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COMMON USES OF RECIDIVISM DATA

- Examine impact of policy or budget changes
- **Evaluate new programs and/or practices**
- **Evaluation against prior performance**
- Comparing different offender groups
- Cost-benefit analysis
COMPONENTS OF TJJD RESEARCH
RECIDIVISM DEFINITION

One, Two, and Three Year Analysis

Recidivism Rate

Disposition Date for Probation/Deferred, Program Start Date, Placement Discharge Date

Re-Offense Re-adjudication Incarceration

Cohort Group-FY Dependent

Tracking Period

Recidivism Event
EXAMPLE:

“Of juveniles adjudicated to probation in FY 2011, 50% re-offended in three years.”
COHORT TRACKING

Supervision Disposition Date: 9/1/13 – 8/31/14

1

9/1/14-8/31/15

2

9/1/15-8/31/16

3

9/1/16-8/31/17
WHY THIS DEFINITION?

• This methodology/definition matches the methodology adopted and used by the LBB

• Use of disposition date for probation and deferred supervision allows us to quantify recidivism events that occur before end of supervision

• Allows other jurisdictions to evaluate our rates in comparison to theirs
TYPES OF RECIDIVISM AVAILABLE TO YOU FROM TJJD

• Disposition to Supervision (Deferred & Probation)
  • Re-Offense (referral & arrest)
  • Re-Adjudication
  • Incarceration (TJJD & TDCJ)
  • Secure Placement

• Exiting Placement (Secure and Non-Secure)
  • Re-Offense (referral & arrest)
  • Re-Adjudication
  • Incarceration (TJJD & TDCJ)
  • Re-Placement into secure facility

• Starting Programs
CALCULATING SUPERVISION RECIDIVISM

• Supervision cohorts selected by disposition date for given fiscal year
  • Only select those with a match to DPS file

• Disposed to probation or deferred prosecution supervision
  • If a youth has multiple dispositions to supervision in a single year, the first disposition is followed

• Tracked for one, two, and three years after disposition date
OF NOTE

- All juveniles in cohort MUST have complete data for the ENTIRE study period
  - E.g. if do not have DPS/adult data, juveniles older than 16 must be excluded for one year analysis

- Using incomplete or incorrect data may skew your rate to appear lower or higher
CALCULATING SUPERVISION RECIDIVISM

- One year analysis:

  Supervision Disposition Date:
  - 9/1/2013-8/31/2014

  Tracked for Year 1 recidivism event during:
  - 9/1/2014-8/31/2015

- Three year analysis:

  Supervision Disposition Date:
  - 9/1/2011-8/31/2012

  Tracked for Year 3 recidivism event during:
  - 9/1/2014-8/31/2015

1st Yr Cohort: 300

2nd Yr Cohort: 200

3rd Yr Cohort: 150

100

50

10
USING TJJD SUPERVISION RECIDIVISM DATA

- Ability to assess youth behavior as well as system behavior by answering three separate questions:
  - How many youth were re-referred or re-arrested within the given time frame?
  - How many youth were re-adjudicated within the given time frame?
  - How many youth were incarcerated within the given time frame?
USING TJJD SUPERVISION RECIDIVISM DATA

- Compare supervision outcomes (one year)
  - Deferred Supervision Recidivism = 30%
  - Probation Supervision Recidivism = 50%

- Visualize trend in recidivism over time
  - One Year Probation Recidivism 2012 = 60%
  - One Year Probation Recidivism 2013 = 55%
  - One Year Probation Recidivism 2014 = 50%

- Visualize cohort trend over time
  - Probation Dispositions 2012 = 13,496
  - Probation Dispositions 2013 = 12,594
  - Probation Dispositions 2014 = 11,535
## STATEWIDE RE-OFFENSE RESULTS – ONE YEAR RE-OFFENSE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2014 Cohort</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ReOffend-All: In One Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>13575</td>
<td>27.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>11535</td>
<td>58.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25110</td>
<td>41.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2013 Cohort</th>
<th></th>
<th>ReOffend-MisdB: In One Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>15243</td>
<td>28.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>12594</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27837</td>
<td>41.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2012 Cohort</th>
<th></th>
<th>ReOffend-MisdB: In One Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>16485</td>
<td>27.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>13496</td>
<td>57.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29981</td>
<td>41.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statewide Re-Offense Results - Two Year Re-Offense Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2013 Cohort</th>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2012 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15243</td>
<td>28.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12594</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27837</td>
<td>41.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23.10% 13.20%
35.40% 18.60%
28.70% 15.70%
22.60% 13.30%
35.20% 19.30%
28.30% 16.00%
PROGRAM RECIDIVISM

• Calculated the same way as supervision recidivism

• Additional information useful to program recidivism:
  • Average Risk and Needs level of cohort
  • Average number of prior referrals for program cohort
  • Proportion of program cohort with a prior violent or assaultive referral
  • Proportion of program cohort with prior violation of probation
  • Majority offense type of program cohort
  • Re-offense type
USING TJJD PROGRAM RECIDIVISM DATA

- Evaluate overall program effectiveness in achieving objectives
  - Process Evaluation → development & implementation of program
  - Outcome Evaluation → effect of a program (recidivism)

- Main goal of all juvenile justice programs is to reduce recidivism
  - Recidivism for specific offenses
  - Recidivism within a specific time frame
  - Recidivism for specific target population
USING TJJD PROGRAM RECIDIVISM DATA

• Compare program outcomes
  • Program A recidivism = 75%
  • Program B recidivism = 40%

Which program appears to be doing a better job?

• Program A = Violent, chronic offenders
• Program B = First time offenders
PROGRAM RECIDIVISM EXAMPLE – PROCESS EVALUATION

- Determine if targeting your intended population
  - Risk level
  - Offense type

- Determine if reached your intended program cohort goal
  - Majority Offense Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Re Offend in One Year</th>
<th>1yr Re-Offense Rate**</th>
<th>Average # of Prior Referrals</th>
<th>Prior Violent/Assaultive Referral</th>
<th>Prior VOP</th>
<th>Majority Offense Type***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant S</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Crisis Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Drugs</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>Misd. Assaultive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM RECIDIVISM EXAMPLE – OUTCOME EVALUATION

- Evaluate for a reduction in overall recidivism
  - Compared to previous years

- Determine if program reduced intended re-offense category
  - E.g. Drug versus Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1 yr Re-Offense Assaultive</th>
<th>1 yr Re-Offense Drug</th>
<th>1 yr Re-Offense Property</th>
<th>1 yr Re-Offense Other**</th>
<th>1 yr Re-Offense Rate**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant S</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Drugs</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECIDIVISM SCENARIO

Your Juvenile Board has asked you to provide historical recidivism data for youth on probation supervision and deferred prosecution. What are two ways you can represent this data, based on the TJJD recidivism workbook?
RECIDIVISM FOR DSA APPLICATIONS

• A core outcome measure for DSA programs is recidivism

• For a thoughtful application you need to:
  • Define your target population
  • Define your program goal
  • Determine how (through what activities) you will achieve your goal and why these activities will assist in achieving your goal
  • Define all possible outcomes including recidivism
    • Think of positive outcomes such as increased pro-social behavior
    • Determine what assessments are needed to measure all outcomes

• The first step for your DSA application is to understand your population and their recidivism or behaviors
DSA EXAMPLE: TARGET POPULATION

- Critical to understand target population to ensure your program is targeting who it needs to target for goal achievement
  - Determine demographic requirements such as age, race, and sex
  - Determine risk and needs level
    - Keep in mind the risk and needs responsivity principle
  - Determine supervision type
  - Determine offense specifications such as disposed for violent offenses
DSA EXAMPLE: RECIDIVISM REQUEST TO TJJD RESEARCH

- Historical Recidivism
  - Specifically re-offense

- Moderate to high risk level
  - Based on PACT assessment

- Youth on probation

- Juvenile justice system age

- No gender restrictions

- Reduction in placement

Question #2 on DSA Application

Addresses, in part, question #1 on DSA application and logic model for target population

Question #2 on DSA Application
We provide summative tables along with individual level data to aid in identifying youth who recidivate.

- Individual data allows the county to perform further analysis as needed.

### Youth Disposed to Probation Supervision Re-Offense Misd B & Higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No Re-Off</th>
<th>% No Reoff</th>
<th>One Year N</th>
<th>% One Year</th>
<th>Two Year N</th>
<th>% Two Year</th>
<th>Three Year N</th>
<th>% Three Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Youth Disposed to Probation Supervision Secure Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No Re-Off</th>
<th>% No Reoff</th>
<th>One Year N</th>
<th>% One Year</th>
<th>Two Year N</th>
<th>% Two Year</th>
<th>Three Year N</th>
<th>% Three Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USING RECIDIVISM TO IMPROVE OUTCOMES

• Set future recidivism targets based on current rate
  • One, two, and three year goals

• Determine youth and program characteristics that may contribute to recidivism
  • Severity of offense
  • Offense history
  • Behavioral health
  • Wrong youth in the program
    • E.g. Substance abusers in Anger Management program
  • Inadequate program content
    • E.g. Drug Education vs. Drug Treatment

• Compare multiple years of program performance to determine if program is worth continuing
  • Base this on recidivism rates AND characteristics mentioned above
  • Use youth characteristics to drive your program selection if you choose to discontinue current practice
QUESTIONS?

WHAT? SORRY. I WAS USING THIS TIME TO THINK ABOUT SOMETHING USEFUL.

MAYBE YOUR BOSS CAN FILL YOU IN.

I WAS BRAIN-GOLFING.
CONTACT INFORMATION

Chara Heskett
Research Specialist
chara.heskett@tjjd.texas.gov

Carolina M. Corpus-Ybarra
Research Specialist
Carolina.corpus-Ybarra@tjjd.texas.gov