations</b>	<b>Percent Violations</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,032	29	2.8%	44	4.3%
Low-Medium	577	38	6.6%	38	6.6%
High-Surveillance	572	50	8.7%	36	6.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,181</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>5.4%</b>

$\phi(2,181)=-.125; p<.001$

*Fiscal Year 2013*

<b>*LSI-R Risk Level</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Probation Revocations</b>	<b>Percent Revoked</b>	<b>Parole Violations</b>	<b>Percent Violations</b>
Banked-Administrative	1,281	58	4.5%	29	2.3%
Low-Medium	671	58	8.6%	48	7.2%
High-Surveillance	688	91	13.2%	50	7.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,640</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>4.8%</b>

$\phi(2,640)=-.183; p<.001$

\*Compiled from the most recent LSI-R assessments.


Note: The rearrest rate for revocations was tracked over a three-year period. Revocations include parole and probation revocation; probation violations that include modification of probation conditions, and summons arrest on probation; and parole violations relating to rules, regulations, and procedures that were serious enough to warrant inclusion in the State's criminal history records (CJIS).

# Indicator #5

## Time to Recidivism, in Months, from Start of Follow-Up to Recidivism Event, by Initial Conviction Type




In FY 2013, the average length of time elapsed prior to recidivism significantly declined to 13.0 months, or 1.3 fewer months than were reported for FY 2011.



F(6,758)=40.0, p<.001

Note: Recidivism is defined as rearrest, revocation, or criminal contempt of court, tracked over a 36-month period.



\*Compiled from the most recent LSI-R assessments.

Note: Recidivism is defined as all rearrests, revocations, and criminal contempt of court.

Note: Recidivism is defined as rearrest, revocation, or criminal contempt of court, tracked over a 36-month period.

**Key Findings:** The year-to-year change in elapsed time to recidivism from FY 2009 to FY 2013 significantly changed for the following type of offenders: Felony Violent (+1.0 month), Felony Property (+1.2 months), Felony Drug (-1.1 months), and Misdemeanors (-1.9 months).

# Indicator #5 (cont.)

## *Time to Recidivism, in Months, from Start of Follow-Up to Recidivism Event, by Initial Conviction Type*

### *Fiscal Year 2009*

<b>Initial Offense Type</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Mean Recidivism Period (Months)</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Felony Violent	140	14.2	10.95
Felony Property	235	12.9	9.66
Felony Drug	251	12.9	10.43
Felony Sex	24	18.8	10.99
Felony Other	77	15.8	11.93
Misdemeanor	206	13.6	10.68
<b>Total</b>	<b>933</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>10.56</b>

### *Fiscal Year 2010*

<b>Initial Offense Type</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Mean Recidivism Period (Months)</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Felony Violent	185	19.3	12.55
Felony Property	342	18.4	12.72
Felony Drug	280	17.2	11.92
Felony Sex	27	15.5	13.72
Felony Other	101	19.0	12.96
Misdemeanor	39	15.1	10.69
<b>Total</b>	<b>974</b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>12.46</b>

### *Fiscal Year 2011*

<b>Initial Offense Type</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Mean Recidivism Period (Months)</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Felony Violent	159	15.7	11.51
Felony Property	279	13.7	10.79
Felony Drug	244	14.5	11.39
Felony Sex	32	13.8	10.44
Felony Other	70	12.2	9.95
Misdemeanor	66	15.4	10.60
<b>Total</b>	<b>850</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>10.93</b>

### *Fiscal Year 2012*

<b>Initial Offense Type</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Mean Recidivism Period (Months)</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Felony Violent	222	12.8	11.38
Felony Property	390	12.8	11.72
Felony Drug	313	13.5	11.35
Felony Sex	35	17.7	13.20
Felony Other	109	13.8	11.56
Misdemeanor	180	13.3	12.02
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,249</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>11.65</b>

### *Fiscal Year 2013*

<b>Initial Offense Type</b>	<b>Number of Offenders</b>	<b>Mean Recidivism Period (Months)</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
Felony Violent	213	13.8	12.02
Felony Property	388	14.0	14.00
Felony Drug	360	12.4	11.67
Felony Sex	26	13.0	13.35
Felony Other	102	13.8	12.57
Misdemeanor	245	11.4	11.24
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,334</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>12.49</b>

Note: from ICIS Recidivism Updates; 2008 thru 2013.

Note: Recidivism is defined as rearrest, revocation, or criminal contempt of court, tracked over a 36-month period.


# Indicator #6

## Sentenced Offenders<sup>†</sup> with Current Drug and Alcohol Problems, as Determined by LSI-R Reassessments




The percentage of offenders with improved drug and alcohol problems has declined every year.

**Percentage of Sentenced Offenders with Improved<sup>1</sup> Drug- and Alcohol-Dependent Condition, Based on LSI-R Reassessments, FYs 2009-2013**




<sup>1</sup>Offenders that have satisfactorily improved condition with drugs and alcohol use after LSI-R

**Percentage of Sentenced Offenders with Improved<sup>1</sup> Drug-Dependent Condition, Based on Initial and Most Recent LSI-R Assessments, FYs 2009-2013**



**Percentage of Sentenced Offenders with Improved<sup>1</sup> Alcohol-Dependent Condition, Based on Initial and Most Recent LSI-R Assessments, FYs 2009-2013**



**Key Findings:** From FYs 2009-2013, there were statistically significant declines in the percentage of offenders who have unsatisfactory encounters with drug and alcohol use after the most recent LSI-R assessment. The year-to-year trends are not statistically significant.

<sup>†</sup>Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release prisoners who use the LSI-R.

# Indicator #6 (cont.)

## Sentenced Offenders<sup>+</sup> with Current Drug and Alcohol Problems, as Determined by LSI-R Reassessments

Fiscal Year 2009

LSI-R Drug/Alcohol Needs	Percentage of Offenders in an Unsatisfactory <sup>1</sup> Situation		
	Initial Assessment	Most Recent Assessment	Percentage Point Change in Drug* and Alcohol** Use
Unsatisfactory Situations with Drug Use	41.1%	23.5%	-17.6%
Unsatisfactory Situations with Alcohol Use	28.1%	20.3%	-7.8%

\* $\phi(2,566) = .841$ ;  $p < .001$   
 \*\* $\phi(2,562) = .951$ ;  $p < .001$

Fiscal Year 2010

LSI-R Drug/Alcohol Needs	Percentage of Offenders in an Unsatisfactory <sup>1</sup> Situation		
	Initial Assessment	Most Recent Assessment	Percentage Point Change in Drug* and Alcohol** Use
Unsatisfactory Situations with Drug Use	44.0%	26.4%	-17.6%
Unsatisfactory Situations with Alcohol Use	28.0%	19.7%	-8.3%

\* $\phi(3,058) = .822$ ;  $p < .001$   
 \*\* $\phi(3,053) = .869$ ;  $p < .001$

Fiscal Year 2011

LSI-R Drug/Alcohol Needs	Percentage of Offenders in an Unsatisfactory <sup>1</sup> Situation		
	Initial Assessment	Most Recent Assessment	Percentage Point Change in Drug* and Alcohol** Use
Unsatisfactory Situations with Drug Use	49.5%	33.2%	-16.3%
Unsatisfactory Situations with Alcohol Use	28.7%	20.3%	-8.4%

\* $\phi(3,776) = .779$ ;  $p < .001$   
 \*\* $\phi(3,774) = .779$ ;  $p < .001$

Fiscal Year 2012

LSI-R Drug/Alcohol Needs	Percentage of Offenders in an Unsatisfactory <sup>1</sup> Situation		
	Initial Assessment	Most Recent Assessment	Percentage Point Change in Drug* and Alcohol** Use
Unsatisfactory Situations with Drug Use	51.6%	37.8%	-13.8%
Unsatisfactory Situations with Alcohol Use	30.3%	20.5%	-9.8%

\* $\phi(6,741) = .659$ ;  $p < .001$   
 \*\* $\phi(6,732) = .691$ ;  $p < .001$

Fiscal Year 2013

LSI-R Drug/Alcohol Needs	Percentage of Offenders in an Unsatisfactory <sup>1</sup> Situation		
	Initial Assessment	Most Recent Assessment	Percentage Point Change in Drug* and Alcohol** Use
Unsatisfactory Situations with Drug Use	45.9%	41.4%	-4.5%
Unsatisfactory Situations with Alcohol Use	29.6%	26.2%	-3.4%

\* $\phi(2,919) = 1.22$ ;  $p < .001$   
 \*\* $\phi(2,922) = 1.25$ ;  $p < .001$

<sup>1</sup>Offenders with "unsatisfactory" situation to "very unsatisfactory" situation with drugs or alcohol.





<sup>+</sup>Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release prisoners who use the LSI-R.

# Indicator #7

## Sentenced Offenders<sup>+</sup> with Employment, Prosocial Peers, and Housing Needs, as Determined by LSI-R Reassessments



The percentage of offenders with improved employment and housing situations has declined every year.



<sup>2</sup>Offenders with “unsatisfactory” situation to “very unsatisfactory” situation with “strong and clear need for improvement”.

**Key Findings:** From FYs 2009-2013, there were statistically significant percentage-point declines in the proportions of offenders who have unsatisfactory situations with employment, prosocial peers, and housing need after reassessment (see page 15, Indicator #7 table), although the year-to-year trends are not statistically significant.

<sup>+</sup>Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release prisoners who were administered the LSI-R.

# Indicator #7 (cont.)

## Sentenced Offenders<sup>1</sup> with Employment, Prosocial Peers, and Housing Needs, as Determined by LSI-R Reassessments

**Fiscal Year 2009**

Selected LSI-R Subdomain Item	Percent of Offenders with an Unsatisfactory <sup>1</sup> Situation		
	Initial Assessment	Most Recent Assessment	Percentage Point Change
Employment*	54.7%	41.6%	-13.1%
Prosocial Peer Group**	42.8%	34.8%	-8.0%
Housing Accommodation***	23.8%	16.2%	-7.6%

\*tau-b(2,543)=.551; p<.001

tau-b (2,577)=.550; p<.001

\*\*\*tau-b(2,562)=.487; p<.001

**Fiscal Year 2010**

Selected LSI-R Subdomain Item	Percent of Offenders with an Unsatisfactory <sup>1</sup> Situation		
	Initial Assessment	Most Recent Assessment	Percentage Point Change
Employment*	60.3%	48.4%	-11.9%
Prosocial Peer Group**	40.7%	34.2%	-6.5%
Housing Accommodation***	26.2%	16.8%	-9.4%

\*tau-b(3,041)=.485; p<.001

tau-b(3,070)=.475; p<.001

\*\*\*tau-b(3,058)=.418; p<.001

**Fiscal Year 2011**

Selected LSI-R Subdomain Item	Percent of Offenders with an Unsatisfactory <sup>1</sup> Situation		
	Initial Assessment	Most Recent Assessment	Percentage Point Change
Employment*	63.9%	52.5%	-11.4%
Prosocial Peer Group**	45.5%	40.6%	-4.9%
Housing Accommodation***	28.5%	21.2%	-7.3%

\*tau-b(3,729)=.477; p<.001

tau-b (3,791)=.463; p<.001

\*\*\*tau-b(3,775)=.450; p<.001

**Fiscal Year 2012**

Selected LSI-R Subdomain Item	Percent of Offenders with an Unsatisfactory <sup>1</sup> Situation		
	Initial Assessment	Most Recent Assessment	Percentage Point Change
Employment*	65.2%	54.4%	-10.8%
Prosocial Peer Group**	47.5%	46.6%	-0.9%
Housing Accommodation***	27.7%	22.8%	-4.9%

\*tau-b(6,668)=.419; p<.001

tau-b(6,761)=.418; p<.001

\*\*\*tau-b(6,734)=.380; p<.001

**Fiscal Year 2013**

Selected LSI-R Subdomain Item	Percent of Offenders with an Unsatisfactory <sup>1</sup> Situation		
	Initial Assessment	Most Recent Assessment	Percentage Point Change
Employment*	61.5%	57.3%	-4.2%
Prosocial Peer Group**	44.3%	43.0%	-1.3%
Housing Accommodation***	29.5%	27.9%	-1.6%

\*tau-b(2,903)=.724; p<.001

tau-b (2,939)=.722; p<.001

\*\*\*tau-b(2,920)=.697; p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Offenders with unsatisfactory situation to very unsatisfactory situation with employment, prosocial peers, and housing needs.

\*Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release prisoners who were administered the LSI-R.




# Indicator #8

## Sentenced Offenders<sup>+</sup> with Higher LSI-R Total Scores After Reassessment, by Risk Levels




The percentage of offenders with higher LSI-R Total scores after reassessment significantly decreased by 16.1 percentage points from FYs 2009 through 2012.

Percentage of Sentenced Offenders with Higher LSI-R Total Scores After Reassessment, FYs 2009-2012



$\phi(9,609)=-.368; p<.001$

The Percentage of Sentenced Offenders with Higher LSI-R Total Scores After Reassessment, by Risk Levels, FYs 2009-2012



**Key Findings:** From FY 2009 through 2012, the percentage of offenders with higher LSI-R Total scores after reassessment differed significantly across risk levels (see page 18, Indicator #8 table). The percentage of offenders with higher LSI-R Total scores after reassessment significantly declined ( $p<.001$ ) for all individual risk levels.

<sup>+</sup>Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release prisoners who were administered the LSI-R.

# Indicator #8 (cont.)

## Sentenced Offenders<sup>+</sup> with Higher LSI-R Total Scores After Reassessment, by Risk Levels

### Fiscal Year 2009

LSI-R Risk Level	Number of Offenders	Number of Offenders with Higher Total Scores, After Reassessment	Percentage of Offenders with Higher Total Scores After Reassessment
Administrative	1,337	303	22.7%
Low	222	63	28.4%
Medium	507	122	24.1%
High	539	67	12.4%
Surveillance	73	3	4.1%
Total	2,678	558	20.8%

tau-b(2,678)=-.340; p<.001

### Fiscal Year 2010

LSI-R Risk Level	Number of Offenders	Number of Offenders with Higher Total Scores, After Reassessment	Percentage of Offenders with Higher Total Scores After Reassessment
Administrative	1,084	207	19.1%
Low	236	57	24.2%
Medium	459	86	18.7%
High	487	66	13.6%
Surveillance	66	5	7.6%
Total	2,332	421	18.1%

tau-b(2,332)=-.302; p<.001

### Fiscal Year 2011

LSI-R Risk Level	Number of Offenders	Number of Offenders with Higher Total Scores, After Reassessment	Percentage of Offenders with Higher Total Scores After Reassessment
Administrative	1,018	140	13.8%
Low	186	32	17.2%
Medium	424	65	15.3%
High	514	48	9.3%
Surveillance	96	3	3.1%
Total	2,238	288	12.9%

tau-b(2,238)=-.224; p<.001

Note: from initial LSI-R

### Fiscal Year 2012

LSI-R Risk Level	Number of Offenders	Number of Offenders with Higher Total Scores, After Reassessment	Percentage of Offenders with Higher Total Scores After Reassessment
Administrative	932	50	5.4%
Low	195	10	5.1%
Medium	433	17	3.9%
High	546	25	4.6%
Surveillance	94	2	2.1%
Total	2,200	104	4.7%

tau-b(2,200)=-.143; p<.001

Note: from initial LSI-R

<sup>+</sup>Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release prisoners who were administered the LSI-R.


# Indicator #9

## Sentenced Offenders<sup>+</sup> with Lower LSI-R Protect Scores After Reassessment, by Risk Levels




The percentage of offenders with Lower LSI-R Protect scores after reassessment significantly decreased by 14.5 percentage points from FYs 2009 through FY 2012.

Percentage of Sentenced Offenders with Lower LSI-R Protect Scores After Reassessment, FYs 2009-2012



$\phi(9,448)=-.332; p<.001$

Percentage of Sentenced Offenders with Lower LSI-R Protect Scores after Reassessment, by Risk Levels, FYs 2009-2012



**Key Findings:** From FY 2009 through 2012, the percent of offenders with lower LSI-R Protect scores after reassessment differed significantly across risk levels (see page 20, Indicator #9 table). The percentage of offenders with lower LSI-R Protect scores after reassessment significantly declined ( $p<.001$ ) for all individual risk levels.

<sup>+</sup>Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release prisoners who were administered the LSI-R.

# Indicator #9 (cont.)

## Sentenced Offenders<sup>+</sup> with Lower LSI-R Protect Scores After Reassessment, by Risk Levels

### Fiscal Year 2009

LSI-R Risk Level	Total Offenders	Offenders with Lower	Percentage of Offenders
		Protect Scores, After Reassessment	with Lower Protect Scores After Reassessment
Administrative	1,336	258	19.3%
Low	223	57	25.6%
Medium	507	100	19.7%
High	541	77	14.2%
Surveillance	73	6	8.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,680</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>18.6%</b>

O(2,680)= .436; p<.001

### Fiscal Year 2010

LSI-R Risk Level	Total Offenders	Offenders with Lower	Percentage of Offenders
		Protect Scores, After Reassessment	with Lower Protect Scores After Reassessment
Administrative	1,083	163	15.1%
Low	234	49	20.9%
Medium	458	82	17.9%
High	484	67	13.8%
Surveillance	66	5	7.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,325</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>15.7%</b>

O(2,325)= .385; p<.001

### Fiscal Year 2011

LSI-R Risk Level	Total Offenders	Offenders with Lower	Percentage of Offenders
		Protect Scores, After Reassessment	with Lower Protect Scores After Reassessment
Administrative	1,017	109	10.7%
Low	185	26	14.1%
Medium	423	65	15.4%
High	512	61	11.9%
Surveillance	96	3	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,233</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>11.8%</b>

O(2,233)= .292; p<.001

### Fiscal Year 2012

LSI-R Risk Level	Total Offenders	Offenders with Lower	Percentage of Offenders
		Protect Scores, After Reassessment	with Lower Protect Scores After Reassessment
Administrative	933	39	4.2%
Low	194	13	6.7%
Medium	431	15	3.5%
High	546	22	4.0%
Surveillance	94	2	2.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,198</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>4.1%</b>


O(2,198)= .190; p<.001



Note: from initial LSI-R

<sup>+</sup>Probationers, Parolees, and Maximum Term Release prisoners who were administered the LSI-R.

# Indicator #10

## Average Program Completion Rates and Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) Scores, from Non-Profit Agencies

 The average program completion rate remained relatively stable during FYs 2006-2013.



\*The Capacity score is designed to measure program quality assurance, leadership and development, and staff capacity to deliver evidence-based interventions.

\*\* The Content score focuses on the extent to which the program meets the principles of risk, need, and responsive treatment, via validated criminogenic assessments, and evidence-based treatment services.

**Key Findings:** The average overall CPC score from assessments conducted in FYs 2012-2013 increased by 1.6 points, to reach 47.4 out of 100 points, and remained in the “needs improvement” range of effectiveness. In FYs 2012-2013, the average Capacity score increased by 9.6 points, and moved into the “effective” range. However, the average Content score was unchanged and remained in the “ineffective” range.

# Indicator #10 (cont.)

## *Average Program Treatment Completion Rates and Correctional Program Checklist (CPC) Scores, from Non-Profit Agencies*

### *FYs 2006-2007*

<b>Type of Treatment</b>	<b>Ave. Participants</b>	<b>Ave. Completion Rate</b>	<b>Ave. CPC Score</b>
IOP/Group Outpatient (N=4)	80.0	70.8	45.2
TC/Residential (N=3)	127.0	78.6	46.5
Total/Ave.	99.0	73.5	45.8

### *FYs 2009-2011*

<b>Type of Treatment</b>	<b>Ave. Participants</b>	<b>Ave. Completion Rate</b>	<b>Ave. CPC Score</b>
IOP/Group Outpatient (N=4)	102	61.3	61.0
TC/Residential (N=3)	140	69.5	44.9
Total/Ave.	118	64.0	54.1

### *FYs 2012-2013*

<b>Type of Treatment</b>	<b>Ave. Participants</b>	<b>Ave. Completion Rate</b>	<b>Ave. CPC Score</b>
IOP/Group Outpatient (N=4)	65	71.7	43.1
TC/Residential (N=1)	100	n.a.	70.0
Drug Court (N=1)	n.a.	74.0	37.0
Total/Ave.	74	72.2	46.6


Note: The CPC assesses for the program's implementation of evidence-based practices, emphasizing the effective use of validated actuarial risk instruments, cognitive behavioral treatment interventions, and treatment services that are focused on criminogenic needs and risk principles.

# Indicator #11

*Percentage of Staff Trained in Evidence-Based Practices, such as Motivational Interviewing (MI), Cognitive Behavior Treatment (CBT), Collaborative Casework (CCW), and Administering the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R)*



The percentage of staff trained in Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs) reflects a declining trend.



**Key Findings:** The proportions of staff (e.g., probation officers, parole officers, social work assistants, and social workers) trained as of FY 2013 are slightly lower than these proportions were in FY 2011 for MI (-1.4%), LSI-R (-11.3%), and CBT (-2.8%).

Note: CCW is a newly-added, ICIS-sanctioned training statistic.

# Indicator #11(cont.)

*Percentage of staff Trained in Motivational Interviewing (MI), Cognitive Behavior Treatment (CBT), and in Administering the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R)*

## *Fiscal Year 2009*

	Current staffing levels (minus vacancies)			Number of staff trained in EBPs			Percentage of staff trained		
	MI	LSI-R	COG	MI	LSI-R	COG	MI	LSI-R	COG
Parole Officers	35	35	35	35	35	35	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Probation Officers	163	160	136	144	140	114	88.3%	87.5%	83.8%
Social Service Assistants	3	2	2	1	0	0	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Social Workers/Case Workers	57	57	56	54	56	39	94.7%	98.2%	69.6%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>90.7%</b>	<b>90.9%</b>	<b>82.1%</b>

## *Fiscal Year 2011*

	Current staffing levels (minus vacancies)			Number of staff trained in EBPs			Percentage of staff trained		
	MI	LSI-R	COG	MI	LSI-R	COG	MI	LSI-R	COG
Parole Officers	35	35	35	35	35	35	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Probation Officers	181	181	136	161	174	118	89.0%	96.1%	86.8%
Social Workers/Case Workers	81	81	81	74	79	70	91.4%	97.5%	86.4%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>90.9%</b>	<b>97.0%</b>	<b>88.5%</b>

## *Fiscal Year 2013*

	Current staffing levels (minus vacancies)				Number of staff trained in EBPs				Percentage of staff trained			
	MI	LSI-R	COG	CCW	MI	LSI-R	COG	CCW	MI	LSI-R	CBT	CCW
Parole Officers	43	43	43	43	42	43	43	39	97.7%	100.0%	100.0%	90.7%
Probation Officers	144	144	144	144	128	120	121	107	88.9%	83.3%	84.0%	74.3%
Social Workers/Case Workers	51	51	51	n.a.	43	41	40	n.a.	84.3%	80.4%	78.4%	n.a.
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>89.5%</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>78.1%</b>




# Indicator #12

## Drug Offenders Rearrested for Drug-Related and Non-Drug-Related Crimes



The total recidivism rate for drug offenders fell 6.4 percentage points from FYs 2009 through 2013.

**Convicted Substance Abuse Offender Recidivism Rates, by Drug-Related and Non-Drug-Related Rearrests, FYs 2009-2013**



Note: Recidivism is defined as all rearrests, revocations, and criminal contempt of court.  $\phi(2,421) = .097, p < .01$

Ave. Drug-Related Rearrest Rate: 8.9%  
Ave. Non-Drug-Related Rearrest Rate: 48.0%

\*The sum of drug-related and non-drug-related rearrests.

Note: Drug-related rearrests include arrests for the promotion of detrimental/dangerous drugs, drug trafficking, driving under the influence, and prohibited acts related to drug paraphernalia, etc. Non-drug-related rearrests include arrests for robbery, theft, assault, and criminal property damage, etc. The recidivism rate for sentenced drug offenders was tracked over a 36-month period.

**Key Findings:** Drug-related and Non-drug-related recidivism rates declined by 0.7 and 5.7 percentage points, respectively, from FYs 2009 through 2013.

# Indicator #12 (cont.)

## *Drug Offenders Rearrested for Drug-Related and Non-Drug-Related Crimes*

<i>Fiscal Year 2009</i>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
Drug-Related Rearrests	30	8.2
Non-Drug-Related Rearrests	203	55.3
<b>Total Rearrests</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>63.5</b>

(N= 367 Offenders)

<i>Fiscal Year 2010</i>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
Drug-Related Rearrests	38	8.3
Non-Drug-Related Rearrests	235	51.3
<b>Total Rearrests</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>59.6</b>

(N= 458 Offenders)

<i>Fiscal Year 2011</i>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
Drug-Related Rearrests	45	10.0
Non-Drug-Related Rearrests	199	44.1
<b>Total Rearrests</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>54.1</b>

(N= 451 Offenders)

<i>Fiscal Year 2012</i>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
Drug-Related Rearrests	58	10.6
Non-Drug-Related Rearrests	229	41.9
<b>Total Rearrests</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>52.5</b>

(N= 546 Offenders)

<i>Fiscal Year 2013</i>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
Drug-Related Rearrests	45	7.5
Non-Drug-Related Rearrests	297	49.6
<b>Total Rearrests</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>57.1</b>

(N= 599 Offenders)

Note: Drug-Related rearrests include arrests for the promotion of detrimental/dangerous drugs, drug trafficking, driving under the influence, and prohibited acts related to drug paraphernalia, etc. Non-Drug-Related rearrests include arrests for robbery, theft, assault, and criminal property damage, etc. The recidivism rate for sentenced drug offenders was tracked over a 36-month period.


# Indicator #13

## Domestic Violence (DV) Offenders Rearrested for DV and Non-DV Crimes



The total recidivism rate for domestic violence offenders significantly declined by 5.9 percentage points from FYs 2009 through 2012.

**Domestic Violence (DV) Offender Recidivism Rates, by DV and Non-DV Rearrests, FYs 2009-2012**



$\phi(1,718) = .124, p < .001$

Ave. DV Rearrest Rate: 18.1%

Ave. Non-DV Rearrest Rate: 33.5%

\*The sum of DV and non-DV rearrests.

Note: DV rearrests include arrests for abuse of a household member, harassment, protective order violation, etc. Non-DV rearrests include arrests for robbery, theft, illegal substance possession, etc. The recidivism rate for sentenced DV offenders was tracked over a 36-month period. Additionally, a separate analysis established that the majority of harassment charges were due to domestic-related situations.

**Key Findings:** The DV rearrest rate significantly declined by 9.8 percentage points from FYs 2009 through 2012. The Non-DV rearrest rate remains relatively stable during the same time period.

# Indicator #13 (cont.)

## *Domestic Violence (DV) Offenders Rearrested for DV and Non-DV Crimes*

<b><i>Fiscal Year 2009</i></b>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
DV Rearrests	128	20.0
Non-DV Rearrests	201	31.4
Total Rearrests	329	51.4

(N= 640 Offenders)

<b><i>Fiscal Year 2010</i></b>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
DV Rearrests	83	22.7
Non-DV Rearrests	122	33.4
Total Rearrests	205	56.2

(N= 365 Offenders)

<b><i>Fiscal Year 2011</i></b>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
DV Rearrests	60	19.1
Non-DV Rearrests	114	35.7
Total Rearrests	174	54.9

(N= 319 Offenders)

<b><i>Fiscal Year 2012</i></b>	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
DV Rearrests	40	10.2
Non-DV Rearrests	138	35.3
Total Rearrests	178	45.4

(N= 394 Offenders)

Note: DV rearrests include arrests for abuse of a household member, harassment related to family/household disputes, protective order violation, etc. Non-DV rearrests include arrests for robbery, theft, illegal substance possession, etc. The recidivism rate for sentenced DV offenders was tracked over a 36-month period.


# Indicator #14

## Sex Offenders Rearrested for Sex Offenses and Non-Sex Offenses



The total recidivism rate for sex offenders increased by 6.2 percentage points.

**Sex Offender Recidivism Rates, by Sex Offense (SO) and Non-Sex Offense Rearrests, FYs 2009-2012**



\*The sum of sex offender-related and non-sex offender-related rearrests.

Ave. SO Rearrest Rate: 2.4%  
Ave. Non-SO Rearrest Rate: 31.1%

Note: SO Rearrests include felony sex assaults, misdemeanor sex offenses, etc. Non-SO Rearrests include robbery, theft, illegal substance possession, etc. The recidivism rate for sentenced sex offenders was tracked over a 36-month period.

**Key Findings:** From FYs 2009 through 2012, the sex offender rearrest rate for new sex offenses declined 2.8 percentage points while new, non-SO rearrests increased 9.0 percentage points, although these are not statistically significant trends.

# Indicator #14 (cont.)

## *Sex Offenders Rearrested for Sex Offenses and Non-Sex Offenses*

### *Fiscal Year 2009*

	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
SO Rearrests	5	3.8
Non-SO Rearrests	37	28.0
<b>Total Rearrests</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>31.8</b>

(N= 132 Offenders)

### *Fiscal Year 2010*

	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
SO Rearrests	4	5.8
Non-SO Rearrests	18	26.1
<b>Total Rearrests</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>31.9</b>

(N= 69 Offenders)

### *Fiscal Year 2011*

	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
SO Rearrests	3	2.3
Non-SO Rearrests	28	21.5
<b>Total Rearrests</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>23.8</b>

(N= 130 Offenders)

### *Fiscal Year 2012*

	<b>Offenders Rearrested</b>	<b>Percent Rearrested</b>
SO Rearrests	1	1.0
Non-SO Rearrests	37	37.0
<b>Total Rearrests</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>38.0</b>

(N= 100 Offenders)

\*Compiled from STATIC-99 risk instrument data.

Note: SO Rearrests include felony and misdemeanor sex offenses. Non-SO Rearrests include robbery, theft, illegal substance possession, etc. The recidivism rate for sentenced sex offenders was tracked over a 36-month period.