Recidivism of Offenders receiving RREC: A follow-up to OPM’s 2012 analysis
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Between October 5, 2011 and September 5, 2012, the CT DOC awarded RREC to 8,700 offenders upon discharge of their sentences.

In September 2012, in response to the heightened political environment, CJPPD was asked to produce a study to assess the impact of RREC on recidivism.
Background

- At the time, opponents were insinuating that RREC had put public safety in jeopardy. Data was presented claiming that recidivism rates were extremely high for offenders who received RREC. (Source: The Hartford Courant, September 18, 2012)

- Given CJPPD’s experience in studying recidivism among prisoners, the Research Unit was tasked with producing a methodologically sound assessment of RREC and its impact on recidivism.

- Given that so little time had elapsed since the DOC had implemented RREC, performing a full scale study presented some difficulties.
**Background**

- Such a study would require:
  - A large and consistent cohort of offenders
  - A set period of time in which to measure recidivism, and
  - Selection of a measure of recidivism.

The distribution of releases for 8,700 offenders receiving RREC between October 2011 and September 2012.
For the study, we chose to track the first 3,279 offenders who were discharged with RREC. This gave us

- a large enough sample size for the study, and
- A consistent time window in which we could track everyone in the release-cohort and measure against bench-mark data.
The study would:

- Track the first 3,279 offenders who received RREC at discharge
- Measure recidivism through return-to-prison data, and
- Compute recidivism rates at the 6 month mark.
Initial study findings

At the 6-month mark:

- Offenders who received RREC returned to prison at significantly lower rates than offenders who were released from prison in both 2005 or 2008.

- Further examination revealed that almost the entire drop in recidivism for the RREC cohort could be explained by the drop in the number of remands.
March 2013 follow-up

At the 12-month mark:

- Offenders who received RREC continued to returned to prison at significantly lower rates than offenders who were released from prison in both 2005 or 2008.
- Again, lower recidivism numbers for the RREC cohort could be explained by fewer remands.
• CJPPD recently completed a study of recidivism among offenders released in 2011, so comparative analysis could be expanded.
• 3 years after discharge, 49% of the RREC cohort was returned, a rate lower than for prisoner-cohorts in previous years.
The RREC cohort after 3-years

- Although the entire RREC cohort returned at a 49% rate, offenders discharging from the community returned at a significantly lower 41% rate.
Reasons for the first return-to-prison

The data illustrates that although remands may have a prophylactic effect on crime, the reduction in remands appear to have had a significant impact on reduced recidivism.
Nationwide juvenile arrests

Juvenile Arrest Rates* 2000 through 2012, Connecticut and the US

* Rate per 100,000 juveniles in the population aged 10 to 17

CT juvenile arrests, by age, 2008 through 2013

Statewide arrests by age of arrestee

Age of arrestee
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New admits to prison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change '08 to '13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>-87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>2206</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 32</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 to 45</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 5756 to 3914, Change: -32%
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