

CENTER  
FOR  
COURT  
INNOVATION

A Project of the Fund for the City of New York

RESEARCH

# Recidivism Among Parolees in New York City, 2001-2008

BY BRYN A. HERRSCHAFT  
WITH ZACHARY HAMILTON

NOVEMBER 2011

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This analysis would not have been possible if it were not for the assistance of the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) and their provision of the sample and recidivism data used in this report. The authors are solely responsible for the methodology and results obtained with the DCJS data. We would also like to thank Center staff including Mike Rempel, Chris Watler, Greg Berman, and Al Siegel for their editorial support.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This research brief presents recidivism rates for parolees who are returning to New York City from state prison facilities. The case sample included formerly incarcerated persons who were released to New York City parole supervision between June 1, 2001 and February 1, 2008. Analyses examine recidivism rates over one-, two-, and three-year tracking periods. Major findings include:

- **Parolee Characteristics:** Parolees returning to New York City are predominantly male (91%), nonwhite (57% black and 35% Hispanic), and multiple-time offenders (10.6 prior arrests and 7.3 prior convictions on average). In addition, 47% were imprisoned on drug charges, 30% on violent felony charges, and 23% on other charges; and almost one-fourth (23%) had a previous parole episode on the same case that ended in re-incarceration.
- **Recidivism Rates:** Over the three-year tracking period:
  - The re-arrest rate was 53%.
  - The re-conviction rate was 42%.
  - Almost one-third (29%) of the parolees had their parole revoked and were returned to prison (23% for a technical violation and 6% for a new felony conviction).
- **Change in Revocation Rates over Time:** Since the early 2000s, three-year revocation rates in New York City declined (from 32% among those released in 2002 to 26% among those released in 2006). The decline stems exclusively from a decline in technical violation revocations (from 27% among 2002 releases to 21% among 2006 releases).
- **Predictors of Recidivism:** Among the strongest predictors of recidivism (including re-arrest, re-conviction, and revocation) are a younger age, more prior arrests and convictions, and having already been paroled earlier on the same case only to have been re-incarcerated.

## **Introduction**

In a series of recent reports, the Pew Center on the States found that approximately one out of every 100 American adults was incarcerated and one out of every 31 adults was under criminal justice supervision including probation and parole (Pew Center on the States, 2008). The Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that in 2009, almost 1.4 million adults had spent at least some time on parole supervision. Of those exiting parole supervision during that same year, 34% were re-incarcerated and 11% had another unsuccessful outcome, including revocation without incarceration or absconding (Glaze and Bonzcar, 2010).

Less is known about parolee characteristics, recidivism rates, and trends within some of the local jurisdictions that are home to large numbers of formerly incarcerated persons, where efforts to improve the current system could make the most difference. In New York State, for example, a recent report of the Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) provided statewide outcomes but did not break out New York City data. However, New York City accounts for the majority of parolees supervised in New York State (56%) yielding significant implications for community corrections policy (see New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, 2009).

In 2008, the Center for Court Innovation obtained a dataset with parole recidivism data for all of New York City as part of its work with Upper Manhattan Reentry Task Force. The Upper Manhattan Reentry Task Force was established in 2007 in collaboration with the New York City Mayor's Office of the Criminal Justice Coordinator to address reentry issues in East and Central Harlem, Washington Heights, and Inwood. The Upper Manhattan Reentry Task Force is one of eighteen reentry task force projects funded by the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) as part of a statewide reentry effort.

This report seeks to provide a portrait of offenders returning to New York City from New York State prison facilities to parole supervision. The portrait outlines case volume and outcome trends for the entire city as well as for the five boroughs individually. Known key predictors of recidivism are also examined for their application to the New York City parole population. Findings from this study are also compared to the findings from a 2010 DCJS report to analyze differences in outcomes between New York State as a whole and New York City.

## **Sampling Frame**

The sample used for the current analyses was provided by the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. Two eligibility criteria were utilized for study inclusion: 1) offenders were released to parole supervision between June 1, 2001 and February 1, 2008; and 2) offenders were initially arrested in one of the five boroughs of New York City (with the vast majority returning to a location near the initial arrest location following incarceration).

Table 1 describes the volume and characteristics of the parolee population between 2001 and 2008 in New York City. Including extrapolated annualized estimates for two partial years (2001 and 2008) the volume of returning offenders has remained relatively constant throughout the city. The average age of released offenders in New York City is 29.8 and the vast majority of parolees (91%) are male. A large percentage of returning offenders are black (57%) and Hispanic (35%), whereas white and other parolees account for a very small proportion of the returning population (8%).

**Table 1. Sample Distribution and Relevant Characteristics for New York City (N = 59,817)**

<b><i>Year of Release</i></b>	
2001*	15%
2002	14%
2003	13%
2004	12%
2005	11%
2006	11%
2007	12%
2008*	13%
<b><i>Demographics</i></b>	
Mean Age	29.8
Male	91%
<b><i>Race</i></b>	
Black	57%
Hispanic	35%
White	7%
Other	1%
Born in USA	84%
<b><i>Criminal History (means)</i></b>	
Total Prior Arrests	10.6
Misdemeanor	4.8
Felony	5.8
Drug	4.0
Violent Felony	1.9
Total Prior Convictions	7.3
Misdemeanor	3.8
Felony	1.9
Drug	2.0
Violent Felony	0.5
<b><i>Any Prior Convictions</i></b>	
Drug	58%
Violent Felony	33%
<b><i>Instant Case</i></b>	
Drug	47%
Violent	30%
Other	23%
Length of Initial Sentence (years)	3.2
Prior Parole Term on Current Case	23%

\*Partial year due to data collection selection dates. Percentages in those rows represent estimates of case totals for a full year.

**Table 2. Sample Distribution and Relevant Characteristics by Borough**

	<b>BRONX</b> n=13,717	<b>BROOKLYN</b> n =12,639	<b>MANHATTAN</b> n =24,020	<b>QUEENS</b> n =8,127	<b>STATEN ISLAND</b> n = 1,317
<b>Year</b>					
2001*	16%	14%	15%	15%	15%
2002	14%	13%	14%	13%	14%
2003	13%	12%	13%	13%	11%
2004	12%	11%	12%	12%	11%
2005	10%	11%	11%	10%	9%
2006	10%	12%	11%	11%	8%
2007	12%	14%	12%	12%	12%
2008*	12%	13%	12%	14%	20%
<b>Demographics</b>					
<i>Mean Age</i>	29.3	27.7	31.9	28.3	28.0
<i>Male</i>	90%	93%	90%	93%	92%
<i>Race</i>					
Black	42%	62%	60%	62%	54%
Hispanic	53%	30%	33%	24%	16%
White	4%	7%	6%	12%	30%
Other	< 1%	< 1%	1%	2%	1%
<i>Born in USA</i>	77%	87%	85%	88%	96%
<b>Criminal History</b>					
<i>(means)</i>					
<i>Total Prior Arrests</i>	9.9	9.6	12.1	8.7	9.9
Misdemeanor	4.3	3.8	6.0	3.6	4.1
Felony	5.7	5.9	6.1	5.1	5.7
Drug	4.2	3.2	4.7	2.9	3.3
Violent Felony	1.7	2.3	1.9	1.9	2.1
<i>Total Prior Convictions</i>	7.1	6.2	8.5	6.1	6.0
Misdemeanor	3.6	2.6	5.1	2.6	2.7
Felony	1.8	1.7	2.0	1.9	1.6
Drug	2.2	1.2	2.5	1.3	1.2
Violent Felony	<0.5	0.5	<0.5	0.5	<0.5
<i>Any Prior Convictions</i>					
Drug	66%	47%	63%	49%	49%
Violent Felony	32%	37%	31%	35%	29%
<b>Instant Case</b>					
Drug	57%	34%	53%	36%	36%
Violent	27%	41%	23%	37%	31%
Weapon	1%	4%	2%	2%	3%
Other	14%	23%	23%	25%	30%
<i>Length of Initial Sentence (years)</i>	3.1	3.5	3.0	3.3	2.7
<i>Re-Paroled on Current Case</i>	25%	22%	22%	19%	26%

\*Partial year due to data collection selection dates. Percentages in those rows represent estimates of case totals for a full year.

Criminal history measures indicate a substantial amount of prior criminal behavior. The average number of prior arrests is 10.6, of which 5.8 were felony arrests. Total convictions averaged 7.3. Most convictions were for misdemeanor offenses (3.8), although parolees still averaged 1.9 felony convictions. Parolees averaged two convictions for drug-related offenses, with 58% having at least one prior drug conviction. Thirty-three percent of parolees had at least one prior violent felony conviction. Most parolees in New York City were serving time for drug convictions (47%). The average number of years on the current sentence was 3.2,<sup>1</sup> while 23% of the population were re-paroled, meaning that they had already served at least one prior parole term for the same case.

Table 2 describes the volume and characteristics of the parolee population between 2001 and 2008 for the five boroughs of New York City individually. Although most statistics are consistent across the five boroughs, there are several boroughs that present important differences from the general trends. Manhattan statistics reveal a slightly older parolee population with an average age of 31.9. Manhattan also displayed a slightly higher average number of prior convictions (8.5) compared with the New York City average (7.3). Over half of the parolee population in the Bronx is Hispanic (53%). The borough of Staten Island reported a parolee population that is 30% white and 70% minority. Both the Bronx (57%) and Manhattan (53%) had a higher proportion of parolees serving time for drug-related offenses while Brooklyn (41%) and Queens (37%) had much larger proportions of parolees serving time for violent offenses. Compared to other boroughs, Staten Island had a smaller percentage of individuals on parole who were re-paroled on their current case (19%).

### **Recidivism Outcomes**

Table 3 depicts one-, two- and three-year recidivism outcomes for the parolee population for all of New York City and for each borough individually. Revocations are broken down into revocations for technical violations and revocations following a conviction for a new felony offense. A revocation for a technical violation occurs when parolees are returned to prison for a violation of the conditions of their supervised release; such violations may include an arrest for a new crime or a conviction for a misdemeanor offense. In line with the definition used by the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (2010), only revocations tied to a new *felony* level conviction are classified as a conviction-based rather than a technical violation-based revocations.

As shown in Table 3, 32% of parolees in New York City are re-arrested within the first year following release. This proportion is fairly similar across all of the boroughs. Twenty-three percent of parolees in New York City are re-convicted during the first year, with proportions also similar across boroughs. On average, 16% of all parolees experience a revocation in their first year of release, and 15% of all parolees abscond, meaning that they disappear from contact with their parole officers for at least some period of time.

As expected, recidivism rates over two-year and three-year tracking periods following release were higher. Forty-five percent of all parolees in New York City experience a re-arrest within two years. Re-arrest rates were slightly higher in the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Staten Island than in Manhattan and Queens. Overall, 35% of New York City parolees were re-convicted, 25% were revoked, and 20% absconded within two years following release to parole.

---

<sup>1</sup> In New York State, some sentences involve a range of years (one to three years, three to six years, etc.). In these cases, calculations are based on the minimum length.

**Table 3. Recidivism Outcomes**

	NYC	Bronx	Brooklyn	Manhattan	Queens	Staten Island
<b>N</b>	59,817	13,717	12,639	24,020	8,127	1,317
<b>Year 1 Outcomes</b>						
<i>Rearrest</i>	32%	34%	32%	32%	29%	34%
<i>Reconviction</i>	23%	25%	22%	23%	22%	25%
<i>Revocation</i>	16%	16%	15%	17%	14%	17%
Technical	15%	15%	14%	16%	3%	16%
New Conviction	1.4%	1.1%	1.2%	1.8%	1.2%	1.4%
<i>Abscond</i>	15%	15%	15%	17%	12%	12%
<b>Year 2 Outcomes</b>						
<i>Rearrest</i>	45%	49%	46%	44%	42%	48%
<i>Reconviction</i>	35%	39%	33%	34%	33%	37%
<i>Revocation</i>	25%	26%	25%	27%	23%	25%
Technical	21%	23%	21%	22%	19%	21%
New Conviction	4.2%	3.4%	3.6%	5.0%	3.6%	4.3%
<i>Abscond</i>	20%	20%	19%	22%	16%	15%
<b>Year 3 Outcomes</b>						
<i>Rearrest</i>	53%	57%	53%	51%	49%	55%
<i>Reconviction</i>	42%	46%	40%	40%	40%	44%
<i>Revocation</i>	29%	29%	29%	31%	26%	30%
Technical	23%	24%	23%	24%	21%	22%
New Conviction	6.1%	5.2%	5.6%	7.0%	5.1%	6.4%
<i>Abscond</i>	22%	23%	20%	24%	17%	16%

\*F-tests for significance were used to compare counties across all measures. However, due to the large N, all comparisons were significant.

Over three years following release, more than half (53%) of parolees were re-arrested. The Bronx had the highest three-year re-arrest rate (57%); Manhattan (51%) and Queens (49%) had the lowest. Within three years after release, 42% of parolees were re-convicted, 29% were revoked, and 22% had absconded at some point. Queens and Staten Island reported significantly lower rates of absconders at the three-year mark than any other borough. Across all boroughs, parolees showed a fairly stable number of months spent in the community before they were re-arrested, re-convicted, or absconded from parole; the average parolee spent 19 months in the community before re-arrest, 25 months before re-conviction, and 27 months before they absconded.

### **Key Predictors of Recidivism Outcomes for New York City**

Several analyses were conducted to identify key predictors of recidivism, including race, age, months of custody, prior parole episode, charge in the instant offense, number of prior arrests, number of prior felony convictions, number of prior felony convictions, and number of prior drug convictions. Bi-variate comparisons on the relationship of these key predictors with recidivism outcomes over the three-year tracking period are presented in Tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 below.

Based on these results, it appears that the parolee population which is re-arrested, re-convicted, and/or revoked differs significantly from the parolee population which does not have these outcomes on almost all key demographic and criminal history predictors of recidivism.



**Table 4.1 Key Predictors of Re-arrest**

N	Re-arrest 31,431	No Re-arrest 28,386
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>		
Black	59%	52%
White	6%	9%
Hispanic	35%	38%
Other	< 1%	1%
<b>Male</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>Born in the USA</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>Re-Paroled on Case</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>Instant Case</b>		
Drug	49%	46%
Violent	29%	31%
Weapon	2%	2%
Other	21%	22%
<b>Age (mean)</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Total Arrests (mean)</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>
Misdemeanor	6	3
Drug	7	3
Felony	2	5
Violent Felony	5	1
<b>Total Convictions (mean)</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>
Misdemeanor	5	3
Drug	3	2
Felony	2	2
Violent Felony	1	<1
<b>Length of Initial Sentence (mean years)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

\*ANOVA tests for significant difference between the means of the groups indicated all predictors were significant at the .001 level.

**Table 4.2 Key Predictors of Reconviction**

N	Reconviction 24,843	No Reconviction 34,974
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>		
Black	59%	54%
White	6%	8%
Hispanic **	35%	37%
Other	< 1%	1%
<b>Male</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>Born in the USA</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>81%</b>
<b>Re-Paroled on Case</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>Instant Case</b>		
Drug	50%	46%
Violent	27%	32%
Weapon	1%	2%
Other	22%	21%
<b>Age (mean)</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Total Arrests (mean)</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>
Misdemeanor	7	3
Drug	5	3
Felony	7	5
Violent Felony	2	2
<b>Total Convictions (mean)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
Misdemeanor	6	3
Drug	3	2
Felony	2	2
Violent Felony	1	<1
<b>Length of Initial Sentence (mean years)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

\*\*ANOVA tests for significant difference between the means of the groups indicated all predictors were significant at the .001 level except there was no difference between the two groups on the percentage of Hispanic individuals in these groups.

**Table 4.3 Key Predictors of Revocation**

<b>N</b>	<b>Revocation 16,150</b>	<b>No Revocation 43,667</b>
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>		
Black	60%	55%
White	6%	8%
Hispanic	35%	37%
Other	< 1%	1%
<b>Male</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>91%</b>
<b>Born in the USA</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>Re-Paroled on Case</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>Instant Case</b>		
Drug	49%	47%
Violent	26%	31%
Weapon	1%	2%
Other	24%	21%
<b>Age (mean)</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Total Arrests (mean)</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>
Misdemeanor	6	4
Drug	5	4
Felony	7	5
Violent Felony	2	2
<b>Total Convictions (mean)</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>
Misdemeanor	5	3
Drug	2	2
Felony	2	2
Violent Felony	1	<1
<b>Length of Initial Sentence (mean years)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

\*ANOVA tests for significant difference between the means of the groups indicated all predictors were significant at the .001 level.

Specifically, those who were re-arrested, re-convicted, and/or revoked had significantly higher percentages of minorities, especially black individuals, and were significantly younger than parolees who did not have these outcomes. Those who were re-arrested, re-convicted, and/or revoked were also more likely to be male, born in the USA, and re-paroled when compared with parolees who had not experienced these outcomes. Individuals who had been re-arrested, re-convicted, and/or revoked were also more likely to have an instant case offense involving drugs when compared with parolees who had not experienced these outcomes. As expected, parolees with a re-arrest, re-conviction, and/or revocation at the three-year benchmark also appeared to have longer and more extensive criminal histories than parolees who did not experience these outcomes. For example, those who were re-convicted within three years following release had an average number of fourteen (14) prior convictions compared to those who were not re-convicted at this benchmark (8).

Additionally, logistic regression models were used to examine three-year post release outcomes, accounting for the same predictors utilized in the bivariate comparisons above but controlling for all predictors simultaneously (see Tables in Appendix A). Results include the following:

- Both Black and Hispanic offenders had a greater likelihood of being re-arrested, re-convicted, and/or revoked at the three-year follow-up point.
- Age was significantly predictive of all measures of recidivism for the three-year period following release – younger offenders were more likely to be re-arrested, re-convicted, and/or revoked than older offenders.

- Re-paroled status (prior failed parole episode on the current case) significantly predicted all measures of recidivism and was the predictor with the single largest impact on the likelihood of revocation – individuals with a prior parole term were more than twice as likely to be revoked over individuals serving a first parole term on their current case.
- Total prior arrests and total prior felony convictions, two possible measures of an extensive criminal history, each predicted more negative post-release outcomes in all analyses.
- The number of months of custody significantly predicted all measures of recidivism over the three year period – the longer the sentence, the less likely the parolee was to recidivate.
- Individuals with either a drug offense or violent offense were more likely to be re-arrested and re-convicted, but were less likely to be revoked during the three-year follow-up period.

### Comparison of Recidivism Outcomes for New York City and New York State

In 2010, the New York State Division of Criminal Justice released its *Crimestat* report for 2009. This report included criminal justice system data for the state, including data and statistics surrounding offender reentry and parole. A significant portion of the offender reentry section was dedicated to the analysis of data on parolee recidivism in New York State, including returns to prison for new convictions and for technical violations. However, the DCJS report measured recidivism only as a return to prison, for either a technical violation or for a new conviction; therefore, comparisons can only be made for these two outcomes between New York State and New York City, not for re-arrests or re-convictions.

Table 5.1 below displays the differences between parolees in New York State (including New York City) and parolees in New York City only on returns to prison for both new convictions and technical violations. Comparisons are for releases in each individual year between 2002 and 2006.

**Table 5.1 Return to Prison Outcomes – Release Years 2002-2006**

	<i>New York State</i>					<i>New York City</i>				
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Number Released	25,634	26,315	24,911	24,223	24,520	9,932	9,410	8,564	7,887	7,945
<b>Returned within 1 year</b>										
Percent Returned – TV <sup>1</sup>	15.1%	15.5%	15.0%	16.4%	18.4%	15.4%	14.9%	12.6%	12.8%	12.9%
Percent Returned – NC <sup>2</sup>	2.9%	3.0%	2.8%	2.7%	2.7%	1.0%	1.5%	1.6%	1.8%	2.0%
Total Percent Returned	<b>18.0%</b>	<b>18.5%</b>	<b>17.8%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>21.3%</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>16.4%</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	<b>14.6%</b>	<b>14.9%</b>
<b>Returned within 2 years</b>										
Percent Returned - TV <sup>1</sup>	24.0%	23.9%	24.5%	26.9%	27.5%	24.1%	22.3%	20.5%	19.2%	19.6%
Percent Returned – NC <sup>2</sup>	7.7%	8.1%	7.7%	7.6%	7.6%	3.4%	4.8%	4.9%	6.4%	5.3%
Total Percent Returned	<b>31.7%</b>	<b>32.0%</b>	<b>32.2%</b>	<b>34.5%</b>	<b>35.2%</b>	<b>27.5%</b>	<b>27.1%</b>	<b>25.4%</b>	<b>25.6%</b>	<b>25.9%</b>
<b>Returned within 3 years</b>										
Percent Returned – TV <sup>1</sup>	27.3%	27.6%	28.8%	30.3%	30.5%	26.7%	24.3%	22.1%	21.3%	20.5%
Percent Returned – NC <sup>2</sup>	11.3%	11.8%	11.1%	10.9%	10.7%	5.6%	7.8%	8.1%	8.9%	5.7%
Total Percent Returned	<b>38.6%</b>	<b>39.4%</b>	<b>39.9%</b>	<b>41.2%</b>	<b>41.2%</b>	<b>32.3%</b>	<b>32.1%</b>	<b>30.2%</b>	<b>30.2%</b>	<b>26.2%</b>

<sup>1</sup>Percent Returned for a Technical Violation

<sup>2</sup>Percent Returned for a New Conviction – Felony Only

Overall, parolees released to New York City appear less likely to be returned to prison than parolees released elsewhere in the state. For instance, among 2006 releases, the three-year revocation rate is 26% for New York City as compared with 41% for the state as a whole. (The upstate revocation rate would have to be higher than 41%, since that figure includes New York City; the DCJS report did not provide a breakout of the data by region.) Furthermore, the differences appear most pronounced with regard to technical violations. Among 2006 releases, 21% in New York City compared with 31% in New York State were revoked due to a technical violation of supervision conditions.

It also appears that over time, the differences between New York State and New York City have increased. New York State experienced gradual increase in returns to prison between 2002 and 2006. In contrast, New York City has experienced a slight decrease in overall returns to prison between 2002 and 2006 and a greater decrease in returns for technical violations (27% among 2002 releases and 21% among 2006 releases). In fact, among 2002 releases, there is less than one percentage point difference in the three-year revocation rate for technical violations in New York City and New York State, whereas that difference balloons to 10 percentage points in 2006. Possible explanations for the divergent trends in the downstate and upstate regions are unknown.

## **Conclusion**

This report provides a profile of New York City parolees who were released between 2001 and 2008. The majority of New York City parolees are young, male, members of a minority group, with fairly extensive criminal histories. Though minor fluctuations in demographics and criminal histories occur across the five boroughs, the majority of these characteristics are relatively consistent throughout the city.

Over half (53%) of all parolees released in New York City will be re-arrested within three years following their release and 42% will be re-convicted within the same period of time. About 29% of parolees will have their parole revoked within three years: 6% for a new conviction and 23% for a technical violation. In 2005, New York City's average recidivism rate, calculated as a return to prison (for a new felony conviction or technical violation) was 31%, slightly below the national average of 34% reported by the Bureau of Justice Statistics in 2009 for parolees released nationwide in 2008 (Glaze and Bonzcar, 2010).

Success on parole in New York City appears to be contingent on several key characteristics known from the literature to predict recidivism. New York City parolees are more likely to recidivate when they are young and/or have more extensive criminal histories including higher numbers of total prior arrests and convictions. Both Black and Hispanic parolees have a greater likelihood of recidivating following their release. Individuals who are re-paroled and have served at least one prior parole term on their current sentence have a greater likelihood of recidivating following a subsequent release, with the greatest likelihood of having their parole revoked an additional time during their supervision period.

In the analysis of parolees released in 2005, New York City reported slightly lower rates of returns to prison for new felony convictions and a substantially lower rate of returns for technical violations than New York State. Specifically, New York State returned parolees to prison for technical violations at a rate significantly greater the rate of New York City when averaged over the three year follow-up period. One possible explanation for this difference is case volume. Based on statistics provided by the NYS Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, New York

City parolees account for 56% of the total number of parolees in New York State. With more parolees to supervise, New York City parole officers have higher caseloads increasing the difficulty of detecting technical violations. Parole officers in other regions of New York State have smaller caseloads and therefore, may engage in closer supervision or be more able to detect technical violations. Another possible explanation for this difference may be that New York City parole bureaus have placed greater emphasis on the use of intermediate sanctions to address issues of non-compliance in place of revocation.

### References

Division of Criminal Justice Services (2010). *2009 Crimestat Report*. Albany, NY: Office of Justice Research and Performance.

Glaze, L.E., and Bonzcar, T.P. (2010). *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2009*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: Office of Justice Programs.

New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (2009). *Parolee Facts*. Available at: [https://www.parole.state.ny.us/program\\_stats.html](https://www.parole.state.ny.us/program_stats.html)

Pew Center on the States (2008). *One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Charitable Trusts.

## Appendix A

### Table A.1. Logistic Regression Predicting Rearrest at Year 3

Predictor	Logistic Coefficients	SE	Wald $\chi^2$	Odds Ratio
Constant	0.08	0.07		
Age	-0.06	0.00	2479.19	0.94
Male	0.13	0.03	14.95	1.14
Black	0.29	0.04	61.21	1.33
Hispanic	0.28	0.04	54.56	1.32
Born in USA	0.09	0.03	10.65	1.10
Prior Parole Term	0.47	0.02	444.63	1.61
Months of Initial Sentence	-0.01	0.00	437.50	0.99
Total Prior Arrests	0.07	0.00	2579.39	1.07
Prior Felony Convictions	0.14	0.01	380.99	1.16
Original Drug Offense	0.15	0.02	38.32	1.16
Original Violent Offense	0.13	0.03	22.17	1.14
N	29906			
Log Likelihood	68813.0			
Model chi-square	8331.8 <sub>(11)</sub>			
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	0.19			

All variables except for those noted were significant at the  $p < 0.001$  level.

\* $p < 0.01$

### Table A.2. Logistic Regression Predicting Reconviction at Year 3

Predictor	Logistic Coefficients	SE	Wald $\chi^2$	Odds Ratio
Constant	-0.73	0.07		
Age	-0.05	0.00	1417.08	0.96
Male*	0.07	0.03	4.46	1.07
Black	0.18	0.04	23.95	1.20
Hispanic	0.25	0.04	39.92	1.28
Born in USA**	0.09	0.03	9.03	1.09
Prior Parole Term	0.62	0.02	822.37	1.86
Months of Initial Sentence	-0.01	0.00	397.59	0.99
Total Prior Arrests	0.06	0.00	2326.06	1.06
Prior Felony Convictions	0.13	0.01	360.14	1.14
Original Drug Offense	0.12	0.02	24.17	1.13
Original Violent Offense***	0.03	0.03	0.09	1.03
N	23723			
Log Likelihood	68885.04			
Model chi-square	7271.20 <sub>(11)</sub>			
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	0.16			

All variables except for those noted were significant at the  $p < 0.001$  level.

\*  $p < 0.05$

\*\* $p < 0.01$

\*\*\* Not significant

**Table A.3. Logistic Regression Predicting Revocation at Year 3**

<b>Predictor</b>	<b>Logistic Coefficients</b>	<b>SE</b>	<b>Wald <math>\chi^2</math></b>	<b>Odds Ratio</b>
Constant	-1.91	0.08		
Age	-0.02	0.00	313.31	0.98
Male	0.26	0.04	52.65	1.30
Black	0.25	0.04	36.32	1.28
Hispanic	0.20	0.04	22.14	1.22
Born in USA	0.15	0.03	22.79	1.16
Prior Parole Term	0.71	0.02	1047.02	2.03
Months of Initial Sentence	-0.01	0.00	316.87	0.99
Total Prior Arrests	0.02	0.00	508.41	1.02
Prior Felony Convictions	0.11	0.01	224.86	1.11
Original Drug Offense**	-0.06	0.03	6.24	0.94
Original Violent Offense*	-0.08	0.03	7.08	0.92
N	15417			
Log Likelihood	62548.9			
Model chi-square	3262.81 <sub>(11)</sub>			
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	0.08			

All variables except for those noted were significant at the  $p < 0.001$  level.

\*  $p < 0.01$

\*\*  $p < 0.05$