

OREGON CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCIL

**RISK AND RECIDIVISM:
A STUDY OF PAROLE IN OREGON**



January, 1988

RISK AND RECIDIVISM:
A STUDY OF PAROLE IN OREGON

Oregon Criminal Justice Council
Portland State University
School of Urban and Public Affairs
P.O. Box 751
Portland, Oregon 97207

January, 1988

OREGON CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCIL

STAFF

Kathleen M. Bogan
Executive Director

Kathryn Ashford
Research Director

Bob Durston
Program Manager
Sentencing Guidelines

Craig Mosbaek
Research Associate

Pat McConnell
Management Assistant

Lois McClure
Clerk Assistant

This Report was prepared by
Kathryn Ashford, Research Director

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

To fulfill its legislative mandate to report to the 1987 Legislature on the assessment of risk of future criminal conduct by offenders, the Oregon Criminal Justice Council spent a portion of its first year becoming familiar with statistical risk assessment, a technique for effective offender management and enhancement of public safety. The Council's Risk Assessment Committee met with a number of expert consultants to consider the use of risk assessment in other states and its potential impact in Oregon at various decision-making points: parole, sentencing and pre-trial. The Council chose to focus its first project on the use of risk assessment at parole release because of data availability and its potential for more immediate short-term impact on the system.

In the fall of 1986 the Council contracted with the Midwest Office of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) to conduct the necessary research. The goals of the project were to:

- * Analyze the current use of risk assessment in parole decision-making in Oregon and recommend improvements.
- * Assess the validity of the present Oregon History/Risk scale.
- * Improve, if possible, the ability to identify high, moderate and low-risk offenders through revision or replacement of the current Oregon Parole Board History/Risk scale.
- * Estimate the potential impact on prison populations and crime of any recommended revisions.
- * Recommend other uses of risk assessment in criminal justice decision-making in Oregon.
- * Analyze state criminal justice data needs related to the project and provide a general assessment of current information system capabilities.

The study tracked 1398 inmates for 24 months following their release from one of four Oregon correctional facilities 6 months on parole. The 1218 men in the cohort were released during the first eight months of 1984. In order to obtain an adequate female cohort the release period was extended from January 1, 1982 to September 1, 1984. This yielded a sample of 180 women.

Detailed data were collected from a variety of sources including Parole Board and institutional files, the Corrections Division Basic Client Tracking System; Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS), and the National Crime Information Center (NCIC).

Development of a Risk-Assessment Tool

The primary goal of the study was to identify offender characteristics most strongly predictive of success on parole. A number of parole outcome measures were examined (arrests, convictions, revocations) and a composite outcome scale devised which takes into account both the frequency and severity of offenses committed. Ultimately, the simplest measure—number of arrests—was used in this analysis because of our relative confidence in the reliability of this data and because this measure was so highly correlated with the composite scale.

Although it was not a primary goal of the project, the data allowed for the first statistical validation of the History of Risk Scale which constitutes one axis of the present Parole Board Matrix the other being the Crime Severity Scale. The analysis revealed a moderate and significant (.35) correlation between offenders' total score on this scale and the number of arrests during the 24-month follow-up period. Thus the researchers conclude that overall, the Oregon History/Risk Scale is a valid measure of offender risk.

The following factors were identified as being predictive and included in the final risk scale:

- ** Number of prior adult arrests
- ** Prior convictions for theft, burglary, or forgery
- ** Age at first conviction
- ** Juvenile adjudications for murder, rape, or assault
- ** Prior paroles
- ** Employment history

Like scales developed in other states, this one draws heavily on the offender's criminal history with a single measure of "social stability"—employment history. Based on the weighing of each item on the scale, offenders are assigned a score from 0-15, with high scores reflecting higher risk propensities. This scale is roughly comparable in terms of its predictive accuracy to the present History of Risk scale presently used by the Parole Board and to scales developed by NCCD for use in other states. At the lowest risk level (0-3), only 27% had new arrests reported, while in the highest risk category (12-15), the comparable arrest rate was 72%.

Validation of the Present History of Risk Scale

Since data on individual score items are not presently automated and were not collected out of the Parole Board files, analysis of the validity of the specific items was quite limited. Based on their analysis of simulated scores roughly approximated with available data, the researchers recommend elimination of Item D on the H/R scale.

continued validation of the History of Risk scale and could be used to generate regular statistics on recidivism.

7. In order to insure that this tracking system is operational soon, the Council recommends that the \$50,000 appropriated to the Council by the 1987 legislature for ongoing parolee monitoring be spent to purchase the required equipment, supplies, and personnel to develop and implement the parole monitoring function. Council staff will work closely with appropriate agency staff on training, planning, development and other issues, and oversee the release or transfer of funds.

8. The Council endorses NCCD's recommendations that the Corrections Department consider using risk assessment more extensively in setting supervision levels for parolees. Application of the scales examined in this study to populations other than parole (eg. as prison classification) would, however, be inappropriate without further research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. STUDY PARAMETERS AND DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF PAROLEES STUDIED . . . 3

- Social and Demographic Background
- Criminal History Records
- Commitment Offense and Institutional Misconduct
- Post-Release Criminal Activity

III. VALIDATION OF THE OREGON HISTORY OF RISK SCALE 8

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL. 11

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 17

Endnotes

Appendix A: Statistical Tables

Appendix B: Data Collection Forms and Coding Instructions

Appendix C: Oregon History of Risk scale (1984)
Oregon History of Risk scale (current)

Appendix D: NCCD Risk Assessment Scale

Appendix E: Proscribed vs. Actual Terms Set: 1986

I. INTRODUCTION

The 1985 legislation establishing the Oregon Criminal Justice Council charges it to "study and make recommendation on the assessment of risk of future criminal conduct by offenders for use in prosecution, sentencing, institutional management and probation and parole." Or. Laws 1985 ch. 558

In order to meet this charge, the Council established a Risk Assessment Committee in January, 1986. The Committee, chaired by Senator Joyce Cohen, included: Bill Brooks, Clackamas County Sheriff; Hazel Hays, Chairperson, State Board of Parole; Tom Mason, State Representative; Ann Schmidt, Executive Director, Oregon Council on Crime and Delinquency; Joan Smith and Rebecca DeBoer, public members. In light of his experience with risk assessment and intensive supervision programs in Marion County, Billy Wasson was appointed to serve as an associate member of the committee.

The committee took as its first responsibility recommending to the Council the area in the criminal justice system where use of risk assessment might best be initially explored. During its early meetings, the committee began with a review of available Oregon offender data in consultation with the Corrections Division, Crime Analysis Center, Oregon Prison Overcrowding Project, and the Oregon Jail Overcrowding Project. A number of consultants and national experts testified before the committee on the use of risk assessment in other states and on the advantages and liabilities of developing a risk tool in Oregon for use at three priority decision points: pretrial, sentencing and parole release.

In June, 1986 the committee recommended to the Council that its first risk assessment project focus on parole release, where the potential for immediate, short-term impact on the system is greatest and where there is the most manageable amount of data available. A request for proposals was sent to 30 research organizations, universities and individuals. In the fall

II. STUDY PARAMETERS AND SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

The parole study tracked 1398 inmates² for 24 months following release from one of four Oregon correctional facilities. Of these, 1218 were men released during the first eight months of 1984. In order to obtain an adequate number of cases to permit analysis by gender, the release period for females was extended from January 1, 1982 to September 1, 1984. This yielded a subsample of 180 women.

Comprehensive data on each offender were collected from a number of different sources.³ Basic information on the conviction offense and sentence were obtained from the Corrections Department Basic Client Tracking System. More detailed data on criminal and social history were obtained from pre-sentence investigation reports and other documents in Parole Board files. Information on institutional misconduct is not systematically recorded in Parole Board files so institutional files also had to be reviewed. Finally, the Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS) Computerized Criminal History (CCH) files served as the data source for post-release criminal activity.

The researchers found criminal justice data in Oregon to be less comprehensive than in other states. They pointed out that Oregon "purges" parole officer files quickly and unlike many states, fails to keep automated records on institutional misconduct.

In spite of data deficiencies, the NCCD research generated a richly descriptive base of information on a cohort of inmates recently released from prisons in Oregon. The data provides for the first time in Oregon a detailed profile of the characteristics and performance of parolees.

The cohort is profiled below in each of four areas: 1) Social and demographic background; 2) Criminal history; 3) Present commitment offense and institutional misconduct; and 4) Post-release criminal activity.

Criminal History Records of the Cohort

The Corrections Department's automated Client Tracking System is designed to record shortly after admission of an offender to a state institution the number of prior juvenile and adult arrests, convictions, as well as prior probation, jail and prison terms served. The NCCD research staff reviewed this criminal history information and chose instead to have the data manually coded from the pre-sentence investigation (PSI) reports in the Parole Board files because of the predominance of missing data on the automated system.

This information is reported in Tables 2.6 through 2.16. They reveal that the majority of parolees have substantial criminal records, frequently stemming from a very young age. Of those cases with available data, two-thirds (66 percent) had been arrested at least once before the age of 18, and more than half (60 percent) had served time as juveniles.⁶

Adult records are generally more complete⁷ and indicate that lengthy adult criminal histories are also typical of this parole cohort. Only six percent had no documented prior adult arrests. Almost half (48 percent) had been arrested as many as seven or more times as adults. Furthermore, upwards of two-thirds (83 percent) had been previously arrested at least once within 24 months of confinement.

The NCCD study pooled adult and juvenile records for the purposes of reporting on prior convictions. Table 2.13 summarizes this information. Only a slight minority of the cohort (7 percent) had no documented prior convictions. Almost half (42 percent) had seven or more prior convictions.

Tables 2.15 and 2.16 show prior convictions for assaultive and property offenses. These results are consistent with a common finding in the recidivism research, namely that property offenders reoffend at higher levels than violent offenders.⁸ Almost three-quarters (73 percent) of the release

Post-Release Criminal Activity of the Cohort

Detailed information on arrests, revocations and convictions was collected for each offender for a uniform 24-month follow-up period following release. For most cases this involved a 6-month period on supervised parole and an additional 18 month period of unsupervised time in the community.¹¹

A number of measures of post-release performance are reported in Tables 2.21 through 2.25. During the first six months following release, 21 percent of the parolees were arrested on a new offense and nine percent were convicted. Convictions for assaultive offenses (including rape, sexual assault, murder, manslaughter, armed robbery or other assaultive offenses involving harm or threat of harm to victim) were relatively rare. Only 23 of the 124 releasees convicted were convicted of such an offense. One-third of the release cohort was revoked during the parole period. Of these, one-third appeared to be technical violations with no new arrests or convictions reported.

As one might expect, levels of criminal activity were higher over the full follow-up period simply by virtue of its duration. After two years, the majority (58 percent) of those released had been rearrested at least once. Almost one-quarter (23 percent) had been arrested three or more times. Four of ten of the releases were convicted at least once; one in ten was convicted three or more times. During the 24-months following release, 9 percent were convicted of an assaultive offense.

Risk scale as a tool for measuring offender risk. Because the total scores on this scale were available for each offender in the study cohort, they were able to examine whether these scores were statistically predictive of recidivism following institutional release. Their analysis revealed a moderate and significant correlation (.35) between offenders' total score on this scale and the number of arrests during the 24-month follow-up period. Correlation coefficients range in magnitude from 0 (no correlation) to 1 (perfect correlation). A correlation of .35 compares favorably with those obtained in other states.

Tables 3.1 and 3.2 suggest further that the scale as a whole discriminates fairly well between offenders on each of the outcome measures considered in the validation analysis: arrests, revocations and convictions. Three-quarters of those classified by the present scale as "excellent" risks remained arrest-free, compared to less than one-quarter of those in the "poor" risk category. Similarly, only three percent of those classified as "excellent" had three or more reported convictions vs. 30 percent of those deemed "poor" risk by the scale.

Another way to assess the scale's accuracy is to compute the percentage of offenders predicted by the scale to succeed who actually succeeded on parole. Table 3.3 classifies those falling into the "Excellent" and "Good" risk categories as predicted successes and the remaining offenders as predicted failures. Those with no reported arrests during the follow-up are classified as actual successes. The table indicates that 61 percent of the 392 inmates predicted to succeed actually remained arrest-free following release. Similarly, 66 percent of the 1006 inmates predicted to fail were in fact arrested. In very crude terms, the total number of correct predictions expressed as a percentage of all offenders provides some measure of the scale's total accuracy. For the History of Risk scale, this figure is

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF AN IMPROVED RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL

Choosing an Outcome Measure

The primary goal of the study was to identify offender characteristics most strongly associated with criminal behavior following release. The first step in such an analysis is to develop a way to measure success or failure on parole. As previously discussed, data on revocations, arrests and convictions were collected. Since convictions were classified according to the type of offense convictions could be weighted to reflect the seriousness of the charge.

Based on their work for the Board of Parole in South Carolina, the NCCD researchers devised a 7-point outcome scale which incorporated both the frequency and severity of violations and criminal behavior. At the low end of the scale, which is presented below, are successes (no arrests or revocations) and technical parole violators. Offenders with frequent (3 or more) convictions or serious (at least one assaultive offense) convictions would receive a score of 7 on the index.

PROPOSED FREQUENCY/SEVERITY SCALE

| Score | Level of Post-Release Criminal Activity |
|-------|---|
| 1 = | No new arrests or revocations |
| 2 = | No new arrests but revoked as a technical violator |
| 3 = | One new arrest but no new convictions |
| 4 = | Two or more new arrests but no new convictions |
| 5 = | One new conviction for a non-assaultive offense |
| 6 = | Two new convictions for non-assaultive convictions |
| 7 = | Three or more new convictions <u>or</u> one or more convictions for an assaultive offense |

4. Prior Juvenile Adjudication for Murder, Rape, Armed Robbery, or Assault
5. Prior Paroles for Adult State Correctional Facilities
6. Employment History

Like scales developed in other states, this one draws heavily on the offender's prior criminal history. It includes a single measure of "social stability"--employment history. Based on the weights assigned to each item, offenders are assigned scores ranging from 0 to 15, with high scores reflecting higher risk propensities. A copy of the proposed NCCD scale is attached as Appendix D.

Table 4.1 summarizes the association between each item on the scale and arrest rates for the cohort as a whole. As a group, those offenders with multiple prior adult arrests or repeated convictions for property offenses (including theft, burglary, forgery or auto theft) have significantly higher rates of rearrest following release than those with less extensive criminal histories.

Age at first arrest or juvenile conviction also bears a significant association to parole success. Those offenders first arrested as mature adults (35 years of age or older) remained arrest free in much higher numbers (81 percent) than their younger counterparts (20 years of age or younger at first arrest). Similar patterns emerged for offenders with juvenile records including violence (adjudications for murder, rape, armed robbery and assault) and those who had been on parole previously.

The last variable which proved to be significantly associated with risk was employment history. Those with chronic unemployment (employed less than 50 percent of non-educational time) were more likely as a group to be rearrested on parole (63 percent) than those with more extensive employment histories (49 percent).

Two additional risk factors are worth noting--institutional misconduct

arrests reported during the two-year follow-up are considered actual successes.

The table indicates that 61 percent of the 127 inmates predicted to succeed actually remained arrest-free following release. Similarly, 63 percent of the 571 inmates predicted to fail were in fact arrested. Again, the total number of correct predictions expressed as a percentage of all offenders provides a gross measure of the scale's total accuracy. According to this measure the NCCD scale has an overall accuracy rate that is marginally lower (63 percent) than that computed for the History of Risk scale.

Like most scales, the one developed for this project tends to over-predict recidivism. In roughly one-third (213) of the cases in the study, use of the scale results in "false-positive" identification--ie. it erroneously predicts failure. The result of these faulty classifications is that a certain percentage of inmates sorted according to this scale would be held longer than public safety requires. In a much smaller percentage of cases (7 percent) the scale errors in the other direction, erroneously predicting that offenders will succeed.

At the request of Council staff, the NCCD consultants, conducted further study on two additional issues: gender and race. During exploratory analysis, they attempted to determine whether male and female offenders differed markedly enough in their performance on parole, or on items thought to be associated with recidivism to warrant development of separate risk scales by gender. They reported that few significant differences were found and proceeded with development of a single scale.

Tables 4.4 and 4.5 compare the resulting risk distributions of men and women. They indicate that the risk scale classifies higher percentages of women as "Excellent" and "Good" risks (29 percent) relative to their male

V. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The NCCD consultants highlighted a number of policy implications stemming from their research. The Council considered these in arriving at its own recommendations, which follow.

The Merits of the History of Risk Scale and the Proposed Scale

First, the NCCD researchers leave open to the Advisory Commission on Prison Standards and Parole Terms the question of whether to continue use of the present History of Risk scale or to replace it with the newly developed scale as proposed. Policy-makers and the general public ought to draw some comfort and assurance from the finding that the basic scale used in Oregon for almost 10 years to classify inmates for release, though it has been modified from time to time,¹⁸ is at least as accurate as predictive tools developed empirically and validated in other states, including the tool proposed by NCCD.

The NCCD scale does have some minor advantages. It offers similar predictive capabilities as the History of Risk scale, but because its items might be easier to score it could be somewhat more reliable. The Council believes, however, that such non-predictive advantages would be outweighed by the costs of implementing a new scale in terms of training, new forms, and other disruptions to the operation of the system. Accordingly:

1. The Council recommends continued use of the present History of Risk scale since the alternative scale developed by NCCD does not appear to offer any predictive advantages. Any future modifications to the scale, including elimination of particular items or changes in the scoring procedures and weights associated with individual items, should be approached cautiously and not without further analysis of the data generated by this project.

Although it is difficult, with existing data, to "tease out" the relative effects of these factors on parole decision-making, these practices, including the use of minimum and consecutive sentences, have dramatic implications for correctional resources. Documentation of the interplay between judicial sentencing and parole decisions as they affect time served will also be critical to the Council's efforts to develop sentencing guidelines.

Accordingly:

2. The Council recommends that the Parole Board, working with Council staff, monitor parole decisions more closely to determine why prison terms are being set outside matrix ranges and why so many terms are being set at the upper end of the ranges.

The NCCD researchers illuminated the possible need for adjustment either to the matrix ranges or the way in which risk classifications are used in decision-making, and specifically recommended consideration of a number of options for more effective use of risk assessment. First, they suggest up-front diversion of the following groups: Crime Category 1 "Good" and "Excellent" risks, and Crime Category 2 "Excellent" risks. The researchers estimate that adoption of such a policy in 1985 would have resulted in 125 beds saved. The Council believes that consideration of such diversion options can most appropriately be made during development of sentencing guidelines. Accordingly:

3. The Council recommends that suggestions for judicial diversion of certain offenders be considered during establishment of the Council's in/out criteria for felony sentencing guidelines.

Secondly, NCCD estimates that if all other "Excellent" and "Good" risk cases (Crime Categories 3-7) had served the median of the range corresponding to their crime category, bed needs in 1985 might have been

Ongoing Parole Monitoring Information System

Through the present project, the Council identified the crucial need for a state information system which would track parolee performance on a regular basis. Such a system could also be used to insure that the History of Risk scale does not lose its predictive accuracy over time as the mix of offenders changes. It would need to include basic information on offenders and Parole Board decisions, and have a mechanism for tracking parolees for some reasonable period following release. Such a system would eliminate the need for expensive one-shot studies which require extensive manual data collection efforts. Accordingly:

6. The Council recommends that the Parole Board seek the initiation of a parole monitoring system. The Board may be in the best position at the present time both to gather and to make immediate use of the information on parolee performance in modifying its release practices or dealing with specific parole revocation cases. The permanent location of the system should be re-evaluated in the future when the Corrections Department has its institution and field information systems ready for on-line integration.

The Parole Board's present automation system would require hardware and software upgrades to manage this task on an ongoing basis, since the system was not designed to track offenders following release and would have to be reprogrammed substantially to do so. In addition, automated records on inmates seen by the Board since January, 1987 are pushing up against the limits of the system's storage capacity.

The Council obtained \$50,000 in funding from the 1987 legislature for the ongoing collection of data on parolee performance and the continued monitoring and updating of the parole release matrix. The Council made it clear to the legislature that this funding would most appropriately be

awaiting sentencing. These groups differ in their propensities for recidivism (base rates) and each is progressively more heterogeneous than the last. Instruments developed separately for use in classifying these different offender groups might include a few common elements but the weights attached to each scale item would likely differ due to the variation between groups.

ENDNOTES

1. Baird, Christopher, Audrey J. Bakke, Douglas A. Holien and Terry Zirk. Oregon Risk Assessment Project Final Report, June, 1987, Madison, Wisconsin: National Council on Crime and Delinquency. This more detailed report can be obtained from the Council's Administrative offices (503) 464-4130.

2. The Corrections Department's Basic Client Tracking System was used to identify a total of 2029 releases during the period selected (January-August 1984 for men and January 1982-August 1984 for women). Of these, approximately 531 cases had to be excluded from the study sample because Parole Board files could not be located. An additional 100 cases were excluded after completed data collection forms were lost or damaged in the mail between Oregon and NCCD's office in Madison, Wisconsin.

In order to determine whether the sample was representative of all eligible cases, the researchers compared the sample cases with those excluded on a number of variables available from the Corrections Department's automated system. The variables examined included: age at release, sex, race, history of risk scores, crime category of major commitment offense, and number of prior arrests, convictions and incarcerations. Except for the finding that the sample cases were somewhat younger on average, the difference between the two groups were not significant.

3. The data collection form and coding instructions are included at the end of this report as Appendix B.

4. The source for the reported estimate of the state's non-white population is the 1980 U.S. Census.

5. According to the 1980 U.S. Census, 71 percent of Oregonians 15 years of age or older had completed high school. The comparable national statistic is 63 percent.

6. Because present law in Oregon allows for expungement of juvenile records, our estimates likely underestimate the true volume of juvenile arrests, convictions and commitments.

7. However, as the Oregon Criminal Justice Council pointed out in its 1986 Annual Report, the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) "Rap sheets" used by PSI writers to document prior criminal activity are not entirely complete. Underreporting of dispositions by the courts and prosecutors is significant and resulting data on adult convictions is likely incomplete.

8. See Heilbrun, A.B., I.J. Knopf and P. Brunner. 1976 "Criminal Impulsivity and Violence and Subsequent Parole Outcome." British Journal of Criminology 16(4):367-377; and Neithercutt, M.G. 1972 "Parole Violation Patterns and Commitment Offense." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 9:87-98.

9. For an inventory of this and other items on parole risk scales nationwide see Baird, C. and D. Lerner. 1985 Survey of Risk Assessment Instruments Used by U.S. Parole Boards. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Madison, WI.

prior felony and misdemeanor convictions while the present scale scores only felonies. It is unlikely, however, that such changes have altered the scale's overall predictive validity significantly. Evidence for the scale's continued validity can be found in a related study conducted by Marion County Community Corrections (See Marion County Community Corrections Tools of Limited Risk Management, September 1986). The study endorsed the validity of the version of the scale in use today based on an analysis of the risks posed by their field caseload.

APPENDIX A
STATISTICAL TABLES

TABLE 2.3
HISTORY OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE

| | Alcohol Abuse | | Drug Abuse | |
|----------|---------------|---------|------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| None | 411 | 29.4% | 403 | 28.8% |
| Moderate | 228 | 16.3% | 453 | 32.4% |
| Major | 759 | 54.3% | 542 | 38.8% |

TABLE 2.4
LAST GRADE COMPLETED

| | Number | Percentage |
|---------------------------------------|--------|------------|
| First through Sixth | 27 | 2.1% |
| Seventh through Ninth | 237 | 18.2% |
| Tenth through Twelfth (No Diploma) | 455 | 34.9% |
| High School Graduate or GED | 402 | 30.9% |
| Some College | 165 | 12.7% |
| College Graduate | 17 | 1.3% |

TABLE 2.5
EMPLOYMENT

| | Percentage |
|--|------------|
| Employed less than 50% non education time | 71.2% |
| Employed continuously for six months prior to last arrest | 7.3% |

TABLE 2.8
NUMBER OF PRIOR ARRESTS AS AN ADULT

| | Number | Percentage |
|---------------|--------|------------|
| None | 78 | 5.6% |
| One | 88 | 6.3% |
| Two | 114 | 8.2% |
| Three | 119 | 8.5% |
| Four | 110 | 7.9% |
| Five | 107 | 7.7% |
| Six | 109 | 7.8% |
| Seven or More | 673 | 48.1% |

TABLE 2.11
NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT JAIL AND PRISON COMMITMENTS

| | Jail | Prison |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| None | 254 (21.6%) | 465 (44.9%) |
| One | 299 (25.5%) | 270 (26.1%) |
| Two | 210 (17.9%) | 140 (13.5%) |
| Three | 125 (10.6%) | 76 (7.3%) |
| Four or More | 286 (24.4%) | 85 (8.2%) |
| Information N/A | 224 | 362 |

TABLE 2.12
PRIOR ARRESTS WITHIN 24 MONTHS OF COMMITMENT

| | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------|--------|---------------|
| None | 182 | 13.0% (17.4%) |
| One | 271 | 19.4% (26.0%) |
| Two | 218 | 15.6% (20.9%) |
| Three | 149 | 10.7% (14.3%) |
| Four or Five | 116 | 8.3% (11.1%) |
| Six or More | 107 | 7.7% (10.3%) |
| Information Not Available | 355 | 25.4% |

NOTE: Percentages in parentheses reflect adjustments for missing data.

TABLE 2.15

PRIOR CONVICTIONS FOR ASSAULTIVE OFFENSES

| | Number | Percent |
|------------------------|--------|---------|
| None | 950 | 68.0% |
| Convicted as Juvenile* | 66 | 4.7% |
| Convicted as Adult | 382 | 27.3% |

*Reflects those cases convicted as a juvenile only. Cases convicted as both juveniles and adults are included in the adult total.

TABLE 2.16

PRIOR CONVICTIONS FOR AUTO THEFT, FORGERY,
THEFT OR BURGLARY (ADULT OR JUVENILE)

| | |
|-------------|-------|
| None | 27.2% |
| One | 21.0% |
| Two or More | 51.9% |

TABLE 2.18

CASES WITH FORMAL RULES VIOLATIONS REPORTED

| | |
|---------------|-------|
| None | 57.0% |
| One | 12.5% |
| Two | 9.4% |
| Three or More | 21.1% |

TABLE 2.19

CASES WITH ASSAULTIVE RULES VIOLATIONS REPORTED

| | |
|-------------|-------|
| None | 91.5% |
| One | 5.5% |
| Two or More | 3.0% |

NOTE: Percentages reflect cases for which data on rules violations were available (N = 745)

TABLE 2.21
NUMBER OF ARRESTS DURING PAROLE PERIOD

| | Number | Percentage |
|-------------|--------|------------|
| None | 1106 | 79.1% |
| One | 210 | 15.0% |
| Two or more | 82 | 6.0% |
| Range | 0 - 20 | Mean .34 |

TABLE 2.22
NUMBER OF ARRESTS DURING 24 MONTH FOLLOW-UP PERIOD

| | Number | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|--------|---------|--------------------|
| None | 578 | 41.3% | 41.3% |
| One | 303 | 21.7% | 63.0% |
| Two | 190 | 13.6% | 76.6% |
| Three or more | 327 | 23.4% | 100.0% |
| Range | 0 - 22 | Mean | 1.85 |

TABLE 2.24
PERCENTAGE OF CONVICTIONS

| | During Parole Period | Within 24 Months of Release |
|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| None | 91.1% | 60.4% |
| One | 5.5% | 18.7% |
| Two | 1.7% | 9.4% |
| Three or More | 1.8% | 11.4% |

TABLE 2.25
NUMBER OF CONVICTIONS FOR ASSAULTIVE OFFENSES

| | During Parole Period | Within 24 Months of Release |
|-------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| None | 1375 (98.4%) | 1267 (90.6%) |
| One or More | 23 (1.7%) | 131 (9.4%) |

TABLE 3.3

PREDICTIVE ACCURACY OF THE HISTORY OF RISK SCALE

| Predicted Outcome | Actual Outcome | | Total |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| | Success (No Arrests) | Failure (1+ Arrests) | |
| Success (6 - 11) | 238 (61%) | 154 (39%) | 392 (28%) |
| Failure (0 - 5) | 340 (34%) | 666 (66%) | 1006 (72%) |
| Total | 578 (41%) | 820 (59%) | 1398 (100%) |

TABLE 4.2

DISCRIMINATION POWER OF THE NCCD SCALE
 OUTCOME = NEW ARRESTS
 n = 1398

| Scale Range | % of Sample | New Arrests Reported | | | |
|-------------|-------------|----------------------|-------|-------|---------------|
| | | None | One | Two | Three Or More |
| 0 - 3 | 6.9% | 72.9% | 12.1% | 7.5% | 7.5% |
| 4 - 5 | 10.4% | 61.5% | 18.9% | 4.7% | 14.5% |
| 6 - 11 | 63.0% | 37.9% | 23.6% | 14.3% | 24.2% |
| 12 - 15 | 19.3% | 28.5% | 20.8% | 18.8% | 31.9% |

TABLE 4.3

PREDICTIVE ACCURACY OF THE PROPOSED NCCD SCALE
 Validation Sample Only
 (n=698)

| Predicted Outcome | Actual Outcome | | Total |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| | Success (No Arrests) | Failure (1+ Arrests) | |
| Success (0 - 5) | 78 (61%) | 49 (39%) | 127 (18%) |
| Failure (6 - 15) | 213 (37%) | 358 (63%) | 571 (82%) |
| Total | 291 (42%) | 407 (58%) | 698 (100%) |

TABLE 4.6
NEW SCALE* BY RACE

| Risk Level | White | Black | Other |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Excellent (0 - 3) | 8.3% | 2.3% | 9.5% |
| Good (4 - 5) | 11.8% | 6.4% | 6.3% |
| Fair (6 - 11) | 63.2% | 60.8% | 63.2% |
| Poor (12 - 15) | 16.7% | 30.4% | 21.1% |

*The cut-off points for risk levels are based on major changes in recidivism rates. Changes may be desired to move some offenders out of the "fair" range to produce a more proportionate distribution across risk levels.



Drug abuse refers to illicit drugs and abused prescription drugs. Minor is rated if the abuse did not seem to impair day to day functions (i.e. job, school, family) or result in arrests. Major is rated if day to day functioning was impaired or resulted in arrests.

Use of alcohol does not necessarily represent abuse. Use the same criteria for drug abuse (impairment/arrest).

Employment History refers to paid jobs and is from age 18 until prison commitment. Check all that apply. If total employment is less than 50% non educational/vocational time available, rate "sporadic". If more than 50%, rate "employed". If not applicable (i.e. student all the time), leave blank. If full time employed for 6 months or more before the commitment offense, check the item.

3. Juvenile Record

The PSI will be the primary source document.

4. Adult Record

Use the PSI prior record section. This data collection section reflects criminal history excluding the commitment offense. If commitment offense is the first arrest and conviction, nothing is rated until you list the commitment offense(s). Relationship to victim pertains to commitment offense(s) only.

5. Parole Release Record

Use parole reports to determine arrests and convictions for new offenses (do not include arrests/incarceration for "technical violations" of parole conditions). The time period rated is release from prison to parole discharge (including temporary leave that went direct to parole status without reincarceration).

6. Parole Period

Rate the items as the situation was during most of the parole period until discharge.

7. Post Parole Record

This refers to the time after parole discharge until December 1986. The source document is current LEDS and NCIC rap sheets reflecting state and national arrests/convictions. Compare LEDS and NCIC data with parts 4 and 5, and revise if needed.

8. Parole Discharge

Rate all items (except revoked) only after LEDS and NCIC data is reviewed. If revoked, so indicate. Check all that apply.

OREGON PAROLE STUDY

PRIOR RECORD
GENERAL GUIDELINES

JUVENILE RECORD (to age 18)

Consider "referrals" for status and criminal offenses the same as "arrests".

ADULT RECORD

Determine the date of release from prison between 1/84 through 9/84 for males and 1/82 through 9/84 for females.

Working backward from that release date, count all arrests for criminal activity, including the arrest for the commitment offense (this is a change from original instructions). Also count number of prior probation/parole episodes and jail terms that occurred before the episode of prison incarceration for which they were released 1/84 through 9/84 (males) and 1/82 through 9/84 (females).

When counting events, be cautious and do not guess. If the data is unclear and you cannot make an accurate determination, do not code the item. Likewise if you are unsure how to categorize a conviction, use the "other" category.

PAROLE RELEASE RECORD

We are only looking at one episode of parole in coding this section. This section pertains to the time from the release date (1/84 through 9/84 for males or 1/82 through 9/84 for females) until discharge, revocation or absconding. Do not concern yourself with reparole and subsequent offender behavior.

Count arrests/convictions for new offenses only (not technical or rule violations).

Interpret date of parole termination to mean date when parole supervision ceased. This includes discharge, revocation and absconding.-

Do not code periods incarcerated. Leave it blank since this data is not usually available in the files.

Code "revoked" if officially revoked or if a parolee absconds and is not officially revoked. In other words, revoked equals official revocation or absconding behavior.

Once the parolee is discharged or "revoked" from this one period of parole, stop counting arrests/convictions or other parolee behavior that may have occurred later. Do not code what occurred on reparole.

PAROLE PERIOD
(Rate During Parole Only)

Employment:

- _____ Full time paid
- _____ Part time paid
- _____ Student
- _____ Neither student nor employed

Income:

- _____ None
- _____ Less than \$300/mo.
- _____ \$300-499/mo.
- _____ \$500-999/mo.
- _____ \$1000+/mo.

Living Arrangements:

- _____ Spouse (sig. other)
- _____ Parents
- _____ Friend(s)
- _____ Alone
- _____ Group Home
- _____ Restitution Center
- _____ Other (Indicate: _____)

POST PAROLE RECORD
(After Date of Parole Discharge Through December 1986)
(Source LEDS and NCIC)

Total No. of Arrests: _____ Date of First Arrest: _____ / _____ /
Mo. Yr.

Number of arrests without dispositions listed: _____

Date of First New Conviction: _____ / _____ /
Mo. Yr.

NUMBER OF NEW CONVICTIONS FOR:

- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|
| Theft/Forgery | _____ | Rape/Sexual Assault | _____ |
| Auto Theft | _____ | Murder/Manslaughter | _____ |
| Burglary | _____ | Armed Robbery | _____ |
| Drugs (other than sale) | _____ | Other Assaultive | _____ |
| Other Property | _____ | Other Person Offenses | _____ |
| Sale of Drugs | _____ | Other | _____ |

PERIOD INCARCERATED (Post Parole; Jail, Prison or Restitution Center):

| | |
|---|---|
| _____ / _____ / to _____ / _____ / Mo. Yr. Mo. Yr. | _____ / _____ / to _____ / _____ / Mo. Yr. Mo. Yr. |
| _____ / _____ / to _____ / _____ / Mo. Yr. Mo. Yr. | _____ / _____ / to _____ / _____ / Mo. Yr. Mo. Yr. |
| _____ / _____ / to _____ / _____ / Mo. Yr. Mo. Yr. | _____ / _____ / to _____ / _____ / Mo. Yr. Mo. Yr. |
| _____ / _____ / to _____ / _____ / Mo. Yr. Mo. Yr. | _____ / _____ / to _____ / _____ / Mo. Yr. Mo. Yr. |

APPENDIX C

CRIMINAL HISTORY/RISK ASSESSMENT UNDER RULE 255-35-015

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| (A) | No prior felony or misdemeanor conviction as an adult or juvenile: | 3 |
| | One prior conviction: | 2 |
| | Two or three prior convictions: | 1 |
| | Four or more prior convictions: | 0 |
| (B) | No prior incarcerations (i.e., executes sentences of 90 days or more) as an adult or juvenile: | 2 |
| | One or two prior incarcerations: | 1 |
| | Three or more prior incarcerations: | 0 |
| (C) | Verified period of 3 years conviction free in the community prior to present incarceration: | 1 |
| | Otherwise: | 0 |
| (D) | Age at commencement of behavior leading to this incarceration: | 2 |
| | 26 or older and at least one point received in Items A, B, or C: | 1 |
| | 26 or older and no points received in A, B, or C: | |
| | 21 to under 26 and at least one point received in A, B, or C: | 1 |
| | 21 to under 26 and no points in A, B, or C: | 0 |
| | Under 21: | 0 |
| (E) | Present commitment does not include parole, probation, failure to appear, release agreement, escape or custody violation: | 2 |
| | Present commitment involves probation, release agreement or failure to appear violation: | 1 |
| | Present commitment involves parole, escape or custody violation: | 0 |
| (F) | Has no admitted or documented heroin or opiate derivative abuse problem: | 1 |
| | Otherwise: | 0 |

TOTAL HISTORY RISK ASSESSMENT SCORE:

Note: This version of the History of Risk scale was in use in 1984 and was validated in the present study.

APPENDIX D

NCCD RISK ASSESSMENT SCALE

| | Score |
|---|-------|
| Number of Prior Adult Arrests | _____ |
| Two or Fewer | 0 |
| Three to Five | 1 |
| Six or More | 3 |
| Prior Convictions for Theft, Burglary, Forgery or Auto Theft (Adult or Juvenile) | _____ |
| None | 0 |
| One | 1 |
| Two or More | 3 |
| Age at First Conviction or Juvenile Adjudication | _____ |
| 20 or Younger | 3 |
| 21 to 24 | 2 |
| 25 to 34 | 1 |
| 35 or Older | 0 |
| Prior Juvenile Adjudications for Murder, Rape, Armed Robbery or Assault | _____ |
| None | 0 |
| One or More | 2 |
| Prior Paroles from Adult State Correctional Systems | _____ |
| None | 0 |
| One or More | 2 |
| Employment History | _____ |
| Employed Less Than 50% of Non Education Time Prior to Last Arrest | 2 |
| All others (include homemakers | 0 |
| TOTAL | _____ |

