CHITTENDEN COUNTY

RAPID INTERVENTION COMMUNITY COURT

OUTCOME EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

CHITTENDEN COUNTY

RAPID INTERVENTION COMMUNITY COURT

OUTCOME EVALUATION

Submitted By

THE VERMONT CENTER FOR JUSTICE RESEARCH

Research Team

Peter Wicklund, Ph.D., Research Associate

Patricia Breneman, M.P.A., Research Analyst

Tim Halvorsen, B.S., Database Consultant

February, 2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Chittenden Rapid Intervention Community Court (hereafter the "RICC") is a program that is available to non-violent offenders whose crimes have been driven by untreated addiction or mental illness. The program is designed as a pre-charge system through which offenders are quickly assessed using evidence-based screening tools and offered diversion to community programming, services, and community-based accountability programs. The RICC staff work closely with the Chittenden County State's Attorney and the Burlington Police Department to identify individuals who may benefit from a rapid intervention program, without which they may reoffend and engage in conduct that is costly both to them and to the community.

The Burlington Community Justice Center accepts referrals from RICC for individuals who agree to meet with a restorative justice panel to take responsibility for the crime, learn how individuals and the community were impacted, and take steps to repair the harm caused by the crime.

Methodology

An outcome evaluation attempts to determine the effects that a program has on participants. In the case of the RICC the objective of this outcome evaluation was to determine the extent to which the RICC reduced recidivism among program participants.

An indicator of post-program criminal behavior that is commonly used in outcome evaluations of criminal justice programs is the number of participants who recidivate -- that is, are convicted of a crime after they complete the program. An analysis of the criminal history records of the 654 subjects who entered the RICC from September 14, 2010 to December 5, 2012, was conducted using the Vermont criminal history record of participants as provided by the Vermont Criminal Information Center at the Department of Public Safety. The Vermont criminal history records on which the recidivism analysis was based included all charges and convictions prosecuted in a Vermont Superior Court – Criminal Division that were available as of September 17, 2012.   The criminal records on which the study was based do not contain Federal prosecutions, out-of-state prosecutions, or traffic tickets.

For this evaluation, the study cohort was divided into three segments – subjects who successfully completed the RICC program (n=470), a segment that did not complete the program and were returned to docket (n=71), and a segment that were currently in the RICC and pending outcome (n=113).

Summary of Conclusions

1. The RICC appears to be a promising approach for reducing recidivism among participants who successfully complete the program. Only 7.4% of the successful participants of the RICC were reconvicted of a crime after leaving the program. In comparison, 25.4% of participants who were unsuccessful at completing the RICC were convicted of a new crime after leaving the program. Although this is a significantly higher rate of recidivism compared to the successful participants, the rate is still relatively low. This indicates that even an abbreviated exposure to the benefits of the RICC may provide a positive influence on those participants who do not complete the program.

2. The RICC was shown to be very effective in producing successful participants that remained conviction free in the community during their first year after leaving the program. Approximately 93% of the successful participants of the RICC had no arrest for any new criminal conviction within one year after program completion. The unsuccessful participants had a significantly lower success rate – only 78% remained conviction free within the first year after leaving the program.

3. The RICC appears to be a promising approach for reducing the number of post-program reconvictions for participants who successfully complete the RICC. The successful participants of the RICC had a significantly lower reconviction rate of 15 per 100 participants compared to 48 reconvictions per 100 participants for those who did not complete the program.

4. A large majority of the recidivists who completed the RICC were reconvicted in Chittenden County (91%), followed by Franklin and Addison counties. The recidivists who did not complete the RICC showed a similar pattern with most of their crimes occurring in Chittenden County (76%), and the remaining occurring in Franklin, Addison, Grand Isle, and Lamoille counties.

5. Comparing the demographic and criminal history profiles between the subjects who were successful in completing the RICC and those who were unsuccessful revealed no significant differences. This leads to the conclusion that the reduced recidivism rates observed for the successful participants compared with those who were unsuccessful at completing the program were more likely due to the benefits of the RICC program rather than to differences in characteristics of the study segments.

INTRODUCTION

This outcome evaluation of the RICC was designed to answer four questions associated with the post-project behavior of subjects who participated in the RICC from September 14, 2010 to December 5, 2012.

1. Which subjects were convicted of additional crimes after their participation in the RICC?

2. For those subjects who were convicted of additional crimes after their participation in the RICC, when were they convicted?

3. For those subjects who were convicted of additional crimes after their participation in the RICC, what crimes did they commit?

4. For those subjects who were convicted of additional crimes after their participation in the RICC, in which counties were the subjects convicted?

This outcome evaluation was supported through funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. However, the findings and conclusions expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Chittenden County State's Attorney's Office or the funding agencies.

CHITTENDEN COUNTY RAPID INTERVENTION COMMUNITY COURT

Overview

The Chittenden Rapid Intervention Community Court is a program that is available to non-violent offenders whose crimes have been driven by untreated addiction or mental illness. The program is designed as a pre-charge system through which offenders are quickly assessed using evidence-based screening tools and offered diversion to community programming, services, and community-based accountability programs. The RICC staff work closely with the Chittenden County State's Attorney and the Burlington Police Department to identify individuals who may benefit from a rapid intervention program, without which they may reoffend and engage in conduct that is costly both to them and to the community.

The Burlington Community Justice Center accepts referrals from RICC for individuals who agree to meet with a restorative justice panel to take responsibility for the crime, learn how individuals and the community were impacted, and take steps to repair the harm caused by the crime.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

An outcome evaluation attempts to determine the effects that a program has on participants. In the case of the RICC, the objective of this outcome evaluation was to determine the extent to which the program affected recidivism among the participants.

An indicator of post-program criminal behavior that is commonly used in outcome evaluations of criminal justice programs is the number of participants who recidivate -- that is, are convicted of a crime after they complete the program. In the case of this study, participants were considered to have recidivated if they were reconvicted for of any crime prosecuted in a Vermont Superior Court – Criminal Division, including violations of probation and motor vehicle offenses, after participating in the RICC.

This evaluation included three study segments – subjects who successfully completed the RICC program (n=470), a segment that did not complete the program and were returned to docket (n=71), and a segment that were currently in the RICC and pending outcome (n=113). During the study period, 87% of RICC participants (470 of 541) successfully completed the RICC.

An analysis of the criminal history records of the 654 subjects who entered the RICC from September 14, 2010 to December 5, 2012, was conducted using Vermont criminal history records as provided by the Vermont Criminal Information Center (VCIC) at the Department of Public Safety. The Vermont criminal history records on which the recidivism analysis was based included all charges and convictions prosecuted in a Vermont Superior Court – Criminal Division that were available as of September 17, 2012. The criminal records on which the study was based do not contain Federal prosecutions, out-of-state prosecutions, or traffic tickets.

RECIDIVISM

How is Recidivism Defined?

Since recidivism is usually the primary measure of interest when evaluating the effectiveness of programs such as the RICC, it is important to consider the manner in which recidivism is defined, and how the definition affects the interpretation of study results. The RICC administrators requested that a rigorous definition for recidivism be used for this analysis. It was determined that a "zero tolerance" standard for recidivism would be adopted such that any RICC participant who was convicted of any crime prosecuted in a Vermont Superior Court – Criminal Division, including violations of probation and motor vehicle offenses, after program completion or termination would be considered a recidivist.

How was Recidivism Determined?

In order to determine which subjects recidivated, a recidivism clock start date was set for each subject, dependent on whether they successfully completed the RICC, were unsuccessful at completing the RICC, or were still in the program.

For those participants that had entered the RICC and either successfully completed the program, or did not complete the program, their recidivism clock started on their "Program Completion Date", which was included in the participant description data provided by the RICC program. For three of the subjects – one who completed the RICC and two who did not – a "Program Completion Date" was not available; the recidivism clock was started on their "Program Start Date" which was also provided in the participant description data. For the subjects who were still in the RICC and pending outcome, their recidivism clock was also started on their "Program Start Date".

Based on each subject's recidivism start date and their criminal records from the VCIC, a subject was considered a recidivist if they committed and were convicted of any new offense after their recidivism start date. The elapsed time to recidivate was also measured between the start of the participant's recidivism clock and the date the participant was arrested for any new offense that ended in conviction.

It should also be noted that of the 654 participants in the study, VCIC criminal records were not found for 171 subjects – 116 who completed the RICC, 12 who did not complete the program, and 43 who were still in the program. Since these subjects did not show any contacts with the criminal justice system after their recidivism start date, they were considered non-recidivists.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: WHICH SUBJECTS WERE CONVICTED OF ADDITIONAL CRIMES AFTER THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE RICC?

Summary of Findings

The result of the research showed that the RICC has a very positive effect on the subjects who successfully graduated from the program. Only 7.4% of the participants were reconvicted of a crime after leaving the RICC. For the participants who were not successful at completing the RICC, 25.4% were convicted of a new crime after leaving the program. Although this is a significantly higher rate of recidivism compared to the participants who successfully completed the RICC, the rate is still relatively low. This indicates that even an abbreviated exposure to the benefits of the RICC may provide a positive influence on those participants who do not complete the program.

Detailed Findings

Table 1 provides data regarding the percentage of RICC participants who recidivated during the study period as per the study definition of recidivism. The table shows a significant difference in recidivism rates between the subjects who completed the RICC and those subjects who failed to complete the program. For the subjects who successfully completed the RICC, only 35 of the 470 (7.4%) were reconvicted of some type of crime as compared to 18 of the 71 subjects (25.4%) who failed to complete the RICC.

The results also showed that for the participants who were still in the program, only two had reconvictions after starting the RICC.

Table 1
Subjects Reconvicted for Any Offense

	Completed		Returned to Docket		Pending		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Recidivist	35	7.4%	18	25.4%	2	1.8%	55	8.4%
Non-recidivist	435	92.6%	53	74.6%	111	98.2%	599	91.6%
Total	**470**	**100.0%**	**71**	**100.0%**	**113**	**100.0%**	**654**	**100.0%**

Note: Shaded values in the same row are significantly different at p< 0.05 in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Tests assume equal variances.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2: WHEN WERE SUBJECTS ARRESTED AND CONVICTED?

Summary of Findings

The success rate, or the percentage of participants who remained conviction-free for the first year after leaving the program, was a respectable 92.8% for participants who successfully completed the RICC. The subjects who did not complete the program had a significantly lower success rate of 77.5%.

Detailed Findings

In addition to recidivism measures, program effectiveness can be also measured in terms of how long a participant remains conviction free in the community. Even if a participant is convicted of another offense after program completion, the longer the subject remains crime free is important in evaluating the crime prevention potential for a project.

Table 2 summarizes the analysis of elapsed recidivism time for subjects who were convicted of any new crime during the study period. For the subjects who successfully completed the RICC only 7.2% (34 of 470) of their arrests for any new criminal conviction occurred in less than one year. For the subjects who were unsuccessful in completing the RICC, significantly more reconvictions (22.5% or 16 of 71) occurred in less than one year.

Table 2

Time to Recidivism

Participant Group	When First Recidivated	Total	Percentage
Completed RICC	< 1 year	34	7.2%
	During year 1	1	0.2%
	During year 2	0	0.0%
	After year 2	0	0.0%
	Total Subjects	**470**	**7.4%**
Returned to Docket	< 1 year	16	22.5%
	During year 1	2	2.8%
	During year 2	0	0.0%
	After year 2	0	0.0%
	Total Subjects	**71**	**25.4%**

Note: Shaded are significantly different at p< 0.05 in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Tests assume equal variances.

If "successful outcome" is defined as no arrest for any new criminal conviction within one year of recidivism eligibility, than the success rate for participants who completed the RICC would be 92.8% (436 subjects with no arrest for any new criminal conviction within one year divided by 470 participants who successfully completed the RICC). A significantly lower success rate of 77.5% (55 of 71) was observed for participants who did not complete the RICC.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3: WHAT CRIMES DID THEY COMMIT?

Overview

When considering the effect that the RICC had on participants it is important to differentiate between the number of participants who recidivated and the number of crimes for which participants were convicted during the study period. For example, if a participant's case were disposed in 2009 and s/he was convicted of two crimes in 2010 and then three crimes in 2011, the participant would be counted as a recidivist only once. However, in order to understand the full offense pattern of participants and to assess the full impact of the RICC on the criminal behavior of participants it is important to also note that the defendant was convicted of those five additional crimes during the study period. While the first section of this evaluation focused on whether or not a *participant* was reconvicted during the study period, this section of the analysis focuses on the *number of crimes* for which participants were reconvicted.

Summary of Findings

Significant differences were observed between study segments with respect to reconviction rate. The subjects that completed the RICC had 15 reconvictions per 100 participants versus 48 reconvictions per 100 participants for those who did not complete the program. In total, the recidivists were convicted of 106 crimes after leaving the RICC, averaging approximately two reconvictions per recidivist. There were no significant differences across study segments in offense levels. Approximately 95% of the reconvictions were misdemeanors.

With respect to reconviction offense types, the graduates of the RICC committed significantly more thefts, and significantly fewer trespassing offenses than did the subjects who did not complete the program. In total, over 76% of reconvictions consisted of (listed in order of frequency): theft, assault, motor vehicle violations, unlawful trespass, failure to appear, and disorderly conduct.

Detailed Findings

Participant Offense Levels and Patterns

Table 3 shows the number of reconvictions by study segment. Overall, the combined recidivists from the RICC were convicted of 106 crimes during the follow-up period. Participants who completed the RICC were convicted of a total of 69 crimes during the study period – 5.8% (four) of those crimes were felonies. Participants who did not complete the RICC were convicted of 34 crimes during the study period – of which only one was a felony. The subjects who were still in the program were only reconvicted of three misdemeanors. There were no significant differences in reconviction offense levels across the three study segments.

Examination of the reconviction rate per 100 subjects provides a more revealing comparison. The reconviction rate for those participants who completed the RICC was 15 reconvictions per 100 participants (69 reconvictions divided by the 470 subjects who completed the RICC, multiplied by 100). In comparison, the subjects who were not successful in completing the RICC had a significantly higher reconviction rate of 48 per 100 participants (34 reconvictions divided by the 71 subjects who did not complete the RICC, multiplied by 100).

Table 3
Offense Levels For All Crimes For Which Subjects Were Reconvicted

	Completed		Returned to Docket		Pending		Total	
	# of Convictions	%	# of Convictions	%	# of Convictions	%	# of Convictions	%
Felony	4	5.8%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	5	4.7%
Misdemeanor	65	94.2%	33	97.1%	3	100.0%	101	95.3%
Total	**69**	**100.0%**	**34**	**100.0%**	**3**	**100.0%**	**106**	**100.0%**

Table 4 shows the types of crime for which the subjects were reconvicted. The recidivists who completed the RICC averaged two reconvictions with a median of two and maximum of six. Over 70% of their reconvictions included (listed in order of frequency): theft, assault, motor vehicle violations, failure to appear, and disorderly conduct. They committed significantly more theft offenses than the subjects who did not complete the RICC. Twelve of their nineteen theft convictions were for shoplifting. A majority (six of nine) of the assault convictions were for simple (four) and domestic assault (two). Most of their motor vehicle violations were for driving with license suspended (seven of nine).

The subjects who did not complete the RICC averaged 1.9 reconvictions with a median of one and a maximum of six. Except for committing significantly more unlawful trespassing offenses, these subjects showed similar offense patterns as subjects who completed the RICC. Over 76% of their reconvictions included (listed in order of frequency): unlawful trespass, assault, disorderly conduct, theft, motor vehicle violations, and failure to appear. Their assault

convictions consisted of three simple assaults and two domestic assaults. All of their DMV convictions were for driving with license suspended.

Table 4
All Crimes For Which Subjects Were Reconvicted

	Completed		Returned to Docket		Pending		Total	
	# of Convictions	%	# of Convictions	%	# of Convictions	%	# of Convictions	%
Total Theft Convictions	19	27.5%	3	8.8%	2	66.7%	24	22.6%
Total Assault Convictions	9	13.0%	5	14.7%	0	0.0%	14	13.2%
Total DMV Convictions	9	13.0%	3	8.8%	1	33.3%	13	12.3%
Unlawful Trespass	3	4.3%	8	23.5%	0	0.0%	11	10.4%
Failure to Appear	7	10.1%	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	10	9.4%
Disorderly Conduct	5	7.2%	4	11.8%	0	0.0%	9	8.5%
Drug Offense	3	4.3%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	5	4.7%
Unlawful Mischief	4	5.8%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	5	4.7%
Total Fraud Convictions	2	2.9%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	4	3.8%
Alcohol Violation	2	2.9%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	3	2.8%
DUI-2nd Offense	1	1.4%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	3	2.8%
Vs Justice *	2	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.9%
Disturbing the Peace	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%
TRO Violation	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%
Unauthorized Practice	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%
Total	**69**	**100.0%**	**34**	**100.0%**	**3**	**100.0%**	**106**	**100.0%**
Number of Recidivists	35		18		2		55	
Average # of Convictions	2.0		1.9		1.5		1.9	
Median # of Convictions	2.0		1.0		1.5		1.0	
Max # of Convictions	6		6		2		6	

* Contempt, False Alarms, Resist Arrest, etc.

Note: Shaded values in the same row are significantly different at $p < 0.05$ in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Tests assume equal variances.

Research Question 4: IN WHICH COUNTIES WERE THE SUBJECTS CONVICTED?

Summary of Findings

The graduates of the RICC and those still pending completion tended to be reconvicted primarily in Chittenden County (91%), with Franklin and Addison counties accounting for the remaining reconvictions. The subjects that did not complete the RICC, showed a similar pattern with most of their crimes occurring in Chittenden County (76%). The remaining crimes were prosecuted in Franklin, Addison, Grand Isle, and Lamoille counties.

Detailed Findings

Table 5 provides the distribution of reconvictions for the combined group of those who completed the RICC and those still pending completion, by the county in which the cases were prosecuted. The results show that Chittenden was the primary county for reconvictions and accounted for 91% of the total (63 of 69). Franklin and Addison counties accounted for the remaining reconvictions.

Table 5
County of Prosecution for Reconvictions:
Participants Who Completed the RICC

	Chittenden		Addison		Franklin		Total	
	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%
Total Theft Convictions	18	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	19	27.5%
Total DMV Convictions	6	9.5%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	9	13.0%
Total Assault Convictions	9	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	13.0%
Failure to Appear	7	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	10.1%
Disorderly Conduct	4	6.3%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	5	7.2%
Unlawful Mischief	4	6.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	5.8%
Unlawful Trespass	3	4.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	4.3%
Drug Offense	3	4.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	4.3%
Vs Justice *	2	3.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
Commerce	2	3.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
Alcohol Violation	2	3.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
Unauthorized Practice	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
TRO Violation	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
DUI-2nd Offense	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
Disturbing the Peace	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
Total	63	100.0%	2	100.0%	4	100.0%	69	100.0%

* Contempt, False Alarms, Resist Arrest, etc.

Table 6 shows the distribution of counties where the recidivists who did not complete the RICC were prosecuted for their new crimes. Similar to the results observed for the subjects who completed the RICC, a majority (76% or 26 of 34) of the new convictions occurred in Chittenden County. Four of the remaining occurred in Franklin County. Addison, Grand Isle, and Lamoille counties accounted for the other new convictions for this study segment.

Table 6
County of Prosecution for Reconvictions:
Participants Who Were Returned to Docket

	Chittenden		Franklin		Other Counties *		Total	
	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%
Unlawful Trespass	8	30.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	23.5%
Total Assault Convictions	4	15.4%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	5	14.7%
Disorderly Conduct	4	15.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	11.8%
Total Theft Convictions	1	3.8%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	3	8.8%
Failure to Appear	3	11.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	8.8%
Driving License Suspended	1	3.8%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	3	8.8%
Total Fraud Convictions	1	3.8%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	2	5.9%
DUI-2nd Offense	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	2	5.9%
Drug Offense	1	3.8%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	2	5.9%
Unlawful Mischief	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.9%
Alcohol Violation	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.9%
Total	**26**	**100.0%**	**4**	**100.0%**	**4**	**100.0%**	**34**	**100.0%**

* Other counties included: Addison, Grand Isle, and Lamoille

PARTICIPANT PROFILE COMPARISONS

Overview

Comparisons of demographic and criminal history profiles of the three study segments were conducted in order to determine if the observed improvement in post-program success for the RICC graduates could be attributed to benefits of the RICC or to differences in characteristics among the study segments.

Participant profiles were also compared against recidivism status in order to determine if there were demographic and/or criminal history characteristics that related to the tendency to recidivate. Significant differences between recidivists and non-recidivists with respect to these characteristics may provide useful criteria for pre-screening potential program participants. Data from the participant records provided by the RICC and VCIC were used for these analyses. The following profiles and variables were examined.

- <u>Demographic Profile</u>: Gender, age when they started the RICC, race, and state of birth.

- <u>Criminal History Profile</u>: Age at first conviction or contact, and prior criminal record.

The 171 subjects who were found to not have criminal records are only included in the "gender" and "age when started the RICC" comparisons.

Demographic Profile Comparisons – Summary of Findings

Comparing demographic profiles across the three study groups revealed no significant differences between the successful and unsuccessful participants in the RICC with respect to gender, age, race, and birth state/country. The only differences found were in gender and age composition of the subjects still in the RICC. They showed a significantly higher percentage of males, and subjects in the 18 to 20 year-old age category, compared to the other two study segments.

Comparing age profiles across recidivism status only showed a difference for the 40 to 49 year old category, with significantly more recidivists falling into that age range compared to the non-recidivists. Although these differences are significant, they are relatively minor findings that do not support broad conclusions regarding any relationship between age at program entry and tendency to recidivate.

Demographic Profile Comparisons - Detailed Findings

Gender by Study Segments

Table 7 presents the gender composition by study groups. Between the subjects who completed the RICC and those that did not, there was no significant difference in the gender distributions. However, the subjects still active in the RICC were significantly more male -- 69% compared to 56% for those who completed the program, and 49.3% for those who did not complete the program.

Table 7
Gender by Study Segments

	Completed		Returned to Docket		Pending		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Female	207	44.0%	36	50.7%	35	31.0%	278	42.5%
Male	263	56.0%	35	49.3%	78	69.0%	376	57.5%
Total	470	100.0%	71	100.0%	113	100.0%	654	100.0%

Note: Values in the same row with different shades of gray are significantly different at p< 0.05 in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Tests assume equal variances.

Gender by Recidivists/Non-recidivists

Table 8 presents the gender composition tabulated by recidivism status. The results show that significantly more male subjects recidivated (70.9%).

Table 8
Gender by Recidivists / Non-recidivists

	Recidivist		Non-recidivist		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Female	16_a	29.1%	262_b	43.7%	278	42.5%
Male	39_a	70.9%	337_b	56.3%	376	57.5%
Total	55	100.0%	599	100.0%	654	100.0%

Note: Values in the same row with different shades of gray are significantly different at p< 0.05 in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Tests assume equal variances.

Age When Started RICC by Study Segments

Table 9 summarizes the age distribution of the study segments at the time they started the RICC. The age profiles of the three study groups were very similar. The only significant difference observed was for the 18 to 20 year-old segment with the group still pending completion having significantly more subjects in that age category (31%) compared to the other two study groups. Overall, the average age of the study cohort was approximately 30 years old.

Table 9
Age When Started RICC by Study Segments

	Completed		Returned to Docket		Pending		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
18 to 20	80	17.0%	13	18.3%	35	31.0%	128	19.6%
21 to 24	111	23.6%	19	26.8%	29	25.7%	159	24.3%
25 to 29	84	17.9%	10	14.1%	18	15.9%	112	17.1%
30 to 34	65	13.8%	8	11.3%	14	12.4%	87	13.3%
35 to 39	42	8.9%	8	11.3%	4	3.5%	54	8.3%
40 to 49	44	9.4%	7	9.9%	8	7.1%	59	9.0%
50 +	44	9.4%	6	8.5%	5	4.4%	55	8.4%
Total	470	100.0%	71	100.0%	113	100.0%	654	100.0%

Note: Values in the same row with different shades of gray are significantly different at p< 0.05 in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Tests assume equal variances.

Age When Started RICC by Recidivists/Non-recidivists

Table 10 shows participant ages by their recidivism status. The data show the two age profiles to be very similar with only the 40 to 49 year-old category showing a significant difference between the recidivist groups.

Table 10
Age When Started RICC by Recidivists/Non-recidivists

	Recidivist		Non-recidivist		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
18 to 20	8	14.5%	120	20.0%	128	19.6%
21 to 24	11	20.0%	148	24.7%	159	24.3%
25 to 29	9	16.4%	102	17.0%	112	17.0%
30 to 34	6	10.9%	81	13.5%	87	13.3%
35 to 39	6	10.9%	49	8.2%	54	8.4%
40 to 49	10	18.2%	49	8.2%	59	9.0%
50 +	5	9.1%	50	8.3%	55	8.4%
Total	55	100.0%	599	100.0%	654	100.0%

Note: Values in the same row with different shades of gray are significantly different at p< 0.05 in the two-sided test of equality for column proportions. Tests assume equal variances.

Race by Study Segments and Recidivists/Non-recidivists

Tables 11 and 12 present the racial characteristics of the RICC participants tabulated by study segment (Table 11) and recidivism status (Table 12). Not surprisingly, almost 90% of all subjects were white. African Americans comprised 4.6% of the total study cohort, with Asians (1.0%) and Hispanics (0.6%) represented at very low percentages. No significant differences were found with regard to race between the study segments or recidivism status.

Table 11
Race by Study Segment

	Completed		Returned to Docket		Pending		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
African American	17	4.8%	3	5.1%	2	2.9%	22	4.6%
Asian	4	1.1%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	5	1.0%
Caucasian	313	88.4%	51	86.4%	66	94.3%	430	89.0%
Hispanic	2	0.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	3	0.6%
Unknown	18	5.1%	4	6.8%	1	1.4%	23	4.8%
Total	**354**	**100.0%**	**59**	**100.0%**	**70**	**100.0%**	**483**	**100.0%**

Table 12
Race by Recidivists / Non-recidivists

	Recidivist		Non-recidivist		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
African American	3	5.5%	19	4.4%	22	4.6%
Asian	0	0.0%	5	1.2%	5	1.0%
Caucasian	50	90.9%	380	88.8%	430	89.0%
Hispanic	0	0.0%	3	0.7%	3	0.6%
Unknown	2	3.6%	21	4.9%	23	4.8%
Total	**55**	**100.0%**	**428**	**100.0%**	**483**	**100.0%**

State or Country of Birth by Study Segments and Recidivists/Non-recidivists

Tables 13 and 14 present information regarding the states where participants were born, tabulated by study segment (Table 13) and recidivism status (Table 14). Approximately 59% of all the participants were born in Vermont. After Vermont, 34 other states and five countries were represented. The next most common birth places were New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. There were no significant differences found between the study segments or recidivism status in regards to the place of birth.

Table 13
State or Country of Birth by Study Segment

	Completed		Returned to Docket		Pending		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
VT	208	58.8%	35	59.3%	41	58.6%	284	58.8%
NY	22	6.2%	3	5.1%	3	4.3%	28	5.8%
MA	11	3.1%	4	6.8%	6	8.6%	21	4.3%
NH	14	4.0%	2	3.4%	1	1.4%	17	3.5%
CT	12	3.4%	2	3.4%	1	1.4%	15	3.1%
FL	4	1.1%	1	1.7%	2	2.9%	7	1.4%
ME	3	0.8%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%	5	1.0%
GA	3	0.8%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	4	0.8%
MI	4	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	0.8%
NJ	3	0.8%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	4	0.8%
Other States	23	6.5%	3	5.1%	11	15.7%	37	7.7%
England	2	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.4%
Germany	3	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.6%
Bosnia	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%
Russia	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%
Peru	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%
Unknown	39	11.0%	6	10.2%	4	5.7%	49	10.1%
Total	**354**	**100.0%**	**59**	**100.0%**	**70**	**100.0%**	**483**	**100.0%**

Table 14
State or Country of Birth by Recidivists / Non-recidivists

	Recidivist		Non-recidivist		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
VT	35	63.6%	249	58.2%	284	58.8%
NY	3	5.5%	25	5.8%	28	5.8%
MA	3	5.5%	18	4.2%	21	4.3%
NH	3	5.5%	14	3.3%	17	3.5%
CT	3	5.5%	12	2.8%	15	3.1%
FL	0	0.0%	7	1.6%	7	1.4%
ME	1	1.8%	4	0.9%	5	1.0%
GA	1	1.8%	3	0.7%	4	0.8%
MI	0	0.0%	4	0.9%	4	0.8%
NJ	0	0.0%	4	0.9%	4	0.8%
Other States	4	7.3%	33	7.7%	37	7.7%
England	0	0.0%	2	0.5%	2	0.4%
Germany	1	1.8%	2	0.5%	3	0.6%
Bosnia	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%
Russia	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%
Peru	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%
Unknown	1	1.8%	48	11.2%	49	10.1%
Total	**55**	**100.0%**	**428**	**100.0%**	**483**	**100.0%**

Criminal History Profile Comparisons - Summary of Findings

The criminal history profile comparisons reveal no significant differences across study segments with respect to age at first conviction or contact, and prior offense levels and types.

These findings lead to the conclusion that the lower recidivism rate for the successful participants of the RICC was more likely due to the benefits they received from the program than to any differences in criminal history characteristics among the study segments.

The same comparisons of the criminal history profiles were made against recidivism status. The only significant finding was that the recidivists had a higher average number of prior convictions of 11.3 compared to the non-recidivists' average of 3.0. This finding indicates a possible connection between prior criminal history and tendency to recidivate and warrants further investigation in subsequent evaluations of the RICC.

Criminal History Profile Comparisons - Detailed Findings

Age at First Conviction or Contact by Study Segments

Table 15 summarizes a comparison by the ages of the participants at their first criminal conviction or, if they had no conviction in their criminal history, their first contact with the criminal justice system. The data show that the age profiles were very similar across the study segments and no significant differences were observed.

Table 15
Age at First Conviction or Contact by Study Segments

	Completed		Returned to Docket		Pending		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
16 to 20	194	54.8%	23	39.0%	42	60.0%	259	53.6%
21 to 24	59	16.7%	13	22.0%	17	24.3%	89	18.4%
25 to 29	45	12.7%	13	22.0%	6	8.6%	64	13.3%
30 to 34	21	5.9%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%	23	4.8%
35 to 39	10	2.8%	3	5.1%	1	1.4%	14	2.9%
40 to 49	14	4.0%	3	5.1%	0	0.0%	17	3.5%
50 +	11	3.1%	4	6.8%	2	2.9%	17	3.5%
Total	354	100.0%	59	100.0%	70	100.0%	483	100.0%

Table 16 shows the distribution of ages at first conviction or contact analyzed by recidivism status. The results show there were no significant differences in age profiles observed between recidivist groups.

Age at First Conviction or Contact by Recidivists / Non-recidivists

Table 16
Age at First Conviction or Contact by Recidivists / Non-recidivists

	Recidivist		Non-recidivist		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
16 to 20	30	54.5%	229	53.5%	259	53.6%
21 to 24	10	18.2%	79	18.5%	89	18.4%
25 to 29	8	14.5%	56	13.1%	64	13.3%
30 to 34	1	1.8%	22	5.1%	23	4.8%
35 to 39	2	3.6%	12	2.8%	14	2.9%
40 to 49	3	5.5%	14	3.3%	17	3.5%
50 +	1	1.8%	16	3.7%	17	3.5%
Total	**55**	**100.0%**	**428**	**100.0%**	**483**	**100.0%**

Prior Convictions Offense Levels by Study Segment and Recidivists/Non-recidivists

Tables 17 and 18 present the data regarding the offense levels of the subjects' prior convictions, tabulated by study segment (Table 17) and recidivism status (Table 18). Misdemeanors comprised the majority of prior convictions across the total study group—accounting for over 90% of prior convictions. There were no significant differences found across study segments or by recidivism status.

Table 17
Prior Convictions Offense Levels by Study Segment

	Completed		Returned to Docket		Pending		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Felony	169	9.1%	29	10.0%	30	10.7%	228	9.4%
Misdemeanor	1680	90.9%	262	90.0%	250	89.3%	2192	90.6%
Total	**1849**	**100.0%**	**291**	**100.0%**	**280**	**100.0%**	**2420**	**100.0%**

Table 18
Prior Convictions Offense Levels by Recidivists / Non-recidivists

	Recidivist		Non-recidivist		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Felony	69	10.9%	159	8.9%	228	9.4%
Misdemeanor	564	89.1%	1628	91.1%	2192	90.6%
Total	**633**	**100.0%**	**1787**	**100.0%**	**2420**	**100.0%**

Prior Convictions Offense Types by Study Segments

Table 19 presents the data on the types of offenses committed prior to involvement with the RICC. In total, the study cohort was convicted of 2,420 prior crimes, with an average of 3.7 convictions per subject. No significant differences were found across the study groups.

Over 60% of the prior convictions for the total study cohort consisted of five types of offenses (listed in order of frequency): theft, violation of probation, assault, DMV violations, and disorderly conduct. Approximately 50% of the theft convictions were for shoplifting. Two-thirds of the assault convictions were for simple assault. A majority of the DMV violations were for driving with license suspended (60%).

Table 19
Prior Convictions Offense Type by Study Segments

	Completed		Returned to Docket		Pending		Total	
	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%
Total Theft Convictions	349	18.9%	66	22.7%	68	24.3%	483	20.0%
Violation of Probation	294	15.9%	38	13.1%	27	9.6%	359	14.8%
Total Assault Convictions	189	10.2%	11	3.8%	28	10.0%	228	9.4%
Total DMV Convictions	175	9.5%	17	5.8%	30	10.7%	222	9.2%
Disorderly Conduct	148	8.0%	20	6.9%	21	7.5%	189	7.8%
Total Fraud Convictions	80	4.3%	30	10.3%	31	11.1%	141	5.8%
Failure to Appear	100	5.4%	14	4.8%	22	7.9%	136	5.6%
Drug Offense	103	5.6%	11	3.8%	10	3.6%	124	5.1%
Total DUI Convictions	97	5.2%	13	4.5%	13	4.6%	123	5.1%
Unlawful Trespass	58	3.1%	34	11.7%	6	2.1%	98	4.0%
Unlawful Mischief	57	3.1%	10	3.4%	7	2.5%	74	3.1%
Vs Justice*	56	3.0%	8	2.7%	4	1.4%	68	2.8%
Alcohol Violation	38	2.1%	6	2.1%	4	1.4%	48	2.0%
Disturbing the Peace	21	1.1%	6	2.1%	0	0.0%	27	1.1%
Escape	20	1.1%	1	0.3%	5	1.8%	26	1.1%
Other Convictions **	18	1.0%	1	0.3%	1	0.4%	20	0.8%
Fish & Game Violation	19	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	0.8%
TRO Violation	17	0.9%	1	0.3%	1	0.4%	19	0.8%
Acts Prohibited/Prostitution	10	0.5%	4	1.4%	2	0.7%	16	0.7%
Total Convictions	**1849**	**100.0%**	**291**	**100.0%**	**280**	**100.0%**	**2420**	**100.0%**
Number of Subjects	470		71		113		654	
Average # of Convictions	3.9		4.1		2.5		3.7	
Median # of Convictions	0.0		1.0		0.0		0.0	
Maximum # of Convictions	53		36		41		53	

* Contempt, False Alarms, Resist Arrest, etc.

** Includes offense types that represented < 0.2% of the total number of total prior convictions

Table 20 presents the data on the types of prior offenses committed, tabulated by recidivism status. The research showed that the recidivists committed on average, significantly more prior crimes than did the non-recidivists (11.5 versus 3.0, respectively). No significant differences were observed between recidivists and non-recidivists with respect to types of prior offenses.

Table 20
Prior Convictions Offense Type by Recidivists / Non-recidivists

	Recidivist		Non-recidivist		Total Convictions	
	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%	# of Conv	%
Total Theft Convictions	132	20.9%	351	19.6%	483	20.0%
Violation of Probation	118	18.6%	241	13.5%	359	14.8%
Total Assault Convictions	49	7.7%	179	10.0%	228	9.4%
Total DMV Convictions	56	8.8%	166	9.3%	222	9.2%
Disorderly Conduct	43	6.8%	146	8.2%	189	7.8%
Total Fraud Convictions	33	5.2%	108	6.0%	141	5.8%
Failure to Appear	35	5.5%	101	5.7%	136	5.6%
Drug Offense	18	2.8%	106	5.9%	124	5.1%
Total DUI Convictions	22	3.5%	101	5.7%	123	5.1%
Unlawful Trespass	44	7.0%	54	3.0%	98	4.0%
Unlawful Mischief	18	2.8%	56	3.1%	74	3.1%
Vs Justice*	16	2.5%	52	2.9%	68	2.8%
Alcohol Violation	5	0.8%	43	2.4%	48	2.0%
Disturbing the Peace	9	1.4%	18	1.0%	27	1.1%
Escape	12	1.9%	14	0.8%	26	1.1%
Other Convictions**	2	0.3%	18	1.0%	20	0.8%
Fish & Game Violation	7	1.1%	12	0.7%	19	0.8%
TRO Violation	8	1.3%	11	0.6%	19	0.8%
Acts Prohibited/Prostitution	6	0.9%	10	0.6%	16	0.7%
Total Convictions	**633**	**100.0%**	**1787**	**100.0%**	**2420**	**100.0%**
Number of Subjects	55		599		654	
Average # of Convictions	11.5		3.0		3.7	
Median # of Convictions	6		0		0	
Maximum # of Convictions	52		53		53	

Note: Values in the same row with different shades of gray are significantly different at p< 0.05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Tests assume equal variances.

* Contempt, False Alarms, Resist Arrest, etc.

** Includes offense types that represented < 0.2% of the total number of total prior convictions

LIMITATIONS

Throughout this report the study cohort has been divided into three groups: "Successful" -- participants who completed the RICC, "Unsuccessful" – participants who did not complete the RICC, and "Pending" -- participants who were currently in the RICC program. The purpose of dividing the study cohort in this way was to show the difference in the post-program behavior among the three groups. It is important to note, however, that the "Unsuccessful" group is not a true control or comparison group as would be found in experimental or quasi-experimental research designs. The key difference is that unlike an experimental design, the "Unsuccessful" group did participate at some level in the RICC program and possibly were affected by that experience. The recidivism pattern of the "Unsuccessful" group is likely to be different from a true control group whose members would not be exposed to the services provided by the RICC program. Given the positive results observed for the "Successful" group in this study it is possible that the levels of recidivism for a true control group might be substantially higher than reported here. Further, since we cannot assume that any differences among the study groups reported on in this research are random (as would be the case in an experimental design) there may be differences between the study groups which are unrelated to program participation which are, however, related to recidivism.

CONCLUSIONS

1. **The result of the research showed that the RICC had a very positive affect on the subjects who successfully graduated from the program.**

   Only 7.4% of the successful participants of the RICC were reconvicted of a crime after leaving the program. Significantly more participants who were unsuccessful at completing the RICC -- 25.4% -- were convicted of a new crime after leaving the program. However this recidivism rate for the unsuccessful participants is still relatively low which indicates that even an abbreviated exposure to the benefits of the RICC may provide a positive influence on those participants who do not complete the program.

2. **The RICC was shown to be very effective in producing successful participants that remained conviction free in the community during their first year after leaving the program.**

   The percentage of successful participants of the RICC who were not convicted for any new crime for the first full year after leaving the program was very high at 92.8%. The percentage of subjects who were unsuccessful in completing the program and still remained conviction-free for the first year after leaving the RICC was significantly lower at 77.5%.

3. **The RICC appears to be a promising approach for reducing the number of post-program reconvictions for participants who successfully complete the RICC.**

   Significant differences were observed among study segments with respect to reconviction rate. The subjects that completed the RICC had a reconviction rate of 15 reconvictions per 100 participants versus 48 reconvictions per 100 participants for those who did not complete the program. In total, the recidivists were convicted of 106 crimes after leaving the RICC, averaging approximately 2 reconvictions per recidivist. There were no significant differences across study segments in offense levels. Approximately 95% of the reconvictions were misdemeanors.

   Offense patterns were similar across the study segments. Over 76% of reconvictions consisted of (listed in order of frequency): theft, assault, motor vehicle violations, failure to appear, disorderly conduct, and unlawful trespass.

4. **The RICC recidivists tended to commit post-program crime in Chittenden County.**

   Most of the recidivists who completed the RICC were reconvicted in Chittenden County (91%), followed by Franklin and Addison counties. Most of the reconvictions for the recidivists who did not complete the RICC also occurred in Chittenden County (74%), with the remaining occurring in Franklin, Addison, Grand Isle, and Lamoille counties.

5. **The reduced recidivism rates observed for the successful participants of the RICC compared with those who were unsuccessful at completing the program were most likely due to the benefits of the RICC program rather than due to differences in the demographic or criminal history profiles of the study segments.**

6. Examining subject profiles with respect to demographic characteristics (gender, age at RICC entry, race, and state of birth) revealed no significant differences between the ***successful and unsuccessful*** participants of the RICC. Similar results were found in comparing criminal history profiles (age at first conviction or contact, prior offense levels, and types of prior convictions). Again, no significant differences were observed between the successful and unsuccessful subjects with respect to these characteristics. These findings support the conclusion that the reduced recidivism rates observed for the successful participants compared with those who were unsuccessful at completing the program were more likely due to the benefits of the RICC program than the differences in characteristics of the study segments.

In conclusion, this study has shown that the RICC is a potentially effective program in reducing recidivism among participating offenders and warrants further research. It is recommended that a research initiative be considered for conducting periodic outcome evaluations on a semi-annual or annual basis to monitor the program's efficacy. In addition, a follow-up research project should be considered that would involve creating a valid random control sample[1] to provide a benchmark for confirming the low recidivism rate reported in this study.

---

[1] A control group study was conducted for Spectrum Youth and Family Services Rapid Referral Program. The report can be found at: http://www.vcjr.org/reports/reportscrimjust/reports/spectrum2report.html