

**Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction**

**2014 INTAKE STUDY**

**August 2015**

**Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction  
Gary C. Mohr, Director**

**Cynthia Mausser, Managing Director  
Court & Community**

**Conducted by:**

**Bureau of Research and Evaluation,  
Department of Rehabilitation and Correction**

**Tables      Jim Bates  
Text         Jim Bates**

**Data and Report Preparation and Support  
Jim Bates  
Reeda Boyd  
Ronnie Easter**

**Editing      Maggie Hardy  
Steve Van Dine**

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

### **Coding of Offender History Information**

- Classification Specialists (Bureau of Research and Evaluation)  
Jim Bates  
Reeda Boyd  
Ronnie Easter

### **Assistance at DRC Reception Centers**

- Thanks to all the staff that enabled the Bureau of Research & Evaluation to efficiently collect demographic and social characteristics information from the offenders.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Acknowledgments.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables.....	iv-v
Executive Summary.....	vi-vii
Introduction.....	1
Methodology.....	1
Caveats Regarding the Data .....	2
Representativeness of Sample.....	3
Structure of the Report.....	4
Demographic and Social Characteristics.....	5-15
Characteristics of Current Commitment Offense.....	16-26
Prior Criminal History.....	27-37
Substance Abuse Assessment .....	38
Assessment of Legislative Impact / Trends .....	38-39

## LIST OF TABLES

*Table* *Page*

### DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

1	Gender.....	5
2	Race/ Ethnicity.....	5
3	County of Commitment.....	5-7
4	Age at Commitment.....	8
5	Marital Status at Arrest.....	9
6	Employment Status at Arrest.....	9
7A	Highest Education Level at Arrest (Condensed).....	9
7B	Highest Education Level at Arrest (Expanded).....	10
8	Military Veteran Status.....	11
9	Primary Living Arrangement from Birth to Age 18.....	11
10	Indication of Physical Abuse as a Child or Adolescent.....	12
11	Indication of Sexual Abuse as a Child or Adolescent.....	12
12	History of Mental Health Problems.....	12
13	Indication of Recent Drug Abuse.....	13
14	Indication of a History of Drug Abuse.....	13
15	Indication of Recent Alcohol Abuse.....	13
16	Indication of a History of Alcohol Abuse.....	14
17	Indication of the Completion of Substance Abuse Treatment.....	14
18	Living Arrangement at Time of Arrest.....	15
19	Number of Dependent Children at Time of Arrest.....	15

### CHARACTERISTICS OF CURRENT COMMITMENT OFFENSE

20	Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	16-18
21	Felony Level-Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	19
22	Adjudication of Offender’s Case.....	19
23	Gun Specification Time in Conviction.....	19
24	Expected Length of Stay for Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	20
25	Type of Drug Involved in Any of the Instant Conviction Offenses.....	20-21
26	Offender’s Legal Status at Arrest for the Conviction Offense.....	21
27	Whether Offender Violated Felony Probation or Parole Conditions.....	22
28	Role of the Offender and Others in the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	22
29	Weapon Used/Possessed/ Present During Conviction Offense... ..	23
30	Type of Weapon Used During Conviction Offense.....	23
31	Drugs/Alcohol Used During Conviction Offense.....	24
32	Primary Victim of the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	24
33	Gender of Victim of the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	25
34	Victim Involvement in the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	25
35	Extent of Victim Injury from the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	25
36	Extent of Victim Psychological Harm from the Most Serious Conviction Offense.....	26

**PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY**

37	Age at First Arrest.....	27
38	Age at Arrest for First Violent Offense.....	27
39	Age at First Arrest Leading to a Delinquency Adjudication or Adult Felony Conviction.....	28
40	Number of Juvenile Violent (Non-Sex) Offenses.....	28
41	Number of Juvenile Sex Offenses.....	29
42	Number of Juvenile Drug Use/Possession Offenses.....	29
43	Number of Juvenile Drug Sale/Trafficking Offenses.....	29
44	Number of Juvenile DUI/OMVI Offenses.....	30
45	Number of Juvenile Property Offenses.....	30
46	Number of Juvenile Social Service Placements.....	30
47	Number of Commitments to Department of Youth Services.....	31
48	Number of Juvenile Supervision Terms.....	31
49	Number of Juvenile Supervision Terms Continued.....	31
50	Number of Revocations of Juvenile Supervision.....	32
51	Number of Prior Adult Non-Violent Misdemeanor Convictions.....	32
52	Number of Prior Adult DUI/OMVI Convictions.....	32
53	Number of Prior Adult Violent Misdemeanor Convictions.....	33
54	Number of Domestic Violence Convictions.....	33
55	Number of Prior Adult Jail Incarcerations.....	33
56	Number of Prior Adult Felony Convictions [Total].....	34
57	Number of Prior Adult Violent (Non-Sex) Felony Convictions.....	34
58	Number of Prior Adult Sex Felony Convictions.....	34
59	Number of Prior Adult Drug Use/Possession Felony Convictions.....	35
60	Number of Prior Adult Drug Sale/Trafficking Felony Convictions.....	35
61	Number of Adult Property Felony Convictions.....	36
62	Number of Prior Adult Prison Incarcerations.....	36
63	Number of Prior Adult Supervision Terms.....	36
64	Number of Prior Revocations of Adult Supervision Terms.....	37
65	Indication of an Escape History.....	37

**SUBSTANCE ABUSE ASSESSMENT**

66	Indication of the Need for Substance Abuse Treatment/ TCU SCORE.....	38
----	--	----

**ASSESSMENT OF LEGISLATIVE IMPACT / TRENDS**

A	Proportion of Each Year’s Intake Who were Truly Non Violent .....	38
B	Proportion of Each Year’s TNV Intake Who were Supervision Violators .....	39
C	Proportion of Each Year’s Total Intake Who were Probation Violators .....	39
D	Proportion of Each Year’s Total Intake Who were Parole/PRC Violators .....	39

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Social and Demographic Characteristics

- Of the 3,366 offenders included in the study, 85.1% were male and 14.9% were female. [Table 1]
- The racial composition of the intake sample was: 37.5% African American, 59.6% Caucasian, and 2.9% all other categories. [Table 2]
- The ten counties with the greatest numbers of offenders committed to Ohio prisons during the intake study period were: Cuyahoga (N=479; 14.2%), Franklin (N=263; 7.8%), Hamilton (N=259; 7.7%), Montgomery (N=171; 5.1%), Summit (N=161; 4.8%), Stark (N=145; 4.3%), Butler (N=120; 3.6%), Lucas (N=109; 3.2%), Clermont (N=65; 1.9%) and Richland (N=62; 1.8%). [Table 3]
- The mean age of offenders in the intake study was 32.6 years and the median age was 31.0. Males had an average age of 32.6 and a median age of 31.0. Females had a mean age of 32.5 and a median age of 30.0. [Table 4]
- At the time of arrest for the instant offense, 65.6% of the offenders were unemployed and 22.4% were employed full-time. Males were more likely to have been employed full-time (22.7%) than females (20.3%). [Table 6]
- Some level of substance abuse treatment was indicated for 76.5% of the intake sample. A severe need for treatment was indicated for 64.8% of the overall group (male = 63.7%; female = 70.6%). [Table 66]

## Current Most Serious Commitment Offense

- Roughly a third (962) of the males (33.6%) were incarcerated for committing a crime against persons (including sex offenses) as their most serious offense. Just over one-fourth (25.3%) of the males were convicted for committing a drug offense. Over one-third (36.6%) of the females were incarcerated for committing a drug offense as their most serious offense. About one-sixth were incarcerated for a miscellaneous property offense (17.7%). Similarly, about one-sixth of the females (16.9%) were convicted of committing crimes against persons (including sex offenses). [Table 20]
- The five offenses (most serious commitment offense) for which the male and female offenders in the sample were most often committed were: [Table 20]

### **MALES**

Drug Possession	11.6%
Drug Trafficking	9.6%
Burglary	9.5%
Theft	5.3%
Felonious Assault	4.9%

### **FEMALES**

Drug Possession	16.3%
Theft	12.7%
Drug Trafficking	9.7%
Burglary	8.8%
Illegal Mfg. Drugs	8.0%

- Nearly four in ten (38.8%) of the males and just under half (46.9%) of the females in the study were incarcerated for a period of one year or less. Overall, 40.0% of the offenders were to serve no more than one year in prison. [Table 24]
- Weapons were involved, or present, in some manner, in the conviction offense in 25.6% of the cases (male = 28.5%; female = 8.6%). [Table 29]

### Criminal History

- Over one-fifth of the offenders (21.6%) have had at least one domestic violence conviction as an adult or juvenile (male = 23.8%; female = 10.2%). [Table 54]
- More than six in ten offenders (61.3%) had at least one prior adult felony conviction (male = 64.3%; female = 44.1%). [Table 56]
- Men were more likely than women to have served a prior prison term (male = 51.8%; female = 29.2%). Just under half of the entire intake sample has served a prior prison term (48.4%). [Table 62]
- Over three-fourths (76.6%) of the offenders have had at least one prior adult supervision term (male = 77.2%; female = 73.6%). [Table 63]. Females were more likely than males to have at least one prior revocation of adult supervision (male = 51.5%; female = 55.1%). [Table 64]

### Trends and Impact

- The Truly Non-Violent (TNV) portion of the 2014 Intake sample was 27.4%, up from 25.4% for the 2013 Intake sample. Still, the 2014 proportion is the third lowest recorded in over two decades of developing this estimate. [See Table A, page 38]
- Of the TNV in 2014, 46.2% were supervision violators (either from probation or parole/PRC, and for both technical and new felony reasons). This is a decrease of 9.4 percentage points from the 2013 Intake Study. A proportion of 46.2% is the seventh highest proportion in the last 18 Intake samples—1996 to 2014. [See Table B, page 39]
- For the total intake (not just TNV), 31.1% were probation violators for either a technical violation or for a new crime also. This is a decrease of 5.1 percentage points from the 2013 Intake Study and is the ninth highest proportion in the last 18 intake samples. [See Table C, page 39] Parole/PRC violators rose from 6.2% to 8.7%. [See Table D, page 39]
- All these tables (A-D, pages 38-39) suggest that legislative and DRC efforts over the last 25 years for community punishment and treatment alternatives for less serious offenders resulted in an intake population that contains proportionately more serious offenders. However, a rise in TNV offenders in 2013-14 may support the claim that during that period there were new kinds of TNV offender populations with issues and backgrounds for which no appropriate community alternatives were available. Since there has been an effort to develop those alternatives, it will be interesting to see the next set of TNV estimates and profiles. (See also *Profiles of TNV Offenders 2013 and 2014*, BRE)

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to present a basic profile of newly committed inmates entering the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (DRC) prison system for a new commitment from common pleas courts during 2014. The profile of Intake 2014 inmates includes the following information: (1) demographic and social characteristics of the inmates, (2) characteristics of the current commitment offense, (3) the inmate's prior criminal history, (4) the need for substance abuse treatment and (5) legislative impact / trends. These tables may be used to compare the characteristics of inmates entering the prison system across the years for which similar data have been collected (1985, 1992, 1996 to 1998 and 2000 to 2013). Copies of many of the reports are available at:

**<http://www.drc.ohio.gov/web/reports/reports18.asp>**.

### Methodology

In general, data for intake studies are collected on all inmates who enter the DRC prison system over a one and a half to two month period for a new commitment from a common pleas court. Information is obtained from seven primary sources:

- (1) Interviews with inmates at reception centers;
- (2) Written investigations;
- (3) The OnBase information system, with offender background reports available in digitized form;
- (4) County web sites;
- (5) Ohio Courts Network (OCN);
- (6) LEADS and
- (7) OHLEG

The interviews with the inmates, conducted by DRC classification specialists, take place at DRC's three reception centers. Male interviews are conducted at the Lorain Correctional Institution and the Correctional Reception Center. Females are interviewed at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. The interview emphasis is on social history information not consistently available in offender files. Bureau of Research and Evaluation Offender History staff code this information into the Intake database.

If a basic written offender investigation (often a PSI) is available, key variables are collected from that investigation. However, with such a large data collection effort, it is inevitable that some of the necessary information on offenders will be missing from the investigation reports. When information is missing, classification specialists must obtain copies of documents available online in digitized form on inmates from the records bureau at the Operation Support Center (OSC), the Ohio Courts Network (OCN), the Ohio Law Enforcement Gateway (OHLEG) and county court records. The classification specialists read through the available information and attempt to retrieve the missing information.

For Intake 2014, Information was collected on all inmates who entered the DRC prison system starting May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2014 and concluding July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2014. The resulting data set contains

information on a sample of 3,366 newly committed inmates received by DRC during this period. This is used for a basic intake profile report and several more detailed reports. One is a report on Truly Non-Violent Offenders for 2014. Secondly, side-by-side county comparison tables for the ten highest committing counties as well as individualized county profiles for those counties have been completed. Profiles of Veterans and of Short Term Offenders admitted during the intake study period have also been prepared.

### Caveats Regarding the Data

There are several limitations to the data of which the reader should be aware when assessing this information. First, the reader should bear in mind that the characteristics of the offense apply to the most serious conviction offense only. One should be cautious when trying to establish the proportion of offenders serving time for particular offenses. For example, an offender may have been convicted for felonious assault and domestic violence. The proportion of offenders currently entering prison for domestic violence will be underestimated when looking only at the proportion of offenders committed for domestic violence as the most serious offense.

A more accurate representation may be found by also considering offenders for whom domestic violence was the second most serious offense; however, we are not able to identify the number of offenders committed for domestic violence as a third or fourth most serious offense. While we believe that considering the most and second most serious offenses captures important offense characteristics for the majority of offenders entering prison for any given offense, estimates using this database must be considered conservative estimates. Similar precautions should be taken when estimating the various proportions of victim characteristics and other variables associated with particular offenses.<sup>1</sup> The database also does not contain information on the number of counts of offenses upon which the inmate was sentenced.

A second concern regards juvenile offense data. The availability of juvenile records continues to be problematic. Many county juvenile courts have a policy of refusing access to juvenile records; some will permit access only with a signed waiver from the inmate. Other juvenile courts routinely destroy juvenile records for individuals born before a specific date. As a result, the completeness of the juvenile record information remains questionable. In addition, the severity of juvenile offenses is difficult to determine due to the varying types of records of juvenile criminal behavior. Great care should be taken when attempting to draw conclusions from juvenile criminal history information contained in the intake databases.

Several limitations of criminal histories in general should be noted. The reader should be aware that the intake adult offense information is only for prior adult convictions. Few conclusions can be drawn regarding arrests from the data. An exception is that the number of arrests for five years prior to the instant offense is recorded in the intake database, although not reported herein.

There is no data recorded on indictment charges nor plea-bargaining for prior convictions. For example, it is possible that an inmate was, at some previous time, charged with a

<sup>1</sup> For inquiries that require a greater degree of specificity, please contact the Bureau of Research and Evaluation for additional analysis.

violent offense but agreed to plead guilty to a lesser, non-violent offense. As a result, there may be a number of individuals in the intake database who are identified as having no prior convictions for violent offenses, but they actually do have a history of violent behavior.

Representativeness of the Sample

It is important to note how representative this cohort of inmates is when compared to the inmates being admitted throughout the year. The Intake 2014 sample should be comparable to inmates admitted during CY 2014. The information below, taken from the CY 2014 Commitment Report, illustrates that the Intake 2014 sample closely resembles the year’s intake on several basic features.

	<b>INTAKE 2014 %</b>	<b>COMM. CY2014 %</b>
<u>Sex</u>		
Female	14.9	14.2
Male	85.1	85.8
<u>Race</u>		
African American	37.5	37.3
Caucasian	59.6	59.8
<u>Counties of Commitment</u>		
Cuyahoga	14.2	13.9
Hamilton	7.7	7.9
Franklin	7.8	7.5
Summit	4.8	5.5
Montgomery	5.1	4.8
<u>Type of Offense</u>		
Crimes Against Persons	25.2	24.6
Sex Offenses	7.5	7.5
Burglary Offenses	10.3	11.4
Property Offenses	12.8	13.1
Drug Offenses	27.0	26.5
Motor Vehicle Offenses	1.5	1.6
Fraud Offenses	2.7	1.9
Weapons Offenses	6.2	6.1
Justice and Public Administration	6.7	7.2
Other Offenses	0.0	0.1
<u>Mean Age in Years</u>		
Female	32.5	32.4
Male	32.6	32.8

This comparison suggests strongly that the Intake 2014 sample is representative of all inmates admitted into ODRC’s prisons in 2014.

## Structure of the Report

This report is organized into five data sections. The first section presents the demographic and social characteristics of the 2014 Intake sample. The second section provides information on the characteristics of the most serious current commitment offense. Information regarding the offender's prior criminal history is presented in section three. Section four indicates the extent of substance abuse treatment needs. Section five includes some trend information and an assessment of legislative impact. In reviewing the tables, please be aware that due to rounding, percentages may not total exactly to 100%. This condition may be true for any table in this report. In addition, percentages in the text are rounded to one decimal place from the two places in the tables.

## DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

Data in this section is collected from social or criminal history records and self-reporting.

**TABLE 1: Gender**

GENDER	N	%
Male	2,863	85.10
Female	503	14.90
TOTAL	3,366	100.00

Of the 3,366 offenders included in the study, 85.1% were male and 14.9% were female.

**TABLE 2: Race / Ethnicity**

ETHNICITY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Asian	3	0.10	1	0.20	4	0.12
African American	1,172	40.94	91	18.09	1,263	37.52
Caucasian	1,597	55.78	409	81.31	2,006	59.60
Native American	3	0.10	1	0.20	4	0.12
Other	88	3.07	1	0.20	89	2.64
TOTAL	2,863	100.00	503	100.00	3,366	100.00

The racial composition of the intake sample was: 0.1% Asian, 37.5% African American, 59.6% Caucasian, 0.1% Native American and 2.6% Other.

**TABLE 3: County of Commitment**

COUNTY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Adams	11	0.38	4	0.80	15	0.45
Allen	22	0.77	5	0.99	27	0.80
Ashland	6	0.21	3	0.60	9	0.27
Ashtabula	30	1.05	3	0.60	33	0.98
Athens	22	0.77	5	0.99	27	0.80
Auglaize	7	0.24	4	0.80	11	0.33
Belmont	11	0.38	3	0.60	14	0.42
Brown	21	0.73	7	1.39	28	0.83
Butler	103	3.60	17	3.38	120	3.57
Champaign	15	0.52	3	0.60	18	0.53
Clark	40	1.40	7	1.39	47	1.40

COUNTY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clermont	55	1.92	10	1.99	65	1.93
Clinton	15	0.52	2	0.40	17	0.51
Columbiana	16	0.56	1	0.20	17	0.51
Coshocton	9	0.31	1	0.20	10	0.30
Crawford	12	0.42	8	1.59	20	0.59
Cuyahoga	432	15.09	47	9.34	479	14.23
Darke	3	0.10	0	0.00	3	0.09
Defiance	14	0.49	2	0.40	16	0.48
Delaware	31	1.08	7	1.39	38	1.13
Erie	20	0.70	6	1.19	26	0.77
Fairfield	22	0.77	10	1.99	32	0.95
Fayette	16	0.56	5	0.99	21	0.62
Franklin	238	8.31	25	4.97	263	7.81
Fulton	9	0.31	0	0.00	9	0.27
Gallia	7	0.24	1	0.20	8	0.24
Geauga	10	0.35	0	0.00	10	0.30
Greene	34	1.19	5	0.99	39	1.16
Guernsey	15	0.52	0	0.00	15	0.45
Hamilton	231	8.07	28	5.57	259	7.69
Hancock	10	0.35	0	0.00	10	0.30
Hardin	11	0.38	4	0.80	15	0.45
Harrison	2	0.07	0	0.00	2	0.06
Henry	4	0.14	2	0.40	6	0.18
Highland	26	0.91	7	1.39	33	0.98
Hocking	11	0.38	4	0.80	15	0.45
Holmes	4	0.14	1	0.20	5	0.15
Huron	13	0.45	1	0.20	14	0.42
Jackson	13	0.45	7	1.39	20	0.59
Jefferson	21	0.73	0	0.00	21	0.62
Knox	8	0.28	2	0.40	10	0.30
Lake	32	1.12	2	0.40	34	1.01
Lawrence	25	0.87	5	0.99	30	0.89
Licking	40	1.40	11	2.19	51	1.52
Logan	7	0.24	0	0.00	7	0.21
Lorain	52	1.82	3	0.60	55	1.63
Lucas	100	3.49	9	1.79	109	3.24
Madison	12	0.42	4	0.80	16	0.48
Mahoning	53	1.85	7	1.39	60	1.78
Marion	39	1.36	3	0.60	42	1.25
Medina	25	0.87	6	1.19	31	0.92
Meigs	5	0.17	2	0.40	7	0.21
Mercer	6	0.21	6	1.19	12	0.36
Miami	36	1.26	3	0.60	39	1.16
Monroe	6	0.21	1	0.20	7	0.21
Montgomery	145	5.06	26	5.17	171	5.08
Morgan	1	0.03	2	0.40	3	0.09

COUNTY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Morrow	6	0.21	2	0.40	8	0.24
Muskingum	23	0.80	10	1.99	33	0.98
Noble	1	0.03	2	0.40	3	0.09
Ottawa	8	0.28	0	0.00	8	0.24
Paulding	7	0.24	0	0.00	7	0.21
Perry	6	0.21	0	0.00	6	0.18
Pickaway	27	0.94	5	0.99	32	0.95
Pike	6	0.21	0	0.00	6	0.18
Portage	28	0.98	4	0.80	32	0.95
Preble	11	0.38	2	0.40	13	0.39
Putnam	3	0.10	2	0.40	5	0.15
Richland	49	1.71	13	2.58	62	1.84
Ross	18	0.63	13	2.58	31	0.92
Sandusky	13	0.45	3	0.60	16	0.48
Scioto	33	1.15	9	1.79	42	1.25
Seneca	16	0.56	3	0.60	19	0.56
Shelby	9	0.31	9	1.79	18	0.53
Stark	118	4.12	27	5.37	145	4.31
Summit	133	4.65	28	5.57	161	4.78
Trumbull	48	1.68	9	1.79	57	1.69
Tuscarawas	10	0.35	1	0.20	11	0.33
Union	7	0.24	3	0.60	10	0.30
Van Wert	11	0.38	1	0.20	12	0.36
Vinton	4	0.14	1	0.20	5	0.15
Warren	31	1.08	2	0.40	33	0.98
Washington	10	0.35	1	0.20	11	0.33
Wayne	11	0.38	4	0.80	15	0.45
Williams	4	0.14	2	0.40	6	0.18
Wood	23	0.80	8	1.59	31	0.92
Wyandot	5	0.17	2	0.40	7	0.21
TOTAL	2,863	100.00	503	100.00	3,366	100.00

The ten counties with the greatest numbers of offenders committed to Ohio prisons during the intake study period were: Cuyahoga (N=479; 14.2%), Franklin (N=263; 7.8%), Hamilton (N=259; 7.7%), Montgomery (N=171; 5.1%), Summit (N=161; 4.8%), Stark (N=145; 4.3%), Butler (N=120; 3.6%), Lucas (N=109; 3.2%), Clermont (N=65; 1.9%) and Richland (N=62; 1.8%).

**TABLE 4: Age at Commitment**

AGE AT COMMITMENT	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Under 18	11	0.38	0	0.00	11	0.33
18	47	1.64	2	0.40	49	1.46
19	84	2.93	7	1.39	91	2.70
20	90	3.14	18	3.58	108	3.21
21	119	4.16	17	3.38	136	4.04
22	128	4.47	13	2.58	141	4.19
23	135	4.72	18	3.58	153	4.55
24	135	4.72	24	4.77	159	4.72
25	126	4.40	26	5.17	152	4.52
26	114	3.98	28	5.57	142	4.22
27	116	4.05	24	4.77	140	4.16
28	110	3.84	28	5.57	138	4.10
29	110	3.84	30	5.96	140	4.16
30	96	3.35	25	4.97	121	3.59
31	130	4.54	17	3.38	147	4.37
32	105	3.67	17	3.38	122	3.62
33	78	2.72	16	3.18	94	2.79
34	103	3.60	20	3.98	123	3.65
35	79	2.76	17	3.38	96	2.85
36	70	2.44	14	2.78	84	2.50
37	62	2.17	16	3.18	78	2.32
38	68	2.38	11	2.19	79	2.35
39	65	2.27	14	2.78	79	2.35
40	59	2.06	8	1.59	67	1.99
41-45	237	8.28	39	7.75	276	8.20
46-50	180	6.29	25	4.97	205	6.09
51-55	120	4.19	15	2.98	135	4.01
56-60	51	1.78	9	1.79	60	1.78
Over 60	35	1.22	5	0.99	40	1.19
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,863</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,366</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
Mean = 32.58	Mean = 32.53	Mean = 32.57
Median = 31.00	Median = 30.00	Median = 31.00

The mean age of offenders in the intake study was 32.6 years and the median age was 31.0. Males had an average age of 32.6 and a median age of 31.0. Females had a mean age of 32.5 and a median age of 30.0. Eleven offenders (0.33%) were under the age of 18 at the time of admission to prison and 235 (7.0%) were older than 50.

**TABLE 5: Marital Status at Arrest**  
**Missing: 40**

MARITAL STATUS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single, Never Married	2,056	72.52	285	58.04	2,341	70.38
Married	271	9.56	49	9.98	320	9.62
Separated	166	5.86	63	12.83	229	6.89
Divorced	323	11.39	84	17.11	407	12.24
Widowed	19	0.67	10	2.04	29	0.87
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,835</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,326</b>	<b>100.00</b>

At the time of arrest (for the current most serious commitment offense), roughly seven-in-ten (70.4%) of the offenders were single (never married), 9.6% were married and 20.0% were separated, widowed, or divorced. Men were more likely to have never been married (72.5%) than women (58.0%).

**TABLE 6: Employment Status at Arrest**  
**Missing: 113**

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Unemployed*	1,802	65.20	331	67.69	2,133	65.57
Employed Part-time	176	6.37	37	7.57	213	6.55
Employed Full-time	628	22.72	99	20.25	727	22.35
Self-Employed	95	3.44	15	3.07	110	3.38
Temporary Agency	52	1.88	4	0.82	56	1.72
Seasonal Employment	11	0.40	3	0.61	14	0.43
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,764</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,253</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\* Includes those who claim working under-the-table.

At the time of arrest for the instant offense, 65.6% of the offenders were unemployed and 22.4% were employed full-time. Males were more likely to have been employed full-time (22.7%) than females (20.3%).

**TABLE 7A: Highest Education Level at Arrest (Condensed)**  
**Missing: 176**

HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL (CONDENSED)	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No High School	194	7.20	21	4.25	215	6.74
Some High School	805	29.86	139	28.14	944	29.59
High School/GED	1,629	60.42	297	60.12	1,926	60.38
College Degree	68	2.52	37	7.49	105	3.29
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,696</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,190</b>	<b>100.00</b>

At the time of arrest 63.7% of the offenders had received a high school degree, GED, or more education. This information is from official documents or is self-reported.

**TABLE 7B: Highest Education Level at Arrest (Expanded)**  
**Missing: 176**

HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Less Than High School</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>7.20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>6.74</b>
No Education Completed	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
1st Grade	5	0.19	1	0.20	6	0.19
3rd Grade	3	0.11	0	0.00	3	0.09
4th Grade	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
5th Grade	4	0.15	0	0.00	4	0.13
6th Grade	21	0.78	1	0.20	22	0.69
7th Grade	31	1.15	2	0.40	33	1.03
8th Grade	128	4.75	17	3.44	145	4.55
<b>Some High School No Vocational</b>	<b>795</b>	<b>29.49</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>26.32</b>	<b>925</b>	<b>29.00</b>
9th Grade	208	7.72	34	6.88	242	7.59
10th Grade	273	10.13	44	8.91	317	9.94
11th Grade	314	11.65	52	10.53	366	11.47
<b>Some High School + Vocational</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0.37</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0.60</b>
9th Grade + Vocational Training	0	0.00	1	0.20	1	0.03
10th Grade + Vocational Training	4	0.15	1	0.20	5	0.16
11th Grade + Vocational Training	6	0.22	7	1.42	13	0.41
<b>High School / GED</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>36.35</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>21.46</b>	<b>1,086</b>	<b>34.04</b>
GED	468	17.36	67	13.56	535	16.77
High School Diploma	512	18.99	39	7.89	551	17.27
<b>High School / GED Some College</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>17.28</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>29.55</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>19.18</b>
High School / GED Some College	466	17.28	146	29.55	612	19.18
<b>High School /GED + Vocational</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>6.79</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>9.11</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>7.14</b>
High School + Vocational Training	120	4.45	31	6.28	151	4.73
GED + Vocational Training	63	2.34	14	2.83	77	2.41
<b>College Degree</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>2.52</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>7.49</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>3.29</b>
AA/AS Degree	41	1.52	28	5.67	69	2.16
BA/BS Degree	18	0.67	7	1.42	25	0.78
MA/MS Degree	6	0.22	1	0.20	7	0.22
PhD	2	0.07	1	0.20	3	0.09
Law Degree	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,696</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,190</b>	<b>100.00</b>

At the time of arrest, the educational attainment of the males was as follows: 7.2% had an eighth grade education or less, 29.9% had some high school (including those with vocational training), 36.4% were high school graduates or the equivalent but had not attended college; 6.8% had high school and have vocational training, 17.3% had high school and some college and 2.5% had attained a college degree. The respective education rates for females were: 4.3%, 28.1%, 21.5%, 9.1%, 29.6% and 7.5%.

**TABLE 8: Military Veteran Status**

Missing: 78

VETERAN STATUS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not a veteran	2,672	95.22	476	98.76	3,148	95.74
Claims Veteran Status	131	4.67	6	1.24	137	4.17
Alternative to Service	3	0.11	0	0.00	3	0.09
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,806</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,288</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Military veteran status was claimed by 4.3% of the intake sample. A separate profile of veterans will be completed at a later date.

**TABLE 9: Primary Living Arrangement from Birth to Age 18**

Missing: 63

LIVING ARRANGEMENT	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lived with Both Parents	1,107	39.34	228	46.63	1,335	40.42
Lived with Mother Only	1,213	43.11	166	33.95	1,379	41.75
Lived with Father Only	141	5.01	19	3.89	160	4.84
Lived with Grandparents	248	8.81	57	11.66	305	9.23
Lived with Other Relatives	49	1.74	11	2.25	60	1.82
Lived with Foster Parents	55	1.95	7	1.43	62	1.88
Lived in Juvenile Institution	1	0.04	1	0.20	2	0.06
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,814</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,303</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\* If there are multiple responses to the variable, it is coded for the longest lasting living arrangement.

Females were more likely than males to have been raised by both parents (male = 39.3%; female = 46.6%). Males were more likely than females to have been raised by their mother alone (male = 43.1%; female = 34.0%). Females were more likely to have been raised by their grandparents than males (male = 8.8%; female = 11.7%).

**TABLE 10: Indication of Physical Abuse as a Child or Adolescent**  
**Missing: 66**

EVIDENCE OF PHYSICAL ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	2,607	92.84	383	77.85	2,990	90.61
Yes	201	7.16	109	22.15	310	9.39
TOTAL	2,808	100.00	492	100.00	3,300	100.00

The data indicates that female inmates in the sample had a much higher percentage of physical abuse as a child or adolescent (male = 7.2%; female = 22.1%). This information comes from both official records and self-report.

**TABLE 11: Indication of Sexual Abuse as a Child or Adolescent**  
**Missing: 57**

EVIDENCE OF SEXUAL ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	2,679	95.10	344	69.92	3,023	91.36
Yes	138	4.90	148	30.08	286	8.64
TOTAL	2,817	100.00	492	100.00	3,309	100.00

Female inmates in the sample indicated a much higher percentage of sexual abuse as a child or adolescent than their male counterparts (male = 4.9%; female = 30.1%). This information comes from both official records and self-report.

**TABLE 12: History of Mental Health Problems**  
**Missing: 40**

HISTORY OF MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1,968	69.47	191	38.74	2,159	64.91
Self Admission/Evidence	68	2.40	18	3.65	86	2.59
Diagnosed with Mental Illness	11	0.39	4	0.81	15	0.45
Treated for Mental Illness	786	27.74	280	56.80	1,066	32.05
TOTAL	2,833	100.00	493	100.00	3,326	100.00

Females in the study were more likely to have had a history of mental health problems than males (male = 30.5%; female = 61.3%). This information comes from both official records and self-report.

**TABLE 13: Indication of Recent Drug Abuse\***  
**Missing: 39**

INDICATION OF RECENT DRUG ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication	586	20.66	72	14.66	658	19.78
Self Admission/Evidence	2,196	77.43	386	78.62	2,582	77.61
Diagnosis of Problem	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Treatment of Drug Abuse	53	1.87	33	6.72	86	2.58
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,836</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,327</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\*Within 6 months of arrest.

Concerning the prevalence of inmates involved in recent drug abuse, female offender rates were slightly higher than males (male = 79.3%; female = 85.3%). Overall, eighty-six offenders (2.6%) had received treatment within the six months prior to their arrest (male = 1.9%; female = 6.7%).

**TABLE 14: Indication of a History of Drug Abuse\***  
**Missing: 34**

INDICATION OF A HISTORY OF DRUG ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication	228	8.03	32	6.52	260	7.80
Self-Admission/Evidence	1,716	60.40	289	58.86	2,005	60.17
Diagnosis of Drug Abuse	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Treatment of Drug Abuse	896	31.54	170	34.62	1,066	31.99
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,841</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,332</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\*More than 6 months prior to arrest.

Females were slightly more likely than males to have had a history of drug abuse (male= 92.0%; female = 93.5%). These numbers are in line with numbers from past years. However, less than one-third of the offenders in the intake study (32.0%) had received drug treatment at some time in the past (male = 31.5%; female = 34.6%).

**TABLE 15: Indication of Recent Alcohol Abuse\***  
**Missing: 46**

INDICATION OF RECENT ALCOHOL ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication	1,821	64.30	214	43.85	2,035	61.30
Self-Admission/Evidence	978	34.53	261	53.48	1,239	37.32
Treatment of Alcohol Abuse	33	1.17	13	2.66	46	1.39
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,832</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,320</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\*Within 6 months of arrest.

Over one-third (35.7%) of the males had indications of recent alcohol abuse. Females had indications of recent alcohol abuse in 56.2% of the cases.

**TABLE 16: Indication of a History of Alcohol Abuse\***  
**Missing: 40**

INDICATION OF HISTORY OF ALCOHOL ABUSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication	849	29.94	93	18.98	942	28.32
Self-Admission/Evidence	1,329	46.86	299	61.02	1,628	48.95
Treatment of Alcohol Abuse	658	23.20	98	20.00	756	22.73
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,836</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,326</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\*More than 6 months prior to arrest.

Data indicated that males and females were also different in regard to having indications of prior alcohol abuse (male = 70.1%; female = 81.0%). Male numbers are consistent with patterns from past years. The data indicating a history of alcohol abuse among females rose to 81.0%, up from 46.4% in 2013. Decreases occurred in the data for females in the 2011 (7.7 percentage points) and 2012 (30.3 percentage points) intake studies. Males were more likely to have had prior treatment for an alcohol problem (male = 23.2%; female = 20.0%).

**TABLE 17: Indication of the Completion of Substance Abuse Treatment**  
**Missing: 35**

INDICATION OF TREATMENT PROGRAM COMPLETION	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication of Treatment	1,497	52.71	190	38.70	1,687	50.65
Failure to Comply with Court	175	6.16	35	7.13	210	6.30
Began Treatment/Compliance Unknown	5	0.18	0	0.00	5	0.15
In Treatment at Arrest	2	0.07	0	0.00	2	0.06
Completed Treatment	885	31.16	189	38.49	1,074	32.24
Treatment After Arrest Only	276	9.72	77	15.68	353	10.60
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,840</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,331</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Female offenders were more likely than males to have completed substance abuse treatment at some time prior to their arrest on the instant offense (male = 31.2%; female = 38.5%). Overall, less than a tenth (male = 6.2%; female = 8.7%) failed to comply with court orders for treatment or began treatment and their compliance was unknown. Some of the offenders, 9.7% of the males and 15.7% of the females, began substance abuse treatment only after their arrest for the instant offense.

**TABLE 18: Living Arrangement at Time of Arrest**  
**Missing: 120**

LIVING ARRANGEMENT AT TIME OF ARREST	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alone	401	14.55	46	9.39	447	13.77
w/Domestic Partner	403	14.62	89	18.16	492	15.16
w/Domestic Partner and Children	567	20.57	76	15.51	643	19.81
w/Dependent Children	17	0.62	107	21.84	124	3.82
w/Adult Children	9	0.33	12	2.45	21	0.65
w/Parent/Guardian	792	28.74	77	15.71	869	26.77
w/Adult Sibling	110	3.99	12	2.45	122	3.76
w/Grandparents	115	4.17	11	2.24	126	3.88
w/Other Relative	86	3.12	10	2.04	96	2.96
w/Friend/Roommate	141	5.12	45	9.18	186	5.73
Homeless	108	3.92	3	0.61	111	3.42
Supervised Setting	7	0.25	2	0.41	9	0.28
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,756</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,246</b>	<b>100.00</b>

At the time of their arrest, males were most likely to live with a parent or guardian (28.7%), or a domestic partner and children (20.6%). Females were most likely to live with their dependent children (21.8%) or a domestic partner (18.2%).

**TABLE 19: Number of Dependent Children at Time of Arrest**  
**Missing: 66**

NUMBER OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN AT TIME OF ARREST	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,225	79.24	305	61.99	2,530	76.67
One	208	7.41	84	17.07	292	8.85
Two	190	6.77	57	11.59	247	7.48
Three	106	3.77	25	5.08	131	3.97
Four	50	1.78	13	2.64	63	1.91
Five	19	0.68	5	1.02	24	0.73
Six or more	10	0.36	3	0.61	13	0.39
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,808</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,300</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Just over one-fifth (20.8%) of the male offenders and 38.0% of the female offenders had dependent children living with them at the time of arrest. Counting only those offenders who had lived with dependent children, the mean number of children living with the males was 2.2 and for female offenders the number was 2.0.

**CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CURRENT COMMITMENT OFFENSE**  
**TABLE 20: Most Serious Conviction Offense\***

OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS</b>	<b>764</b>	<b>26.69</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>16.70</b>	<b>848</b>	<b>25.19</b>
Abduction	26	0.91	1	0.20	27	0.80
Aggravated Arson	9	0.31	3	0.60	12	0.36
Aggravated Assault	35	1.22	7	1.39	42	1.25
Aggravated Murder	20	0.70	0	0.00	20	0.59
Aggravated Robbery	91	3.18	6	1.19	97	2.88
Aggravated Vehicular Assault	16	0.56	7	1.39	23	0.68
Aggravated Vehicular Homicide	10	0.35	4	0.80	14	0.42
Assault	22	0.77	7	1.39	29	0.86
Contributing To Non-Support Of Dependents	55	1.92	3	0.60	58	1.72
Domestic Violence	99	3.46	3	0.60	102	3.03
Endangering Children	16	0.56	6	1.19	22	0.65
Felonious Assault	140	4.89	10	1.99	150	4.46
Harassment By Inmate	3	0.10	0	0.00	3	0.09
Intimidation	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
Involuntary Manslaughter	22	0.77	1	0.20	23	0.68
Kidnapping	12	0.42	2	0.40	14	0.42
Menacing	12	0.42	0	0.00	12	0.36
Murder	25	0.87	2	0.40	27	0.80
Retaliation	2	0.07	1	0.20	3	0.09
Robbery	140	4.89	19	3.78	159	4.72
Telephone Harassment	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
Voluntary Manslaughter	6	0.21	1	0.20	7	0.21
Extortion	1	0.03	1	0.20	2	0.06
<b>SEX OFFENSES / REGISTRATION</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>8.63</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>7.49</b>
Compelling Prostitution	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
Disseminating Obscene Information	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
Duty to Register as a Sex Offender	3	0.10	0	0.00	3	0.09
Gross Sexual Imposition	49	1.71	0	0.00	49	1.46
Importuning	4	0.14	0	0.00	4	0.12
Pandering Obscenity	21	0.73	0	0.00	21	0.62
Promoting Prostitution	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
Periodic Verification of Address (Sex Offender)	2	0.07	0	0.00	2	0.06
Failure To Notify Change Of Address	44	1.54	1	0.20	45	1.34
Rape	76	2.65	3	0.60	79	2.35
Sexual Battery	19	0.66	0	0.00	19	0.56
Unlawful Sexual Conduct with a Minor	26	0.91	1	0.20	27	0.80
<b>BURGLARY OFFENSES</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>10.62</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>8.75</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>10.34</b>
Aggravated Burglary	31	1.08	0	0.00	31	0.92
Burglary	273	9.54	44	8.75	317	9.42
<b>MISCELLANEOUS PROPERTY CRIMES</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>11.98</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>17.69</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>12.83</b>
Arson	7	0.24	1	0.20	8	0.24
Breaking & Entering	79	2.76	4	0.80	83	2.47
Disrupting Public Services	3	0.10	0	0.00	3	0.09
Receiving Stolen Property	88	3.07	19	3.78	107	3.18
Safecracking	3	0.10	0	0.00	3	0.09
Tampering With Coin Machine	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
Theft	151	5.27	64	12.72	215	6.39

\*The characteristics of the committing offenses are based on the *most serious conviction offense* only. Some offenders may have been incarcerated for a number of offenses, but the characteristics reported to be associated with the commitment crime reflect the information as it relates to the most serious conviction offense only.

OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Theft in Office	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
Unauthorized Use of Vehicle	2	0.07	1	0.20	3	0.09
Vandalism	8	0.28	0	0.00	8	0.24
<b>DRUG OFFENSES</b>	<b>724</b>	<b>25.29</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>36.58</b>	<b>908</b>	<b>26.98</b>
Corrupting Another with Drugs	4	0.14	0	0.00	4	0.12
Deception to Obtain Dangerous Drug	2	0.07	4	0.80	6	0.18
Drug Possession	332	11.60	82	16.30	414	12.30
Drug Trafficking	275	9.61	49	9.74	324	9.63
Illegal Mfg of Drug or Cultivation of Marijuana	104	3.63	40	7.95	144	4.28
Illegal Processing of Drug Documents	0	0.00	2	0.40	2	0.06
Permitting Drug Abuse	4	0.14	4	0.80	8	0.24
Sale of Counterfeit Drugs	2	0.07	1	0.20	3	0.09
Drug Law	0	0.00	2	0.40	2	0.06
Abusing Harmful Intoxicants	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
<b>MOTOR VEHICLE OFFENSES</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>1.47</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>1.54</b>
Operating Motor Vehicle Under the Influence	42	1.47	8	1.59	50	1.49
Failure to Stop after an Accident	0	0.00	2	0.40	2	0.06
<b>FRAUD OFFENSES</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>2.27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>5.37</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>2.73</b>
Forgery	39	1.36	18	3.58	57	1.69
Misuse of Credit Card	5	0.17	1	0.20	6	0.18
Passing Bad Checks	3	0.10	0	0.00	3	0.09
Taking Identity of Another	9	0.31	3	0.60	12	0.36
Tampering with Records	6	0.21	4	0.80	10	0.30
Telecommunication Fraud	2	0.07	1	0.20	3	0.09
Scrap Metal Dealer & Merchandise Container Offenses	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
<b>WEAPONS OFFENSES</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>6.50</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4.77</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>6.24</b>
Carrying a Concealed Weapon	35	1.22	2	0.40	37	1.10
Firearm Specification	2	0.07	0	0.00	2	0.06
Having a Weapon Under Disability	120	4.19	1	0.20	121	3.59
Improper Handling of Firearm	9	0.31	2	0.40	11	0.33
Bringing Weapons into a Detention Facility	19	0.66	19	3.78	38	1.13
Unlawful Possession of Firearm	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
<b>OFFENSES AGAINST JUSTICE/PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>6.57</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>7.16</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>6.65</b>
Bribery	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
Engaging in Pattern of Corrupt Activity	23	0.80	9	1.79	32	0.95
Escape	19	0.66	7	1.39	26	0.77
Failure to Appear	8	0.28	0	0.00	8	0.24
Fail to Comply	62	2.17	4	0.80	66	1.96
Intimidation of Victim/Witness	5	0.17	0	0.00	5	0.15
Money Laundering	1	0.03	2	0.40	3	0.09
Obstructing Justice	3	0.10	1	0.20	4	0.12
Participation in a Gang	5	0.17	0	0.00	5	0.15
Possessing Criminal Tools	3	0.10	4	0.80	7	0.21
Tampering with Evidence	38	1.33	5	0.99	43	1.28
Traffic in Food Stamps	1	0.03	1	0.20	2	0.06
Violating Protection Order	10	0.35	0	0.00	10	0.30
Violation Release own Recognizance	7	0.24	3	0.60	10	0.30
Inciting to Riot	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
Aggravated Riot	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,863</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,366</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\*Note: Attempted offenses are included in the primary categories.

Roughly a third (962) of the males (33.6%) were incarcerated for committing a crime against persons (including sex offenses) as their most serious offense. Just over one-fourth (25.3%) of the males were convicted for committing a drug offense. Over one-third (36.6%) of the females were incarcerated for committing a drug offense as their most serious offense. Just over one-sixth were incarcerated for a miscellaneous property offense (17.7%). An identical percentage of the females (17.7%) were convicted of committing crimes against persons (including sex offenses).

The top five listed offenses in the 2014 intake sample were:

**MALES**

Drug Possession	11.6%
Drug Trafficking	9.6%
Burglary	9.5%
Theft	5.3%
Felonious Assault	4.9%

**FEMALES**

Drug Possession	16.3%
Theft	12.7%
Drug Trafficking	9.7%
Burglary	8.8%
Illegal Mfg. Drugs	8.0%

**OVERALL**

Drug Possession	12.3%
Drug Trafficking	9.6%
Burglary	9.4%
Theft	6.4%
Robbery	4.7%

**TABLE 21: Felony Level-Most Serious Conviction Offense**

FELONY LEVEL	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Death	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
Life	56	1.96	3	0.60	59	1.75
1st	274	9.57	25	4.97	299	8.88
2nd	476	16.63	72	14.31	548	16.28
3rd	832	29.06	122	24.25	954	28.34
4th	556	19.42	103	20.48	659	19.58
5th	668	23.33	178	35.39	846	25.13
Total	2,863	100.00	503	100.00	3,366	100.00

Overall, less than half (44.7%) of the offenders in the study were sentenced on felony four or five offenses (male = 42.8%; female = 55.9%). In the 2004 intake study, 60.1% of the offenders were incarcerated on felony four or felony five offenses.

**TABLE 22: Adjudication of Offender's Case****Missing: 9**

ADJUDICATION	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Guilty Plea	2,821	98.74	500	100.00	3,321	98.93
Convicted by Judge/Jury	36	1.26	0	0.00	36	1.07
TOTAL	2,857	100.00	500	100.00	3,357	100.00

Overwhelmingly, offenders (98.9%) pled guilty to charges (male = 98.7%; female = 100.0%).

**TABLE 23: Gun Specification Time in the Conviction**

GUN SPECIFICATION TIME IN THE CONVICTION	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,700	94.31	497	98.81	3,197	94.98
1 Year	53	1.85	5	0.99	58	1.72
3 Years	106	3.70	1	0.20	107	3.18
5 Years	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
6 Years	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
7 Years	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
8 Years	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.03
Total	2,863	100.00	503	100.00	3,366	100.00

Additional time for having or using a firearm in the commission of an offense was added to convictions in 5.7% of the male cases and 1.2% of the female cases. Three year specifications were the most prevalent for males, making up 65.0% of the male specifications. One year specifications accounted for five of the six female gun year specifications.

**TABLE 24: Expected Length of Stay for Most Serious Conviction Offense\***  
**Missing:12**

LENGTH OF STAY (IN YEARS)	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
6 Months or Less	392	13.75	95	18.89	487	14.52
Over 6 Mo to 1 Yr	713	25.01	141	28.03	854	25.46
To 1.5 Yr	352	12.35	61	12.13	413	12.31
To 2.0 Yr	295	10.35	51	10.14	346	10.32
To 2.5 Yr	140	4.91	24	4.77	164	4.89
To 3.0 Yr	220	7.72	46	9.15	266	7.93
To 3.5 Yr	71	2.49	15	2.98	86	2.56
To 4.0 Yr	172	6.03	28	5.57	200	5.96
To 4.5 Yr	53	1.86	5	0.99	58	1.73
To 5.0 Yr	79	2.77	9	1.79	88	2.62
To 6.0 Yr	72	2.53	10	1.99	82	2.44
To 7.0 Yr	37	1.30	5	0.99	42	1.25
To 8.0 Yr	44	1.54	0	0.00	44	1.31
To 9.0 Yr	26	0.91	1	0.20	27	0.81
To 10.0 Yr	39	1.37	2	0.40	41	1.22
To 11.0 Yr	16	0.56	2	0.40	18	0.54
To 12.0 Yr	9	0.32	1	0.20	10	0.30
To 13.0 Yr	12	0.42	0	0.00	12	0.36
To 14.0 Yr	14	0.49	2	0.40	16	0.48
To 15.0 Yr	17	0.60	1	0.20	18	0.54
To 20.0 Yr	31	1.09	3	0.60	34	1.01
More Than 20 Yr	47	1.65	1	0.20	48	1.43
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,851</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,354</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\*The length of stay is not the actual sentence length. Jail time credit has been deducted from the original length.

Nearly four-in-ten (38.8%) of the males and just under half (46.9%) of the females in the study expect to be in prison for a period of one year or less. Overall, 40.0% of the offenders were expected to serve no more than one year in prison. This table is not the equivalent of the sentence table in previous years before 2012. Before 2012 the table indicated the length of the specific sentence imposed by the court. This table indicates the expected length of stay after jail time credits (plus any other known credits) are deducted from the original sentence. This table cannot take into account those who will be judicially released by the sentencing court prior to their originally calculated release date.

**TABLE 25: Type of Drug Involved in Any of the Instant Conviction Offenses**  
**Missing: 21**

TYPE OF DRUG	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Drugs Involved	1,971	69.23	287	57.63	2,258	67.50
Drugs Present/Incidental	45	1.58	1	0.20	46	1.38
Crack Cocaine	79	2.77	6	1.20	85	2.54
Powder Cocaine	36	1.26	2	0.40	38	1.14
Unspecified Cocaine	77	2.70	12	2.41	89	2.66
Heroin	264	9.27	77	15.46	341	10.19
Marijuana	69	2.42	5	1.00	74	2.21

LSD/Acid	8	0.28	1	0.20	9	0.27
Crystal Meth/Ice	126	4.43	49	9.84	175	5.23
Amphetamines	1	0.04	3	0.60	4	0.12
Pharmaceuticals	80	2.81	33	6.63	113	3.38
Counterfeit Drugs	2	0.07	1	0.20	3	0.09
Chemical/Inhalant	6	0.21	0	0.00	6	0.18
Steroids	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Drug Paraphernalia	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Drug Residue	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Crack Cocaine + Marijuana	4	0.14	0	0.00	4	0.12
Powder Cocaine + Heroin	5	0.18	0	0.00	5	0.15
Unspecified Cocaine + Heroin	26	0.91	7	1.41	33	0.99
Unspecified Cocaine + Marijuana	2	0.07	0	0.00	2	0.06
Heroin + Crystal Meth	2	0.07	1	0.20	3	0.09
Crack + Heroin	18	0.63	2	0.40	20	0.60
Ecstasy, MDMA	2	0.07	0	0.00	2	0.06
Multiple Drug Types	20	0.70	11	2.21	31	0.93
Crack + Powder Cocaine	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,847</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,345</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Drugs were involved in 32.5% of the intake overall (male = 30.8%; female = 42.4%). In the 1,087 instances where drugs were involved in the offense, 277 (25.5%) involved cocaine in some form, either by itself or in combination with another drug.

Heroin, either alone or in combination with another substance, was involved in 37.0% of the offenses involving drugs in the current study.

Pharmaceuticals were involved in 10.4% of the drug related cases in the 2014 intake study.

**TABLE 26: Offender's Legal Status at Arrest for the Conviction Offense**  
Missing:11

LEGAL STATUS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Free of CJ Supervision	1,592	55.78	275	54.89	1,867	55.65
Active Arrest Warrant	20	0.70	1	0.20	21	0.63
Released on Own Recognizance/Bond	122	4.27	2	0.40	124	3.70
On Probation	831	29.12	213	42.51	1,044	31.12
On Parole	282	9.88	9	1.80	291	8.67
In Jail	3	0.11	0	0.00	3	0.09
In Prison/DYS	4	0.14	0	0.00	4	0.12
Escapee	0	0.00	1	0.20	1	0.03
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,854</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,355</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Less than half of the offenders in the sample (44.4%) were on some type of supervision, warrant, or were incarcerated at the time of their arrest for the instant offense (male = 44.2%; female = 45.1%). The most common status for those under some type of supervision was probation (male = 29.1%; female = 42.5%).

**TABLE 27: Whether Offender Violated Felony Probation or Parole Conditions**  
Missing: 12

VIOLATION STATUS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Offender was not a Violator	1,739	60.91	276	55.31	2,015	60.08
Technical Probation Violator	498	17.44	170	34.07	668	19.92
New Crime and Technical Violation/Returned to Prison on the Technical Violation	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
New Crime Probation Violator	333	11.66	44	8.82	377	11.24
New Crime Parole/PRC Violator	284	9.95	9	1.80	293	8.74
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,855</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>499</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,354</b>	<b>100.00</b>

All the offenders in this sample were entering prison for a new felony conviction and commitment from a county Court of Common Pleas. However, some were on supervision when they committed the offenses for which they were sent to prison. Nearly four-in-ten of the males (39.1%) and over four-in-ten of the females (44.7%) in the study were incarcerated on either a technical or new crime violation of felony probation or a new crime violation of parole.

**TABLE 28: Role of the Offender and Others in the Most Serious Conviction Offense**  
Missing: 16

OFFENDER/OTHERS' ROLE(S)	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Offender Acted Alone	2,338	82.04	375	75.00	2,713	80.99
Others Present, but Not Arrested	48	1.68	19	3.80	67	2.00
One or More Others Charged	75	2.63	26	5.20	101	3.01
One or More Others Went to Trial	9	0.32	6	1.20	15	0.45
One or More Others Convicted, Incarceration Status Unknown	14	0.49	2	0.40	16	0.48
One or More Others Convicted and Incarcerated	297	10.42	67	13.40	364	10.87
One or More Others Prob./Comm. Control	69	2.42	5	1.00	74	2.21
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,850</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,350</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Over four-fifths (81.0%) of the offenders acted alone in the commission of the offense for which they were committed (male = 82.0%; female = 75.0%). Overall, in the 637 cases where the

offender acted with someone else in the commission of the offense, another offender was also incarcerated in 57.1% of the cases (male = 58.0%; female = 53.6%.)

**TABLE 29: Weapon Used/Possessed/Present During Conviction Offense**  
Missing:176

WEAPON USED/POSSESSED/ PRESENT DURING CONVICTION OFFENSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Weapon	1,948	71.49	425	91.40	2,373	74.39
Weapon Incidental to Crime	38	1.39	0	0.00	38	1.19
Weapon Present, but Not Used	191	7.01	5	1.08	196	6.14
Feigned Possession of Weapon	12	0.44	0	0.00	12	0.38
Used by Other Actor w/Offender	22	0.81	5	1.08	27	0.85
Offender Threatened Use	171	6.28	9	1.94	180	5.64
Used in Attempt to Injure	49	1.80	5	1.08	54	1.69
Used Weapon to Injure	233	8.55	14	3.01	247	7.74
Used Weapon to Kill	61	2.24	2	0.43	63	1.97
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,725</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,190</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Weapons were involved, or present, in some manner, in the conviction offense in 25.6% of the cases. In the 777 male offenses where weapons were involved or present (28.5%), non-fatal injury occurred 30.0% of the time and death occurred in 7.9% of the cases. Females had weapons involved or present in 40 cases (8.6%). In 14, or 35.0%, of the cases non-fatal injuries occurred. Death resulted 2 times, or in 5.0% of the cases.

**TABLE 30: Type of Weapon Used During Conviction Offense**  
Missing: 170

TYPE OF WEAPON USED DURING CONVICTION OFFENSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Weapon/Incidental	1,977	72.42	426	91.42	2,403	75.19
Handgun	436	15.97	15	3.22	451	14.11
Rifle-Shotgun	19	0.70	2	0.43	21	0.66
Assault Weapon	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
Sharp Instrument	70	2.56	11	2.36	81	2.53
Blunt Instrument	11	0.40	3	0.64	14	0.44
Brute Force/Fists	166	6.08	7	1.50	173	5.41
Other	47	1.72	2	0.43	49	1.53
Multiple Weapons	3	0.11	0	0.00	3	0.09
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,730</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,196</b>	<b>100.00</b>

An actual weapon, aside from brute force/fists, was used in 620 (19.4%) of the cases examined. Males used a weapon in 587 (21.5%) of the cases. In the instances where a weapon was used males used a handgun 74.3% of the time. Sharp instruments were second at 11.9%. Females used a weapon in 40 cases (8.6%). Females were more likely to use a handgun (37.5%) over a

sharp instrument (27.5%) at times where a weapon was used. In the 473 cases where a firearm was present or used in the commission of the offense, gun specification time was given in 169 cases (35.7% ; Table 23).

**TABLE 31: Drugs/Alcohol Used During Conviction Offense**

**Missing: 74**

DRUGS/ALCOHOL USED DURING CONVICTION OFFENSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Indication	1,432	51.11	193	39.39	1,625	49.36
Drugs	813	29.01	210	42.86	1,023	31.08
Alcohol	295	10.53	40	8.16	335	10.18
Both	262	9.35	47	9.59	309	9.39
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,802</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,292</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Just under half (49.4%) of the offenders were under the influence of drugs, alcohol or both at the time of at least one of the instant conviction offenses (male = 48.9%; female = 60.6%). Nearly a third (31.1%) were under the influence of drugs. Females were more likely than males to have been under the influence of drugs (male = 29.0%; female = 42.9%). Males were more likely to have been under the influence of alcohol (10.5%) than females (8.2%). Females were more likely than males to be under the influence of both alcohol and drugs at the time of their offense (male = 9.4%; female = 9.6%).

**TABLE 32: Primary Victim of the Most Serious Conviction Offense**

**Missing: 493**

VICTIM RELATIONSHIP TO OFFENDER	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Direct Victim	1,137	45.87	232	58.88	1,369	47.65
Family Member	188	7.58	23	5.84	211	7.34
Friend or Acquaintance	431	17.39	30	7.61	461	16.05
Work or School Associate	6	0.24	2	0.51	8	0.28
Any Corrections or Law Enforcement Employee	47	1.90	10	2.54	57	1.98
Other	3	0.12	2	0.51	5	0.17
Stranger	487	19.65	47	11.93	534	18.59
Non-Personal*	180	7.26	48	12.18	228	7.94
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,479</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,873</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\*This category includes: business/place of employment, non-profit organization, and state or county government institution/property.

When looking at offenses which have a direct personal victim, 1,276 cases, strangers (41.8%) were more likely than friends or acquaintances (36.1%) to be the primary victims of an offense. Family members were listed as the victim in 16.5% of the cases examined with a direct personal victim.

**TABLE 33: Gender of Victim of the Most Serious Conviction Offense**  
**Missing: 262**

VICTIM GENDER	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Non- Personal	1,318	49.36	280	64.52	1,598	51.48
Male	646	24.19	88	20.28	734	23.65
Female	706	26.44	66	15.21	772	24.87
TOTAL	2,670	100.00	434	100.00	3,104	100.00

In cases where there was a personal victim (N=1,506), 48.7% were male and 51.3% were female.

**TABLE 34: Victim Involvement in the Most Serious Conviction Offense**  
**Missing: 237**

VICTIM INVOLVEMENT	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Personal / Direct Victim	1,288	47.62	232	54.72	1,520	48.58
No Victim Precipitation	1,403	51.87	192	45.28	1,595	50.97
Indication of Victim Precipitation	14	0.52	0	0.00	14	0.45
TOTAL	2,705	100.00	424	100.00	3,129	100.00

Of the most serious conviction offenses, 48.6% did not involve a direct personal victim. In the cases where there was a direct personal victim (N=1609), 99.1% had no victim precipitation. There were indications of victim involvement in 0.9% of the cases where there was a direct personal victim.

**TABLE 35: Extent of Victim Injury from the Most Serious Conviction Offense**  
**Missing: 537**

EXTENT OF VICTIM BODILY INJURY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not Applicable (non-personal crime)	1,319	53.97	280	72.73	1,599	56.52
No Bodily Injury to Victim	887	36.29	79	20.52	966	34.15
Some Bodily Injury – No Treatment Required	64	2.62	11	2.86	75	2.65
Injury with Treatment Required at Scene Only	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Injury Requiring Out Patient Treatment	48	1.96	3	0.78	51	1.80
Injury Requiring In-Patient Hospitalization	46	1.88	2	0.52	48	1.70
Victim was Killed by Offender(s)	78	3.19	10	2.60	88	3.11
TOTAL	2,444	100.00	385	100.00	2,829	100.00

Over half (56.5%) of the most serious conviction offenses were for non-personal crimes or had no direct victim. Where there was a personal victim (N=1,230), 78.5% received no bodily injury as a result of the offense. Treatment was received by 57.4% of the 176 non-fatally injured victims. Offenses resulting in death of the victim occurred in approximately 7.2% of the cases where a personal victim was identified.

**TABLE 36: Extent of Victim Psychological Harm from the Most Serious Conviction Offense**

**Missing: 1,396**

EXTENT OF VICTIM PSYCHOLOGICAL HARM	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not Applicable (non-personal crime)	1,319	78.65	280	95.56	1,599	81.17
Not Applicable Because Victim Died	78	4.65	10	3.41	88	4.47
No Psychological Harm was Indicated by the Victim	7	0.42	0	0.00	7	0.36
Victim Sustained Some Psychological Harm/Fear	264	15.74	3	1.02	267	13.55
Victim Sustained Psych. Harm/Required Treatment	9	0.54	0	0.00	9	0.46
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,677</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>1,970</b>	<b>100.00</b>

For several hundred cases in the sample, there was no indication whether the victim had psychological harm. Those cases are part of the “missing” for this table. With those cases removed, approximately four-fifths (81.2%) of the most serious conviction offenses were non-personal crimes. In the cases where personal victims were identified (371), 88 (23.7%) died. Additionally, victims sustained some or significant psychological harm/fear/treatment 74.4% of the time. Victims indicated that no psychological harm/fear resulted from the offense only seven times (1.9%).

## PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY

**TABLE 37: Age at First Arrest**

Missing: 4

AGE AT FIRST ARREST	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Younger than 10	30	1.05	1	0.20	31	0.92
10-14	519	18.15	38	7.55	557	16.57
15-19	1,415	49.49	178	35.39	1,593	47.38
20-24	549	19.20	128	25.45	677	20.14
25-29	163	5.70	74	14.71	237	7.05
30-34	86	3.01	45	8.95	131	3.90
35-39	31	1.08	18	3.58	49	1.46
40-44	23	0.80	8	1.59	31	0.92
45-49	14	0.49	5	0.99	19	0.57
50 or Older	29	1.01	8	1.59	37	1.10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,859</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,362</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
Mean = 19.11	Mean = 22.86	Mean = 19.67
Median = 18.00	Median = 20.00	Median = 18.00

The mean age at first arrest for offenders in the intake study was 19.7 years (male = 19.1; female = 22.9). Thirty-one offenders (0.9%), of whom thirty were male, were first arrested before they were ten years old. Thirty-seven offenders (1.1%) were first arrested at the age of fifty or older.

**Table 38: Age at Arrest for First Violent Offense**

Missing: 14

AGE AT ARREST FOR FIRST VIOLENT OFFENSE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Violent Offense Arrest	483	16.95	220	43.74	703	20.97
Less Than 10	14	0.49	0	0.00	14	0.42
10-14	291	10.21	18	3.58	309	9.22
15-19	897	31.48	74	14.71	971	28.97
20-24	609	21.38	84	16.70	693	20.67
25-29	249	8.74	41	8.15	290	8.65
30-34	155	5.44	29	5.77	184	5.49
35-39	66	2.32	18	3.58	84	2.51
40-44	33	1.16	7	1.39	40	1.19
45-49	22	0.77	5	0.99	27	0.81
50 or Older	30	1.05	7	1.39	37	1.10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,849</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,352</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<u>Males*</u>	<u>Females*</u>	<u>Total*</u>
Mean = 21.43	Mean = 24.52	Mean = 21.76
Median = 19.00	Median = 22.00	Median = 20.00

\*For those who have a violent arrest

For offenders who had ever been arrested for a violent offense, the mean age at their first arrest for a violent offense was 21.8 years. Females (24.5 years) were older than males (21.4 years) at their first arrest for a violent offense. Over four-fifths (83.0%) of the males and over half of the females (56.3%) had an arrest for a violent offense.

**TABLE 39: Age at First Arrest Leading to a Delinquency Adjudication or Adult Felony Conviction**  
Missing: 4

AGE AT FIRST CONVICTION	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Younger than 10	13	0.45	0	0.00	13	0.39
10-14	471	16.47	33	6.56	504	14.99
15-19	979	34.24	94	18.69	1,073	31.92
20-24	608	21.27	121	24.06	729	21.68
25-29	316	11.05	107	21.27	423	12.58
30-34	216	7.56	54	10.74	270	8.03
35-39	100	3.50	43	8.55	143	4.25
40-44	64	2.24	21	4.17	85	2.53
45-49	43	1.50	11	2.19	54	1.61
50 or Older	49	1.71	19	3.78	68	2.02
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,859</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,362</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Total</u>
Mean = 21.86	Mean = 26.50	Mean = 22.55
Median = 19.00	Median = 25.00	Median = 20.00

The overall mean age in the intake study for the first arrest leading to a delinquency adjudication or adult felony conviction was 22.6 years. Females (26.5) were older than the males (21.9). Thirteen offenders (0.4%), all male, were less than ten years old at the time of their first delinquency adjudication. In total, sixty-eight offenders (2.0%) were age fifty or older at the time of their first conviction (male = 1.7%; female = 3.8%).

**TABLE 40: Number of Juvenile Violent (Non-Sex) Offenses**  
Missing: 452

NUMBER OF JUVENILE VIOLENT (NON-SEX) OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1,922	78.03	415	92.02	2,337	80.20
One	357	14.49	27	5.99	384	13.18
Two	106	4.30	5	1.11	111	3.81
Three	45	1.83	2	0.44	47	1.61
Four	20	0.81	1	0.22	21	0.72
Five or more	13	0.53	1	0.22	14	0.48
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,463</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,914</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Male offenders in the sample were more likely to have one or more adjudications for juvenile violent (non-sex) offenses (male = 22.0%; female = 8.0%). Roughly 2.8% of the overall sample have three or more violent offenses as a juvenile. Given the variations in county juvenile records

it is difficult to determine whether these are felony or misdemeanor offenses. This is true for all tables representing juvenile offenses in this study.

**TABLE 41: Number of Juvenile Sex Offenses**

Missing: 452

NUMBER OF JUVENILE SEX OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,400	97.44	451	100.00	2,851	97.84
One	59	2.40	0	0.00	59	2.02
Two	3	0.12	0	0.00	3	0.10
Three	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,463</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,914</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The data reflects that 2.6% of the male offenders had sex offenses as a juvenile. None of the females in the study had a juvenile sex offense recorded.

**TABLE 42: Number of Juvenile Drug Use/Possession Offenses**

Missing: 451

NUMBER OF JUVENILE DRUG USE/POSSESSION OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,265	91.92	441	97.78	2,706	92.83
One	152	6.17	7	1.55	159	5.45
Two	38	1.54	3	0.67	41	1.41
Three or More	9	0.37	0	0.00	9	0.31
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,464</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,915</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Drug use/possession offenses as a juvenile were reflected in the records of 7.2% of the intake study.

**TABLE 43: Number of Juvenile Drug Sale/Trafficking Offenses**

Missing: 452

NUMBER OF JUVENILE DRUG SALE & TRAFFICKING OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,416	98.09	448	99.33	2,864	98.28
One	44	1.79	3	0.67	47	1.61
Two	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Three	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,463</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,914</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Juvenile drug trafficking offenses were found in 1.7% of the intake sample (male = 1.9%; female = 0.7%).

**TABLE 44: Number of Juvenile DUI/OMVI Offenses**  
**Missing: 452**

NUMBER OF JUVENILE DUI/OMVI OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,446	99.31	448	99.33	2,894	99.31
One	15	0.61	3	0.67	18	0.62
Two	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,463</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,914</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Juvenile DUI offenses were found for less than one percent (0.7%) of the offenders in the intake sample. Males accounted for all but three of the offenses.

**TABLE 45: Number of Juvenile Property Offenses**  
**Missing: 450**

NUMBER OF JUVENILE PROPERTY OFFENSES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1,843	74.77	411	91.13	2,254	77.30
One	311	12.62	31	6.87	342	11.73
Two	152	6.17	4	0.89	156	5.35
Three	74	3.00	3	0.67	77	2.64
Four	34	1.38	1	0.22	35	1.20
Five or More	51	2.07	1	0.22	52	1.78
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,465</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,916</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Just over one-fifth (22.7%) of the offenders have had a juvenile property offense (male = 25.2%; female = 8.9%)

**TABLE 46: Number of Juvenile Social Service Placements**  
**Missing: 452**

NUMBER OF JUVENILE SOCIAL SERVICE PLACEMENTS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,042	82.91	424	94.01	2,466	84.63
One	252	10.23	17	3.77	269	9.23
Two	81	3.29	6	1.33	87	2.99
Three	46	1.87	0	0.00	46	1.58
Four	15	0.61	2	0.44	17	0.58
Five or More	27	1.10	2	0.44	29	1.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,463</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,914</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Male offenders (17.1%) are more apt to have juvenile social service placements than the female offenders (6.0%).

**TABLE 47: Number of Commitments to Department of Youth Services****Missing: 450**

NUMBER OF COMMITMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH SERVICES	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,115	85.80	442	98.00	2,557	87.69
One	245	9.94	6	1.33	251	8.61
Two	59	2.39	2	0.44	61	2.09
Three	29	1.18	0	0.00	29	0.99
Four	9	0.37	1	0.22	10	0.34
Five or More	8	0.32	0	0.00	8	0.27
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,465</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,916</b>	<b>100.00</b>

DYS commitments were higher for males than females (male = 14.2%; female = 2.0%). Overall, 12.3% of the intake sample had been committed to DYS.

**TABLE 48: Number of Juvenile Supervision Terms****Missing: 451**

NUMBER OF JUVENILE SUPERVISION TERMS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1,691	68.63	388	86.03	2,079	71.32
One	463	18.79	40	8.87	503	17.26
Two	197	8.00	16	3.55	213	7.31
Three	82	3.33	5	1.11	87	2.98
Four	27	1.10	2	0.44	29	0.99
Five or More	4	0.16	0	0.00	4	0.14
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,464</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,915</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Men were much more likely than women to have been placed on juvenile supervision (male = 31.4%; female = 14.0%).

**TABLE 49: Number of Juvenile Supervision Terms Continued****Missing: 452**

NUMBER OF JUVENILE SUPERVISION TERMS CONTINUED	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,111	85.71	423	93.79	2,534	86.96
One	161	6.54	18	3.99	179	6.14
Two	78	3.17	3	0.67	81	2.78
Three	37	1.50	2	0.44	39	1.34
Four	33	1.34	1	0.22	34	1.17
Five or More	43	1.75	4	0.89	47	1.61
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,463</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,914</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Males were more likely than females to have had a probation continuance (male = 14.3%; female = 6.2%).

**TABLE 50: Number of Revocations of Juvenile Supervision**  
**Missing: 452**

NUMBER OF REVOCATIONS OF JUVENILE SUPERVISION	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,363	95.94	448	99.33	2,811	96.47
One	68	2.76	2	0.44	70	2.40
Two	24	0.97	1	0.22	25	0.86
Three	5	0.20	0	0.00	5	0.17
Four	2	0.08	0	0.00	2	0.07
Five	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,463</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>2,914</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Men were more likely than women to have had a revocation of supervision as a juvenile (male = 4.1%; female = 0.7%).

**TABLE 51: Number of Prior Adult Non-Violent Misdemeanor Convictions**  
**Missing: 34**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT NON-VIOLENT MISDEMEANOR CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	926	32.73	178	35.39	1,104	33.13
One	482	17.04	87	17.30	569	17.08
Two	324	11.45	77	15.31	401	12.03
Three	242	8.55	48	9.54	290	8.70
Four	187	6.61	40	7.95	227	6.81
Five or More	668	23.61	73	14.51	741	22.24
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,829</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,332</b>	<b>100.00</b>

About two-thirds (66.9%) of the offenders had at least one prior adult conviction for a non-violent misdemeanor (male = 67.3%; female = 64.6%).

**TABLE 52: Number of Prior Adult DUI/OMVI Convictions**  
**Missing: 35**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT DUI/OMVI CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,302	81.40	429	85.29	2,731	81.99
One	323	11.42	53	10.54	376	11.29
Two	100	3.54	13	2.58	113	3.39
Three	38	1.34	5	0.99	43	1.29
Four	25	0.88	2	0.40	27	0.81
Five or More	40	1.41	1	0.20	41	1.23
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,828</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,331</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Men were slightly more likely than women to have had one or more prior adult DUI convictions (male = 18.6%; female = 14.7%).

**TABLE 53: Number of Prior Adult Violent Misdemeanor Convictions****Missing: 33**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT VIOLENT MISDEMEANOR CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1,942	68.62	421	83.70	2,363	70.90
One	524	18.52	56	11.13	580	17.40
Two	201	7.10	18	3.58	219	6.57
Three	84	2.97	7	1.39	91	2.73
Four	41	1.45	0	0.00	41	1.23
Five or More	38	1.34	1	0.20	39	1.17
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,830</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,333</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Just under one third (29.1%) of the offenders had at least one prior adult conviction for a violent misdemeanor (male = 31.4%; female = 16.3%).

**TABLE 54: Number of Domestic Violence Convictions\*****Missing: 218**

NUMBER OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,018	76.24	450	89.82	2,468	78.40
One	355	13.41	35	6.99	390	12.39
Two	144	5.44	12	2.40	156	4.96
Three	68	2.57	2	0.40	70	2.22
Four	33	1.25	0	0.00	33	1.05
Five or More	29	1.10	2	0.40	31	0.98
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,647</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,148</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\*Includes both adult and juvenile domestic violence convictions

Over one-fifth of the offenders (21.6%) have had at least one domestic violence conviction as an adult or juvenile (male = 23.8%; female = 10.2%).

**TABLE 55: Number of Prior Adult Jail Incarcerations****Missing: 34**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT JAIL INCARCERATIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1,201	42.45	251	49.90	1,452	43.58
One	612	21.63	106	21.07	718	21.55
Two	306	10.82	60	11.93	366	10.98
Three	244	8.62	29	5.77	273	8.19
Four	151	5.34	23	4.57	174	5.22
Five or More	315	11.13	34	6.76	349	10.47
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,829</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,332</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Men were more likely than women to have served at least one prior jail incarceration (male = 57.5%; female = 50.1%).

**TABLE 56: Number of Prior Adult Felony Convictions [Total]**  
**Missing: 30**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1,010	35.65	281	55.86	1,291	38.70
One	636	22.45	116	23.06	752	22.54
Two	395	13.94	48	9.54	443	13.28
Three	265	9.35	31	6.16	296	8.87
Four	185	6.53	12	2.39	197	5.91
Five or More	342	12.07	15	2.98	357	10.70
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,833</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,336</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Over six in ten offenders (61.3%) had at least one prior adult felony conviction (male = 64.3%; female = 44.1%).

**TABLE 57: Number of Prior Adult Violent (Non-Sex) Felony Convictions**  
**Missing: 30**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT VIOLENT (NON-SEX) FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1,958	69.11	434	86.28	2,392	71.70
One	575	20.30	53	10.54	628	18.82
Two	195	6.88	11	2.19	206	6.18
Three	75	2.65	4	0.80	79	2.37
Four	18	0.64	0	0.00	18	0.54
Five or More	12	0.42	1	0.20	13	0.39
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,833</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,336</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Less than a third (28.3%) of the offenders had at least one prior adult conviction for a violent (non-sex) felony (male = 30.9%; female = 13.7%).

**TABLE 58: Number of Prior Adult Sex Felony Convictions**  
**Missing: 30**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT SEX FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,724	96.15	502	99.80	3,226	96.70
One	101	3.57	1	0.20	102	3.06
Two	7	0.25	0	0.00	7	0.21
Three	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,833</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,336</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Males were more likely to have adult felony convictions for a sexually oriented crime (male = 3.8%; female = 0.2%).

**TABLE 59: Number of Prior Adult Drug Use/Possession Felony Convictions****Missing: 30**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT DRUG USE/ POSSESSION FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,212	78.08	435	86.48	2,647	79.35
One	405	14.30	48	9.54	453	13.58
Two	143	5.05	16	3.18	159	4.77
Three	46	1.62	4	0.80	50	1.50
Four	14	0.49	0	0.00	14	0.42
Five or More	13	0.46	0	0.00	13	0.39
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,833</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,336</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Just over one-fifth (20.6%) of the offenders had at least one prior adult felony conviction for drug use or possession (male = 21.9%; female = 13.5%).

**TABLE 60: Number of Prior Adult Drug Sale/Trafficking Felony Convictions****Missing: 30**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT DRUG SALE/ TRAFFICKING FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,414	85.21	468	93.04	2,882	86.39
One	304	10.73	32	6.36	336	10.07
Two	83	2.93	3	0.60	86	2.58
Three	26	0.92	0	0.00	26	0.78
Four	5	0.18	0	0.00	5	0.15
Five or More	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.03
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,833</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,336</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Roughly one-in-seven offenders (13.6%) had at least one prior adult felony conviction for drug sale or trafficking (male = 14.8%; female = 7.0%).

**TABLE 61: Number of Adult Property Felony Convictions****Missing: 30**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT PROPERTY FELONY CONVICTIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	2,056	72.57	387	76.94	2,443	73.23
One	416	14.68	69	13.72	485	14.54
Two	177	6.25	29	5.77	206	6.18
Three	69	2.44	9	1.79	78	2.34
Four	42	1.48	4	0.80	46	1.38
Five or More	73	2.58	5	0.99	78	2.34
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,833</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,336</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Over one-fourth (26.8%) of the offenders had at least one prior felony conviction for property offenses (male = 27.4%; female = 23.1%).

**TABLE 62: Number of Prior Adult Prison Incarcerations****Missing: 31**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT PRISON INCARCERATIONS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1,365	48.20	356	70.78	1,721	51.60
One	543	19.17	67	13.32	610	18.29
Two	339	11.97	45	8.95	384	11.51
Three	194	6.85	17	3.38	211	6.33
Four	130	4.59	10	1.99	140	4.20
Five or More	261	9.22	8	1.59	269	8.07
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,832</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,335</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Men were more likely than women to have served a prior prison term (male = 51.8%; female = 29.2%). Just under half of the entire intake sample has served a prior prison term (48.4%).

**TABLE 63: Number of Prior Adult Supervision Terms****Missing: 30**

NUMBER OF PRIOR ADULT SUPERVISION TERMS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	647	22.84	133	26.44	780	23.38
One	721	25.45	179	35.59	900	26.98
Two	474	16.73	73	14.51	547	16.40
Three	321	11.33	45	8.95	366	10.97
Four	216	7.62	27	5.37	243	7.28
Five or More	454	16.03	46	9.15	500	14.99
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,833</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,336</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Over three-fourths (76.6%) of the offenders have had at least one prior adult supervision term; (male = 77.2%; female = 73.6%).

**TABLE 64: Number of Prior Revocations of Adult Supervision Terms****Missing: 30**

NUMBER OF PRIOR REVOCATIONS OF ADULT SUPERVISION TERMS	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1,373	48.46	226	44.93	1,599	47.93
One	930	32.83	221	43.94	1,151	34.50
Two	311	10.98	36	7.16	347	10.40
Three	108	3.81	12	2.39	120	3.60
Four	62	2.19	3	0.60	65	1.95
Five or More	49	1.73	5	0.99	54	1.62
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,833</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,336</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Females were more likely than males to have at least one prior revocation of adult supervision (male = 51.5%; female = 55.1%).

**TABLE 65: Indication of an Escape History****Missing: 8**

INDICATION OF AN ESCAPE HISTORY	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	2,522	88.31	475	94.62	2,997	89.25
Yes	334	11.69	27	5.38	361	10.75
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,856</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>3,358</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Males were more likely to have a history of escape (male = 11.7%; female = 5.4%). It should be noted that many of these escapes are the version created by Senate Bill 2 in 1996 (sustained parole-violator-at-large status can result in an escape offense).

## SUBSTANCE ABUSE ASSESSMENT

**TABLE 66: Indication of the Need for Substance Abuse Treatment / TCU SCORE\***

Missing: 52

TCU SCORE	Males		Females		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0=No Need	687	24.35	93	18.86	780	23.54
1=Minimal Need	174	6.17	28	5.68	202	6.10
2=Moderate Need	162	5.74	24	4.87	186	5.61
3 or greater = Severe Need	1798	63.74	348	70.59	2146	64.76
Total	2,821	100.00	493	100.00	3,314	100.00

\*The TCU Score is derived from an instrument used to indicate the need for substance abuse treatment, created by the Texas Christian University.

Some level of substance abuse treatment was indicated for 76.5% of the intake sample. A severe need for treatment was indicated for 64.8% of the overall group (male = 63.7%; female = 70.6%).

## ASSESSMENT OF LEGISLATIVE IMPACT/ TRENDS

The percentage of inmates admitted who were truly non-violent (TNV) was 27.4% in the 2014 Intake Study, with a 2.0 percentage point increase from the 2013 Intake Study. (See Table A below.) A TNV offender is one who has no violent current conviction or indictment offense, no known prior felony or misdemeanor conviction for a violent (except F2 or F3 burglary) or sex offense, no gun time, and no weapon involvement in the current offense. In the 1992 and 1996 Intake Studies (which included only Pre-Senate Bill 2 inmates), the percentage of truly non-violent inmates was 44.4%. This figure declined to roughly 40 percent in the 1997 and 1998 Intake Studies, and then dropped slowly but steadily to 29.7% in 2005. The figure then reversed and rose slightly but steadily until 2008. From then until 2012 it decreased 8.7 percentage points to 23.2%. An increase in 2013 to 25.4% was attributed to the increase in TNV offenders who were supervision violators. (See Table B, below.)

The current two point increase cannot be related to supervision violators since TNV offenders who were violators actually dropped 9.3 points. (See Table B, below.) However, the 2014 TNV offenders are slightly more likely than the 2013 TNV offenders to have been sentenced on felony level one, two or three offenses (2013=33.2% ; 2014= 35.7%). Similarly, the proportion of TNV offenders serving less than one year is 56.3% for 2013 and 53.0% for 2014. This suggests that the 2014 TNV offenders are being sentenced from court for more serious albeit non-violent offenses. (See the 2013 & 2014 *Profile of TNV Offenders*, published separately)

**TABLE A: Proportion of Each Year's Intake Who were Truly Non Violent (TNV), in %**

<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
44.4	40.0	39.9	38.6	35.8	33.9	33.2	31.5	29.7
<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
30.7	31.9	31.9	29.1	27.8	27.9	23.2	25.4	27.4

One comment during the debate about HB 86 in 2011 was that the restrictions on F4 & F5 sentencing might lead to a reduction in plea bargaining to that level. The TNV felony sentencing patterns 2010 to 2014 suggest that might be a plausible explanation for some of the change.

**Proportion of Each Year’s TNV Intake Who were Supervision Violators**

In 2014, the percentage of TNV offenders who were supervision (parole or probation) violators decreased to 46.2%. This decrease of 9.3 percentage points puts the proportion of violators closest to where it was in 2001 and reverses increases beginning in 2011. See Table B below, titled “TNV Intake Who were Supervision Violators”, to follow the patterns since 1996.

**TABLE B: Proportion of Each Year’s TNV Intake Who were Supervision Violators, in %**

1996	1997	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
36.0	50.0	54.0	49.4	45.8	53.3	53.6	44.2	44.4	40.4	40.8	43.5	39.5	34.4	42.4	50.7	55.5	46.2

**Proportion of Each Year’s Total Intake Who were Probation Violators**

The percentage of all admissions that were probation violators (Table C, below) was at a low of 25.6% in 2010 and a high of 39.0% in 1998. The 5.1 percentage point decrease in 2014 to 31.1% reverses an increase noted in 2011 to 2013 and is nearest the rate in the 2008 study. The recent decline covers a period in which DRC funded initiatives to reduce probation violators.

**TABLE C: Proportion of Each Year’s Total Intake Who were Probation Violators, in %**

1996	1997	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
30.0	35.0	39.0	36.6	33.6	35.6	32.5	32.8	30.5	30.8	29.2	30.6	27.9	25.6	29.0	33.4	36.2	31.1

**Proportion of Each Year’s Total Intake Who were Parole/PRC Violators**

At 8.7%, the percentage of new admissions that had committed a new crime while on parole or post release control in the 2014 Intake Study was higher than that of 2013 and is identical to the 2007 number (Table D, below). The rate in the 2014 Intake Study is 4.8 times higher than in the 1996 study, and it is lower than the rates only in the 2003 and 2005 years.

**TABLE D: Proportion of Each Year’s Intake Who were Parole/PRC Violators**

1996	1997	1998	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
1.8	2.5	3.1	4.3	7.9	8.5	10.3	8.6	9.8	8.5	8.7	8.3	7.8	6.4	5.1	5.9	6.2	8.7

All of these tables (A - D) suggest that legislative (SB2 in 1996 and HB 86 in 2011) and DRC efforts over the last 25 years for community punishment and treatment alternatives for less serious offenders resulted in an intake population that contains proportionately more serious offenders. However, a rise in TNV offenders in 2013-14 may support the claim that during that period there were new kinds of TNV offender populations with issues and backgrounds for which no appropriate community alternatives were available. Since there has been an effort to develop those alternatives, it will be interesting to see the next set of TNV estimates and profiles.