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INTRODUCTION

Recidivism figures for any single year provide only a static view of a number of dynamic phenomena. Individuals change physically, cognitively and emotionally during the course of their incarceration. Challenges facing the communities and families to which offenders return also change, as do public policy and the dynamics of the criminal justice system. To document these changes, the Hampden County Sheriff’s Department conducts an ongoing study of recidivism that follows each sentenced offender from the beginning of their sentence for a period of three years post release. Beginning with 2174 offenders released in 2000, the study now covers nearly 39,000 individuals released over an 18-year period. Recidivism rates are reported at one and three-year intervals. To our knowledge, there is no other recidivism study of this magnitude being conducted at any comparable facility in the country.

For this report, recidivism rates were calculated from varied perspectives including demographic characteristics, offense types, release type, classification, criminogenic risks and criminal history in the attempt to identify those variables most commonly associated with a return to criminal activity. Analyzing recidivism is a complex process, and examining why some individuals return to criminal behavior while others do not is somewhat like assembling a jigsaw puzzle with many pieces. All the data are informative in some way, but no single variable can be identified as a causal factor.

There is seldom only one triggering mechanism that leads to recidivism, but a confluence of circumstances and factors, some that are shared by many, others that are unique to the individual. One drawback to the consideration of an overall recidivism rate is that it may mask the effect of personal and environmental influences and certain life circumstances (drug use, school, work, domestic relations, lack of adequate housing) that significantly influence criminal behavior. So what can we learn from this study? With a sample size so large covering an extensive period of time, the data from this study reveal trends in offender characteristics and behavior that are useful in making security, classification and programming decisions and allocating resources to enhance each offender’s potential for successful reintegration into society. The data also provide information as to how other agencies such as parole, probation and the courts affect our population and support the need for collaboration with both public and private partners to respond to emerging issues.
METHODOLOGY

Lists of individuals released from the House of Correction are drawn monthly by a query of the Jail Management System (JMS) and the TRAX Case Management System. Offenders not released to the street (transferred to other institutions or returned to pretrial status for new charges) are not included. Official criminal records are accessed from the Department of Criminal Justice Information Services (DCJIS) website. Any activity within the criminal court system in Massachusetts is recorded.

Recidivism is reported along four dimensions:

- **New Arraignment** – arraignment in any Massachusetts court for *new criminal offense*.

- **New Conviction** – any guilty finding on a *new case*. Dispositions range from guilty-filed to commitment.

- **New Incarceration** – sentence of any length to a federal, state or county correctional facility for a *new offense*.

- **Technical Violation** - return to custody for violation of either parole or probation for any reason other than a new offense.

Several data sources are utilized in preparing the recidivism report. Information relative to gender, race, age, residence, current charges, sentence, release type and classification are obtained from JMS. Assessment data are retrieved from TRAX. Parole violations are tracked through JMS and the Notice of Preliminary Hearing (Form A) from the Institutional Parole Office. Data on probation violations are recorded from the official criminal record.
OVERVIEW OF THE 2019 RELEASE COHORT

- During 2019, 1079 sentenced offenders were released to the street. This represents a decrease of 154 (12%) from the previous year.

- Of those released, 29% (308) were females and 71% (771) were males.

- 14.4% (155) were paroled and 88.6% (924) were released via expiration of sentence or payment of fines (“wrapped”). Two inmates had their sentences revised or revoked by the court. Parolees served 55% of their sentence; those who wrapped served 74%.

- 58% (177) of females and 74% (573) of males were already recidivists by virtue of having at least one prior adult incarceration.

- Of those serving their first adult incarceration, 26% (85) had a juvenile record in Massachusetts. Mean age at first arrest was 19. Six percent were arrested at age 12 or younger.

- Female releases ranged in age from 20 to 69 years of age. The most common age was 28. Males ranged from 19 to 73 years; the most common age was 31.

- 9% of the females released were African American, 19% were Hispanic and 69% were Caucasian. Of the male releases, 16% were African American, 49% were Hispanic and 34% were Caucasian.

- The breakdown of security level at time of release was as follows: Medium/Maximum 54%, Minimum/PRC 17%, Community Reentry Unit (CRU) 10%, WMRWC 16% and Day Reporting 3%. 
The 2018 release cohort included 81 DOC reentry inmates (11 females, 70 males), 22 Bureau of Prisons inmates (1 female, 21 males) and 4 United States Probationers (all males). 89% were released from lower security.

68% (729) of those released served time for a nonviolent offense (property, drugs, MV, prostitution, other), 32% (350) for a violent offense (crime against a person, domestic violence, sex offense, firearms).

23% served a sentence of 90 days or less, 27% between 90 and 180 days, 16% between 180 and 364 days, and 34% a year or more.

68 individuals served sentences part or all of which were mandatory. These mandatory sentences accrued 18,135 bed-days, 9,465 for MV offenses, 6,480 for firearms and 1,825 for drugs.

38% of those released were from Springfield, 10% from Holyoke, 7% from Chicopee, 14% from other Hampden County towns, 25% from other counties and 2.5% from out of state. 33 individuals did not provide an address. Worcester County women accounted for 37% of female releases.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2019 Releases One Year Post Release

- Of the 1079 inmates released in 2019, 64 (5.9%) were reincarcerated within one year for a new offense and 36 (3.3%) returned for a technical violation of parole or probation. The new offense rate decreased from 9.8% the previous year.

- The total reincarceration rate was 9.2%, a decrease of 5.1 percentage points from the previous year. This is the ninth year of success rates of more than 80%.

- Mean time to recidivate was 137 days. 39% of new arraignments occurred within 90 days of release, and 67% occurred within 180 days of release.

- 200 individuals had new cases awaiting disposition at the end of the first year post release. Disposition of these cases will be reflected in the three-year follow up.

- 73 new arraignments were dismissed, nol pros (not prosecuted) or continued without a finding.

- 66 men and 8 women had new restraining orders filed against them after their release.

- Many new arraignments lead to incarceration for violation of release conditions. This is particularly true of nonviolent offenses, which represented 61% of new arraignments, but only 34% of new incarcerations.
• 43% of those serving time for a violent offense were arraigned for a new violent offense. These are primarily young minority offenders with substance use, criminal associates, mental health and poor family support the leading risk factors. 51% lack a high school diploma or equivalent, 74% were released without supervision.

• Mean sentence for a new offense was 249 days, for a probation violation 215 days and for a parole violation 87 days.

• Offenders with Pre/Work Release status had the lowest re-incarceration rates (7.6%) following by WMRWC (7.8%).

• Juvenile history, unemployment, substance use and criminal associates were most strongly correlated with re-incarceration. Adult criminal history (2 or more adult convictions) was also a significant predictor.

• Special reentry populations included 81 DOC and 26 Bureau of Prisons and US Probation inmates. Thirteen DOC and 2 Federal inmates have been re-arraigned; 1 DOC inmate and 1 BOP inmate have been re-incarcerated.

• Black males had the highest reincarceration rates for a new offense and the lowest rates for technical violations. Because the female population is overwhelmingly White, it is difficult to make comparisons; however, Black women were re-incarcerated for new crime at a much rate than either Hispanic or White women.

• For males, those aged 18-24 were nearly three times more likely to be arraigned for a new crime as those over 50. For females, rates of reoffending for a new crime are highest for those 31-40.
- Hampden County women had the highest overall reincarceration rate (10.7%) followed by Worcester County (8.7%).
2017 Releases Three Years Post Release

- Three years post-release, 60.2% (882) of offenders had been arraigned, 39.2% (581) had been convicted and **25.4% (372) had been incarcerated for a new crime.** Another 6.8% (99) had been incarcerated for a technical violation of probation or parole (most in the first year).

- **The total three-year reincarceration rate for 2017 releases is 32.2%.**

- Rates of re-offending drop off significantly in the second and third year post-release. 69% of new arraignments occurred in the first year post release, another 23% in the second year and 8% in the third year.

- Participants in Minimum/PRC and Day Reporting commit significantly fewer new offenses that those released from other security levels.

- Although the overall reincarceration rate for those who were paroled is higher than those who completed their sentence, only 8.3% of parolees committed a new offense compared to 28.2% of those who wrapped up their sentence. The majority of parolees return for violation of their release conditions.

- Those arraigned for a violent offense were most likely to be incarcerated for that offense. A nonviolent offense, however, often resulted in a violation of parole or probation.

- Three years after release, 40% of 2017 releases remained crime-free, and nearly 75% had not been reincarcerated for a new crime.
SECTION ONE

ONE-YEAR RECIDIVISM RATES

2019 RELEASES
ONE-YEAR RECIDIVISM RATES
2019 RELEASES

Recidivism Type (% of Total Releases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recidivism Type</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The incarceration rate for a new offense decreased significantly from 9.8% to 5.9%. An additional 3.3% returned for a technical violation of parole or probation. The total re-incarceration rate of 9.2% is down over 5 percentage points from the previous year.
39% of new arraignments occur within 90 days of release, and 67% within 180 days of release. Mean time to recidivate was 137 days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Activity</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Cases-New</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Cases-Existing</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Warrants</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Restraining Order</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most existing cases remain open for a period of probation supervision.
### Disposition of New Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting Disposition</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nol Pros</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued w/o Finding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fined/Filed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Sentence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty-Time Served</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

200 individuals had new cases awaiting disposition at the end of their first year post release. Disposition of these cases will be reflected in the three year follow up.
## Reincarceration Rates by Original Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Offense Type</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Offense Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 violent offenders (52 men and 9 women) were arraigned for a new violent offense. These are primarily younger minority offenders who score as high risk, with substance use, unemployment, criminal associates, mental health and poor family support the leading risk factors. 51% lack a high school diploma or equivalent, 57% have a juvenile history and 93% have 2 or more adult convictions. 74% were released with no supervision. Forty-two were released from medium/maximum, 8 from the CRU, 3 from WMRWC and 8 from minimum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Violent and nonviolent offenders recidivate at the same rates.
## New Offense (% of Arraignments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Females N</th>
<th>Females %</th>
<th>Males N</th>
<th>Males %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Violent Offenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Nonviolent</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>65.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>184</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Violation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Technical Violations</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women were arraigned for nonviolent offenses at a higher rate than men, particularly property crimes. Men were more likely to be arraigned for a domestic violence offense.
### New Incarceration Offense (% of New Incarcerations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Violent Offenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Nonviolent Offense</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Violation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Technical Violations</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first offense for which an individual is arraigned is often not what leads to a new incarceration, instead, a new arraignment often leads to a violation of probation or parole. This is particularly true of nonviolent offenses, which account for 61% of new arraignments, but only 34% of incarcerations.

47% of men and 72% of women were reincarcerated for violating parole or probation.
### New Sentence (Days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean sentence length can be skewed by an extreme value therefore it is more accurate to use the *median* when making comparisons. Median sentence for a probation violation was highest at 240 days, for a new offense 180 days and for a parole violation only 67 days. This is because parolees receive credit for time served on parole prior to revocation.
### Incarceration Rates by Security Level & Type of Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Return</th>
<th>Technical N</th>
<th>Technical %</th>
<th>New Offense N</th>
<th>New Offense %</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Reporting (38)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum (120)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/Work Release (66)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRU (109)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMRWC (167)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Security Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Gen. Pop. (298)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Reentry (257)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum (15)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium/Maximum Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Incarceration Rates by Security Level

![Bar Chart showing Incarceration Rates by Security Level](chart.png)
**Incarceration Rates by Risk and Security Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Lower Security</th>
<th>Medium/Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Risk</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offenders generally recidivate at lower levels when released from a lower security setting.
## Violations of Release Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parole Violation-Technical</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Violation-New Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violation-Technical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violation-New Offense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Re-incarceration Rates by Release Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wrap</th>
<th>Parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reincarceration rate for parolees was nearly three times that of those who wrapped however, most parolees were reincarcerated for technical violations. Those who wrapped were far more likely to be reincarcerated for a new crime while committing only 10 technical violations of probation.

## Re-incarceration Rates by Post Release Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Only (234)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Only (111)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation &amp; Parole (44)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (689)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### One-Year Recidivism Rates (2019 Releases)

#### Special Reentry Populations

**Doc Reentry Class at Release**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Reporting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/Work Release</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRU</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMRWC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOC Recidivism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technical Violations**  None

**Disposition of New Cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-Awaiting Disposal</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed/Nol Pros</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fined/Filed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>1 (Possess to distribute class A, B, E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bureau of Prisons/US Probation Class at Release

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Reporting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/Work Release</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two males were arraigned for a new crime. One individual received a suspended sentence and one individual was incarcerated for 90 days for distribution of a class A drug.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black (124)</th>
<th>Hispanic (378)</th>
<th>White (265)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Offense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment</td>
<td>50 40.3</td>
<td>153 40.5</td>
<td>83 31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>16 12.9</td>
<td>41 10.8</td>
<td>28 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>12 9.7</td>
<td>26 6.9</td>
<td>17 6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Violation</strong></td>
<td>2 1.6</td>
<td>10 2.6</td>
<td>8 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black males had the highest reincarceration rates for a new offense and the lowest rates for technical violations.
### Recidivism by Race – Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black (28)</th>
<th>Hispanic (58)</th>
<th>White (214)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Offense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Violation</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the female population is overwhelmingly White, it is difficult to make comparisons; however, Black women were re-incarcerated for new crime at a much rate (7.1%) than either Hispanic (5.2%) or White women (1.9%).
### Recidivism by Age – Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-24 (67)</th>
<th>25-30 (175)</th>
<th>31-40 (294)</th>
<th>41-50 (158)</th>
<th>Over 50 (77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Offense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment</td>
<td>36 53.7</td>
<td>67 38.3</td>
<td>123 41.8</td>
<td>45 28.5</td>
<td>16 20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>11 16.4</td>
<td>21 12.0</td>
<td>32 10.9</td>
<td>17 10.8</td>
<td>4  5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>9 13.4</td>
<td>12 6.9</td>
<td>20 6.8</td>
<td>11 7.0</td>
<td>3  3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Violation</strong></td>
<td>3 4.5</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>6 2.0</td>
<td>4 2.5</td>
<td>2 2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rates of re-offending generally decrease with age. Those aged 18-24 were nearly three times more likely to be arraigned for a new crime as those over 50.
Recidivism by Age – Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>Over 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(89)</td>
<td>(122)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rates of reoffending for a new crime are highest for those 31-40. Technical violation rates were very high for those 25-30.
### Recidivism Rates by County – County Women Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Berkshire (41)</th>
<th>Hampden (94)</th>
<th>Hampshire (16)</th>
<th>Worcester (138)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Offense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment</td>
<td>16 39.0</td>
<td>34 36.2</td>
<td>5 31.3</td>
<td>45 32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>4 9.8</td>
<td>10 10.6</td>
<td>1 6.3</td>
<td>17 12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
<td>4 4.3</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>4 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Violation</strong></td>
<td>2 4.9</td>
<td>6 6.4</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>8 5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hampden County women had the highest overall reincarceration rate (10.7%) followed by Worcester County (8.7%).
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## 2017 RELEASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 Recidivism Rates</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraignment</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the end of the third year post-release, 25.4% of offenders had been reincarcerated for a new offense. The 6.8% technical violation rate increased slightly from the previous year. The total reincarceration rate after three years was 32.2%.

The three-year rate for women was 31.3%, for men 32.5%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to New Arraignment (% of Arraignments and Violation Hearings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69% of new arraignments occur in the first year post-release, another 23% in the second year and 8% in the third year.
2017 Three-Year Recidivism Rates

- Arraignment: 60.2%
- Conviction: 39.7%
- Incarceration: 25.4%

- Technical Violation
- New Offense
## Reincarceration Rates by Classification & Year of Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th># Released</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th></th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th></th>
<th>Third Year</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Released</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td># Released</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>Third Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Reporting</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12 20.7</td>
<td>3 5.2</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum/PRC</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>19 10.3</td>
<td>16 8.6</td>
<td>13 7.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reentry Unit</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>20 12.9</td>
<td>15 9.7</td>
<td>11 7.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMRWC</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>46 16.5</td>
<td>17 6.1</td>
<td>5 1.8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium/Maximum</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>156 19.9</td>
<td>92 11.8</td>
<td>44 5.6</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those released from WMRWC and Minimum/PRC had the highest success rates after three years.

## Reincarceration Rates by Classification & Return Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th># Released</th>
<th>New Offense</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Released</td>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Reporting</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10 17.3</td>
<td>6 10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum/PRC</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>35 18.9</td>
<td>13 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reentry Unit</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>34 21.9</td>
<td>12 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMRWC</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>45 16.1</td>
<td>23 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium/Maximum</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>248 31.7</td>
<td>44 5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those released from the MI and the CRU were most likely to be reincarcerated for a new offense by the end of the third year post-release.
### Reincarceration Rates by Release Type & Reason for Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wrapped (N=1259)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violation of Probation</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>398</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paroled (N=206)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violation of Parole</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violation of Probation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Offense on Parole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Offense <em>after</em> Parole Supervision</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the overall reincarceration rate for parolees is higher, only 8% of parolees were committed for a new offense, compared to 32% of those who wrapped up their sentence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Arraignment Offense</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Violent Offenses</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offenses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Nonviolent Offenses</strong></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Violation-Technical</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violation-Technical</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Technical Violations</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Incarceration Offense</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Violent Offenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offenses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Nonviolent Offenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>158</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>222</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Violation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violations of Release Conditions</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>159</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those arraigned for a violent offense were most likely to be incarcerated for that offense. A nonviolent offense, however, often resulted in a violation of parole or probation. 69% of new arraignments were for nonviolent offenses, but only 47% of new incarcerations. Violations represent only 8% of new arraignments, but 37% of incarcerations.
SECTION III
RECIDIVISM SUMMARY
With the implementation of mandatory targeted programs in 2001, the percentage of offenders released from lower security increased steadily, while recidivism rates decreased. The trend began leveling off in 2011, and the gap had begun to close in the last three years, as overall population has decreased and the severity and chronicity of offenders’ criminogenic risk factors increased. In 2018, the gap began to widen once again.
One-Year Reincarceration Rates

![Bar chart showing one-year reincarceration rates from 2001 to 2019. The chart includes bars for new crimes and technical violations.](image-url)
### Three-Year Recidivism Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arraigned</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Violation</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three years after release, 40% of 2017 releases remained crime-free, and nearly 75% had not been incarcerated for a new crime. Technical violation rates remained low, driven in part by the lower number of parolees. For example, in 2010 over 27% of sentenced releases were parolees, and the reincarceration rate for technical violation (mostly of parole) was 8.9%. By 2015, following the reorganization of the Parole Board, paroles had decreased to only 13% of sentenced releases, and the violation rate was 5.8%. Paroles increased slightly in 2017, accompanied by a rise in revocation rates.
Three-Year Recidivism Rates
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## ONE-YEAR REINCARCERATION RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Number Released</th>
<th>New Offense</th>
<th>Technical Violation</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2434</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2468</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2362</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2197</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td>Technical Violation</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>