

Supervision Outcomes of Interstate Compact Cases



Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

Reginald A. Wilkinson
Director

Thomas J. Stickrath
Assistant Director

**Office of Management Information Systems
Bureau of Planning and Evaluation**

August 1997

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

http://www.drc.state.oh.us

Reginald A. Wilkinson, Director
Thomas J. Stickrath, Assistant Director

Office of Management Information Systems

Peg Ritchie-Matsumoto, Deputy Director

Bureau of Planning and Evaluation

Evalyn Parks, Chief

Project Staff:

Bureau of Planning and Evaluation

Principal Author:

R. Craig Bennie, Researcher

Stephen V. Anderson, Assistant Chief

Pat McLaughlin, Research Assistant

Division of Parole and Community Services

John Y. Chin, Researcher

Technical Assistance:

Interstate Compact Administration

Gail Price, Deputy Compact Administrator

Susan Sheley

Joanne Mounts

Sheila Nichols

Nicole Erb

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- ▶ These findings are based on a non-random sample of Interstate Compact cases that may not be a representative group of Interstate Compact cases. Therefore, the findings may not be representative for the population as a whole. The number of cases examined was 755.
- ▶ **Fewer than one-fourth of the cases examined (23.2 percent) had an unsuccessful supervision outcome** (technical violators, new crimes while under supervision and violators at large). If we also add in individuals who successfully completed supervision but were then sent to prison for a new crime within the three year follow-up period, the recidivism rate only rises to 24.2 percent.
- ▶ **Sub-groups exhibiting higher supervision failure rates** were: males, non-whites, offenders in the 21-30 age group; parolees; offenders convicted of property offenses, and offenders initially assigned to the maximum level of supervision.
- ▶ In terms of **criminal behavior of offenders while under supervision**, sub-groups exhibiting higher failure rates were: those arrested or convicted; offenders who received some type of criminal sanction on supervision (jail time, fines, probation); and offenders who absconded or were recommended to be declared a technical violator.
- ▶ **All of the individual items in the initial risk assessment instrument and most of the items on the initial needs assessment instrument** were clearly associated with failure rates in expected ways, that is, as the values of the variables increased in "risk" or "need," the likelihood of successful outcome decreased. The exception to this pattern was the needs assessment item dealing with "financial management" which did not appear to be associated with supervision outcome. It appeared that several individual items on both instruments (with respect to supervision outcome) could be simplified from the current three or four level categorization to two categories.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
Executive Summary	ii
Purpose	1
Methodology	1
Findings	2
Supervision Outcomes	3
Recidivism	3
Demographic Variables by Supervision Outcome	4
Supervision Type/Current Offense by Supervision Outcome	5
Initial Supervision by Supervision Outcome	5
Behavior During the Supervision Period	7
Risk and Criminal History Variables by Supervision Outcome	10
Needs Variables by Supervision Outcome	13
Summary of Findings	15
APPENDIX - Supplemental Tables	17

Purpose

The purpose of the third phase of this study was to look at the recidivism rates of offenders supervised under the Interstate Compact. The goal was to track all Interstate Compact offenders accepted for supervision during a one-year period to determine their status after three years.

Methodology

The original offenders targeted for this study were those admitted to supervision in Calendar Year 1992. Proceeding with this idea, Interstate Compact staff were asked for a complete list of offenders who began supervision in that period. For a variety of reasons a list could only be produced for offenders admitted to supervision between August 1, 1992 and July 31, 1993. Approximately 1,700 offenders were accepted for supervision in the target period (source: the monthly field agency statistics). For the reasons cited below the number of cases examined was reduced to 755:

- Missing cases in the Interstate Compact data base
- Missing files in the field Adult Parole Authority offices
- Missing files in the Interstate Compact central office

It is clear that this study is based on fewer than half of the number of cases we set out to collect. For the most part, there is no reliable way of knowing the direction in which the missing cases were skewed. It is important, therefore, that the reader appreciate the impact on the utilization of the findings reported herein. It cannot be asserted that this report is based on either a **population** (that is, all cases beginning supervision in our target period) or a **sample** (that is, a randomly selected group presumed to be representative of the entire population). Instead, this study reports on findings for a non-representative group whose characteristics and outcomes may or may not be true for the population as a whole.

Many of the cases that were missing had been destroyed. Most of the destroyed files were almost certainly the files of successfully-closed cases. The obvious impact of this is to underestimate the true number of successful cases, resulting in a recidivism rate that is higher than the 'true' recidivism rate.

For the 755 cases, we collected a substantial amount of information on each offender. Included were demographic data, current and criminal history, needs assessments, initial risk assessments and reassessments, as well as supervision outcome and three year follow-up information.

For the purpose of this study a successful outcome was defined as one of the following supervision outcomes: final release or end of definite sentence, active status and cases that were relocated out of Ohio. We decided to count offenders on active supervision or relocated out of Ohio

as successes because if an offender has been on active supervision for three years (mostly probationers), there is a good chance that person is succeeding. Using the same logic, it is our assumption that an offender must be in good standing to be given permission to relocate out of Ohio.

An unsuccessful outcome occurred when an offender became a technical parole or probation violator, a parole or probation violator at large, or when an offender was sentenced to Ohio prison for conviction of a new criminal offense.

It should be noted that we were not able to locate information for some of the variables. Missing data are not included (but noted) in the analysis. Therefore the total number of cases and percentages presented in the text of this report are based upon the actual number of cases, excluding all missing cases.

Findings

We have not included a descriptive profile of this study group because *Phase II: Interstate Compact Population Profile*, previously published, includes such descriptive data (refer to *Exploratory Study of Interstate Compact Policies and Practices, 1996* - the demographic results of this study are presented in the Appendix).

For the purpose of this study, there were two definitions of outcome. The first definition focused on supervision outcome determined by what happened to cases at the end of supervision (e.g., Final Release, Parole Violator at Large, etc.) or what happened at the end of a three year follow-up period, whichever came first. Those on supervision could either succeed or fail supervision. Successful cases included those that were final released, cases actively supervised at the end of the three year follow-up period, and cases that relocated out of Ohio. Failed cases included technical parole/probation violators (TPVs), recommissioned parole/probation violators (PVRs), and parole/probation violators at large (PVALs). This definition of outcome is known as supervision outcome and is the primary outcome measure reported in this study.

The second definition of outcome focused on what happened to the offenders during a three year follow-up period (the issue of final release from supervision being immaterial). This outcome measure is designated as recidivism. Successful cases were those who did not return to prison during the three-year follow-up period or were relocated out of Ohio. Failed cases were those offenders who were sent to prison or could not be located (either TPV, PVR, PVAL or new crime after final release from supervision) during a three year follow-up period.

Table 1 is based on the first definition of outcome and presents the major finding of the report. We found that 23.2 percent of the Interstate Compact study group had an unsuccessful supervision outcome. (Except for the results presented in Table 2, the findings presented in this report are based on this definition of outcome.)

Table 1. Interstate Compact Group Supervision Outcomes (n=755)		
	Count	Percent
Successful Outcomes	580	76.8
Unsuccessful Outcomes*	175	23.2

* "Unsuccessful Outcomes" include Technical Parole/Prob. Violators, Recommissioned Parole/Prob. Violators, and Parole/Prob. Violators at Large that *failed during their supervision periods.*

Table 2 is based on the second definition of outcome. This definition produced the Interstate Compact study group's recidivism rate which was 24.2 percent.

Table 2. Interstate Compact Group Recidivism Rate After Three years (n=755)		
	Count	Percent
Successful Outcomes	572	75.8
Unsuccessful Outcomes*	183	24.2

* "Unsuccessful Outcomes" include Technical Parole/Prob. Violators, Recommissioned Parole/Prob. Violators, Parole/Prob. Violators at Large, plus eight cases that *returned to prison after their final release but within the three year follow-up period.*

Table 3 presents demographic data by final supervision outcome. The male subjects were more likely to fail than the female subjects in the study group. The first finding illustrates that 24.6 percent of the males failed in final supervision outcome compared to only 16.2 percent of the female subjects in the group.

Next, non-whites had a higher failure rate than the whites in this group. The table shows that 27.7 percent of the non-whites failed in contrast with 21.4 percent of the white subjects in this group.

There appears to be a relationship between age and failure rate in that as age (at release from prison or at placement on probation) increased the failure rate decreased for this group. For example, the 21-30 age subgroup had a 26.3 percent failure rate compared to only 7.4 percent for the 51 and over age subgroup. However, the exception to this trend was that the failure rate for the youngest age subgroup (20 and under) was 20.4 percent.

Table 3. Demographic Variables by Supervision Outcome

Variable (valid n)	Successful Outcome		Unsuccessful Outcome	
	%	n	%	n
Sex (n=755)				
Male	75.4%	471	24.6%	154
Female	83.8%	109	16.2%	21
Race (n=755)				
White	78.6%	426	21.4%	116
Non-white	72.3%	154	27.7%	59
Age (valid n=750)				
20 and under	79.6%	39	20.4%	10
21-30	73.7%	264	26.3%	94
31-40	77.6%	180	22.4%	52
41-50	82.1%	69	17.9%	15
51 and over	92.6%	25	7.4%	2
Unknown 5				
Education (valid n=666)				
No HS/GED	77.0%	197	23.0%	59
HS/GED	74.8%	241	25.2%	81
Post-Secondary*	80.7%	71	19.3%	17
Unknown 89				
* "Post-Secondary" includes any type of education (e.g., vocational, etc.) beyond the High School level.				

Finally, an examination of education level at the start of supervision showed little variation in failure rates. There was only a two-percentage point difference in the failure rate between those subjects with (25.2 percent) and without (23.0 percent) a High School education or equivalence in the group. Those subjects that acquired post-secondary education (e.g., college, vocational, etc.) had a failure rate of 19.3 percent.

Table 4 illustrates the supervision type of those on Interstate Compact and the most serious offense that lead to their Compact supervision. Parolees had a slightly higher failure rate than the probationers in this group. The failure rate for parolees was 27.1 percent compared to 21.0 percent for the probationers. Property offenders had the highest (27.4 percent) failure rate followed by Other/Miscellaneous (24.1 percent), violent (23.1 percent), sex (20.8 percent), drug (19.7 percent), and OMVI/DUI (13.3 percent) offenders in the group.

Table 4. Supervision Type and Current Offense by Supervision Outcome

Variable (n)	Successful Outcome		Unsuccessful Outcome	
	%	n	%	n
Supervision Type (n=755)				
Parole	72.9%	196	27.1%	73
Probation	79.0%	384	21.0%	102
Most Serious Current Offense (n=755)				
Property	72.6%	209	27.4%	79
Violent	76.9%	113	23.1%	34
Sex	79.2%	38	20.8%	10
Drug	80.3%	159	19.7%	39
OMVI/DUI	86.7%	39	13.3%	6
Other*	75.9%	22	24.1%	7
<hr/> * "Other" includes public order offenses (e.g., public intoxication, indecent exposure, disorderly conduct, etc.) and 'non-support' in child welfare cases.				

Table 5 shows the initial supervision levels of the Interstate Compact offenders. The assigned levels are a function of the investigating officer's initial inquiry into the risk and needs of an offender. *(The specific items on the risk and needs assessment instruments will be discussed later.)*

Table 5. Initial Supervision by Supervision Outcome

Variable (valid n)	Successful Outcome		Unsuccessful Outcome	
	%	n	%	n
Initial Classification (valid n=603)				
Maximum	64.2%	111	35.8%	62
Medium	76.8%	199	23.2%	60
Minimum	92.0%	138	8.0%	12
Sex Offender	90.5%	19	9.5%	2
Unknown 152				

The findings revealed a relationship between initial supervision level and supervision outcome in which failure rates increased with higher levels of supervision. That is, there was a consistent pattern of increase in failure rates as the supervision level progressed from minimum to maximum classification.

The sex offender supervision level (which is similar to the Maximum supervision level) does not follow this pattern, showing only a 9.5 percent failure rate. The small number of cases in this category suggests viewing this findings with caution.

Table 6 illustrates variables that reflect the behavior of offenders during their supervision periods. We looked at arrests and convictions, and the types of offenses that were committed by subjects while under supervision. In addition, drug testing, absconding, and Technical Parole/Probation Violator (TPV) status were examined. The table reports the percentage breakdown for the respective variables along with a frequency and percentage breakdown by successful/unsuccessful outcome.

The results indicate that about one-third (33.1 percent) of the study group were arrested during their supervision period. The table shows that half (50.8 percent) of those subjects that were arrested during their supervision period failed in terms of final supervision outcome. In contrast, only 9.5 percent of those not arrested while under supervision failed in this group.

In addition, the table shows that 20.9 percent of the group were convicted of an offense during their supervision period. Over half (56.3 percent) of those convicted while under supervision failed regarding final outcome of supervision. In contrast, only 14.4 percent of those not convicted failed in this study group.

Of those convicted (20.9 percent) while under supervision, most were for property crimes (31.4 percent), followed by OMVI/DUI (19.9 percent), violent (18.6 percent), drug (11.5 percent), and sex (4.5 percent) crimes. Of those convicted of an offense while under supervision, drug offenders had the highest failure rate (83.3 percent), followed by sex (71.4 percent), property (67.3 percent), violent (65.5 percent), Other/Misc. (45.5 percent), and OMVI (22.6 percent) offenders. It is interesting to note that about one-third (34.5 percent) of the violent offenders convicted under supervision succeeded in their supervision. An explanation for the success of these violent offenders was that all of the offenders for whom seriousness of new conviction offense was known (7 out of 10) were convicted of misdemeanor offenses. Again, the small numbers in each category of this variable suggest caution in drawing conclusions from these data.

Table 6. Variables Related to Behavior During the Supervision Period

Variable (n) Characteristic (Frequency %)	Successful Outcome		Unsuccessful Outcome	
	%	n	%	n
Arrested During supervision? (n=755)				
Yes (33.1%)	49.2%	123	50.8%	127
No (66.9%)	90.5%	457	9.5%	48
Convicted During Supervision? (n=755)				
Yes (20.9%)	43.7%	69	56.3%	89
No (79.1%)	85.6%	511	14.4%	86
Conviction Offense Under Supervision (valid n=156)				
Drug (11.5%)	16.7%	3	83.3%	15
Sex (4.5%)	28.6%	2	71.4%	5
Property (31.4%)	32.7%	16	67.3%	33
Violent (18.6%)	34.5%	10	65.5%	19
OMVI/DUI (19.9%)	77.4%	24	22.6%	7
Other (14.1%)	54.5%	12	45.5%	10
Not Applicable 597				
Unknown 2				
Felony Level of Conviction Offense Under Supervision (valid n=121)				
Felony 1 (2.5%)	-----	-----	100.0%	3
Felony 2 (2.5%)	-----	-----	100.0%	3
Felony 3 (9.9%)	16.7%	2	83.3%	10
Felony 4 (17.4%)	19.0%	4	81.0%	17
Misdemeanor (67.8%)	65.9%	54	34.1%	28
Not Applicable 634				
Received Criminal Sanctions* Under Supervision? (n=755)				
Yes (20.9%)	50.0%	79	50.0%	79
No (79.1%)	83.9%	501	16.1%	96
Failed Drug Testing Under Supervision? (n=755)				
Yes (17.5%)	53.8%	71	46.2%	61
No (82.5%)	81.7%	509	18.3%	114
Abscond During Supervision? (n=755)				
Yes (12.7%)	18.8%	18	81.2%	78
No (87.3%)	85.3%	562	14.7%	97
Recommended Technical Parole/Prob. Violator During Supervision? (n=755)				
Yes (21.1%)	21.4%	34	78.6%	125
No (78.9%)	91.6%	546	8.4%	50

* "Criminal sanctions" include jail, fine, and/or probation.

Roughly two-thirds of those convicted under supervision were convicted for misdemeanors (67.8 percent) followed by Felony 4 (17.4 percent), Felony 3 (9.9 percent), Felony 2 (2.5 percent), and Felony 1 (2.5 percent) cases. There is an obvious relationship between felony level and failure rate, in that as felony degree increased in seriousness the failure rate increased. For example, the results showed that misdemeanor cases had a rate of 34.1 percent, in contrast with felony 1 and 2 cases which had a failure rate of 100.0 percent in this group. However, again, due to small numbers in the categories for this variable, the reader must be cautious when interpreting these failure rates.

The table also shows that 20.9 percent of the study group received criminal sanctions while under supervision. A criminal sanction for our purposes included jail, fine, and/or probation. Half (50.0 percent) of those subjects that received criminal sanctions while under supervision failed in terms of final outcome, compared to only 16.1 percent of those that did not receive criminal sanctions for this group.

Further, we found that 17.5 percent of the study group failed drug testing while under supervision. Of those that failed drug testing while under supervision, almost half (46.2 percent) failed in final outcome, compared to only 18.3 percent of those that passed their drug tests while under supervision. The result that about half of those who fail a drug test while under supervision had unsuccessful outcomes paired with the finding that more than eighty percent of those who did not fail a drug test had successful outcomes indicates that drug testing is a particularly useful tool in predicting the likelihood of a successful supervision outcome.

Next, the table illustrates that 12.7 percent of the group absconded during their supervision period. An overwhelming majority (81.2 percent) of those that absconded from their supervision failed in final outcome compared to only 14.7 percent of those that did not abscond. A noteworthy finding is that 18.8 percent of those that absconded, nevertheless, succeeded in final supervision outcome. This may be explained by how absconding was defined. Field supervision officers declare absconding any time a subject does not make himself or herself available for supervision. Thus, a change of employment and/or residence without properly notifying the supervising officer can result in an absconding report. It is very possible that some absconders were those that failed to notify their supervising officers of these types of changes (i.e., employment, residence, etc.) and then proceeded to successfully complete their supervision periods.

Finally, 21.1 percent of the study group were recommended to be declared (to the sending state) a Technical Parole/Probation Violator (TPV) during their supervision. There is an overwhelming 78.6 percent failure rate in final outcome for those recommended to be declared TPV's during their supervision. In sharp contrast, only 8.4 percent of those that were not recommended to be declared TPV's failed in final outcome of their supervision for this group. It is interesting to note that 21.4 percent of those recommended to be declared TPV's succeeded in final outcome of their supervision. An explanation for this finding is that many times a sending state will not pick-up a violator because they do not believe a violation to be serious enough for revocation.

In these type of instances the sending state responds with an official "continue on supervision."

Summarizing the criminal behavior of this group (N=755) while under supervision, we find:

- about one-third (250/755) were arrested, half (127/250) of whom subsequently failed supervision;
- one-fifth (158/755) were convicted of a new offense (the modal new crime was a property offense);
- of those reconvicted, drug offenders had the highest rate of supervision failure;
- about one-third of the offenders convicted of violent crimes while under supervision were eventually successful supervision completers (10/29);
- two-thirds of those convicted (82/121) while under supervision were convicted of misdemeanors;
- one-fifth (158/755) received a criminal sanction while on supervision and half (79/158) of those failed supervision;
- fewer than one-fifth (132/755) failed drug testing; about half (61/132) of them failed supervision;
- of the four-fifths (623/755) of offenders who did not fail a drug test, over eighty percent (509/623) successfully completed supervision;
- slightly more than one in ten (96/755) absconded supervision, but four-fifths (78/96) of those who did failed supervision; and
- one in five (159/755) offenders were recommended to be declared a technical violator of probation or parole during supervision; three-fourths (125/159) of these failed supervision.

Table 7 focuses on risk factors, including criminal history data. The findings seem to be consistent with our expectations of how such characteristics may influence supervision outcome.

The risk factors examined in this table are taken from the initial risk assessment instrument which is used at the beginning of supervision to aid in determining the most appropriate supervision level. After total risk scores are computed, they are collapsed into three levels of risk (low, medium, and high). It is a basic operating assumption of the risk levels that higher levels will be associated with higher failure rates. As Table 7 shows, the collapsed risk levels determined by the instrument are clearly associated with expected failure rates: 14.5 percent of the low risk group failed supervision, compared with 30.2 percent of the medium risk group and 49.2% of the high risk group.

A closer look at the individual variables that make-up the risk instrument revealed that all of the variables varied in the expected direction, i.e., as risk increased success decreased. However, it should be noted that three risk items, *Number of Prior Felony Convictions*, *Number of Prior Adult Incarcerations in a State or Federal Institution*, and *Alcohol Usage Problems* have somewhat inconsistent patterns in their failure rates that are worth discussing.

Table 7. "Risk" / Criminal History Variables by Supervision Outcome

Variable (valid n)	Successful Outcome		Unsuccessful Outcome	
	%	n	%	n
Number of Prior Felony Convictions (valid n=578)				
None	82.8%	279	17.2%	58
One	76.7%	79	23.3%	24
Two or more	64.5%	89	35.5%	49
Unknown 177				
Arrested Within Five Years Prior to Arrest?(valid n=575)				
No	86.0%	233	14.0%	38
Yes	69.7%	212	30.3%	92
Unknown 180				
Age at Arrest Leading to First Felony Conviction (valid n=576)				
24 and over	84.5%	246	15.5%	45
20-23	75.5%	108	24.5%	35
19 and under	64.1%	91	35.9%	51
Unknown 179				
Number of Prior Adult Incarcerations in a State or Federal Institution (valid n=573)				
None	82.4%	361	17.6%	77
1-2	62.9%	66	37.1%	39
3 and more	56.7%	17	43.3%	13
Unknown 182				
Age at Admission to Institution or Probation (valid n=577)				
30 and over	80.7%	222	19.3%	53
18-29	73.9%	221	26.1%	78
17 and under	100.0%	3	-----	-----
Unknown 178				
Number of Prior Adult Probation/Parole Supervision (valid n=575)				
None	82.4%	291	17.6%	62
One or more	68.9%	153	31.1%	69
Unknown 180				
Number of Prior Probation/Parole Revocations Resulting in Imprisonment (Adult or Juvenile) (valid n=576)				
None	80.3%	374	19.7%	92
One or more	64.5%	71	35.5%	39
Unknown 179				

Table 7. (continued) "Risk" Variables by Supervision Outcome

Variable (valid n)	Successful Outcome		Unsuccessful Outcome	
	%	n	%	n
Amount of Time Employed in Last 12 Months (Prior to incarceration for Parolees) (valid n=579)				
More than 7 months	82.2%	227	17.8%	49
5-7 months	76.4%	84	23.6%	26
Less than 5 months	71.0%	137	29.0%	56
Unknown 176				
Alcohol Usage Problems (Prior to Incarceration for Parolees) (valid n=579)				
No Interference	83.3%	195	16.7%	39
Some Interference	74.9%	173	25.1%	58
Serious Interference	70.2%	80	29.8%	34
Unknown 176				
Drug Usage Problems (Prior to Incarceration for Parolees) (valid n=578)				
No Interference	81.6%	218	18.4%	49
Some Interference	76.2%	147	23.8%	46
Serious Interference	69.5%	82	30.5%	36
Unknown 177				
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Initial Assessment Risk Level (valid n=566)				
Low Risk	85.5%	301	14.5%	51
Medium Risk	69.8%	104	30.2%	45
High Risk	50.8%	33	49.2%	32
Unknown 189				

First, *Number of Prior Felony Convictions* revealed only a six percentage-point difference in failure rates between subjects with none (17.2%) and one (23.3%) prior felony convictions. On the other hand, the failure rate jumped appreciably (35.5%) for those subjects with two or more prior felony convictions. Offenders without any priors and those with just one prior behaved more alike with respect to outcome than those with two or more priors.

Although the variable *Number of Prior Adult Incarcerations in a State or Federal Institution* varies in the expected direction (more priors - greater risk) there is an interesting pattern worth exploring. Those without any prior adult incarcerations had a low failure rate (17.6 percent)

compared to those with one or two (37.1%) or three and more (43.3%) prior incarcerations, both of which are much higher than those without any prior adult incarcerations. This particular risk factor appears to function (with respect to supervision outcome) dichotomously, i.e., having no priors or having any priors, rather than, as currently operationalized, continuously.

Examining the results of the *Alcohol Usage Problems* variable revealed a pattern where supervision failure was more a function of any alcohol usage and no alcohol interference rather than a separation between none, some and serious alcohol interference. The failure rate for those with some interference (25.1%) and serious interference (29.8%) due to alcohol usage problems were relatively close. The failure rate for subjects with no alcohol interference problems was 16.7 percent.

In summary of Table 7, all of the risk variables demonstrate the expected pattern in failure rates through which rates increase with seriousness of risk. We did find a few examples of internal inconsistencies in the risk patterns for a few of the variables which might suggest a need to retool the instrument. Nevertheless, the risk instrument seemed to work remarkably well with this particular sample of Interstate Compact offenders as evidenced by the initial assessment of risk level.

Table 8 focuses on items taken from the initial needs instrument in the context of supervision outcome. This instrument was originally postulated to identify offenders that required more supervision because of their need for certain types of programming. While supervision outcome was not necessarily expected to be associated with high or low programming needs, the results generally support that conclusion. Those variables showing a consistent pattern of increased likelihood of supervision failure with increased need include *Domestic Relationship*, *Drug Abuse*, *Alcohol Usage*, *Academic Training*, *Attitudes*, and *Officer's Impressions of Needs*.

There were four items in the instrument that revealed what some might consider unexpected patterns with respect to supervision outcome. The item *Emotional and Mental Stability* showed that outcome really only differed when the need became severe. Those without any symptoms (22.4%), limited symptoms (23.0%), and prohibitive symptoms (22.0%) failed at a rate within one percentage point of each other. This contrasts with the thirty percent failure rate for those who had severe mental health needs.

The item that examined *Associations* revealed a relatively small differences between those with occasional, frequent or complete negativity (26.0-30.8 percent). Those without any adversity with respect to associations had a failure rate of 15.8 percent. These results suggest that it is not the extent to which Interstate Compact offenders are associated with individuals who are a poor influence that increases the likelihood of supervision failure, rather it appears to be a function of any negative association activity that increases the likelihood of supervision failure.

Table 8. "Needs" Variables by Supervision Outcome

Variable (valid n)	Successful Outcome		Unsuccessful Outcome	
	%	n	%	n
Emotional and Mental Stability (valid n=586)				
No symptoms	77.6%	225	22.4%	65
Limited symptoms	77.0%	174	23.0%	52
Prohibitive symptoms	78.0%	39	22.0%	11
Severe symptoms	70.0%	14	30.0%	6
Unknown		169		
Domestic Relationship (valid n=586)				
Stable relations	79.7%	271	20.3%	69
Some disorganization	74.1%	169	25.9%	59
Major disorganization	66.7%	12	33.3%	6
Unknown		169		
Associations (valid n=587)				
No adversity	84.2%	186	15.8%	35
Occasional negativity	74.0%	182	26.0%	64
Frequent negativity	71.3%	67	28.7%	27
Complete negativity	69.2%	18	30.8%	8
Unknown		168		
Drug Abuse (valid n=587)				
No disruption	81.4%	219	18.6%	50
Some disruption	76.9%	163	23.1%	49
Frequent disruption	67.0%	71	33.0%	35
Unknown		168		
Alcohol Usage (valid n=587)				
No disruption	82.2%	189	17.8%	41
Some disruption	75.5%	189	24.5%	61
Frequent disruption	70.1%	75	29.9%	32
Unknown		168		
Employment (valid n=585)				
Satisfactory	82.0%	251	18.0%	55
Underemployed	81.3%	65	18.7%	15
Unsatisfactory	68.1%	126	31.9%	59
Unemployable	64.3%	9	35.7%	5
Unknown		170		
Academic/Vocational Skills/Training (valid n=586)				
Adequate skills	79.8%	309	20.2%	78
Low skills	72.3%	133	27.7%	51
No skills	66.7%	10	33.3%	5
Unknown		169		
Financial Management (valid n=587)				
No difficulties	78.9%	194	21.1%	52
Minor difficulties	75.5%	237	24.5%	77
Severe difficulties	81.5%	22	18.5%	5
Unknown		168		

Table 8. (continued) "Needs" Variables by Supervision Outcome

Variable (valid n)	Successful Outcome		Unsuccessful Outcome	
	%	n	%	n
Attitudes (valid n=585)				
No difficulties	82.6%	317	17.4%	67
Periodic difficulties	68.6%	116	31.4%	53
Frequent difficulties	56.3%	18	43.7%	14
Unknown 170				
Officer's Impressions of Needs (valid n=586)				
Low	92.1%	116	7.9%	10
Medium	78.3%	235	21.7%	65
Maximum	63.1%	101	36.9%	59
Unknown 169				
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Initial Assessment Needs Level (valid n=578)				
Low Needs	86.4%	222	13.6%	35
Medium Needs	71.4%	152	28.6%	61
High Needs	64.8%	70	35.2%	38
Unknown 177				

Whether a supervisee had *Employment* needs showed a roughly eighteen percentage point failure rate for those with low employment needs (Satisfactory and Underemployed). This contrasts to the roughly one-third failure rate for those with higher employment needs (Unsatisfactory and Unemployable). This finding is quite interesting because rather than differentiating on a four-fold typology of employment needs, the item differentiated by the employment/unemployment dichotomy.

Financial Management attempts to get at the relative financial difficulties an offender may face while on supervision. This item was not associated with supervision outcome. It may be a measure of financial difficulties, but a higher or lower need was not associated with a higher or lower likelihood of supervision failure.

Generally, the need variables were associated in the expected direction with respect to supervision outcome (although, as mentioned above, that is not the general theory behind the needs instrument). That is, as need increased so did supervision failure. This is evidenced by the overall needs score at the end of the table. Those with low needs had a failure rate of 13.6 percent. Those with medium needs a rate of 28.6 percent and those with high needs a rate of 35.2 percent. Those with medium and high needs failed at rates relatively close to each other in contrast to those with low needs. This suggests that when one examines the needs of interstate compact offenders with respect

to supervision outcome there is a type of threshold. As needs become greater than low, supervision failure increases. There is an additional increase in failure between those with medium and high needs but that difference is relatively small.

Summary of Findings

Because of serious problems encountered in trying to identify the population of Interstate Compact cases accepted for supervision during a specified time period and in locating the case files of cases which we were able to identify, this study can report only on a non-representative group of Interstate Compact cases whose characteristics and outcomes may or may not be true for the population as a whole.

Overall, fewer than one-fourth of the cases examined (23.4 percent) had unsuccessful supervision outcomes (technical violators, recommissioned parole violators, and parole violators at large). If added to unsuccessful supervision outcomes, those individuals who successfully completed supervision but were sent to prison for the commission of a new crime within the three year follow-up period, the recidivism rate only rises to 24.2 percent.

Sub-groups exhibiting higher supervision failure rates were: males, non-whites; offenders in the 21-30 age group; parolees; offenders convicted of property offenses; and offenders initially assigned to the maximum level of supervision.

In terms of criminal behavior of offenders while under supervision, sub-groups exhibiting higher failure rates were: offenders arrested or convicted while under supervision; offenders convicted for drug offenses, property offenses or violent offenses while on supervision (although most of the conviction offenses were misdemeanors rather than felonies); offenders who received some other type of criminal sanction (jail time, fines, or probation) while on supervision; and offenders who absconded or were recommended to be declared a technical violator during supervision.

Most of the individual items on the initial risk instrument were clearly associated with failure rates in expected ways, that is, as the values of the variables increased in "risk," the likelihood of successful outcome decreased. This was generally true for such criminal history and risk variables as recent arrest, age at arrest leading to first felony conviction, age at admission to institution or probation, prior adult probation or parole supervisions, prior probation or parole revocations, amount of time employed, and drug usage problems. However, three variables (prior felony convictions, prior adult incarcerations, and alcohol usage problems) appeared to function (with respect to supervision outcome) dichotomously rather than continuously, as currently operationalized.

Similarly, many of the individual items on the initial needs instrument showed expected patterns of association with supervision outcome, that is, as need levels increased, the likelihood of successful outcome decreased. Three variables (emotional and mental stability, associations, and employment) showed the dichotomous pattern (rather than continuous) seen with several of the risk

instrument variables. Financial management did not appear to be associated with supervision outcome.

APPENDIX

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES

**Table 1. Distribution of the Interstate Compact Group
Demographic Characteristics**

Variable Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Sex (n=755)		
Male	625	82.8%
Female	130	17.2%
Race (n=755)		
White	542	71.8%
Black	185	24.5%
Hispanic	19	2.5%
Other	9	1.2%
Age (valid n=750)		
20 and below	49	6.5%
21-30 years	358	47.7%
31- 40 years	232	30.9%
41- 50 years	84	11.2%
51 and over	27	3.6%
Unknown	5	
Mean Age	31.1 years	
Minimum	17 years	
Maximum	73 years	
Education (valid n=666)		
No HS/GED	256	38.4%
HS Diploma	217	32.6%
GED	105	15.8%
Vocational Certificate	42	6.3%
Associate's Degree	20	3.0%
Bachelor's Degree	18	2.7%
Post-Graduate	8	1.2%
Unknown	89	
Marital Status (valid n=737)		
Married	187	25.4%
Not Married	550	74.6%
Unknown	18	

**Table 2. Distribution of the Interstate Compact Group
Criminal Characteristics**

Variable Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Most Serious Current Offense (n=755)		
Property	288	38.1%
Drug	198	26.2%
Violent	147	19.5%
Sex	48	6.4%
OMVI/DUI	45	6.0%
Other	29	3.8%
Supervision Type (n=755)		
Parole	269	35.6%
Probation	486	64.4%
Age at Admission to Institution or Probation for Current Offense (valid n=577)		
30 and Over	275	47.7%
18-29 years	299	51.8%
17 and Under	3	.5%
Unknown	178	
Prior Felony Convictions (valid n=578)		
None	337	58.3%
One	103	17.8%
Two or more	138	23.9%
Unknown	177	
Arrested Within Five (5) Years Prior to Arrest (valid n=575)		
Yes	304	52.9%
No	271	47.1%
Unknown	180	
Age at Arrest Leading to First Felony Conviction (valid n=576)		
24 and Over	291	50.5%
20-23	143	24.8%
19 and Under	142	24.7%
Unknown	179	
Prior Adult Incarcerations in a State or Federal Institution (Valid n=573)		
0	438	76.4%
1-2	105	18.3%
3 and Above	30	5.2%
Unknown	182	
Prior Adult Probation/Parole Supervisions (valid n=575)		
None	353	61.4%
One or more	222	38.6%
Unknown	180	
Prior Probation/Parole Revocations Resulting in Imprisonment (valid n=576)		
None	466	80.9%
One or more	110	19.1%
Unknown	179	

**Table 3. Distribution of the Interstate Compact Group
Needs Characteristics**

Variable Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Emotional and Mental Stability (valid n=586)		
No Symptoms	290	49.5%
Limited Symptoms	226	38.6%
Prohibitive Symptoms	50	8.5%
Severe Symptoms	20	3.4%
Unknown 169		
Domestic Relationships (valid n=586)		
Stable Relationships	340	58.0%
Some Disorganization	228	38.9%
Major Disorganization	18	3.1%
Unknown 169		
Associations (valid n=587)		
No Adversity	221	37.6%
Occasional Negativity	246	41.9%
Frequent Negativity	94	16.0%
Complete Negativity	26	4.4%
Unknown 168		
Drug Abuse (valid n=587)		
No Disruption	269	45.8%
Some Disruption	212	36.1%
Frequent Disruption	106	18.1%
Unknown 168		
Alcohol Usage (valid n=587)		
No Disruption	230	39.2%
Some Disruption	250	42.6%
Frequent Disruption	107	18.2%
Unknown 168		
Employment (valid n=585)		
Satisfactory	306	52.3%
Underemployed	80	13.7%
Unsatisfactory	185	31.6%
Unemployable	14	2.4%
Unknown 170		
Academic/Vocational Skills/Training (Valid n=586)		
Adequate Skills	387	66.0%
Low Skills	184	31.4%
No Skills	15	2.6%
Unknown 169		
Financial Management (valid n=587)		
No Difficulties	246	41.9%
Minor Difficulties	314	53.5%
Severe Difficulties	27	4.6%
Unknown 168		
Attitudes (valid n=585)		
No Difficulties	384	65.6%
Periodic Difficulties	169	28.9%
Frequent Difficulties	32	5.5%
Unknown 170		

**Table 4. Distribution of the Interstate Compact Group
Needs Characteristics (continued)**

Variable Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Residence (valid n=585)		
Suitable	532	90.9%
Adequate/Temporary	49	8.4%
Unacceptable	4	.7%
Unknown 170		
Mental Ability/Intelligence (valid n=585)		
Independent Functioning	536	91.6%
Some need for Assistance	47	8.0%
Severely Limited	2	.3%
Unknown 170		
Health (valid n=586)		
Sound Health	529	90.3%
Minor Handicap	42	7.2%
Serious Handicap	15	2.5%
Unknown 169		
Sexual Behavior (valid n=586)		
No Dysfunction	549	93.7%
Minor Problems	17	2.9%
Severe Problems	20	3.4%
Unknown 169		
Investigating Officer's Impressions of Needs (valid n=586)		
Low Needs	126	21.5%
Medium Needs	300	51.2%
Maximum Needs	160	27.3%
Unknown 169		

**Table 5. Distribution of the Interstate Compact Group
Recidivism Characteristics**

Variable Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Initial Classification (valid n=603)		
Maximum	173	28.7%
Medium	259	43.0%
Minimum	150	24.9%
Sex Offender	21	3.5%
Unknown	152	
Arrested During Supervision? (n=755)		
Yes	250	33.1%
No	505	66.9%
Convicted During Supervision? (n=755)		
Yes	158	20.9%
No	597	79.1%
Conviction Offense Under Supervision (valid n=156)		
Property	49	31.4%
Violent	29	18.6%
Drug	18	11.5%
Sex	7	4.5%
OMVI/DUI	31	19.9%
Other*	22	14.1%
Unknown/NA	599	
Felony Level of Conviction Offense Under Supervision (valid n=121)		
Felony 1	3	2.5%
Felony 2	3	2.5%
Felony 3	12	9.9%
Felony 4	21	17.4%
Misdemeanor	82	67.8%
Unknown/NA	634	
Criminal Sanctions**During Supervision? (n=755)		
Yes	158	20.9%
No	597	79.1%
Abscond During Supervision? (n=755)		
Yes	96	12.7%
No	659	87.3%
Failed Drug Testing During Supervision? (n=755)		
Yes	132	17.5%
No	623	82.5%
Declared a Technical Parole/Probation Violator Under Supervision? (n=755)		
Yes	159	21.1%
No	596	78.9%
<p>* "Other" includes public order offenses (e.g., public intoxication, indecent exposure, disorderly conduct, resisting arrest, and public nuisance violations) and 'non-support' in child welfare cases.</p> <p>**"Criminal Sanctions" include jail, fine, and probation.</p>		

**Table 6. Distribution of the Interstate Compact Group
Recidivism Characteristics (continued)**

Variable Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Supervision Reclassification (valid n=638)		
Minimum	306	48.0%
Medium	153	24.0%
Maximum	108	16.9%
Extended	28	4.4%
Sex Offender	43	6.7%
Unknown 117		
Supervision Outcome (n=755)		
Final Release/EDS	337	44.6%
Active	166	22.0%
Relocated Outside Ohio	77	10.2%
Technical Parole/Prob. Violator	73	9.7%
Parole/Prob. Violator at Large	65	8.6%
Parole Violator Recommissioned	37	4.9%
Supervision Success/Failure Rates (n=586)		
Successful Outcomes	580	76.8%
Unsuccessful Outcomes*	175	23.2%
<hr/> <small>**Unsuccessful Outcomes* include Technical Parole/Probation Violators, Recommissioned Parole Violators, and Parole/Probation Violators at Large.</small>		