



**California Department of
Corrections and Rehabilitation**

**2016 Juvenile Justice
Outcome Evaluation Report**
Examination of Youth Released from the
Division of Juvenile Justice in Fiscal Year 2011-12

**Office of Research
February 2017**

You can obtain reports by contacting the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation at the following address:

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
Office of Research, Research and Evaluation Branch
1515 S Street, Suite 221N
Sacramento, California 95811

Or

On the internet at:

http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/adult_research_branch/

CDCR Office of Research

"Providing quality research, data analysis and evaluation to implement evidence-based programs and practices, strengthen policy, inform management decisions and ensure accountability."



Produced by

**Center for Evidence-Based Corrections
University of California, Irvine**

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
Denise Allen, Chief of Research
Kevin Grassel, Systems Software Specialist III

This report would not have been possible without the generous support of others. Specifically, the authors would like to thank the following: the Department of Justice for the data-sharing agreement that allows us to examine arrests and convictions; and Ashley Gabbard, with CDCR's Office of Research for coordinating this work as well as staff from Center for Evidence-Based Corrections for leading the analyses.

Permission is granted to reproduce reports.
For questions regarding the contents of this report, please contact
Kevin Grassel, Office of Research

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Evaluation Design.....	4
2.1	Objectives and Purpose of the Evaluation	4
2.2	Definition of Recidivism	4
2.3	Methods.....	4
2.3.1	Sample Selection and Limitations	5
2.3.2	Data Sources and Analysis	5
3	Description of Release Cohort	7
3.1	Juvenile Demographics and Characteristics.....	7
4	Overall DJJ Youth Recidivism Rates.....	10
4.1	DJJ Return.....	10
4.2	DAI Return/Commitment.....	11
4.3	Any State-Level Incarceration (Return to DJJ or Return/Commitment to DAI)	12
4.4	Arrests	13
4.4.1	Arrest Rate	13
4.4.2	Type of Arrest.....	14
4.4.3	Count of Arrests	15
4.5	Convictions.....	16
4.5.1	Conviction Rate	16
4.5.2	Conviction Type.....	17
4.5.3	Count of Convictions.....	18
5	Rates by Type of Release	19
6	Time to Return	21
7	Rates by Juvenile Demographics.....	22
7.1	Gender	22
7.2	Race/Ethnicity	22
7.3	Age at Admission.....	23
7.4	Age at Release.....	23
8	Rates by Juvenile Characteristics.....	24
8.1	Juvenile Offender Type	24
8.2	Commitment Offense Category	26

8.3 Commitment Offenses 27

9 Conclusion..... 29

Appendix A..... 30

Demographics and Characteristics of Youth Released from DJJ by Juvenile Offender Type..... 30

Appendix B..... 32

Recidivism Rates for Youth Released in FY 2007-08 through FY 2011-12 32

Appendix C..... 35

One-Year, Two-Year, and Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Fiscal Year..... 35

Appendix D..... 38

Definition of Terms 38

List of Tables and Figures

Tables

Table 1. Description of Youth Released from DJJ in FY 2011-12.....	9
Table 2. Rates of DJJ Return by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases.....	10
Table 3. Rates of DAI Return/Commitment by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases	11
Table 4. Rates of Return to Any State-Level Incarceration by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases	12
Table 5. Arrest Rates by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases	13
Table 6. Type of Arrest, FY 2011-12 Releases.....	14
Table 7. Count of Arrests, FY 2011-12 Releases	15
Table 8. Three-Year Conviction Rate by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases.....	16
Table 9. Type of Conviction, FY 2011-12 Releases.....	17
Table 10. Count of Convictions, FY 2011-12 Releases	18
Table 11. Three-Year Recidivism Rates for First Releases and Re-Releases, FY 2011-12	20
Table 12. Three-Year Quarterly and Cumulative Rate of Return for the 252 Youth Returning to any State-Level Incarceration During the Three-Year Follow-Up Period	21
Table 13. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Gender, FY 2011-12 Releases	22
Table 14. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Race/Ethnicity, FY 2011-12 Releases	22
Table 15. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Age at Admission, FY 2011-12 Releases	23
Table 16. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Age at Release, FY 2011-12 Releases.....	23
Table 17. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12	25
Table 18. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Commitment Offense Category, FY 2011-12 Releases	26
Table 19. Three-Year Return to State-Level Incarceration Rate by Commitment Offense, FY 2011-12 Releases	28

Figures


Figure 1. Three-Year Return to State-Level Incarceration Rate for Youth Released in FY 2011-12	3
Figure 2. Rates of DJJ Return by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases.....	10
Figure 3. Rates of DAI Return/Commitment by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases.....	11
Figure 4. Rates of Return to Any State-Level Incarceration by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases	12
Figure 5. Arrest Rates by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases.....	13
Figure 6. Three-Year Conviction Rate by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases	16
Figure 7. Recidivism Rate by Release Status, FY 2011-12	19
Figure 8. Three-Year Quarterly and Cumulative Rate of Return for the 252 Youth Returning to any State- Level Incarceration During the Three-Year Follow-Up Period	21
Figure 9. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12.....	24
Figure 10. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Commitment Offense Category, FY 2011-12 Releases.....	26
Figure 11. Three-Year Return to State-Level Incarceration Rate by Commitment Offense, FY 2011-12 Releases	27

Executive Summary

As a division of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) provides education and treatment to California’s most serious and violent youthful offenders and juveniles sex offenders with the most intense treatment needs. Today in California, most juvenile offenders are committed to county-level facilities in their home communities where they can be closer to their families and community-based treatment services that are vital to rehabilitation. As such, DJJ’s population has diminished in size and has become more serious with respect to their offense histories. Currently, DJJ’s population represents less than one percent of the estimated 86,823 youth arrested in California each year.¹

The CDCR 2016 Juvenile Justice Outcome Evaluation Report presents the rate of recidivism of youth discharged from DJJ during Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12. This report employs multiple recidivism measures including rates for a return to DJJ, a return to the Division of Adult Institutions (DAI), or a return to either DJJ or DAI (i.e., any state-level correctional institution) for a three-year follow-up period. Recidivism is also measured by tracking arrests and convictions (in California only) of the release cohort for the three-year follow-up period. In FY 2011-12, a total of 675 youth were released from DJJ and tracked for three years following the date of their release. As shown in Figure A, 37.3 percent of the release cohort (252 youth) were returned to state-level incarceration (returned to DJJ or returned to DAI, combined) within three years of their release.² The three-year return to DJJ rate is 13.8 percent (93 youth) and the three-year return to DAI rate is 30.5 percent (206 youth). Of the 675 youth released in FY 2011-12, 74.2 percent (501 youth) were arrested and 53.8 percent (363 youth) were convicted.

Figure A. Three-Year Return to State-Level Incarceration Rate for Youth Released in FY 2011-12



¹ See California Department of Justice (2014). *Juvenile Justice in California, 2014* available at <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/cjsc/publications/misc/jj14/preface.pdf>

² If a youth is returned to both DJJ and DAI during the three-year follow-up period, each return is counted separately in the return to DJJ and return to DAI measures, however, the rate of state-level incarceration only includes one (the first) return if a youth was returned to both DJJ and DAI.

In 2007, Senate Bill (SB) 81 was passed and continued the fundamental shift of keeping lower-level juvenile offenders close to home so they could be near local treatment services and receive support from their families and the community at large. Only youth whose most recent sustained offense was listed under the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) 707(b), violent offenses, or an offense listed in Penal Code (PC) 290.008, sex offenses, (henceforth, “707(b)/290”) are eligible for commitment to DJJ. In addition, this legislation required that remaining non-707(b) offenders be returned to the county of commitment upon release for community supervision, rather than DJJ parole. Due to the fundamental shift in the types of youth eligible for commitment to DJJ with the passage of SB 81, this report provides rates for the 619 released 707(b)/290 youth, as well as the 56 released non-707(b)/290 youth. The rates for the 619 released 707(b)/290 youth were higher across all five measures of recidivism than non-707(b)/290 youth.

In addition to the overall rates, rates for the five measures of recidivism by youth demographics (e.g. race, gender, and age) and youth characteristics (e.g. commitment offense category, commitment offense and juvenile offender type) are also provided in this report. As discussed in the following sections, this report employs a different methodology than previous reports, therefore, the rates of recidivism presented in this report may be used as a baseline rate for future analyses conducted by the Department, however, direct comparisons between the rates presented in this report and previous reports cannot be made.

In keeping with the CDCR’s goal of developing a comprehensive system of program evaluation, these recidivism rates may be used to monitor DJJ’s population over time, investigate the relationship between youth’s risk to recidivate, and to evaluate the effectiveness of DJJ programs, policies, and procedures. This report employs a different methodology than previous analyses of DJJ youth. While direct comparisons between past reports and the rates in this report should not be made, the recidivism rates presented in the following sections of this report may serve as baseline rates for future analyses conducted by the CDCR and in order to monitor changes in youth’s risk to recidivate over time.

In February 2016, the class-action lawsuit known as *Farrell v Kernan*³ was terminated after DJJ fully implemented sweeping reforms to the juvenile system. Among the many reforms was the implementation of the Integrated Behavior Treatment Model (IBTM), a comprehensive approach to assessing, understanding, and treating youth. The IBTM is intended to reduce institutional violence and the risk of future criminal behavior by working with youth to prioritize and achieve goals for successful community living. The DJJ adopted the IBTM as the foundation for developing and implementing the education, mental health, and treatment model for committed youth. The IBTM provides collaborative services and evidence-based interventions and programs that develop youths’ skills for success. The data presented in this report pre-dates some of the important reforms that took place near the conclusion of the lawsuit; therefore, more time is needed to fully understand the long-term impacts of DJJ programs on recidivism.

³ *Margaret Farrell v. Scott Kernan* (Case No. RG 03079344). Stipulation and Order Dismissing Consent Decree with Prejudice, dated February 25, 2016.

Key Findings

Overall DJJ Youth Recidivism Rates

- At the end of the three-year follow-up period:
 - 13.8 percent (93 youth) of the 675 youth released from DJJ in FY 2011-12 were returned to DJJ.
 - 30.5 percent (206 youth) were returned or committed to DAI.
 - 37.3 percent (252 youth) were returned to state-level incarceration (i.e., returned to DJJ and/or DAI, combined).⁴
 - 74.2 percent (501 youth) were arrested.
 - 53.8 percent (363 youth) were convicted.
- Over 64 percent of youth who returned to state-level incarceration did so within 18 months of their release from DJJ.

Additional Findings

- Youth who were re-released (i.e., released from an institution after serving time for a supervision violation or a recommitment) from incarceration were more likely to recidivate by every measure when compared to youth who were released for the first time from a DJJ institution. The return to state-level custody rate was 55.5 percent (161 youth) for re-releases and 23.6 percent (91 youth) for first releases.
- In general, males were more likely to recidivate than females, although the number of females released was very small (27 female youth). While 38.4 percent of males (249 youth) were returned to state-level custody, 11.1 percent of females (3 female youth) were returned to state-level custody.
- Black youth were most likely to be incarcerated at any state-level commitment (51.2 percent or 126 youth), followed by Hispanic youth (30.4 percent or 102 youth), and White youth (25.7 percent or 18 youth).
- The proportion of non-707(b)/290 youth has diminished significantly in the last 5 years to 56 youth in the current cohort. In general, 707(b)/290 youth were more likely to recidivate across all measures. While 5.4 percent of the non-707(b)/290 youth (3 of the 56 releases) were returned to state-level custody, 40.2 percent of the 707(b)/290 youth (249 of the 619 releases) were returned to state-level custody.

⁴ To avoid double-counting, we only included a youth's first return if he or she was admitted to both DJJ and DAI during the three-year follow-up period.

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation 2016 Juvenile Justice Outcome Evaluation Report

1 Introduction

California's juvenile justice system is comprised of county and state-level facilities, each operating evidence-based rehabilitative programs. Compared to other states, California's state-level juvenile justice system serves an older youth population who commit more serious and violent offenses. During FY 2011-12, the Division of Juvenile Justice was responsible for the confinement and rehabilitation of youth adjudicated or sentenced to state-level custody. Youth released from DJJ prior to February 2011 were released to state-level parole, while youth released after February 2011, like the cohort presented in this report, were released to their county of commitment for community supervision.

In 2007, SB 81 was passed and continued the fundamental shift of keeping lower-level juvenile offenders close to home so they could be near local treatment services and receive support from their families and the community at large. This legislation limited the type of youth eligible for commitment to DJJ. Only youth whose most recent sustained offense was listed under the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) 707(b), violent offenses, or an offense listed in Penal Code (PC) 290.008, sex offenses, (henceforth, "707(b)/290") are eligible for commitment to DJJ. In addition, this legislation required that remaining non-707(b) offenders be returned to the county of commitment upon release for community supervision, rather than DJJ parole. It is also important to note W&IC 707(b) commitments to DJJ prior to 2012 had their jurisdictional age set at age 25. As of July 1, 2013, SB 1021 changed jurisdictional age from age 25 W&IC 1769(b) to age 23 W&IC 1769(c) for W&IC 707(b) offenders.

This report employs a different methodology than previous reports, therefore, the rates of recidivism presented in this report may be used as baseline rates for future analyses conducted by the Department, however, direct comparisons between the rates presented in this report and previous reports cannot be made. This analysis is provided for use by CDCR executives and managers, lawmakers, other correctional stakeholders, and California citizens who have an interest in the dynamics of youthful offenders' behaviors and in reducing juvenile recidivism rates.

Definition of Recidivism

Understanding the rate of recidivism for the DJJ population is complicated because it occurs at the intersection of juvenile and adult corrections. It is not simply the case that individuals under the age of 18 go to DJJ and individuals over 18 go to DAI. In reality, DJJ can and does house and provide treatment services for offenders over the age of 18. Most youth who are released from DJJ are no longer "juveniles" (i.e., younger than 18), however, that may not necessarily mean they would be committed to an adult institution for a supervision violation. In contrast, a youth in DJJ can commit offenses while in DJJ that could send them to DAI for a new term. When youth under the jurisdiction of DJJ are released and reoffend, they could be handled exclusively at the county-level, in which case arrest and conviction information is useful. They could be returned to a DJJ institution, or they could be committed to state

prison and be placed at a DAI institution. For these reasons, multiple measures are utilized to better assess recidivism patterns.

Furthermore, there is no universally agreed-upon definition of recidivism for juvenile offenders in California. Recently the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) developed a definition, in response to Assembly Bill 1050, for adults defined as “a new felony or misdemeanor committed within three years of release from custody or committed within three years of placement on supervision for a previous criminal conviction.” However, even the committee that drafted the definition acknowledged different supplemental measures may be used. Thus, although there are numerous ways to define recidivism, for this report DJJ defines recidivism as follows:

A return to DJJ custody, a return or commitment to DAI custody, an arrest, or a conviction within three years of release from DJJ custody.

Recidivism Measures

This report includes multiple measures of recidivism or re-offending because of the limitations and benefits of the data for each available measure. This analysis includes five measures of recidivism to offer the most complete picture of the likelihood of re-offending after incarceration in DJJ. The recidivism measures and their components are:

- 1) Return or Recommitment to the Division of Juvenile Justice
- 2) Return or Commitment to the Division of Adult Institutions
- 3) Return to any state-level institution (returned to DJJ or returned to DAI, combined)
- 4) Arrest
 - Type of Arrest (felony versus misdemeanor)
 - Number of Arrests
- 5) Conviction
 - Type of Conviction (felony versus misdemeanor)
 - Number of Convictions


Recidivism Rates

Figure 1 shows the three-year, state-level incarceration recidivism rate for youth released in FY 2011-12. In other words, it shows the percent of youth released from DJJ in FY 2011-12 who were returned to DJJ and/or DAI within the three years following release. Of the 675 youth who were released from DJJ in this cohort, 62.7 percent, or 423 youth, were not returned to any state-level incarceration within three years. In contrast, 252 youth, or 37.3 percent were returned to either DJJ or DAI within the three-year follow-up period. The three-year return to DJJ rate is 13.8 percent (93 youth) and the three-year return to DAI rate is 30.5 percent (206 youth).⁵ Of the 675 youth released in FY 2011-12, 74.2 percent (501

⁵ If a youth is returned to both DJJ and DAI during the three-year follow-up period, each return is counted separately in the return to DJJ and return to DAI measures, however, the rate of state-level incarceration only includes one (the first) return if a youth was returned to both DJJ and DAI.

youth) were arrested and 53.8 percent (363 youth) were convicted. The following sections of this report present rates across all five measures of recidivism by offender type (707(b)/290 and non-707(b)/290), by youth demographics (e.g. race, gender, and age), and by youth characteristics (e.g. commitment offense category and commitment offense).

Figure 1. Three-Year Return to State-Level Incarceration Rate for Youth Released in FY 2011-12



N = 675

2 Evaluation Design

2.1 Objectives and Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to report the recidivism rates for youth released from DJJ and to examine how these rates vary by time (to return) and person (personal and juvenile offender characteristics).

2.2 Definition of Recidivism

This report defines recidivism as:

A return to DJJ custody, a return or commitment to DAI custody, an arrest, or conviction within three years of release from DJJ custody.

This definition differs from definitions in other reports. The 2010 Juvenile Justice Outcome Evaluation Report indicates the intention was always to expand the DJJ recidivism definition to include convictions as separate recidivism measures. Due to factors related to cohort selection and definitions of recidivism, recidivism rates reported in this document may not match previous reports. This was necessary to ensure the most accurate results.

For the purpose of this report, the recidivism rate is calculated using the ratio of the number of youth in the release cohort who were returned to DJJ, and or returned/committed to DAI, arrested, or convicted during the recidivism period (recidivists) to the total number of youth in the release cohort, multiplied by 100.

$$\text{Recidivism Rate} = \frac{\text{Number of Recidivists}}{\text{Total Release Cohort}} \times 100$$

2.3 Methods

This report contains the recidivism rates from a three-year follow-up period for DJJ youth released from a CDCR facility between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012 (FY 2011-12). The release cohort includes youth who were released for the first time on their current term as well as those who were re-released after a previous return to custody. Re-released youth were those released prior to FY 2011-12, who violated and were returned to DJJ on the same term, and then were re-released during FY 2011-12. In some instances, a youth may be serving concurrent sentences in DJJ and DAI. Concurrent jurisdiction cases have two release dates, the release from DJJ (even if they are still incarcerated in DAI) and a release from DAI date (even if they may still be incarcerated in DJJ). In these cases, the date that the youth was shown to have been released from both sentences was used as the “release date” regardless of whether

the last stay was in a DJJ facility or a DAI facility. Youth whose new release dates were no longer in FY 2011-12 were moved into their correct cohort.

Historically, these outcome reports offer a variety of tables and figures that reflect multiple-year trends. The method for calculation of recidivism in this report is not the same as previous reports. The introduction of the Strategic Offender Management System (SOMS) system has improved the quality of data related to return to DAI facilities. The new calculation of release dates for concurrent jurisdiction cases and updates to the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) dataset for state arrest and conviction data have all refined the calculation of recidivism from previous reports. As such, the rates of recidivism should not be directly compared to previous reports. We have provided longitudinal trends from the years in which recidivism rates were calculated, FY 2007-08 to FY 2011-12, in the appendix of this document for context, however, direct comparisons between the rates provided in Appendix B and the rates provided for the FY 2010-11 cohort presented in this report should not be made.

2.3.1 Sample Selection and Limitations

An individual was included in this sample if he/she was either discharged from DJJ custody or released to supervision between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012 (see definition of “DJJ Population” in the Definition of Terms section of this report for more specifics). As stated in the previous section, if a concurrent jurisdiction case had an actual release date that was not in FY 2011-12 the juvenile offender was moved into the correct release cohort. In this report, each person can only appear as a release one time. The same individual can be represented across different fiscal years (i.e., different yearly reports) for any release and re-release, but they will only be in each fiscal year cohort one time.

Typically, the CDCR does not calculate recidivism rates for offender releases (i.e. denominators) that are under 30 records. Due to the small number of overall records (675 releases) contained in this report, recidivism rates are presented for subgroups of juvenile offenders under 30. Because these subgroups may be influenced by nuances associated with each case, caution should be exercised when interpreting results associated with fewer records.

2.3.2 Data Sources and Analysis

Data from three systems was used and analyzed in this report. Once the cohort was selected, data managed by DJJ through the Offender Based Information Tracking System (OBITS) was used to determine which individuals in the cohort had been returned to a DJJ institution within three years after their release date for either a new commitment or a supervision violation. This information is captured in the dependent measure, “Return to DJJ.” OBITS data also provided juvenile offender and incarceration characteristics. The CDCR also maintains SOMS and each cohort record was matched with any record of a commitment to DAI within three years of the release date (i.e., “Return to DAI”). Finally, the California Department of Justice (DOJ) provided data regarding the arrest and conviction history of the sample using the CLETS using the DOJ identifier. Youth who had a subsequent arrest and/or

conviction within three years after release from a CDCR institution are reflected in the “Arrest” and “Conviction” sections of this report. The details of each arrest and conviction were also analyzed for this report.

3 Description of Release Cohort

The passage of California Senate Bill (SB) 81 and California Assembly Bill (AB) 191 in 2007 mandates that only youth with a sex offense requiring registration as a sex offender (PC 290), youth with violent and/or serious offenses [W&IC 707(b)], and youth committed to DJJ from adult court may be committed to DJJ. As youth who do not meet these criteria are now retained in county facilities, the DJJ youth population has diminished in size and has more serious offense histories. While youth who are not 707(b)/290 are no longer committed to DJJ, a small subset (56 youth) of DJJ youth who had previously been incarcerated before SB 81 and AB 191 had been released in this cohort. Previous reports on the DJJ population present direct comparisons between 707(b)/290 and non-707(b)/290 (e.g., 2010 Juvenile Justice Outcome Evaluation Report). Due to the small size of this group, comparisons between these two groups are available primarily in Appendix A.

In February 2016, the class-action lawsuit known as *Farrell v Kernan*⁶ was terminated after DJJ fully implemented sweeping reforms to the juvenile system. Among the many reforms was the implementation of the IBTM, a comprehensive approach to assessing, understanding, and treating youth. The data presented in this report pre-dates some of the important reforms that took place near the conclusion of the lawsuit; therefore, more time is needed to fully understand the long-term impacts of DJJ programs on recidivism.

Table 1 provides a description of the cohort of youth who were released from a DJJ facility during FY 2011-12 (675 youth in total).

3.1 Juvenile Demographics and Characteristics

The FY 2011-12 DJJ release cohort was overwhelmingly male (96 percent or 648 youth). The largest racial/ethnic group in the release cohort was Hispanic youth (49.8 percent or 336 youth), followed by Black youth (36.4 percent or 246 youth), White youth (10.4 percent or 70 youth), and a small group of Asian/Pacific Islander youth (2.5 percent or 17 youth) or those with any other racial/ethnic background (0.9 percent or 6 youth). A majority of youth (57.0 percent or 385 youth) were being released from DJJ for the first time, as compared to the remaining youth who were being re-released from a previous return.

Most youth in this cohort were 16 to 18 years old (78.9 percent or 533 youth) when they were first admitted to DJJ. This cohort was between 12 and 28 years old when they were released from DJJ in FY 2011-12. While rare, Welfare and Institutions Code 1800 allows the court to extend a youth's jurisdiction and confinement with DJJ up to two years at a time, provided the court finds that they meet certain criteria. In addition, if a youth tried in juvenile court is committed to DJJ at a later age (over 18 for example), W&IC 1769 requires DJJ to set jurisdiction at 21, 23, or two years from date of court action, whatever is longer. Any youth whose release date is beyond the standard jurisdictional age (21,

⁶ *Margaret Farrell v. Scott Kernan* (Case No. RG 03079344). Stipulation and Order Dismissing Consent Decree with Prejudice, dated February 25, 2016.

23 or 25), was subject to either a W&IC 1800 extension or was committed to DJJ at a late age and subject to W&IC. 1769. Over 93 percent of the youth (629 youth) were 18 years or older at the time of their release.

As previously mentioned, legislation in 2007 ensured that only serious and violent juvenile offenders were committed to DJJ. As such, it is not surprising that over 94 percent (94.2 percent or 636 youth) of the youth in this release cohort were committed for crimes against persons. Only 4.1 percent (28 youth) of the DJJ youth were committed for a property crime. Eleven of the FY 2011-12 release cohort were originally admitted for a drug or other type of crime.

Approximately 82 percent (553 youth) were 707(b) only cases (i.e., serious and/or violent crimes). Only 2.2 percent (15 youth) were 290 only cases, or registered sex offenders. And over 6 percent (45 youth) were both 707(b) and 290. Six youth were classified as “other” which indicates that they were superior court commitments to DJJ, whose crime would have been a 707(b) if the commitment were from a juvenile court.⁷ Finally, only 8.3 percent or 56 youth included in this cohort were not a 707(b) or 290 cases. Comparisons between juvenile offender characteristics by 707(b)/290 and non-707(b)/290 statuses are available in Appendix A.

⁷ Youth committed to DJJ by the superior court under W&IC 1731.5(a) who would have been designated as a 707(b) offender if the commitment had resulted from a juvenile court.

Table 1. Description of Youth Released from DJJ in FY 2011-12

Characteristics	Number	Percent
Total	675	100.0%
Gender		
Male	648	96.0%
Female	27	4.0%
Race/Ethnicity		
Hispanic	336	49.8%
Black	246	36.4%
White	70	10.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	17	2.5%
Other	6	0.9%
Release Type		
First Release	385	57.0%
Re-Release	290	43.0%
Age at First Admission		
12 - 13	7	1.0%
14	29	4.3%
15	79	11.7%
16	177	26.2%
17	214	31.7%
18	142	21.0%
19 - 23	27	4.0%
Age at Release		
12 - 16	11	1.6%
17	35	5.2%
18	74	11.0%
19	131	19.4%
20	120	17.8%
21	100	14.8%
22	81	12.0%
23	52	7.7%
24	59	8.7%
25 - 28	12	1.8%
Commitment Offense Category		
Crimes Against Persons	636	94.2%
Property Crimes	28	4.1%
Drug Crimes	3	0.4%
Other Crimes	8	1.2%
Juvenile Offender Type		
707(b) only	553	81.9%
290 only	15	2.2%
707(b) and 290	45	6.7%
Other	6	0.9%
Neither	56	8.3%

4 Overall DJJ Youth Recidivism Rates

4.1 DJJ Return

Figure 2. Rates of DJJ Return by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases




Figure 2 and Table 2 show that 13.8 percent (93 youth) of those released from DJJ in FY 2011-12 were returned to DJJ within the three-year follow-up period. The rate of return to DJJ remained relatively stable across the three years. Nearly all of the returns to DJJ occurred by the first year. There was no change in the rate from year two to year three. None of the non-707(b)/290 youth were returned to DJJ.

Table 2. Rates of DJJ Return by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases

DJJ Return	Number Released	One-Year		Two-Year		Three-Year	
		Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate
707(b)/290	619	87	14.1%	93	15.0%	93	15.0%
Non-707(b)/290	56	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	675	87	12.9%	93	13.8%	93	13.8%

4.2 DAI Return/Commitment

Figure 3. Rates of DAI Return/Commitment by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases




Figure 3 and Table 3 present the rate of return to DAI (i.e., adult prison). In total, 30.5 percent (206 youth) of those released from DJJ in FY 2011-12 were returned or committed to DAI within three years. Unlike most recidivism measures, which are highest within the first year after release and then grow slowly as the years progress, this measure actually increases steadily across the three years. In the first year, 8.9 percent (60 youth) of the FY 2011-12 cohort was returned to DAI. In year two, an additional 11.2 percent (74 youth, 136 total youth and 20.1 percent) were admitted to DAI. Finally, in the third year, an additional 10.4 percent (70 youth) of the cohort was committed to DAI for a three-year recidivism rate of 30.5 percent of the cohort (206 youth). The youth who were returned or committed for the first time to DAI were almost exclusively 707(b)/290 offenders.

Table 3. Rates of DAI Return/Commitment by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases

DAI Return	Number Released	One-Year		Two-Year		Three-Year	
		Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate
707(b)/290	619	60	9.7%	134	21.6%	203	32.8%
Non-707(b)/290	56	0	0.0%	2	3.6%	3	5.4%
Total	675	60	8.9%	136	20.1%	206	30.5%

4.3 Any State-Level Incarceration (Return to DJJ or Return/Commitment to DAI)

Figure 4. Rates of Return to Any State-Level Incarceration by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases




Figure 4 and Table 4 present the rate of return for the FY 2011-12 cohort to any state-level institution. Youth who were returned to either DJJ and/or DAI are included as recidivists here. In this cohort, 19.4 percent (131 youth) of those released were returned after one year. Twenty-nine percent (196 youth) of the release cohort was returned to any state-level incarceration by year two. And at the three-year mark, 37.3 percent (252 youth) of those released from DJJ had been returned to a state correctional institution. Almost all of the returns were 707(b)/290 offenders.


Table 4. Rates of Return to Any State-Level Incarceration by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases

Any State-Level Return	Number Released	One-Year		Two-Year		Three-Year	
		Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate
707(b)/290	619	131	21.2%	194	31.3%	249	40.2%
Non-707(b)/290	56	0	0.0%	2	3.6%	3	5.4%
Total	675	131	19.4%	196	29.0%	252	37.3%

4.4 Arrests

4.4.1 Arrest Rate

Figure 5. Arrest Rates by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases



As shown in Figure 5 and Table 5, youth released from DJJ in FY 2011-12 had a 74.2 percent (501 youth) arrest rate by the end of three years. Most arrests (54.2 percent or 366 youth) occurred during the first year. In general, the non-707(b)/290 offenders were less likely to be arrested post-release, however, due to the small size of the group, any comparisons or generalizations about the group should be done with caution.

Table 5. Arrest Rates by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases

Arrest	Number Released	One-Year		Two-Year		Three-Year	
		Number Arrested	Arrest Rate	Number Arrested	Arrest Rate	Number Arrested	Arrest Rate
707(b)/290	619	353	57.0%	438	70.8%	480	77.5%
Non-707(b)/290	56	13	23.2%	19	33.9%	21	37.5%
Total	675	366	54.2%	457	67.7%	501	74.2%

4.4.2 Type of Arrest

Table 6 reports the types of crimes for which youth released from DJJ in FY 2011-12 were arrested during the three-year follow-up period. This table reflects the most serious charge from the first arrest within the three-year period for the cohort. Of the 501 arrests, 86.4 percent (433 youth) of the most serious arrests were for felonies, 12.2 percent (61 youth) were for misdemeanors, and 1.4 percent (7 youth) were for supervision violations. Of the felony arrests, most (57.3 percent) were for crimes against persons, followed by “other” felony crimes at 12.6 percent (63 youth), felony property crimes at 10.2 percent (51 youth), and felony drug/alcohol crimes at 5.2 percent (26 youth). Over 4 percent (4.6 percent or 23 youth) were arrested for misdemeanor crimes against persons, 3.6 (18 youth) for misdemeanor drug/alcohol crimes, 1.6 percent (8 youth) for “other” misdemeanor crimes and 1.4 percent (7 youth) for misdemeanor property crimes.

Table 6. Type of Arrest, FY 2011-12 Releases

Type of Arrest	Number	Percent
All Felonies	433	86.4%
Felony Crimes Against Persons	287	57.3%
Felony Property Crimes	51	10.2%
Felony Drug/Alcohol Crimes	26	5.2%
Felony Other Crimes	63	12.6%
Felony Unknown	6	1.2%
All Misdemeanors	61	12.2%
Misdemeanor Crimes Against Persons	23	4.6%
Misdemeanor Property Crimes	7	1.4%
Misdemeanor Drug/Alcohol Crimes	18	3.6%
Misdemeanor Other Crimes	8	1.6%
Misdemeanor Unknown	5	1.0%
All Supervision Violations	7	1.4%
Total	501	100.0%

4.4.3 Count of Arrests

Table 7 reports the total count of arrest cycles for the FY 2011-12 release cohort. In other words, this table shows the number of times a juvenile offender was arrested after release from DJJ. Nearly 26 percent (174 youth) were not arrested at all after release from DJJ. Fifteen percent (101 youth) of the cohort were arrested once. Over 12 percent (86 youth) were arrested two times after their release from DJJ, and 11 percent (74 youth) were arrested three times. In total, 26.9 percent (181 youth) of the release cohort was arrested 5 or more times.

Table 7. Count of Arrests, FY 2011-12 Releases

Number of Arrests	Number	Percent
0	174	25.8%
1	101	15.0%
2	86	12.7%
3	74	11.0%
4	59	8.7%
5	46	6.8%
6	29	4.3%
7	26	3.9%
8	10	1.5%
9	18	2.7%
10	13	1.9%
11	10	1.5%
12+	29	4.3%
Total	675	100.0%

4.5 Convictions

4.5.1 Conviction Rate

Figure 6. Three-Year Conviction Rate by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases




Figure 6 and Table 8 report conviction rates for the FY 2011-12 release cohort three years post-release. By the end of the follow-up period, almost 54 percent (363 youth) of the cohort had been convicted of another crime. Most of the youth who were re-convicted were 707(b)/290 offenders.

Table 8. Three-Year Conviction Rate by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12 Releases

Conviction	Number Released	One-Year		Two-Year		Three-Year	
		Number Convicted	Conviction Rate	Number Convicted	Conviction Rate	Number Convicted	Conviction Rate
707(b)/290	619	145	23.4%	272	43.9%	353	57.0%
Non-707(b)/290	56	3	5.4%	8	14.3%	10	17.9%
Total	675	148	21.9%	280	41.5%	363	53.8%

4.5.2 Conviction Type

Table 9 reports the breakdown of the types of crime for which the release cohort was re-convicted during the follow-up period. A majority of the convictions (78.8 percent or 286 youth) were felony convictions. Of these felonies, crimes against persons were most common (38 percent or 138 youth). Of the 21.2 percent (77 youth) of misdemeanor convictions, 10.5 percent (38 youth) were convicted for misdemeanor crimes against persons.

Table 9. Type of Conviction, FY 2011-12 Releases

Type of Conviction	Number	Percent
All Felonies	286	78.8%
Felony Crimes Against Persons	138	38.0%
Felony Property Crimes	51	14.0%
Felony Drug/Alcohol Crimes	26	7.2%
Felony Other Crimes	67	18.5%
Felony Unknown	4	1.1%
All Misdemeanors	77	21.2%
Misdemeanor Crimes Against Persons	38	10.5%
Misdemeanor Property Crimes	14	3.9%
Misdemeanor Drug/Alcohol Crimes	11	3.0%
Misdemeanor Other Crimes	4	1.1%
Misdemeanor Unknown	10	2.8%
Total	363	100.0%

4.5.3 Count of Convictions

Table 10 presents the number of conviction cycles for the FY 2011-12 cohort. More than 46 percent (312 youth) of the cohort did not have a new conviction. Of those who did have a new conviction, most only had 1 conviction (28.1 percent of the total cohort, 190 youth). In other words, 52.3 percent of DJJ releases that were re-convicted were only re-convicted once.

Table 10. Count of Convictions, FY 2011-12 Releases

Number of Convictions	Number	Percent
0	312	46.2%
1	190	28.1%
2	94	13.9%
3	44	6.5%
4	19	2.8%
5	9	1.3%
6+	7	1.0%
Total	675	100.0%

5 Rates by Type of Release

Figure 7. Recidivism Rate by Release Status, FY 2011-12




Figure 7 and Table 11 show the three-year recidivism rates for FY 2011-12 releases from DJJ by their release status. At the end of the three-year follow-up period, youth who were released from DJJ as a first release (i.e., for the first time from DJJ) were less likely to recidivate according to all five measures of recidivism compared to re-releases (i.e., released from an institution after serving time for a supervision violation or a recommitment). Over eighty-five percent (247 youth) of re-releases from DJJ were arrested compared to 66 percent (254 youth) of first-releases. Over 65 percent (191 youth) of re-releases were convicted of a new offense within three-years compared to about 45 percent (172 youth) of first-releases. All of the youth who were returned to DJJ were re-releases. Almost 40 percent (115 youth) of re-releases were returned or committed to DAI compared to about 24 percent (91 youth) of DJJ first-releases. Finally, over half (55.5 percent or 161 youth) of re-releases were incarcerated in a state correctional institution within three years, compared with only 23.6 percent (91 youth) of first-releases.

Table 11. Three-Year Recidivism Rates for First Releases and Re-Releases, FY 2011-12

Release Type	Number Released	Return to DJJ		Return to DAI		Any State Custody		Arrest		Conviction	
		Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Arrested	Return Rate	Number Convicted	Return Rate
First Release	385	0	0.0%	91	23.6%	91	23.6%	254	66.0%	172	44.7%
Re-Release	290	93	32.1%	115	39.7%	161	55.5%	247	85.2%	191	65.9%
Total	675	93	13.8%	206	30.5%	252	37.3%	501	74.2%	363	53.8%

6 Time to Return

Figure 8. Three-Year Quarterly and Cumulative Rate of Return for the 252 Youth Returning to any State-Level Incarceration During the Three-Year Follow-Up Period




Figure 8 and Table 12 present the percentage of recidivists by months after release. They also include the cumulative percent of youth who recidivated over time. Of the 675 youth released from DJJ in FY 2011-12 nearly 28 percent (70 youth) were returned to state-level incarceration within the first six months. By the one-year mark, more than half (52 percent or 131 youth) of all the youth who would be returned to a state institution had already been returned.

Table 12. Three-Year Quarterly and Cumulative Rate of Return for the 252 Youth Returning to any State-Level Incarceration During the Three-Year Follow-Up Period

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Percentage Returning	11.5%	16.3%	14.7%	9.5%	3.6%	8.7%	6.7%	6.7%	7.9%	6.0%	5.2%	3.2%
Cumulative Percentage	11.5%	27.8%	42.5%	52.0%	55.6%	64.3%	71.0%	77.8%	85.7%	91.7%	96.8%	100.0%

7 Rates by Juvenile Demographics

7.1 Gender

Table 13 reports the rate of recidivism at the end of the three-year follow-up period by gender. There are few females (27 female youth) in this release cohort and rates should be interpreted with caution. Of the 27 females in the cohort, 13 were arrested by year three, 6 were convicted, and only 3 were returned to either DJJ or DAI. Of the males in the FY 2011-12 cohort, 75.3 percent (488 youth) were arrested by the end of the three-year follow-up. Over half of the males (55.1 percent or 357 youth) were convicted. A smaller proportion of released DJJ males were returned to either DJJ (14.2 percent or 92 youth), DAI (31.5 percent or 204 youth), and any state commitment (38.4 percent or 249 youth).

Table 13. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Gender, FY 2011-12 Releases

Gender	Number Released	Return to DJJ		Return to DAI		Any State Custody		Arrest		Conviction	
		Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Arrested	Return Rate	Number Convicted	Return Rate
Male	648	92	14.2%	204	31.5%	249	38.4%	488	75.3%	357	55.1%
Female	27	1	3.7%	2	7.4%	3	11.1%	13	48.1%	6	22.2%
Total	675	93	13.8%	206	30.5%	252	37.3%	501	74.2%	363	53.8%

7.2 Race/Ethnicity

Table 14 presents the rates of recidivism at the end of three years by race/ethnicity. In this cohort, there were few Asian/Pacific Islanders and youth classified in the “Other” race/ethnicity category. In general, Black youth released from DJJ recidivated at a higher rate than any other racial/ethnic category (84.1 percent or 207 youth arrested, 66.7 percent or 164 youth convicted, 19.9 percent or 49 youth returned to DJJ, 40.2 percent or 99 youth returned to DAI, and 51.2 percent or 126 youth returned to any state institution). Recidivism rates for Hispanic youth (69.6 percent or 234 youth arrested, 49.4 percent or 166 youth convicted, 10.4 percent or 35 youth returned to DJJ, 25.9 percent or 87 youth returned to DAI, and 30.4 percent or 102 youth returned to any state commitment) were higher as compared to White releases (61.4 percent or 43 youth arrested, 37.1 percent or 26 youth convicted, 10 percent or 7 youth returned to DJJ, 21.4 percent or 15 youth returned to DAI, and 25.7 percent or 18 youth returned to any state institution).

Table 14. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Race/Ethnicity, FY 2011-12 Releases

Race/Ethnicity	Number Released	Return to DJJ		Return to DAI		Any State Custody		Arrest		Conviction	
		Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Arrested	Return Rate	Number Convicted	Return Rate
Hispanic	336	35	10.4%	87	25.9%	102	30.4%	234	69.6%	166	49.4%
Black	246	49	19.9%	99	40.2%	126	51.2%	207	84.1%	164	66.7%
White	70	7	10.0%	15	21.4%	18	25.7%	43	61.4%	26	37.1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	17	2	11.8%	4	23.5%	5	29.4%	15	88.2%	5	29.4%
Other	6	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	2	33.3%
Total	675	93	13.8%	206	30.5%	252	37.3%	501	74.2%	363	53.8%

7.3 Age at Admission

Table 15 reports the rates of recidivism at the end of three years by age at admission. Youths that were admitted at older ages (19-23 years old) have the lowest recidivism rate in every measured category. Youth who were between 15 and 17 at the time of admission were generally the most likely to recidivate.

Table 15. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Age at Admission, FY 2011-12 Releases

Age at Admission	Number Released	Return to DJJ		Return to DAI		Any State Custody		Arrest		Conviction	
		Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Arrested	Return Rate	Number Convicted	Return Rate
12 - 13	7	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	4	57.1%	4	57.1%
14	29	4	13.8%	9	31.0%	11	37.9%	21	72.4%	17	58.6%
15	79	13	16.5%	25	31.6%	30	38.0%	62	78.5%	50	63.3%
16	177	27	15.3%	62	35.0%	75	42.4%	147	83.1%	104	58.8%
17	214	31	14.5%	69	32.2%	87	40.7%	157	73.4%	109	50.9%
18	142	16	11.3%	36	25.4%	43	30.3%	97	68.3%	69	48.6%
19 - 23	27	1	3.7%	3	11.1%	4	14.8%	13	48.1%	10	37.0%
Total	675	93	13.8%	206	30.5%	252	37.3%	501	74.2%	363	53.8%

7.4 Age at Release

Table 16 reports the three-year recidivism rates by age at release. In general, the rate of recidivism is relatively stable across ages of release. The most variation is observed at the youngest groups and the eldest groups, and is most likely due to the fact that very few youth comprise those categories.

Table 16. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Age at Release, FY 2011-12 Releases

Age at Release	Number Released	Return to DJJ		Return to DAI		Any State Custody		Arrest		Conviction	
		Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Arrested	Return Rate	Number Convicted	Return Rate
12 - 16	11	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	5	45.5%	4	36.4%
17	35	2	5.7%	10	28.6%	12	34.3%	28	80.0%	19	54.3%
18	74	8	10.8%	24	32.4%	27	36.5%	59	79.7%	42	56.8%
19	131	12	9.2%	35	26.7%	40	30.5%	97	74.0%	68	51.9%
20	120	22	18.3%	35	29.2%	45	37.5%	83	69.2%	63	52.5%
21	100	15	15.0%	38	38.0%	47	47.0%	76	76.0%	54	54.0%
22	81	20	24.7%	24	29.6%	34	42.0%	63	77.8%	46	56.8%
23	52	7	13.5%	16	30.8%	19	36.5%	43	82.7%	31	59.6%
24	59	6	10.2%	17	28.8%	21	35.6%	41	69.5%	32	54.2%
25 - 28	12	0	0.0%	6	50.0%	6	50.0%	6	50.0%	4	33.3%
Total	675	93	13.8%	206	30.5%	252	37.3%	501	74.2%	363	53.8%

8 Rates by Juvenile Characteristics

8.1 Juvenile Offender Type

Figure 9. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12




Figure 9 and Table 17 report the rate of recidivism by Juvenile Offender Type (i.e., Serious/Violent only, Sex Offender only, Both, or Neither). A majority of the FY 2011-12 cohort is Serious/Violent only, so any comparisons should be made with caution. However, in general, Serious/Violent Only releases were the most likely to recidivate in every category. The next highest rates were found for youth who were both serious/violent and sex offenders (707(b) & 290).

Table 17. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Juvenile Offender Type, FY 2011-12⁸

Juvenile Offender Type	Number Released	Return to DJJ		Return to DAI		Any State Custody		Arrest		Conviction	
		Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Arrested	Return Rate	Number Convicted	Return Rate
Serious/Violent 707(b)	557	87	15.6%	191	34.3%	235	42.2%	442	79.4%	323	58.0%
Sex Offender (290)	15	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	7	46.7%	5	33.3%
Both (707(b) & 290)	47	6	12.8%	11	23.4%	13	27.7%	31	66.0%	25	53.2%
Neither	56	0	0.0%	3	5.4%	3	5.4%	21	37.5%	10	17.9%
Total	675	93	13.8%	206	30.5%	252	37.3%	501	74.2%	363	53.8%

⁸ Due to the small number of juvenile offenders (six juvenile offenders), superior court commitments that would have been classified as Serious/Violent or Sex Offenders if they were tried in Juvenile Court are included in the Serious/Violent 707(b) category or the Sex Offender (290) category, as appropriate.

8.2 Commitment Offense Category

Figure 10. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Commitment Offense Category, FY 2011-12 Releases




Table 18 presents the rate of recidivism by commitment offense category. All commitment offenses are classified as a crimes against persons, property crimes, drug crimes, or other crimes. Overwhelmingly, the DJJ release cohort in FY 2011-12 was committed for crimes against persons. The small number of youth who committed any other type of offense makes it difficult to perform meaningful comparisons. As a whole, despite the serious nature of crimes against persons, youth who committed them were not the most likely to recidivate.

Table 18. Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Commitment Offense Category, FY 2011-12 Releases

Juvenile Offender Type	Number Released	Return to DJJ		Return to DAI		Any State Custody		Arrest		Conviction	
		Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Arrested	Return Rate	Number Convicted	Return Rate
Crimes Against Persons	636	84	13.2%	186	29.2%	230	36.2%	469	73.7%	337	53.0%
Property Crimes	28	9	32.1%	13	46.4%	15	53.6%	23	82.1%	18	64.3%
Drug Crimes	3	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	2	66.7%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%
Other Crimes	8	0	0.0%	5	62.5%	5	62.5%	6	75.0%	5	62.5%
Total	675	93	13.8%	206	30.5%	252	37.3%	501	74.2%	363	53.8%

8.3 Commitment Offenses

Figure 11. Three-Year Return to State-Level Incarceration Rate by Commitment Offense, FY 2011-12 Releases




Figure 11 and Table 19 show the three-year return to any state-level incarceration by commitment offense. These rates represent recidivism by commitment offense. They do not reflect what type of recidivism crime the offender committed to be returned to state-custody. In many cases, only one offender was committed for a given offense. Therefore, caution should be exercised when interpreting the rates.

Table 19. Three-Year Return to State-Level Incarceration Rate by Commitment Offense, FY 2011-12 Releases

Offense	Number Released	Three-Year	
		Number Returned	Return Rate
Assault and Battery	2	0	0.0%
Burglary Second Degree	1	0	0.0%
Receive Stolen Property	1	0	0.0%
Accessory	1	0	0.0%
Assault/Attempt Murder	23	1	4.3%
Murder First Degree	13	1	7.7%
Lewd Contact	84	7	8.3%
Manslaughter	11	2	18.2%
Rape	23	6	26.1%
Sodomy	10	3	30.0%
Murder Second Degree	3	1	33.3%
Misc Assault	3	1	33.3%
Aggravated Assault	196	68	34.7%
Carjacking	21	9	42.9%
Robbery Enhanced	103	49	47.6%
Possession Hard Narcotics	2	1	50.0%
Robbery Unenhanced	128	69	53.9%
Burglary First Degree	25	14	56.0%
Discharge Firearm	7	5	71.4%
Extortion Kidnapping	7	5	71.4%
Assault/ Attempt Rob	8	7	87.5%
Vehicular Manslaughter	1	1	100.0%
Grand Theft/Fraud	1	1	100.0%
Sale Dangerous Drugs	1	1	100.0%
Total	675	252	37.3%

9 Conclusion

This report provides recidivism rates for the 675 youth who were released from DJJ in FY 2011-12 and tracked for a three-year follow-up period. Multiple measures of recidivism were used to better assess patterns among youth and include: returns to DJJ, returns to DAI, returns to either DJJ or DAI (i.e., any state-level correctional institution), arrests, and reconvictions. Due to recent legislation, which changed and limited the type of youth eligible for commitment to DJJ, the release cohort was examined in two groups: 1) 619 youth comprising 707(b) cases (i.e. serious and/or violent crimes, 290 cases (registered sex youth), both 707(b) and 290 cases, and superior court commitments to DJJ and; 2) 56 youth that were not 707(b) or 290 cases.

For all five measures of recidivism, the 619 youth including 707(b) and 290 cases recidivated at higher rates than the 56 non-707(b)/290 cases, as expected. Overall, 13.8 percent of youth released from DJJ in FY 2011-12 were returned to DJJ within three years of their release and 30.5 percent were returned or committed to DAI. In total, 37.3 percent of the youth returned to state-level incarceration (i.e. DJJ and/or DAI). Over 70 percent (74.2 percent) of the cohort was arrested and 53.8 percent of the cohort was re-convicted after three years of follow-up.

In February 2016, the class-action lawsuit known as *Farrell v Kernan*⁹ was terminated after DJJ fully implemented sweeping reforms to the juvenile system. Among the many reforms was the implementation of the IBTM a comprehensive approach to assessing, understanding, and treating youth. The IBTM is intended to reduce institutional violence and the risk of future criminal behavior by working with youth to prioritize and achieve goals for successful community living. The DJJ adopted the IBTM as the foundation for developing and implementing the education, mental health, and treatment model for committed youth. The IBTM provides collaborative services and evidence-based interventions and programs that develop youths' skills for success. The data presented in this report pre-dates some of the important reforms that took place near the conclusion of the lawsuit; therefore, more time is needed to fully understand the long-term impacts of DJJ programs on recidivism.

California's juvenile justice system is made up of county and state-level facilities and evidence-based rehabilitative programs. In keeping with the CDCR's goal of developing a comprehensive system of program evaluation, these recidivism rates may be used to monitor DJJ youth population over time, investigate the relationship between youth risk to recidivate and, and to evaluate the effectiveness of DJJ programs, policies, and procedures.

⁹ *Margaret Farrell v. Scott Kernan* (Case No. RG 03079344). Stipulation and Order Dismissing Consent Decree with Prejudice, dated February 25, 2016.

Appendix A

Demographics and Characteristics of Youth Released from DJJ by Juvenile Offender Type

Characteristics	Total		707(b)/290		Non-707(b)/290	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	675	100.0%	619	100.0%	56	100.0%
3 Year State Incarceration Rate						
Not Returned within 3 Years	423	62.7%	370	59.8%	53	94.6%
Returned to State Level Incarceration within 3 Years	252	37.3%	249	40.2%	3	5.4%
Gender						
Male	648	96.0%	592	95.6%	56	100.0%
Female	27	4.0%	27	4.4%	0	0.0%
Race/Ethnicity						
White	70	10.4%	51	8.2%	19	33.9%
Hispanic	336	49.8%	307	49.6%	29	51.8%
Black	246	36.4%	239	38.6%	7	12.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	17	2.5%	17	2.7%	0	0.0%
Other	6	0.9%	5	0.8%	1	1.8%
Release Type						
First Release	385	57.0%	330	53.3%	55	98.2%
Re-Release	290	43.0%	289	46.7%	1	1.8%
Age at First Admission						
12-13	7	1.0%	7	1.1%	0	0.0%
14	29	4.3%	26	4.2%	3	5.4%
15	79	11.7%	72	11.6%	7	12.5%
16	177	26.2%	165	26.7%	12	21.4%
17	214	31.7%	201	32.5%	13	23.2%
18	142	21.0%	128	20.7%	14	25.0%
19-23	27	4.0%	20	3.2%	7	12.5%
Age at Release						
12-16	11	1.6%	7	1.1%	4	7.1%
17	35	5.2%	30	4.8%	5	8.9%
18	74	11.0%	66	10.7%	8	14.3%
19	131	19.4%	117	18.9%	14	25.0%
20	120	17.8%	101	16.3%	19	33.9%
21	100	14.8%	98	15.8%	2	3.6%
22	81	12.0%	80	12.9%	1	1.8%
23	52	7.7%	49	7.9%	3	5.4%
24	59	8.7%	59	9.5%	0	0.0%
25-28	12	1.8%	12	1.9%	0	0.0%

Demographics and Characteristics of Youth Released from DJJ by Juvenile Offender Type (continued)

Characteristics	Total		707(b)/290		Non-707(b)/290	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Commitment Offense						
Crimes Against Persons	636	94.2%	581	93.9%	55	98.2%
Property Crimes	28	4.1%	27	4.4%	1	1.8%
Drug Crimes	3	0.4%	3	0.5%	0	0.0%
Other Crimes	8	1.2%	8	1.3%	0	0.0%
Offender Type						
707(b) Only	553	81.9%	553	89.3%	0	0.0%
290 Only	15	2.2%	15	2.4%	0	0.0%
707(b) and 290	45	6.7%	45	7.3%	0	0.0%
Other	6	0.9%	6	1.0%	0	0.0%
Neither	56	8.3%	0	0.0%	56	100.0%

Appendix B

Recidivism Rates for Youth Released in FY 2007-08 through FY 2011-12

The data provided in the following tables present rates for youth released from DJJ between FY 2007-08 and FY 2011-12. These rates have been provided for context, but due to changes in the methods used to calculate the below rates, as well as the makeup of each cohort, direct comparisons should not be made across fiscal years.

		One-Year		Two-Year		Three-Year		
Return to DAI	Number Released	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	
FY 2007-08	707(b)/290	916	77	8.4%	180	19.7%	272	29.7%
	Non-707(b)/290	488	44	9.0%	134	27.5%	196	40.2%
	Total	1,404	121	8.6%	314	22.4%	468	33.3%
FY 2008-09	707(b)/290	808	70	8.7%	162	20.0%	239	29.6%
	Non-707(b)/290	228	37	16.2%	72	31.6%	91	39.9%
	Total	1,036	107	10.3%	234	22.6%	330	31.9%
FY 2009-10	707(b)/290	890	99	11.1%	212	23.8%	282	31.7%
	Non-707(b)/290	103	14	13.6%	33	32.0%	42	40.8%
	Total	993	113	11.4%	245	24.7%	324	32.6%
FY 2010-11	707(b)/290	788	75	9.5%	163	20.7%	239	30.3%
	Non-707(b)/290	26	2	7.7%	7	26.9%	7	26.9%
	Total	814	77	9.5%	170	20.9%	246	30.2%
FY 2011-12	707(b)/290	619	60	9.7%	134	21.6%	203	32.8%
	Non-707(b)/290	56	0	0.0%	2	3.6%	3	5.4%
	Total	675	60	8.9%	136	20.1%	206	30.5%

		One-Year		Two-Year		Three-Year		
Return to DJJ	Number Released	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	
FY 2007-08	707(b)/290	916	179	19.5%	319	34.8%	358	39.1%
	Non-707(b)/290	488	3	0.6%	3	0.6%	3	0.6%
	Total	1,404	182	13.0%	322	22.9%	361	25.7%
FY 2008-09	707(b)/290	808	250	30.9%	324	40.1%	342	42.3%
	Non-707(b)/290	228	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Total	1,036	250	24.1%	324	31.3%	342	33.0%
FY 2009-10	707(b)/290	890	321	36.1%	396	44.5%	418	47.0%
	Non-707(b)/290	103	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Total	993	321	32.3%	396	39.9%	418	42.1%
FY 2010-11	707(b)/290	788	202	25.6%	277	35.2%	283	35.9%
	Non-707(b)/290	26	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%
	Total	814	203	24.9%	278	34.2%	284	34.9%
FY 2011-12	707(b)/290	619	87	14.1%	93	15.0%	93	15.0%
	Non-707(b)/290	56	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Total	675	87	12.9%	93	13.8%	93	13.8%

Recidivism Rates for Youth Released in FY 2007-08 through FY 2011-12
(continued)

Return to Any State-Level Commitment		Number Released	One-Year		Two-Year		Three-Year	
			Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate	Number Returned	Return Rate
FY 2007-08	707(b)/290	916	239	26.1%	437	47.7%	510	55.7%
	Non-707(b)/290	488	47	9.6%	136	27.9%	198	40.6%
	Total	1,404	286	20.4%	573	40.8%	708	50.4%
FY 2008-09	707(b)/290	808	290	35.9%	394	48.8%	439	54.3%
	Non-707(b)/290	228	37	16.2%	72	31.6%	91	39.9%
	Total	1,036	327	31.6%	466	45.0%	530	51.2%
FY 2009-10	707(b)/290	890	383	43.0%	499	56.1%	547	61.5%
	Non-707(b)/290	103	14	13.6%	33	32.0%	42	40.8%
	Total	993	397	40.0%	532	53.6%	589	59.3%
FY 2010-11	707(b)/290	788	254	32.2%	372	47.2%	414	52.5%
	Non-707(b)/290	26	3	11.5%	8	30.8%	8	30.8%
	Total	814	257	31.6%	380	46.7%	422	51.8%
FY 2011-12	707(b)/290	619	131	21.2%	194	31.3%	249	40.2%
	Non-707(b)/290	56	0	0.0%	2	3.6%	3	5.4%
	Total	675	131	19.4%	196	29.0%	252	37.3%

Arrest		Number Released	One-Year		Two-Year		Three-Year	
			Number Arrested	Arrest Rate	Number Arrested	Arrest Rate	Number Arrested	Arrest Rate
FY 2007-08	707(b)/290	916	542	59.2%	694	75.8%	734	80.1%
	Non-707(b)/290	488	326	66.8%	397	81.4%	417	85.5%
	Total	1,404	868	61.8%	1,091	77.7%	1,151	82.0%
FY 2008-09	707(b)/290	808	482	59.7%	574	71.0%	614	76.0%
	Non-707(b)/290	228	159	69.7%	183	80.3%	198	86.8%
	Total	1,036	641	61.9%	757	73.1%	812	78.4%
FY 2009-10	707(b)/290	890	536	60.2%	658	73.9%	709	79.7%
	Non-707(b)/290	103	66	64.1%	76	73.8%	79	76.7%
	Total	993	602	60.6%	734	73.9%	788	79.4%
FY 2010-11	707(b)/290	788	458	58.1%	584	74.1%	629	79.8%
	Non-707(b)/290	26	15	57.7%	15	57.7%	16	61.5%
	Total	814	473	58.1%	599	73.6%	645	79.2%
FY 2011-12	707(b)/290	619	353	57.0%	438	70.8%	480	77.5%
	Non-707(b)/290	56	13	23.2%	19	33.9%	21	37.5%
	Total	675	366	54.2%	457	67.7%	501	74.2%


Recidivism Rates for Youth Released in FY 2007-08 through FY 2011-12
(continued)

Conviction		Number Released	One-Year		Two-Year		Three-Year	
			Number Convicted	Conviction Rate	Number Convicted	Conviction Rate	Number Convicted	Conviction Rate
FY 2007-08	707(b)/290	916	220	24.0%	403	44.0%	503	54.9%
	Non-707(b)/290	488	168	34.4%	274	56.1%	336	68.9%
	Total	1,404	388	27.6%	677	48.2%	839	59.8%
FY 2008-09	707(b)/290	808	175	21.7%	331	41.0%	433	53.6%
	Non-707(b)/290	228	94	41.2%	144	63.2%	160	70.2%
	Total	1,036	269	26.0%	475	45.8%	593	57.2%
FY 2009-10	707(b)/290	890	213	23.9%	381	42.8%	503	56.5%
	Non-707(b)/290	103	30	29.1%	58	56.3%	67	65.0%
	Total	993	243	24.5%	439	44.2%	570	57.4%
FY 2010-11	707(b)/290	788	172	21.8%	333	42.3%	445	56.5%
	Non-707(b)/290	26	9	34.6%	14	53.8%	15	57.7%
	Total	814	181	22.2%	347	42.6%	460	56.5%
FY 2011-12	707(b)/290	619	145	23.4%	272	43.9%	353	57.0%
	Non-707(b)/290	56	3	5.4%	8	14.3%	10	17.9%
	Total	675	148	21.9%	280	41.5%	363	53.8%

Appendix C


One-Year, Two-Year, and Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Fiscal Year

One-Year Recidivism Rates by Fiscal Year




One-Year, Two-Year, and Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Fiscal Year

Two-Year Recidivism Rates by Fiscal Year



One-Year, Two-Year, Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Fiscal Year

Three-Year Recidivism Rates by Fiscal Year



Appendix D

Definition of Terms

Arrest

Taking a person into custody, in a case and in the manner authorized by the law (California Penal Code section 834)

Assembly Bill (AB) 191

AB 191 – A bill enacted on September 27, 2007 that provides more specific language for Senate Bill 81.

Conviction

A judgement, based either on the verdict of a jury or a judicial officer or on the guilty plea of the defendant, that the defendant is guilty.

Department of Justice (DOJ) Identifier

DOJ assigns a Criminal Identification and Index number (CII Number) to anyone who is arrested or fingerprinted. An initial record of arrest and prosecution (rap sheet) is then created and subsequent arrests are added to it as DOJ received notification from the courts. A CII number may also be issued if a youth not fingerprinted by DOJ has received a disposition notification from the court.

Division of Adult Institutions (DAI)

The DAI is part of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) and is responsible for the state-level supervision and custody of adult, felony offenders.

Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)

The DJJ is a part of the CDCR and is responsible for state-level supervision and custody of youthful offenders.

DJJ Population

This DJJ release cohort is comprised of youth directly committed from the juvenile or adult/superior court. Not included in this release cohort are the housing and contract cases- C cases (County Referrals), D cases (adult court diagnostic), E cases (youth under age 18 committed to DAI but housed at DJJ for education), G cases (emergency housing from the counties), J cases (overflow cases from Juvenile Hall), M cases (youth under the age of 18 who under W&IC 1731.5(c) are committed to DAI but ordered by adult court to be housed in DJJ), S cases (juvenile cases whose records are sealed), and Z cases (parole caseload from other cases).

707(b)/290 Offenders

Youth committed to DJJ with an offense included in W&IC 707(b), or youth required to register as sex offenders under Penal Code (PC) section 290. Youth committed to DJJ from adult court are considered a 707(b) case whether or not their commitment offense is included in W&IC 707(b).

Non-707(b)/290 Offenders

All other DJJ youth who were committed to the DJJ with commitment offenses not falling under W&IC 707(b) or PC section 290.

Juvenile Court Commitment

Youth committed to DJJ from the juvenile court. DJJ maintains jurisdiction until age 21 if any commitment offense is not designated by the court to be a W&IC 707(b) offense. If the court deems one of the commitment offenses as falling under the offenses listed in W&IC 707(b), the jurisdiction increase to age 25.

Parole Violation

If a youth released onto parole commits a law violation or a technical violation (e.g., absence without leave, positive drug test), s/he can be returned to DJJ or DAI custody by the Juvenile Parole Board. A law violation can be a recommitment by the court for a new offense or a disposition by the Juvenile Parole Board that there was probable cause of a law violation was committed.

Registered Sex Offender

Under PC section 290, if a committing court designates someone as a sex offender, s/he must register with local law enforcement as such.

Senate Bill (SB) 81

SB 81 – A bill enacted on September 1, 2007 mandating that only youth with a sex offense requiring their registration as a sex offender (PC 290), youth with violent and/or serious offense [W&IC 707(b)], and youth committed to DJJ from adult court may be committed to DJJ. Since 2007, youth with new court commitments who do not meet these criteria are retained in county facilities.

Superior Court Commitment

Youth committed to DJJ from adult court. DJJ maintains jurisdiction until age 25 from the adult court under W&IC 1731.5(a). Not to be confused with “E” or “M” cases [W&IC 1731.5(c)], which are also adult court commitments to DJJ but are not included in the release cohort analyzed in this report. “E” and “M” case admissions are juveniles sentenced to an adult institution but housed in juvenile facilities.