

Idaho Department of Correction



Annual Statistical Report Fiscal Year 2009

Prepared by
Research and Analysis
Evaluation and Compliance

Table of Contents

Section 1—Overview	
Department Description	1
Idaho State Prison Descriptions	2
Facility Map	5
Section 2—Incarcerated Offender Demographics	
Status	6
Gender	6
Ethnicity	7
Crime Groups	7
Crime Groups Male	8
Crime Groups Female	8
Age Groups	9
Section 3—Incarcerated Offender Population Growth	
Population Growth Since 1980	10
Population Percent Increase by Gender	10
Incarcerated Offenders by Status	11
Prison Admissions and Releases	12
Court Commitments by Status	12
Court Commitments by Crime	13
Admissions to Term	14
Term Admissions and Releases	14
Term Court Commitments by Violence Type	15
Lengths of Stay by Violence Type	16
Drug Trafficking Offenses	16
Non-violent Term Releases by Type	17
Length of Stay for Non-violent Term Releases	18
Violent Term Releases by Type	18
Length of Stay for Violent Term Releases	19
Rider Population Growth	20
Historical Incarcerated Offender Admissions and Releases	20
Section 4—Supervised Offender Demographics	
Status	22
Gender	23
Ethnicity	23
Crime Groups	23
Crime Groups Male	24
Crime Groups Female	24
Age Groups	25

Section 5—Supervised Offender Population Growth	
Supervised Offender Population Growth Since 1995	26
Parole Population Growth by Gender	27
Parole Admissions by Type	28
Non-violent Parolee Length of Stay	29
Violent Parolee Length of Stay	30
Non-violent Parole Releases by Type	31
Violent Parole Releases by Type	32
Probation Population Growth by Gender	33
Court Commitments to Probation by Crime	34
Court Commitments to Probation by Crime Violence	35
Probation Admissions	36
Probationer Length of Stay	37
Non-violent Probationer Length of Stay	38
Non-violent Probationer Releases	39
Violent Probationer Length of Stay	40
Violent Probationer Releases	41
Historical Supervised Offender Admissions and Releases	42
Section 6—Recidivism	
Recidivism Measure Definitions	43
Historical Time to Revoke Probation	44
Historical Time to Revoke Parole	44
Historical Time to Return after Discharge	45
Recidivism Summary	46
Historical Term Admissions by Recidivist Type	47
Historical Probation Revocation Rate by Crime and Gender	47
Historical Parole Revocation Rate by Crime and Gender	48
Historical New Crime Rate by Crime and Gender	49
Section 7—Special Topics	
Sex Offender Definitions	50
Referable Sex Offenders by Status	50
Anticipated Sex Offender Population Growth	51
Registerable Sex Offender Commitment Status by Year	52
Sex Offender Sentence Length	53
Sentence Length for Other Than Sex Crimes	54
Sex Offender Management Practices	56
Methamphetamine Discussion	58
Cost of Meth	59
Substance Abuser Court Commitments by Status	60
Commitments for Meth Users by Status	61
Drug Crime Commitments for Meth Users by Status	62
Probationer Drug Preferences	63
Rider Drug Preferences	64
Inmate Drug Preferences	65
Estimated Cost to IDOC for Meth Users	65

Appendices

Appendix 1—Standard Report, June 2009

Appendix 2—Offender Forecast FY 2010-2013

Appendix 3—FY 2009 Programs and Education Report

Appendix 4—Definitions

Chart Index

No.	Title	Page
1	Offender Flow	2
2	Status Distribution of Incarcerated Offenders	6
3	Gender Distribution of Incarcerated Offenders	6
4	Ethnic Distribution of Incarcerated Offenders	7
5	Crime Group Distribution of Incarcerated Offenders	7
6	Crime Group Distribution of Incarcerated Offenders Males	8
7	Crime Group Distribution of Incarcerated Offenders Females	8
8	Age Group Distribution of Incarcerated Offenders	9
9	Incarcerated Offender Population Growth Since 1980	10
10	Incarcerated Offender Population Annual Percent Increase	11
11	Incarcerated Offenders by Status	11
12	Admissions and Releases from Prison	12
13	Portion of Total Court Commitments by Status	13
14	Court of Commitments to Term by Fiscal Year and Crime	13
15	Term Admissions by Type and Fiscal Year	14
16	Total Admissions to and Releases from Term by Fiscal Year	15
17	Court Commitments to Term by Violence Type and Fiscal Year	15
18	Length of Stay by Crime Violence and Fiscal Year	16
19	Sentence Length by Crime Violence	17
20	Non-Violent Term Releases by Type and Fiscal Year	17
21	Length of Stay for Non-Violent Term Releases	18
22	Violent Offender Term Releases by Type and Fiscal Year	19
23	Length of Stay for Violent Term Releases	19
24	Rider Population by Month, FY 1996 – 2009	20
25	Supervised Offenders by Status	22
26	Gender Distribution of Supervised Offenders	22
27	Ethnic Distribution of Supervised Offenders	23
28	Crime Group Distribution of Supervised Offenders	23
29	Crime Group Distribution of Supervised Offenders Males	24
30	Crime Group Distribution of Supervised Offenders Females	24
31	Age Group Distribution of Supervised Offenders	25
32	Supervised Offender Population Growth Since 1995	26
33	Parolee Percent Increase by Gender and Fiscal Year	27
34	Admissions to Parole by Type and Year	28
35	Average Length of Stay for Non-Violent Parolees	29
36	Average Length of Stay for Violent Parolees	30
37	Non-violent Parole Releases by Type and Year	31
38	Violent Parole Releases by Type and Year	32
39	Probationer Percent Increase by Gender and Fiscal Year	33
40	Court Commitments to Probation by Fiscal Year and Crime	34
41	Court Commitments to Probation by Crime Violence and Year	35
42	Admissions to Probation by Type and Year	36

43	Average Length of Stay for Probationers by Crime Violence & Year	37
44	Average Length of Stay for Non-Violent Probation Releases	38
45	Non-Violent Probation Releases by Type and Year	39
46	Average Length of Stay for Violent Probation Releases	40
47	Violent Probation Releases by Type and Year	41
48	Months from Probation to Revocation	44
49	Months from Parole to Revocation	45
50	Months from Discharge to Recidivation	46
51	Portion of Term Admissions by Recidivist Type and Year	47
52	Portion of Registerable Sex Offender Court Commitments by Commitment Status and Year	53
53	Average Sex Offender Sentence Length by Status and Year	54
54	Average Non-Sex Offender Sentence Length	55
55	Court Commitments for Substance Abusers	60
56	Portion of Court Commitments for Meth Users	61
57	Portion of Drug Crime Court Commitments for Meth Users	62

Table Index

No.	Title	Page
1	Historical Incarcerated Offender Admissions and Releases	21
2	Historical Supervised Offender Admissions and Releases	42
3	Recidivism Rate Summary by Measure and Source	46
4	Probation Revocations by Gender and Crime	48
5	Parole Revocations by Gender and Crime	48
6	New Prison Sentence after Discharge by Gender and Crime	49
7	Offenders Incarcerated or Supervised for Referable Crimes	51
8	Registerable Sex Offender Court Commitments	52
9	Probationer Drug Preferences	63
10	Rider Drug Preferences	64
11	Inmate Drug Preferences	65

Section 1 Overview

Idaho Department of Correction

The purpose of this document is to describe current and historic statistical information regarding offenders incarcerated or supervised by the Idaho Department of Correction (IDOC). At the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 the incarcerated population was 7,283 offenders and the supervised population was 13,756 offenders. Only felony offenders are committed to the Idaho Department of Correction for incarceration or supervision.

Incarcerated offenders include Termers, Retainer Jurisdiction (Riders) and Parole Violators (Chart 1). Termers are offenders sentenced to a term of imprisonment by the courts. Offenders can also be returned to Term by the parole commission upon parole revocation. Riders serve a 120-day sentence of incarceration at a specialized facility, where they are assessed to determine needs and receive intensive programming and education. The court retains jurisdiction over Riders and determines whether the offender should be placed on Probation or sentenced to Term upon completing the Rider. Parole Violators are offenders who violated the conditions of their parole or committed a new crime while on parole and are awaiting a revocation hearing from the parole commission. At the end of FY 2009 IDOC incarcerated 6,238 Termers, 699 Riders and 346 Parole Violators.

In Idaho there are two types of supervision for offenders. The first is Probation, a period of community supervision by the Department. Historically, the courts sentence almost two thirds of felony offenders to Probation (Chart 1). Probationers make up the majority of supervised offenders. At fiscal year end there were 11,128 probationers being supervised by the Department. The second type of supervised offender is the parolee. Offenders are eligible for Parole supervision after they have served the determinate portion of their prison sentence. The Parole Commission has the authority to grant Parole once offenders have met specified conditions. At the end of fiscal year 2009, there were 2,628 offenders on Parole.


To understand how the IDOC system works, one must first understand how offenders come to the department, how they flow through the system and how they are eventually discharged. Chart 1 helps illustrate the process.

All commitments to IDOC result from a court order. Once an offender is found guilty, the courts decide what status they will be sentenced to (Probation, Rider or Term incarceration) and for how long. The blue lines in Chart 1 represent these commitment decisions. The percentages represent the historical average portion for commitment status. Historically, only 15% of initial court orders sentence offenders to Term.

The green lines in the chart represent offender moves from one status to another and the historical averages for moves from each status. The system process can be described as follows; an offender may enter Term incarceration from a new court commitment or as a failed Rider or from a revoked Probation or from a revoked Parole. The Term offender may be paroled or discharged. Status change and discharge decisions for Probationers and Riders are made by the courts. Parole decisions for Term offenders are made by the Parole Commission. Violation, revocation and early discharge decisions for Parolees are also made by the Parole Commission.

Chart 1
Flow of Offenders

Historic Patterns of Court Commitments and Offender Flow Through the Idaho Department of Correction



Percentages represent averages from FY 1996 through 2008

Note: The historical parole revocation rate is the product of the Parole to Parole Violator moves multiplied by the Parole Violator to Term moves, or about 40%

Idaho State Prisons

The State of Idaho incarcerates offenders in eight state run institutions, one privately operated institution and five community work centers that have a combined operating capacity of 6,973. At the end of 2009, IDOC contracted 120 beds out of state. There were also 529 IDOC offenders temporarily housed in county jail beds.

Idaho Correctional Institution Orofino (ICIO)

ICIO is modified from its former use as a state hospital mental health facility. This prison houses male offenders of all custody levels. This facility also houses protective custody offenders. The operating capacity is 541 beds, 100 offenders participating in the work camp are housed separately. Program areas include anger management, cognitive programming, drug and alcohol education, therapeutic community, literacy, special and secondary education and workforce development.

Idaho Maximum Security Institution (IMSI)

IMSI is one of the five institutions located south of Boise and is the highest security prison. It opened in November 1989 to confine Idaho's most violent and problematic

offenders. The population includes a large number of mental health offenders in the acute mental health services program and Idaho's inmates under sentence of death. The operating capacity is 514 offenders. Programs are limited because of the high security risks but do include anger management, cognitive programming, special and secondary education, and drug and alcohol groups.

Idaho State Correctional Institution (ISCI)

ISCI is the department's largest prison. It is the main facility for long-term male, medium custody offenders. The compound includes a chapel, recreation center, education center, infirmary and a large Correctional Industries operation. All incoming male offenders go through ISCI's reception and diagnostic unit prior to institutional placement. The operating capacity is 1,694 offenders. Programming is widely available and includes anger management, cognitive programming, drug and alcohol programming, pre-release assistance, literacy, special and secondary education and workforce development. Additionally, ISCI houses the Behavioral Health Unit (BHU) which provides sheltered living and mental health services.

South Idaho Correctional Institution (SICI)

SICI houses minimum-custody offenders in a dormitory setting. A 100-bed parole release center (PRC) focuses on substance abuse issues and helps ease the transition for those near the end of their sentence. The total operating capacity is 728 offenders. Programming includes anger management, cognitive programming, therapeutic community, pre-release assistance, literacy, special and secondary education, workforce development and drug and alcohol programming.

St. Anthony Work Camp (SAWC)

SAWC is a former regional hospital converted to a work camp, located in the town of St. Anthony. It serves low-risk, minimum and community custody males. The program focus is to provide a work therapy program through full-time paid employment. Offenders also participate in community service projects. The operating capacity is 240. Programs include cognitive programming, pre-release assistance, drug and alcohol groups, literacy, secondary education and workforce development.

North Idaho Correctional Institution (NICI)

NICI is a former military radar station north of the town of Cottonwood. This prison houses males in the Retained Jurisdiction (Rider) program and term sex offenders. It focuses on programming offenders who might be viable candidates for probation rather than incarceration. The operating capacity is 399. Programming includes sex offender treatment, cognitive programming, drug and alcohol treatment, parenting and relationship classes, literacy, secondary and special education and workforce development. In 2009, NICI implemented a sex offender treatment program for about 50 Minimum custody Termers.

Idaho Correctional Center (ICC)

ICC opened in July 2000 as the first state-owned, privately operated facility in Idaho. Corrections Corporation of America is currently the contracted prison operator. It houses medium and minimum custody male offenders. The operating capacity is 1,838

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

offenders. Programming includes literacy, special and secondary education, drug and alcohol treatment, cognitive programming, anger management, therapeutic community, sex offender programming and workforce development.

Pocatello Women's Correctional Center (PWCC)

PWCC is designed specifically to meet the unique program and security needs of female offenders. The institution includes the female reception and diagnostic center. It houses all custody levels including inmates under sentence of death. The institution also operates a work release/work crew program as part of its community transition release program. Operating capacity is 285. Programs include mental health, drug and alcohol treatment, cognitive programming, literacy, special and secondary education, post traumatic stress disorder therapy, building healthy relationships and workforce development.

South Boise Women's Correctional Center (SBWCC)

This minimum-custody facility houses females in the retained jurisdiction program and therapeutic community. Women are housed in a dorm-like setting. Their time is focused on specialized classes and programming. Operating capacity is 284 offenders. Programming includes anger management, cognitive programming, building healthy relationships, drug and alcohol treatment, literacy, secondary and special education and workforce development.

Community Work Centers (CWC)

Community Work Centers house minimum and community custody offenders. Community custody offenders may participate in work release activities. A portion of these offenders' wages is returned to the CWC to offset housing and supervision expenses. The CWC program allows offenders to re-establish community ties, develop work skills, acquire employment and save money to help with the expenses they will face when they transition back into the community. Residents at the Work Centers can participate in education programs offered through local schools, colleges, universities, and district programs. Programs allow them to receive cognitive programming, substance abuse treatment, secondary education and selected vocational training.

There are a total of 450 community work center beds. The Nampa CWC houses 85 male offenders, Twin Falls CWC houses 81 male offenders and Idaho Falls CWC houses 84 male offenders. SICI also operates a work center with an operating capacity of 100. The female CWC is located in Boise and has an operating capacity of 100 offenders.

Idaho's incarcerated offender population exceeds our available bed capacity. To meet this need, Idaho housed 120 offenders in out of state facilities at the end of 2009.

In addition to these institutions, the IDOC Community Corrections Division (CCD) operates seven Probation and Parole districts that correspond with the seven judicial districts. Each district operates a number of satellite offices, as well. 188 Probation and Parole Officers supervised 11,128 probationers and 2,628 parolees at end of FY 2009.

Section 2

Incarcerated Offender Demographics

Incarcerated Offender Demographics

This section describes the characteristics of the incarcerated population. There were 7,283 incarcerated offenders under the jurisdiction of the Idaho Department of Correction at the end of fiscal year 2009. The supporting data for these charts can be found in the June 2009 edition of the Standard Reports in Appendix 1.




Chart 2 illustrates the three types of incarcerated offenders and the distribution in Idaho's prisons. Term offenders make up the vast majority of incarcerated offenders.




Chart 3 indicates a significantly higher incidence of incarceration for male offenders than for female offenders. There were 6,509 males and 774 females incarcerated at the

end of FY 2009.

**Chart 4
Incarcerated Offenders by Ethnicity**




Chart 4 represents the ethnic distribution of the incarcerated population. The population is primarily white as is the population of Idaho. Hispanics tend to be over-represented in the incarcerated offender population.

**Chart 5
Incarcerated Offenders by Crime Group**




Chart 5 illustrates the incarcerated population by crime group as indicated by the offender's worst crime for the current period of incarceration. About 51% are incarcerated for non-violent offenses (Drug, Property and Alcohol). This has changed dramatically since 2007, when more than 54% were incarcerated for non-violent crimes.

There is a clear distinction between Crime Groups by gender. Chart 6 shows the male Crime Group distribution. There were 6,509 male offenders incarcerated at the end of FY 2009. This chart shows a distribution similar to the one in Chart 5 because more than 89% of incarcerated offenders are male. About 48% of males are incarcerated for non-violent offenses (Drug, Property and Alcohol). At the end of FY 2007, 51% of males were incarcerated for non-violent offenses.

**Chart 6
Male Incarcerated Offenders by Crime Group**



Chart 7 shows the female Crime Group distribution. There were 798 female offenders incarcerated at the end of FY 2009. This distribution is clearly different than the one for males. In fact, more than 78% of the females are incarcerated for non-violent offenses (Drug, Property and Alcohol). At the end of FY 2007, 83% of females were incarcerated for non-violent offenses.

**Chart 7
Female Incarcerated Offenders by Crime Group**





Chart 8 shows the age distribution of the incarcerated population. The values represent the offenders' age at the end of FY 2009. The wide variance in age presents challenges in a prison setting. The average incarcerated offender age is increasing. The average age of incarcerated offenders at the end of FY 2009 was 36.7. The average age of incarcerated offenders at the end of FY 2000 was 34.6. IDOC is also experiencing an increase in the number and portion of offenders in the elderly category. At the end of FY 2009, 12.7% (822 offenders) of incarcerated offenders were over age 50. At the end of FY 2000, 8.8% (442 offenders) were over 50.

Chart 8
Incarcerated Offenders by Age Group



Section 3

Incarcerated Offender Population Growth

Incarcerated Offender Population Growth Patterns

Since the end of FY 1980, the incarcerated population has increased from 915 to 7,283. Since FY 1995, the incarcerated offender population has more than doubled, from 3,298 to 7,283. In the last decade, the male portion of the incarcerated offender population has increased 43% and the female incarcerated offender population has increased 78%. After a pattern of nearly continuous increase since 1995, the incarcerated offender population has declined for the last two years for both male and female offenders.

Chart 9 shows the male, female, and total incarcerated populations at year end since 1980. Though the female population is still a small portion of the overall incarcerated population, the growth has been tremendous and continues to present challenges as the Department of Correction prepares plans for managing this population group.

**Chart 9
Incarcerated Offender Population Growth**




Chart 10 illustrates the annual percent increase for the male and female incarcerated offender populations since 1995. Incarcerated statuses include Term, Rider and Parole Violator. The male incarcerated offender population has increased an average of 7.2% per year. The female population has increased at nearly double the male rate with an average annual percent increase of 12.3%. The greatest increase for male incarcerated offenders since 1996 occurred in 2000 when the population increased 12.5%. The greatest percent increase in the female population also occurred in 2000, when the population increased 20.2%. The overall incarcerated offender population increased by 13.2% in 2000. The annual percent increase for both males and females has moderated over the last five years with an average annual growth of 4.7% for males and 5.7% for females.

Chart 10
Incarcerated Offender Annual % Increase by Gender






Chart 11 shows the annual count of incarcerated offenders by incarcerated status since 1996. Annual data is only shown since fiscal year 1996, because the analysis involved requires detail that has only been available since 1996. Fiscal years 1998, 2003, 2008 and 2009 are noteworthy because of their small or negative growth. The incarcerated offender population actually decreased by 19 in 2008 and by 55 in 2009.

Chart 11
Incarcerated Offenders by Status and Fiscal Year




The small increases in 1998, 2003, 2008 and 2009 are noteworthy because they mark changes from historical patterns, as can be seen in Charts 10 and 11. The small growth in 1998 was due primarily to abnormally low admissions to prison, the small growth in 2003 was due primarily to a dramatic increase in the number of releases from prison, and the reduction in incarcerated offenders beginning in 2008 was due the convergence of unexpectedly low admissions to prison and unexpectedly high releases (Chart 12).

Chart 12
Admissions to and Releases From Prison by Fiscal Year




Court commitments can be sorted by status type and crime group. Chart 13 shows the portion of court commitments sentenced to Probation, Rider and Term by year. Note the clear change in court commitment rates to Probation that occurred in 1999 and 2000. These commitments migrated to Term, resulting in a substantial increase in the portion of all commitments that went to Term during that period. Rider commitment rates have remained essentially constant over the entire period. Term commitments went from about 13% in 1998 to 18% in 2000 and 2001. In recent years, the portion of offenders that were sentenced to Probation and Term moved back toward the historical patterns of 1996 through 1998, in stages. The portion of total commitments sentenced to Term for the period 2002 through 2006 was still nearly 3% higher than for the period 1996 through 1998. In 2007, we began to see a steady decline in the portion committed to Term, and in 2009, the Term commitment portion returned to the historical level of 1996 through 1998.

Chart 13
Portion of Total Commitments by Status



The primary contributor to increased Term commitments was Drug crimes. This can be seen in Chart 14, which shows Term commitments by crime type and year. In Chart 14, values are only shown for Drug crimes because it is the largest commitment. Although Drug crimes are still the largest single contributor to prison commitments, commitments for Drug crimes have decreased steadily over the last three years. The other crime groups have experienced growth more consistent with the Idaho population growth.

Chart 14
Court Commitments to Term by Fiscal Year and Crime



Although new court commitments are the obvious entry point for Term, there are admissions to Term from other sources. Offenders may also go to prison because of a failed Rider, revoked Probation or revoked Parole. Chart 15 shows all admissions to Term from FY 1996 through 2007. Historically, about 66% of all admissions to Term come from sources other than direct court commitments. Since 2003, revoked Probation has contributed more offenders to Term than new court commitments. In 2009, revoked Parole contributed more admissions to prison than any other source.

Chart 15
Term Admissions by Type and Year




Chart 16 shows total admissions to, and releases from Term, by year. Note the dip in admissions in 1998, and again in 2002. We can clearly see the influence of these dips on releases. Releases lag admissions by about two years. In fact, the average length of stay in Term is about two and a half years. Based on this pattern, we may be able to anticipate a decline in releases in 2010. Note that in 2008 and 2009 the admissions were actually lower than the releases, hence, a decrease in the Term population for these years.

We generally discuss admissions and releases by crime groups or by Violent and Non-violent crime types. For our next discussion, we'll address lengths of stay and releases from Term as they relate to Violent or Non-violent crimes because it allows us to reduce the number of variables while maintaining the essential data content. Generally, Idaho Violent crime types are similar to those described in Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) references. This is essentially the same as grouping our Alcohol, Drug and Property crimes into the Non-violent category, and Assault, Murder & Manslaughter and Sex crimes into the Violent category. This allows us to group by important aspects of analysis information such as typical sentence length and length of stay.

Chart 16
Inmate Admissions and Releases





Chart 17 shows court commitments to Term by crime violence and year. The 1998 and 2002 dips in total admissions show up mostly in Non-Violent crime commitments. The higher number of commitments for Non-Violent crimes beginning in 2001 parallels the increase for Drug crimes seen in Chart 14. So does the reduction for 2007 through 2009.


Chart 17
Court Commitments to Term by Crime Violence and Fiscal Year



In Idaho, offenders are incarcerated with a two-part sentence. The first part is the fixed or determinate portion of the sentence. The offender will typically serve all of the determinate sentence. The second part is the indeterminate portion of the sentence. The Idaho Commission for Pardons and Parole may grant parole for any portion of the indeterminate part of the sentence. Offenders are generally not incarcerated for their full sentence.

Chart 18 shows the average length of stay by release year and crime violence for offenders whose initial court commitment was to prison. Note the Violent crime length of stay has had fluctuations but remains relatively constant, while the Non-violent group has experienced a clear and persistent increase in length of stay. Historically, about two thirds of all initial court commitments to Term are Non-violent offenders and one third are Violent. Since Violent offenders spend nearly twice as much time incarcerated as Non-violent offenders, at the end of 2009, nearly 52% of all inmates were convicted for Violent crimes.

Chart 18
Length of Stay by Crime Violence and Fiscal Year



Although some would like to attribute the increased length of stay for Non-violent crimes to mandatory minimum sentences for Drug Trafficking crimes, these crimes, by themselves cannot account for the dramatic increase in length of stay. Chart 19 shows the indeterminate sentence length for Violent and Non-violent prison commitments since 1996. As in Chart 18, Violent crime sentences have been relatively constant, while Non-violent crime sentence length has steadily increased. It appears that the increase in sentence length, including mandatory minimum sentences, is a manifestation of the “tough on crime” bias that has pervaded the criminal justice system for the last two decades. During the period 1996 through 2009, Violent offenders received an average full term sentence length of 136 months. Non-Violent offenders sentence length increased from 64 to 93 months and averaged 79 months.

Chart 19
Sentence Length by Crime Violence and Fiscal Year





Chart 20 shows the number of releases by year, for initial Term commitments of Non-Violent offenders. The dip in paroles in 2000 is related to the dip in total admissions to prison in 1998 shown in Chart 17. Almost 80% of Non-violent offenders are paroled from their initial court commitment.

Chart 20
Non-Violent Term Releases by Type and Fiscal Year



Length of stay by release type and fiscal year for initial court commitments of Non-Violent offenders is shown in Chart 21. Note that length of stay has increased for both paroles and discharges. Length of stay prior to initial parole on the offender's first incarceration has increased from about two years for the period 1996 through 1998, to nearly three years by 2009. Sentence length is the primary contributor to this increase in length of stay (Chart 19). This can also be seen in the increase in length of stay for those offenders who discharged from their sentence without ever paroling. For these offenders, length of stay prior to discharge increased from about three years for the period 1996 through 1998, to a little more than four years for the period 2005 through 2009. A recent analysis indicates that we would see a reduction of about 800 in bed demand over a four year period, if we could return to the 1996 level of sentence length for non-violent offenders.






Chart 22 shows the number of Violent offenders released from their initial prison commitment by year and release type. Only 74% of Violent offenders were paroled from their initial commitment. The rest topped out.

Chart 22
Violent Offender Term Releases by Type and Fiscal Year



Length of stay by release type and year for Violent offenders is shown in Chart 23. Note that length of stay remained relatively constant for paroles, but discharges had a period of longer lengths of stay from 2002 through 2005 and again in 2007 through 2009.

Chart 23
Length of Stay for Violent Crimes by Release Type and Fiscal Year



We have concentrated our analysis on the Term population, but the Rider population merits some discussion because it is the second largest component of the incarcerated population. Chart 24 shows the monthly Rider population. The Rider population has been very volatile since 2002. There is a strong seasonal pattern for 2002 through 2005 with local maximums occurring at the end of the fiscal year. The 2008 pattern is dramatically different, starting with a maximum value in July and a minimum the following June. Rider length of stay averages about five months, so it is the best indicator of changes in court commitment patterns. The seasonal pattern of commitments to Rider has not yet re-established itself since the 2008 drop in commitments.

Chart 24
Rider Population by Month, FY 1996 through 2009



Table 1 shows details of admissions and releases by status from 1998 through 2009. Some interesting information can be gleaned from this table because of the detail shown. For example, we previously acknowledged the decline in incarcerated offender count that occurred in 2008 and 2009. Examination of Table 1 shows that the 2008 Term releases were greater than Term admissions (circled in red). The same thing happened in 2009. As a result, there was a slight decline in the Term population both years. Also note the substantial decline in the Rider population in 2008. The Rider population (circled in red) declined because of the drop in Rider admissions in 2008. The Parole Violator population (circled in red) experienced a substantial growth in 2008. This resulted from the increase in paroles in 2007. The cumulative effect of these separate and distinct changes in historical patterns accounts for the decline in incarcerated offenders in 2008 and 2009.

There are a number of topics that help explain the changes in growth patterns through the years. Drug crimes (including mandatory minimum sentence Drug crimes) brought about an increase in Non-violent court commitments starting around 1998. Commitments for Drug crimes dropped dramatically in 2008 and 2009 (Chart 14). Since Drug crimes are the largest contributor to Term commitments, this resulted in a marked decline in total commitments to Term. All of these factors converge to bring about the patterns of growth seen in Table 1.

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

Table 1

Historical Incarcerated Offender Admissions and Releases by Status FY 1998 to 2008

Term	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
Beginning Admissions	3,402	3,500	3,899	4,502	4,848	5,014	5,122	5,469	5,762	6,205	6,461	6,435	
New Commitments	397	533	584	651	598	662	651	641	737	677	573	546	
Revoked Probation	433	516	586	581	593	628	728	788	803	802	723	571	
Revoked Parole	260	392	354	291	336	367	466	436	465	470	487	658	
Failed Rider	128	148	159	161	123	154	141	172	224	256	242	225	
Total	1,218	1,589	1,683	1,684	1,650	1,811	1,986	2,037	2,229	2,205	2,025	2,000	
Releases													
Parole	827	800	704	905	935	1116	1,051	1,104	1,180	1,330	1,429	1,448	
Discharged	293	390	376	433	549	587	588	640	606	619	622	585	
Total	1,120	1,190	1,080	1,338	1,484	1,703	1,639	1,744	1,786	1,949	2,051	2,033	
Net Admission & Releases	98	399	603	346	166	108	347	293	443	256	-26	-33	Historical
Ending	3,500	3,899	4,502	4,848	5,014	5,122	5,469	5,762	6,205	6,461	6,435	6,402	Average
Non Bed	163	167	170	164	159	165	163	172	183	181	163	164	Percent
Total Incarcerated	3,337	3,732	4,332	4,684	4,855	4,957	5,306	5,590	6,022	6,280	6,272	6,238	Increase
Annual Percent Increase	1.4%	11.8%	16.1%	8.1%	3.7%	2.1%	7.0%	5.4%	7.7%	4.3%	-0.1%	-0.5%	7.1%
Rider													
Beginning Admissions	658	582	612	583	659	781	783	1003	894	867	961	820	
New Commitments	607	697	695	745	767	807	927	916	1041	996	920	913	
Failed Probation	503	498	500	549	577	598	830	786	901	870	860	775	
Total	1,110	1,195	1,195	1,294	1,344	1,405	1,757	1,702	1,942	1,866	1,780	1,688	
Releases													
Probation	1,058	1,017	1,065	1,061	1,093	1,249	1,392	1,640	1,745	1,516	1,679	1,474	
Term	128	148	159	157	129	154	145	171	224	256	242	225	
Total	1,186	1,165	1,224	1,218	1,222	1,403	1,537	1,811	1,969	1,772	1,921	1,699	
Net Admission & Releases	-76	30	-29	76	122	2	220	-109	-27	94	-141	-11	Historical
Ending	582	612	583	659	781	783	1,003	894	867	961	820	809	Average
Non Bed	78	96	64	84	91	103	177	159	135	123	133	110	Percent
Total Incarcerated	504	516	519	575	690	680	826	735	732	838	687	699	Increase
Annual Percent Increase	-16.7%	2.4%	0.6%	10.8%	20.0%	-1.4%	21.5%	-11.0%	-0.4%	14.5%	-18.0%	1.7%	1.5%
Parole Violator													
Beginning Parole	348	424	417	394	401	466	369	350	381	377	398	562	
Releases	415	481	444	395	546	525	659	752	749	745	895	855	
Term	249	385	350	285	347	341	466	449	406	466	481	654	
Reinstated Parole	90	103	117	103	134	281	212	272	347	258	250	238	
Total	339	488	467	388	481	622	678	721	753	724	731	892	
Net Admission & Releases	76	-7	-23	7	65	-97	-19	31	-4	21	164	-37	Historical
Ending	424	417	394	401	466	369	350	381	377	398	562	525	Average
Non Bed	265	243	243	208	209	181	170	180	155	159	183	179	Percent
Total Incarcerated	159	174	151	193	257	188	180	201	222	239	379	346	Increase
Annual Percent Increase	9%	9%	-13%	28%	33%	-27%	-4%	12%	10%	8%	59%	-9%	8.3%
Total Incarcerated	4,506	4,928	5,479	5,908	6,261	6,274	6,822	7,037	7,449	7,820	7,817	7,736	
Non Bed	506	506	477	456	459	449	510	511	473	463	479	453	
Total Beds Occupied	4,000	4,422	5,002	5,452	5,802	5,825	6,312	6,526	6,976	7,357	7,338	7,283	
Annual Percent Increase	-1.0%	10.6%	13.1%	9.0%	6.4%	0.4%	8.4%	3.4%	6.9%	5.5%	-0.3%	-0.7%	5.9%

Section 4
Supervised Offender
Demographics

Supervised Offender Demographics

Characteristics of the supervised offender population are included in this section. At the end of FY 2009, there were 13,756 offenders under community supervision by the Department of Correction. There were 2,628 offenders under Parole supervision, and 11,128 offenders supervised on Probation. The supporting data for this section can be found in the June edition of the Monthly Standard Reports in Appendix 1.

Chart 25
Supervised Offenders by Status




Chart 25 shows the ratio of parolees to probationers in the supervised offender population. New court commitments and successful Rider participants contribute to the Probation population while Term and Parole Violator contribute to Parole.

Chart 26
Supervised Offenders by Gender




Chart 26 illustrates the ratio of males to females within the supervised population. More than 25% of the supervised population is female, while only 10.6% of the incarcerated population is female (see Chart 3 for reference).

**Chart 27
Supervised Offenders by Ethnicity**




Chart 27 shows the ethnic distribution of the supervised offender population. In comparison to the incarcerated offender population there is a higher portion of white offenders and a smaller portion of Hispanic offenders in the community.

**Chart 28
Supervised Offenders by Crime Group**





Chart 28 indicates a higher ratio of non-violent offenses among the supervised population than the incarcerated population. Drug, Property and Alcohol crimes account for about 74% of the supervised offenders compared to only about 51% of the incarcerated population (see Chart 5 for reference).


There is a distinction in Crime Group by gender for supervised offenders similar to that for incarcerated offenders. Chart 29 shows the distribution by Crime Group for male supervised offenders. There were 10,285 males supervised at the end of FY 2009. This distribution is similar to Chart 28 because males comprise nearly 75% of supervised offenders. About 69% of supervised males were supervised for non-violent crimes (Drug, Property and Alcohol) while only 48% of incarcerated males were incarcerated for non-violent crimes (Chart 6).

**Chart 29
Male Supervised Offenders by Crime Group**




Females show a different crime distribution (Chart 30). There were 3,437 females supervised at the end of FY 2009. Almost 90% are supervised for non-violent crimes (Drug, Property and Alcohol). By comparison, about 78% of incarcerated females were incarcerated for non-violent crimes (Chart 7).

**Chart 30
Female Supervised Offenders by Crime Group**



The age distribution of the supervised population is shown in Chart 31. The age represents the offenders' age at the end of FY 2009. When compared to incarcerated offenders, supervised offenders are biased slightly toward younger offenders. The average for supervised offenders was 35.5, while the average age of incarcerated offenders was 36.7.



Section 5
Supervised Offender
Population Growth


Supervised Offender Population Growth Patterns

Idaho has two types of supervised offenders, those paroled from prison and those sentenced by the courts to probation. Crime patterns for Parolees are very similar to those of the incarcerated offender group, since they were all once incarcerated. By contrast, Probation commitments tend to be less violent.

Since 1995, the supervised offender population in Idaho has more than doubled. The supervised population has increased from 5,106 to 13,756, an increase of 169%. The male portion of the supervised offender population has increased 150% during that time and the female supervised offender population has increased 253%.

Chart 32 shows the Probation, Parole and total supervised populations at year-end for the past eleven fiscal years. Though the Parole population is still a small portion of the overall supervised population, the growth has been tremendous and continues to offer challenges as the Department of Correction prepares for increases in future growth.

**Chart 32
Supervised Offender Population Growth Since 1995**



Since Probation and Parole populations are substantially different, we'll split our discussion at this point and cover the Parole group and the Probation group separately. Parole will be covered first since it closely parallels the incarcerated offender group.

Parole Population Growth Patterns

Chart 33 shows the annual percent increase for the male and female Parole populations since 1996. The male Parole population has increased an average of 11.2% per year. The female population has increased at a substantially higher rate with an average annual percent increase of 17.5%. These rates generally follow the rates of growth in admissions for incarcerated offenders with a two year lag.

**Chart 33
Parolee % Increase by Gender and Fiscal Year**





Chart 34 shows admissions to Parole by source. Note the dip in admissions from Term in 2000. This corresponds with the previous discussion relating to the two year length of stay in prison for Non-violent offenders and the dip observed in 1998 for admissions to Term (Chart 16). Note also the dramatic increase in the number of Parole Violators re-instated to Parole beginning in 2002. This marks an abrupt change in the portion of Parole Violators that are re-instated to Parole. This new practice has remained fairly constant since 2003.

Chart 34
Admissions to Parole by Type and Year



We'll address lengths of stay and releases from Parole as they relate to Violent or Non-violent crimes next. Chart 35 shows the average length of stay on Parole for Non-violent offenders paroled from their initial incarceration by year. Parolees can leave parole by discharge or by violating parole. Those who successfully complete Parole average about two years on Parole prior to discharge. There is a pattern of steady increase in length of stay prior to discharge over the years, which is attributed to increases in sentence length (Chart 19). Non-violent offenders who violate parole average about 12 months on Parole prior to violation. Non-violent offenders make up about 74% of releases from Term to Parole.

Chart 35
Average Length of Stay for Non-violent Parolees
by Release Type and Year




Chart 36 shows the length of stay on parole for Violent offenders paroled from their initial incarceration by year. Those who successfully complete parole average almost three years on Parole prior to discharge, but there is a pattern of steady increase over the years. Violent offenders who violate parole average 15 months on Parole prior to violation. There is a clear pattern of increasing length of stay on parole prior to discharge for Violent offenders, with an average of about 43 months over the last three years. This is consistent with the intuitive notion that Violent offenders should serve longer sentences than Non-violent offenders. Violent offenders make up about 26% of releases from Term to Parole.

An interesting note here is that both Violent and Non-violent offenders violate at a rate of about 55% (54% for Non-violent, 56% for Violent). This appears to be the result of a pervasive pattern of drug use among convicted felons irrespective of their crime of conviction. Historical Level of Service Inventory – Revised (LSI-R) assessments indicate that more than 80% of incarcerated offenders have a substance abuse problem.

Chart 36
Average Length of Stay for Violent Parolees
by Release Type and Year






Chart 37 shows that Non-Violent offenders on their initial Parole tend to violate more often than successfully completing parole and discharging. Again, this seems to be associated with substance abuse. The clear pattern of increased releases from parole mirrors increases in admissions to prison in prior years.

Chart 37
Non-violent Parolee Release by Type and Year



Historically, Violent offenders tended to violate their initial parole at about the same rate that they discharged. That changed in 2004, when the pattern for Violent offenders began to look very much like the pattern for Non-Violent offenders. Chart 38 shows Parole release type by year.

Chart 38
Violent Parolee Release by Type and Year




Efficient management of Parolees is an important goal of the Idaho Department of Correction. Many offenders complete their programming in an aftercare environment. Department experts believe that completing this programming is vitally important in helping offenders succeed on parole. Managing this group is critically important to the Department. The Parole population is forecast to be 2,651 at the end of 2009.

Probation Population Growth Patterns

Probation represents a group of offenders supervised by the Idaho Department of Correction. These offenders are assigned to the Department by a court order. Most Probationers are sentenced to the Department by direct commitment from the courts. About one third arrive after successfully completing a Rider. In Fiscal Year 2009, the Probation population increased by 270 to 11,128. That was the smallest annual increase since 2000.

Chart 39 shows the annual percent increase for the male and female Probation populations since 1996. The male Probation population has increased an average of 5.1% per year. The female population increased at nearly double that rate with an average annual percent increase of 8.8%. The greatest percent increase in male supervised offenders occurred in 1996 when the population increased 11.8%. The greatest percent increase in the female population also occurred in 1996 when the population increased 22.3%. The male probation populations experienced their smallest growth rates in 1999, when the population actually declined. Since then growth rates have gradually increased, approaching their historic averages. The female probation populations experienced their smallest growth rates in 2009.

Chart 39
Probationer % Increase by Gender and Fiscal Year



The next series of charts will group admissions by several important factors: admission source, crime group and crime violence. Chart 40 shows court commitments to Probation by crime group. As with the incarcerated offender analyses, annual data will only be shown since fiscal year 1996, because the analyses involved require a level of data detail that has only been available since then. Drug crimes are the only ones with values shown because they have been the largest contributing crime group since 2000. Drug crimes also show the most significant decline in commitments in the last three years. Most other crime groups remained relatively constant over that period. The exception was the Alcohol crimes which had a marked increase. The decline in Drug commitments in the last three years has been attributed to the increased availability of community based substance abuse treatment. In the future, the funds to support community based substance abuse treatment may become limited, with a possible result of an increase in drug related felony commitments, especially to Probation.

Chart 40
Court Commitments to Probation by Fiscal Year and Crime






Chart 41 shows the same information grouped by Violent and Non-violent crimes. As would be expected, the portion of court commitments for Non-violent crimes committed to Probation (81%) is higher than what was seen in Chart 17 for Non-violent court commitments to Term (60%). The effect of the decline in Drug crime commitments can be seen in the Non-Violent crime group.

Chart 41
Court Commitments to Probation by Fiscal Year and Crime Violence



Although “New Court Commitments” is the obvious entry point for Probation, about one third (35%) of all Probation admissions come from successful Riders. Most Riders (88%) successfully complete the Rider program and are subsequently sent to Probation. Chart 42 shows admissions to Probation by type and year. Note that the dip in 1998 that was so evident for Term admissions (Chart 17) is not as pronounced for admissions to Probation. There was a pattern of steady increases from 2000 through 2006 similar to the pattern seen in court commitments to Term beginning in 2000 as shown in Chart 14. The last three years have seen a marked decline in commitments to Probation. Admissions from Rider show a similar pattern of increased admissions beginning in 2000 and a decline since 2006.

Chart 42
Admissions to Probation by Type and Year



Next, we’ll address lengths of stay and releases from Probation as they relate to Violent or Non-Violent crimes. This grouping shows important aspects of the analysis such as typical sentence length and typical length of stay.

Chart 43 shows the average length of stay by release year and violence level. The data in this chart represents information for offenders released from Probation during the year referenced. Both the Violent and Non-Violent crime lengths of stay have increased by more than a year over the last 13 years. The Non-Violent increase is attributed to the increase in sentence length for Drug crimes. Chart 43 shows how this group's length of stay has influenced the Non-violent crime length of stay, even though they represent only a portion of admissions.

The average Violent offender length of stay is now about three and a half years. Non-violent offenders show a pattern of increased lengths of stay from about two years in 1996 to more than three years in 2009. Historically, about 82% of all admissions to Probation are Non-violent offenders.

Chart 43
Average Length of Stay for Probationers
by Crime Violence and Release Year





Chart 44 shows length of stay detail by release type for Non-violent offenders by release year. The lengths of stay on Probation prior to revocation to Term or sentencing to Rider are almost the same for the period 1996 through 2006. For both revocation to Term and failures to Rider, there is an increase in length of stay prior during the last two years, concurrent with an IDOC initiative to aggressively pursue alternative sanctions in lieu of incarceration. This effort was complemented by the increased availability of community based substance abuse treatment provided by the Department of Health and Welfare during this time. There is a clear pattern of increased length of stay prior to discharge. This has tentatively been attributed to increased sentence length overall and to an increasing reluctance of prosecutors and judges to discharge for Drug crimes, especially Drug Trafficking.

Chart 44
Average Length of Stay for Non-violent Probationers
by Release Type and Year



Non-Violent Probationer releases by release type and year are shown in Chart 45. The number that discharged declined from 1999 through 2002. This reflects the reluctance of prosecutors and the courts to discharge offenders with substance abuse issues cited earlier and mirrors the increase in length of stay for this period seen in Chart 44. After 2002, the number discharged increases steadily. The number of releases that go to Rider showed only a moderate increase until 2004. In 2004, we see the effects of an ongoing change in business practices that resulted in a higher portion of releases going to Rider. The number of releases that revoke to Term has remained relatively constant. The decline in 2008 and 2009 in both reflects the IDOC initiative to more aggressively pursue previously cited sanctions in lieu of revocation and the increased availability of Health and Welfare community based substance abuse treatment.

Chart 45
Non-violent Probation Releases by Type and Year




Chart 46 shows the average length of stay for Violent Probationers by release type and year. Again, we see a pattern of increasing length of stay prior to discharge, with a substantial jump in the last three years. As with Non-violent Probationers, lengths of stay prior to sentencing to Rider or revocation to Term are relatively constant. Violent Probationers stay on Probation about 22 months prior to sentencing to Rider or revocation to Term, which is similar to Non-violent Probationers. From 2002 through 2006, Violent offenders stayed about 50 months prior to discharge, while Non-violent Probationers stayed about 38 months. Violent Probationers length of stay prior to discharge has increased dramatically to about 57 months for the last three years.

Chart 46
Average Length of Stay for Violent Probationers
by Release Type and Year





Chart 47 shows Violent Probationer releases by release type and year. The pattern of releases to Rider shows a steady increase. Revocations to Term have increased in a manner consistent with the increase of commitments to Probation. Discharges have remained relatively constant at about 250, with only minor fluctuations. Since there is a relatively constant pattern of increases in commitments to Probation, the portion that is discharging is actually decreasing. This leads to a growth in the Probation population since releases are not keeping pace with admissions.

Chart 47
Violent Probationer Releases by Type and Year



Efficient management of the Probation population is very important to the Department. It is the largest population group managed by the Department and in recent years Probation revocations have contributed more admissions to Term than have new court commitments (Chart 15). This is a rapidly growing population group and the Department is actively seeking ways to help offenders succeed on Probation and avoid revocation to Term.

Table 2 provides historical details of supervised offender admissions and releases by status and year.

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

Table 2

Historical Supervised Offender Admissions and Releases by Status FY 1998 to 2009

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
Probation													
Beginning	7,338	7,693	7,771	7,821	8,165	8,939	10,022	10,855	11,872	12,741	13,118	13,552	
Admissions													
New Commitments	2,028	2,098	1,924	2,089	2,189	2,501	2,575	2,778	2,886	2,860	2,715	2,828	
Successful Rider	1,052	1,005	1,056	1,056	1,125	1,260	1,429	1,663	1,756	1,508	1,665	1,459	
Total	3,080	3,103	2,980	3,145	3,314	3,761	4,004	4,441	4,642	4,368	4,380	4,287	
Releases													
Revoked Probation	433	516	586	583	594	628	728	789	806	801	724	571	
Sentenced to Rider	490	487	486	518	551	569	791	754	877	868	855	773	
Discharged	1,802	2,022	1,858	1,700	1,395	1,481	1,652	1,881	2,090	2,322	2,367	2,702	
Total	2,725	3,025	2,930	2,801	2,540	2,678	3,171	3,424	3,773	3,991	3,946	4,046	
Net Admit/Release	355	78	50	344	774	1,083	833	1,017	869	377	434	241	Historical
Ending	7,693	7,771	7,821	8,165	8,939	10,022	10,855	11,872	12,741	13,118	13,552	13,793	Average
Non Caseload	1,348	1,455	1,429	1,443	1,850	2,321	2,659	2,786	2,898	2,793	2,694	2,665	Percent
Probation Caseload	6,345	6,316	6,392	6,722	7,089	7,701	8,196	9,086	9,843	10,325	10,858	11,128	Increase
Annual % Increase	4.1%	-0.5%	1.2%	5.2%	5.5%	8.6%	6.4%	10.9%	8.3%	4.9%	5.2%	2.5%	5.7%
Historical Average Percent Increase covers the period 1996 through 2009													
Parole													
Beginning	1,094	1,256	1,337	1,366	1,624	1,857	2,182	2,332	2,418	2,568	2,953	3,263	
Admissions													
Paroled	857	846	768	935	996	1,191	1,118	1,146	1,267	1,396	1,447	1,477	
Re-instated Violator	84	82	105	91	144	213	211	281	268	277	298	255	
Total	941	928	873	1,026	1,140	1,404	1,329	1,427	1,535	1,673	1,745	1,732	
Releases													
Parole Violator	428	493	449	397	544	523	662	751	732	738	883	852	
Discharged	351	354	395	371	363	556	517	590	653	550	552	723	
Total	779	847	844	768	907	1,079	1,179	1,341	1,385	1,288	1,435	1,575	
Net Admit/Release	162	81	29	258	233	325	150	86	150	385	310	157	Historical
Ending	1,256	1,337	1,366	1,624	1,857	2,182	2,332	2,418	2,568	2,953	3,263	3,420	Average
Non Caseload	341	361	402	401	473	537	573	578	586	697	760	792	Percent
Parole Caseload	915	976	964	1,223	1,384	1,645	1,759	1,840	1,982	2,256	2,503	2,628	Increase
Annual % Increase	19.0%	6.7%	-1.2%	26.9%	13.2%	18.9%	6.9%	4.6%	7.7%	13.8%	10.9%	5.0%	11.4%
Total Supervised													
Non Caseload	1,689	1,816	1,831	1,844	2,323	2,858	3,232	3,364	3,484	3,490	3,454	3,457	
Supervised Caseload	7,260	7,292	7,356	7,945	8,473	9,346	9,955	10,926	11,825	12,581	13,361	13,756	
Annual % Increase	5.8%	0.4%	0.9%	8.0%	6.6%	10.3%	6.5%	9.8%	8.2%	6.4%	6.2%	3.0%	6.5%

Section 6

Recidivism

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

Recidivism is an important and complicated issue that all correctional systems must deal with. There is very little consensus among states as to just what constitutes recidivism. A review of recidivism research literature shows there is wide variation in recidivism measures. The Idaho State Board of Correction reviewed this topic and established the following standards.

Recidivist Definition

The Board of Correction established this definition for a recidivist.

recidivist - an offender committed to Term incarceration by the department for revocation of parole or probation, or for a new crime.

They established a more specific definition of recidivist for Idaho's data collection purposes.

recidivist - an offender who, after having been previously discharged from a period of incarceration or supervision by the Idaho Department of Correction, is committed by the courts to a new period of incarceration by the Idaho Department of Correction; or an offender who revokes Probation or Parole while under the supervision of the Idaho Department of Correction.

Based on this definition, we can see that there are three distinct pools of offenders who can recidivate;

1. Offenders who have been previously discharged,
2. Offenders who are on Probation and
3. Offenders who are on Parole.

The Board further established two types of recidivism measures described below.

1. Admission Recidivism Measure. This measure deals with the number of recidivists that are admitted to Term incarceration. It indicates how each recidivist group influences the correctional system and allows us to examine what portion of Term admissions over any time period came from each of the three potential recidivist pools. The purpose of this measure is to indicate how each recidivist pool contributes to Term incarcerations.
2. Release Recidivism Measure. This measure deals with the historical experience of individual offenders and their cumulative patterns of recidivism. It is an outcome measure that establishes the historical portion of discharged offenders (or offenders on parole or probation) who recidivate. It allows us to examine how offender attitudes and actions, or changes in Enforcement, Prosecution, Judicial or Correctional System initiatives such as programs and education, influence recidivism.

Each of the measures above is divided into contributions from each of the recidivist pools described above.

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

The final area of Board deliberation was “time to recidivate”. As indicated previously, the standard used for recidivism research varies widely. Some researchers use as little as one year while others used the “if ever” standard. The following analyses examine the time to recidivate for each of the three recidivist types. The Board chose a five year window for recidivism analyses. A five year window allows a reasonable compromise between making sure we have reasonably complete data and completing timely analyses. The following discussions show Idaho’s historical recidivism experience, which is the foundation for this choice.

Chart 48 shows the distribution of time to revoke for Idaho Probationers during the period FY 1996 through 2009. By the end of 12 months, almost half of those who will revoke have done so. For Probationers, 82% of those who revoke do so within 30 months. The number of Probation revocations tapers off very quickly after that point and only 13% recidivate after 3 years.

Chart 48
Months from Probation to Revocation to Term, FY 1996 - 2009




Chart 49 shows the distribution of time to revoke for Idaho Parolees during the period FY 1996 through 2008. By the end of 12 months, nearly half of those who will recidivate have done so. For Parolees, 83% of those who recidivate do so within 24 months. The number of recidivists after 12 months tapers off even more quickly than the Probationers and only 6% recidivate after 3 years.

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

Chart 49
Months from Parole to Revocation to Term, FY 1996 - 2009




Chart 50 shows the distribution of time to recidivate for Idaho offenders previously discharged from incarceration or supervision with recidivism events occurring during the period FY 1996 through 2008. For discharged offenders, it takes 60 months to get 74% of those who will recidivate. It takes 36 months to get to 56% of those who eventually recidivate. The highest number of recidivist events occurs between 12 and 24 months. This contrasts sharply with the maximum values for both the Parolee and Probationer events, both of which occur between 6 and 12 months. This group takes substantially longer to recidivate than either the Probationers or Parolees and is the primary reason that the Board chose a five year window for recidivism analyses.

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

Chart 50
Months from Discharge to Recidivation to Term, FY 1996 - 2006




Table 3 shows a recidivism summary analysis of data from FY 1996 through the end of FY 2008 based on the Board established criteria.

Table 3
Recidivism Rate Summary by Measure and Source

	Admission Measure	Release Measure
Previously Discharged Offenders	12%	6%
Probation Revocations	35%	14%
Parole Revocations	22%	36%

The Admission rate is the rate from all admissions FY 1996 through 2009

The Release rate is the rate for offenders released since 1995 who recidivated by FY 2009

To illustrate the Admission Measure, the 12% listed for the Previously Discharged Offenders means that 12% of the admissions to Term from FY 1996 through 2009 were offenders who had been previously discharged. Similarly, 35% of all admissions to Term for the same period were Probation Revocations and 22% were Parole Revocations. During this period, 69% of all Term admissions were recidivists. In FY 2009, 71% of all offenders admitted to prison were recidivists. Admission Measure trends will be discussed in more detail later.


In Table 3, the Release Measure of 14% in Probation Revocations means that 14% of the offenders who had been on Probation revoked and went to Term. The Probation group is our largest population segment (11,128 at the end of FY 2009) and although

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

they only revoke at 14%, they make up 35% of the total admissions to prison. This underscores the importance of effective management of our supervised offenders. Release Measure trends will be discussed in more detail later.

Chart 51 shows detail by year for the Admission Measure for each recidivist type. It shows the portion of all Term admissions that came from each recidivist type. Recidivist court commitments show an average of 12% with only minor fluctuations until 2009 when it decreased sharply. Revoked Parole shows more fluctuation with an average of about 21% until 2009, when it increased sharply. Revoked Probation seems to have been relatively stable at around 35% until 2003. It increased briefly to 39%, averaged 36% from 2006 through 2008 and then decreased sharply in 2009. The reason for the decline in recidivist court commitments is not known, but it may be related to an increase in availability of diversionary options such as Drug Courts and community based substance abuse treatment. The decline in probation revocations is attributed to the implementation of a violation matrix focusing on sanction alternatives to revocation. The increase in Parole revocations is attributed to the dramatic increase in paroles beginning in 2007.

Chart 51
Portion of Term Admissions by Recidivist Type and Year



With regard to the Release Measure for recidivism, one of the most frequently asked questions is “how does recidivism vary by crime or by gender?” The next series of analyses will address these questions.

Table 4 shows the recidivism experience for Probationers by crime and gender. We limited our pool of potential recidivists to offenders who went to Probation between July 1995 and January 2007. This allows each offender at least 30 months to recidivate. Based on the information in Chart 48 we anticipate that for offenders who went to

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

Probation in December 2006, at least 82% of the offenders who will revoke have revoked. This approach allows us to use the most current available data without understating the actual size of the Probation revocation problem. The pool includes offenders admissions to Probation between July 1995 and January 2006. In Tables 4, 5 and 6, the crime group refers to the offender's initial commitment crime for this incarceration series, which is not necessarily the recidivist crime.

Table 4

Probation Revocations by Gender and Crime for FY 1996 through 2009

Gender	Crime Group	Pool	Revoked	Revocation Rate	
Female	Alcohol	481	51	11%	
Female	Assault	681	77	11%	
Female	Drug	4,806	425	9%	
Female	Murder & Man	31	4	13%	Female
Female	Property	5,220	421	8%	Total
Female	Sex	85	8	9%	9%
Male	Alcohol	3,035	416	14%	
Male	Assault	5,270	1,080	20%	
Male	Drug	10,866	1,590	15%	
Male	Murder & Man	145	28	19%	Male
Male	Property	12,273	1,949	16%	Total
Male	Sex	2,686	538	20%	16%
Total		45,579	6,587	14%	

Data represents Probationers who have revoked since FY 1996 and the pool of Probationers who could have potentially revoked during this time period. The Pool excludes offenders who went to Probation after January 2007 in order to allow all pool members adequate time to revoke.

Table 5 shows the recidivism experience for Parolees by crime and gender. We limited our pool of potential recidivists to offenders who went to Parole between July 1995 and June 2006. This allows each offender at least 24 months to recidivate. We anticipate that for offenders who went to Parole in June 2006, about 83% (Chart 49) of the

Table 5

Parole Revocations by Gender and Crime for FY 1996 through 2009

Gender	Crime Group	Pool	Revoked	Revocation Rate	
Female	Alcohol	62	29	47%	
Female	Assault	139	41	29%	
Female	Drug	596	170	29%	
Female	Murder & Man	38	9	24%	Female
Female	Property	553	159	29%	Total
Female	Sex	21	6	29%	29%
Male	Alcohol	739	246	33%	
Male	Assault	1,825	755	41%	
Male	Drug	2,703	830	31%	
Male	Murder & Man	201	33	16%	Male
Male	Property	2,862	1,228	43%	Total
Male	Sex	882	307	35%	37%
Total		10,621	3,813	36%	

Data represents Parolees who have revoked since FY 1996 and the pool of Parolees who could have potentially revoked during this time period. The Pool excludes offenders who went to Parole after July 2007 in order to allow all pool members adequate time to revoke.

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

offenders who will revoke have revoked. This allows us to use the most current data without understating the size of the Parole revocation problem. The pool includes only offenders on their first Parole in any incarceration series. It excludes offenders on a subsequent parole because they tend to be a distinct group of more persistent violators.

Table 6 shows the recidivism experience for Previously Discharged Offenders by crime and gender. We limited our pool of potential recidivists to offenders who were discharged between July 1995 and June 2004. This allows each offender at least 60 months to recidivate. Based on the information in Chart 50, we anticipate that for offenders who were discharged in June 2004, about 74% of the offenders who will recidivate have returned. The full five year window was used for this group so as to not understate the actual size of the Previously Discharged Offenders' recidivism problem. In Table 6, the crime group refers to the offender's commitment crime for the offender's previous incarceration series, which is not necessarily the same as the recidivist crime.

Table 6

New Prison Sentence after Discharge by Gender and Crime for FY 1996 - 2009

Gender	CrimeGroup	Pool	Returned	Recidivism Rate	
Female	Alcohol	250	12	5%	
Female	Assault	285	6	2%	
Female	Drug	1,954	48	2%	
Female	Murder & Man	35	0	0%	Female
Female	Property	2,516	36	1%	Total
Female	Sex	42	1	2%	2%
Male	Alcohol	2,017	199	10%	
Male	Assault	2,942	149	5%	
Male	Drug	5,497	254	5%	
Male	Murder & Man	240	10	4%	Male
Male	Property	7,882	481	6%	Total
Male	Sex	1,755	65	4%	6%
Total		25,415	1,261	5%	

Data represents Previously Discharged Offenders who have recidivated since FY 1996 and the pool of discharged offenders who could have potentially returned during this time period. The Pool excludes offenders who were discharged after July 2004 in order to allow all pool members time to re-offend.

These analyses are useful in establishing expectations of what future recidivism might be. However, it is important to note that some offenders recidivate more than once or in more than one way. A Parolee may revoke more than once on a single incarceration series. Of the 658 offenders who revoked Parole during 2009, 167 had two or more Parole Revocations on this incarceration series. Similarly, Previously Discharged Offenders may recidivate more than once. Of the 546 new court commitments in FY 2009, 185 had served a previous period of supervision or incarceration with IDOC, and 52 of these had two or more previous discharges. Finally, an offender may recidivate from all three pools on the same incarceration series. Of the 658 Parolees who revoked in FY 2009, 188 had previous discharges from IDOC, 368 had previously revoked Probation on this incarceration series and 167 had revoked parole at least once before on this incarceration series. Of the 658 Parolees who revoked in FY 2009, 73 recidivated from all three pools. They had a previous discharge from IDOC, revoked Probation and revoked Parole on this incarceration series.

Section 7
Special Topics

Sex Offender Management

Meth-Amphetamine

Sex Offender Statistical Summary

Events over the last few years have prompted debate over sex offender management practices. This section will provide facts to promote an informed discussion of this emotionally charged topic. To start the discussion we will establish a few definitions. For this discussion, a sex offender is any offender convicted of a crime where there is clearly a sexual context. This is a broad definition which basically means “if it sounds like sex offender, then it is sex offender.” It includes the obvious sexual offenses plus crimes that do not necessarily refer to a sexual act such as Section 18-8311 which deals with failure to register as a sex offender. As of December 1, 2009, IDOC had 1,456 inmates imprisoned as sex offenders. This was 23.3% of the total inmate population. This portion increased at a slow steady pace from 20% in 2001 to 21.1% in 2007. It increased more rapidly to 22.2% in 2008 and 23.1% in 2009, consistent with the decline in non-violent court commitments beginning in 2008 (Chart 17).

A registerable sex offender is an offender who is required to register under Section 18-8304 IC. The Section can be found at <http://www.legislature.idaho.gov/idstat/Title18/T18CH83SECT18-8304.htm>. Generally speaking, this is the list of obvious sexual offenses. As of December 1, 2009, IDOC had 1,356 inmates imprisoned for registerable sex offenses. At that time, 94.5% of all sex offense inmates were convicted of registerable sex offenses.

A Violent Sexual Predator (VSP) is an offender that has been reviewed by the Sex Offender Classification Board (SOCB) and been determined to be a violent sexual predator presenting a high risk of re-offense. Section 18-8314 IC provides the definition. The Section can be found at <http://www.legislature.idaho.gov/idstat/Title18/T18CH83SECT18-8314.htm>. As of December 1, 2009, the SOCB had designated 76 offenders as VSPs. Of these, 25 (21 Inmates and 4 Parole Violator) were incarcerated and 6 (4 on Probation and 2 on Parole) were supervised. Another 45 VSPs are no longer incarcerated or supervised in Idaho.

The Jason Smith v. State of Idaho case was decided by the Supreme Court in February 2009. This was a VSP designation appeal that was largely concerned with the offender’s due process rights being violated during the VSP designation review and subsequent appeal to the court. The Court found in Smith’s favor, ruling that the statute and process governing VSP reviews was unconstitutional. As a result, all pending cases in line for SOCB review were halted. During this time, 5 additional VSP designation appeals were in the process of being reviewed by the district courts. The designations in these cases were vacated and four cases were remanded back to the SOCB for review at a later date.

Now that we have these definitions, let’s establish the magnitude of the problem. First, let’s review some numbers we’ve already seen. In December, there were 1,458 sex offender inmates. They made up 23.2% of the total inmate population. In December there were 1,430 inmates who were convicted of registerable sex offenses. They made up 98% of the total inmate sex offender population. Also in December, there were 21

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

inmates who had been designated as VSPs. They made up 1.6% of the referable sex offender Inmate population. Of the registerable sex offenders, 1 has a Death sentence, 27 have Life With No Parole and 222 have a Life sentence.

Table 7 shows the number of offenders by status who were convicted of crimes that make them referable to the SOCB. The data is current as of December 1, 2009. For comparison purposes it also shows the total number of offenders by status, the number of sex offenders by status, the number of registerable sex offenders by status and the number of VSPs by status. Note that three crimes make up the clear majority of all referable offenses; Lewd and Lascivious Conduct With a Minor Under 16, Sexual Abuse of a Child Under 16 and Rape. We must also acknowledge that the SOCB can review offenders who have been convicted of two or more registerable (not necessarily referable) sex offenses. In addition, Idaho State Police typically designate offenders living in Idaho who were similarly designated by authorities in other states.

Table 7, Offenders Incarcerated or Supervised for SOCB Referable Crimes

Crime Description	Probation	Parole	Term	Rider	Parole Violator
Crime Against Nature	3	0	5	0	0
Failure to Register	77	15	67	6	6
Forcible Penetration With Foreign Object	1	0	0	0	0
Incest	0	0	2	0	0
Kidnapping For the Purpose of Rape	0	0	0	0	0
Lewd & Lascivious Conduct W/Minor Under 16	219	121	647	13	15
Male Rape	0	1	2	0	0
Murder Committed During Rape	0	0	2	0	0
Rape	110	66	290	15	8
Ritualized Abuse of a Child	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual Abuse Of A Child Under 16	188	55	286	14	6
Sexual Exploitation Of A Child	31	4	15	2	0
Total	629	262	1,316	50	35
Total for all Crimes by Status	11,097	2,683	6,282	752	353
Total for all Sex Crimes by Status	755	307	1,458	65	40
Registerable Sex Offenders by Status	723	295	1,430	57	37
Offenders Referable to SOCB by Status	629	262	1,316	50	35
VSPs by Status	4	2	21	0	4

There are another 45 VSPs NOT Currently Supervised or Incarcerated by IDOC
Data reflects sex offenders supervised or incarcerated as of December 1, 2009

The next area to look at is “how has this problem grown?” Table 8 shows the growth in court commitments to IDOC for registerable sex offenses by commitment status for the period FY 1996 through 2009 and the anticipated growth through 2014. So, how have

commitments for registerable sex offenses varied when compared to total commitments? From 1996 through 2008, the average portion of all court commitments that were for registerable sex offenses was about 7%. This percentage has been reasonably stable, varying from a high of 8.1% in 2003 to a low of 6.3% in 2006. Court commitments for registerable sex offenses have essentially grown at the same rate as total court commitments.


Table 8
Registerable Sex Offender Court Commitments by Fiscal Year and Status

	Commitment Year	Probation	Rider	Prison	Total
Historical	1996	67	64	46	177
	1997	69	90	54	213
	1998	77	80	36	193
	1999	94	63	74	231
	2000	101	50	97	248
	2001	105	72	76	253
	2002	112	75	96	283
	2003	144	80	99	323
	2004	124	76	109	309
	2005	118	74	109	301
	2006	120	66	107	293
	2007	87	83	124	294
	2008	116	81	106	303
Anticipated	2009	103	75	109	287
	2010	112	81	118	311
	2011	113	82	120	315
	2012	114	83	122	319
	2013	116	84	123	323
	2014	117	85	125	327

Acknowledging that there has been no significant change in the portion of total court commitments for registerable sex offenses, has there been any change in the pattern of commitment by status? Yes, a review of Chart 52 shows that there have been two points where significant changes in commitment patterns occurred. Beginning in 1999, we saw a clear shift from Rider commitments to Prison commitments. The second change occurred in 2007, where we see a clear shift from Probation commitments to incarcerated commitments of Prison and Rider. Both of these shifts resulted in a higher portion of registerable sex offenders being incarcerated. This change in commitment patterns should eventually result in a higher portion of sex offenders in the incarcerated offender population. For FY 2007, the portion of all incarcerated offenders sentenced for sex offenses was 21.0% compared to a previous average of about 20%. It increased to 21.7% in FY 2008 and increased again in 2009 to 22.6%. These observations are consistent with what would be anticipated given the changes in

commitment patterns shown in Chart 52 and the decline in non-violent court commitments beginning in 2008 (Chart 17).

Chart 52
Portion of Registerable Sex Offender Court Commitments
by Commitment Status and Fiscal Year



Another area of interest is sentence length. For this discussion, we'll use maximum (or indeterminate) sentence length for the group "registerable sex offenders who did not get a life or death sentence." Life and death sentences are excluded because there is no sentence length specified in the court order. Between 2000 and 2009, there has been an average of 15 prison commitments with life sentences a year for registerable sex offenses. There was a peak value of 21 in 2006. Since 2006, the average has dropped to about 16, a little higher than the period prior to 2006.

Chart 53 shows the average indeterminate sentence length in years by year for initial sex offender court commitments to prison. Sentence length for all commitment statuses has shown a pattern of increase for the entire period. Probation and Rider sentences have shown a persistent pattern of increase, while sentence lengths for Term commitments were fairly flat until 2004. Since 2004, Term sentence length has increased sharply. For the period 1996 through 2008, the average sentence length for Prison commitments was 14.6 years, the average Rider sentence was 10.8 years and the average Probation sentence was 8.3 years. There also appears to be a crime severity association with commitment type and length of sentence. In other words, the more severe the crime, the more likely an offender will go to prison and get a longer sentence. The less severe the crime, the more likely an offender will go to Probation with a shorter sentence.

Chart 53
Average Sex Offender Sentence Length by Commitment Status and Year





Chart 54 compares sentence length by crime and shows the average maximum sentence length by crime group and year of court commitment for offenders who were sentenced to prison on their initial commitment for crimes other than registerable sex offenses. Again, life and death sentences are excluded. The information in this chart can be compared to the top line in Chart 52. Note that registerable sex offenders tend to get sentences greater than the Murder & Manslaughter group, which averaged 13.2 years over the period 1996 through 2009. The next closest crime group is Assault, which averaged 8.5 years.

Chart 54
Average Sentence Length by Crime and Year



Having established the sentencing patterns for registerable sex offenders and comparison crime groups, the next question of interest is, “do the groups parole at similar rates?” No, for registerable sex offenders released from their initial commitment to prison during the period 1996 through 2009, 63% were paroled. The remaining 37% topped their sentences without ever being paroled. This parole rate is much lower than the 77% parole rate for all other crime groups. Even the Murder & Manslaughter group, which has the next highest sentence length, has a 76% parole rate. Clearly, the Parole Commission views registerable sex offenders as a substantial risk to the community and, as a result, they are paroled at a lower rate than any other crime group.

The final question is “do sex offenders recidivate at a higher rate than other crime groups?” Generally, the best indicator of recidivism is parole revocation rate for offenders on their first parole. Our analysis allows the parolees two years to revoke in order to make sure that the majority of those that will revoke have had enough time to do so (Chart 50 and related discussion). For male sex offenders paroled between FY 1996 and 2007, the parole revocation rate was 35%. That compares to a male parole revocation rate of 37% for all other crime groups (Table 5). For many people this is a counter-intuitive finding, but it is consistent with national studies on the topic. Our final recidivism measure is the number of offenders who are sentenced to prison after being discharged from incarceration or supervision. Male Sex offenders discharged between 1995 and 2005 returned at a rate of 4%, while all other crime groups returned at a rate of 6% (Table 6). Again, this is not what we might have expected, but it is consistent with national studies.

IDOC Sex Offender Management Practices

IDOC uses several assessments to identify programming needs and risk to re-offend. The first of these is the Static 99. The Static 99 is a static assessment that measures risk to re-offend with a sex offense. The assessment is public domain and is typically completed by trained staff as part of the RDU process, clinicians as part of a sex offender risk assessment, and sex offender officers when an offender is placed on Probation or Parole.

Stable 2007 is primarily a dynamic tool. Clinical staff in the Sex Offender Treatment Program (SOTP) use the Stable 2007 for treatment planning purposes, parole recommendations, and risk assessment. Additionally, CCD uses the Stable 2007 in conjunction with the Static 99 and Acute 2007.

Acute 2007 is a dynamic tool that can change more rapidly when used in conjunction with the Static 99 and Stable 2007 to develop appropriate supervision levels.

MSOST- R is primarily a static assessment, but does have some dynamic questions. It is a public domain assessment used to estimate risk to re-offend with a sex offense. This assessment is completed on most sex offenders prior to release to determine potential risk to re-offend. It is frequently completed as part of the pre-parole hearing risk assessment. Offenders who are determined to be potentially high risk to re-offend are referred to the SOCB for consideration for VSP designation. It is scored by trained clinicians in the institutions. It is not scored on every sexual offender in all institutions.

A Psychosexual Evaluation is a complete description of an offender's psychological profile emphasizing sexual deviancy. The SOCB has established standards for psychosexual evaluations and the clinical providers who conduct the evaluations. It can be ordered pre-sentence by the court to assist with sentencing, at the request of the sex offender supervising officer or the SOCB, and as part of sex offender treatment delivered in IDOC facilities.

Polygraph testing is used as a supervision management tool to verify compliance with the offenders' supervision requirements. Idaho uses three kinds of sex offender polygraph testing.

1. Full disclosure sexual history is an exam that verifies an offenders honesty about his entire written sexual and sex offender history,
2. Specific issue exams verify the details of a specific event,
3. Maintenance polygraph exams verify compliance with treatment and supervision conditions.

Sex Offender Management and Treatment Practices

In Idaho, nearly 99% of all offenders sentenced to prison will eventually be paroled or discharged. Accordingly, IDOC aggressively pursues Community Supervision practices

and community based treatment methods that are designed to help the offender succeed in the community and minimize their risk of re-offense. IDOC has specialized sex offender supervision officers in each district. They are trained in sex offender specific management techniques and typically maintain a caseload of 45 to 55 offenders per officer. Typically, sex offenders on Probation or Parole are required to complete community based sex offender treatment. The cost of the treatment is borne by the offender. Once the offender has completed the assigned sex offender treatment and passed a Sexual History Polygraph they may be transferred to a regular case load officer.

Community based sex offender treatment providers must be clinical members of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers (ATSA), licensed master's level treatment providers, and pass an approval process managed by IDOC. Providers must agree to discuss offender progress in treatment with POs. During treatment, the offender is not allowed to have contact with their victim or potential victims without approval of the therapist and supervising officer.

Institutional sex offender treatment and programming resources have been expanded. The IDOC has several sex offender programs offering treatment within facilities. Inmates are placed into programs/groups based on their risk level. Research clearly indicates that sex offenders should be treated in groups who are at the same risk level. The primary location for low and low-moderate risk offenders is at NICI. Those who are mod-high and high risk will participate in SOTP at ICC.

Sex offenders who complete programming and/or treatment in prison are required to complete community-based aftercare while on parole or probation. Sex offenders who serve their entire sentence in prison without parole do not carry any obligations to continue treatment when they are discharged.

At NICI, Riders sentenced for sex offenses are assigned to the Sex Offender Assessment Group, where they are assessed for readiness to change. This group identifies offender amenability to treatment and prepares them for sex offender treatment in the community.

Methamphetamine

“America’s Most Dangerous Drug” was the title of an August, 2005 Newsweek article describing the serious problems many states are facing because of widespread and increasing methamphetamine (meth) abuse. Meth is highly addictive and its widespread use leads to numerous expensive societal impacts. A quick web search for information on meth will provide a long list of references, including a site titled “Life or Meth” (<http://www.lifeormeth.org/>). This is a Kansas educational site designed to help 5th and 6th graders avoid meth addiction, underscoring the fact that the problem can begin with the very young and that extended use can have lifelong destructive, even life-threatening effects. The authors of this site listed the following adverse societal impacts: automobile accidents, explosions and fires triggered by the illegal manufacture of meth, increased criminal activity (specifically including domestic violence), emergency room and other medical costs, spread of infectious disease (specifically HIV, AIDS and hepatitis) and lost worker productivity. They note that the economic costs of these impacts fall on local, state, and federal governments, which must allocate additional resources for social services, treatment, prevention, research, and law enforcement.

A federally funded study of national meth related problems, (“Methamphetamine Use: Lessons Learned”, Hunt, Kuck and Truitt 2005) echoed the concern in the law enforcement community: “Data from the National Drug Threat Assessment Survey (NDTAS) show that by 2002 almost one-third of state and local law enforcement agencies listed meth as their primary drug threat, mostly in the West and Midwest. In the Pacific Northwest, over 80% of law enforcement agencies reporting to NDTAS report meth as their principal drug threat, and in the West Central region, 74% see meth as their principal threat (U.S. DOJ, NDIC, 2003). Cheap, easy to manufacture and long acting, meth has become a major player in the drug culture of these areas.”

The U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency’s web site describes meth as follows: “The effects of amphetamines, especially meth-amphetamine, are similar to cocaine, but their onset is slower and their duration is longer. In contrast to cocaine, which is quickly removed from the brain and is almost completely metabolized, meth-amphetamine remains in the central nervous system longer, and a larger percentage of the drug remains unchanged in the body, producing prolonged stimulant effects. Chronic abuse produces a psychosis that resembles schizophrenia and is characterized by paranoia, picking at the skin, preoccupation with one’s own thoughts, and auditory and visual hallucinations. These psychotic symptoms can persist for months and even years after use of these drugs has ceased and may be related to their neurotoxic effects. Violent and erratic behavior is frequently seen among chronic abusers of amphetamines, especially meth-amphetamine.”

The Idaho Meth Project was formed in January, 2007. At the core of the Meth Project’s effort is research-validated, high-impact advertising that graphically communicates the risks of Meth use. Idaho has launched a large-scale, statewide public messaging campaign and community action program unprecedented in power and influence in the state. Saturating TV, radio, billboards, newspapers, and the Internet, we reach 70-90% of young people 3-5 times a week with research-validated, hard-hitting messaging that graphically communicates the risks of Meth use and its impact on individuals, families,

and communities. More information can be found at <http://www.idahomethproject.org/index.php> .

The role of methamphetamines in incarceration is currently a much discussed topic. This analysis was undertaken to determine the magnitude of the meth problem for offenders incarcerated in Idaho. It includes data on the extent to which incarcerated offenders report a serious problem with meth and/or substance abuse issues in general.

The Department provides several different drug treatment options for meth users, but programming resources for both supervised and incarcerated offenders are limited. Among the programming options are Cognitive Self Change, Relapse Prevention, Therapeutic Community and Meth Matrix.

In addition to the programming requirement, meth users also bring increased costs for medical expenses. This is due to higher incidence of infectious diseases and increased dental costs related to meth use.

Cost of Meth

Meth abuse has devastating effects on the individuals involved and has been widely described as being very costly to society and government. In this section we will try to estimate the IDOC costs that can be associated with meth abuse. We will use court commitments to IDOC to establish an historical pattern of commitments that are related to meth, and the supervised and incarcerated populations on 12/01/2009 to establish our current situation. Meth association will be determined by Level of Service Inventory–Revised (LSI-R) assessments completed during the offender’s Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI).

Chart 55 shows the historical portion of court commitments to Probation, Retained Jurisdiction (also referred to as a Rider) or Term that are associated with offenders who have substance abuse problems by fiscal year. A substance abuse problem is indicated for offenders whose LSI-R Substance Abuse domain score is 4 or greater. Court commitments are very highly associated with substance abuse for all three statuses. The portion of offenders with substance abuse problems increased to its maximum value in 2006, and then declined during the period 2007 through 2009. Historically, Rider commitments have had the highest portion of substance abusing offenders and Probation commitments have had the lowest portion.

Chart 55
Portion of Court Commitments Where Assessments Indicate Substance Abuse by Status and Fiscal Year




Chart 56 shows the portion of commitments where substance abusing offenders cited meth among their drugs of choice by status and fiscal year. There has been a clear reduction in the portion citing meth as a drug of choice in the last three years for all three commitment statuses. Citations of meth preference peaked in 2006, but by the end of 2008 we see essentially the same level of meth preference as in 2003, and the 2009 levels were lower than the 2003 values for all commitment statuses.

Chart 56
Estimated Portion of Court Commitments Where Assessments Indicate Meth Preference by Status and Fiscal Year





Chart 57 shows the portion of commitments where offenders convicted of drug crimes cited meth among their drugs of choice by status and fiscal year. Until 2006, this group had a very high portion citing meth as a drug of choice, substantially higher than the general population. There has been a dramatic reduction in the portion citing meth as a drug of choice in the last three years for all three commitment statuses. In fact, there was a substantially lower portion of drug crime offenders citing meth among their drugs of choice in 2008 and 2009 than there was in 2003. This group is still not down to the meth preference levels of the general population, but there appears to have been a substantial change in substance abuse practices among felony offenders in Idaho over the last three years. While meth citations as a drug of choice have gone down, citations for marijuana, heroin and prescription drugs have all gone up. The decrease in meth citations has been mostly offset by the increase in other drug citations.

Chart 57
Estimated Portion of Court Commitments for Drug Crimes Where Assessments Indicate Meth Preference by Status and Fiscal Year



FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

Table 9 shows information for offenders on probation on 12/01/2009. It shows the number of probationers by gender, the portion that have an LSI, the portion that have an LSI indicated substance abuse issue, the portion that specified at least one drug of choice and the portion that listed specific drugs of interest among their drugs of choice. Meth was cited as a drug of choice by 28% of offenders on probation, more than any other drug. This dropped from 36% in 2008. Meth was also cited as the offender's only drug of choice for 20% of Probationers, down from 21% in 2008. Female probationers tend to use meth and prescription drugs at a higher rate than males. Male probationers tend to use marijuana, cocaine and heroin at a higher rate than females. These patterns are consistent with national patterns of drug use by gender and will be present in the Rider and Termer populations as well.

Table 9: Probationer Drug Preferences Indicated by the LSI-R

	Female	Male	Total
Total Probationers	2,996	8,045	11,041
Portion with an LSI-R	99%	99%	99%
Portion With Substance Abuse Problem	50%	55%	54%
Portion With Drug Problem Specifying a Drug of Choice	64%	52%	55%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Meth Among Drugs of Choice	33%	26%	28%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Meth As Only Drug of Choice	26%	18%	20%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Marijuana Among Drugs of Choice	16%	32%	27%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Cocaine Among Drugs of Choice	2%	3%	3%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Heroin Among Drugs of Choice	2%	1%	1%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Prescriptions Among Drugs of Choice	7%	5%	6%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Alcohol Among Drugs of Choice	0%	1%	0%

Data for Probationers supervised as of 12/1/2009

A Substance Abuse Domain Score 4 or greater indicates a substance abuse problem.

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

Table 10 shows information for offenders in Rider status on 12/01/2009. It shows the number of Riders by gender, the portion that have an LSI, the portion that have an LSI indicated substance abuse issue, the portion that specified at least one drug of choice and the portion that listed specific drugs of interest among their drugs of choice. Meth was cited as a drug of choice by 45% of Riders, down from 49% in 2008. Meth was cited as the only drug of choice for 21% of Riders, down from 24% in 2008. Female Riders tended to report meth use at a much higher rate than males. Riders show a higher rate of meth use than Probationers and a much higher rate of other drug use than Probationers. Note that 50% of Riders cited marijuana among their drugs of choice as compared to only 29% of Probationers.

Table 10: Rider Drug Preferences Indicated by the LSI-R

	Female	Male	Total
Total Riders	157	595	752
Portion with an LSI-R	100%	100%	100%
Portion With Substance Abuse Problem	90%	86%	87%
Portion With Drug Problem Specifying a Drug of Choice	82%	67%	70%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Meth Among Drugs of Choice	69%	37%	45%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Meth As Only Drug of Choice	34%	17%	21%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Marijuana Among Drugs of Choice	38%	54%	50%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Cocaine Among Drugs of Choice	5%	5%	5%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Heroin Among Drugs of Choice	3%	3%	3%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Prescriptions Among Drugs of Choice	12%	6%	8%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Alcohol Among Drugs of Choice	1%	6%	4%

Data for Riders incarcerated as of 12/1/2009

A Substance Abuse Domain Score 4 or greater indicates a substance abuse problem.

The sum of percents citing drugs of choice can exceed 100% because offenders frequently list multiple drugs of choice.

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

Table 11 shows information for offenders in Term status on 12/01/2009. It shows the number of Termers by gender, the portion that have an LSI, the portion that have an LSI indicated substance abuse issue, the portion that specified at least one drug of choice and the portion that listed specific drugs of interest among their drugs of choice. Meth was cited as a drug of choice by 53% of Termers, compared to 58% in 2008. Meth was cited as the only drug of choice for 35% of Termers. As with Riders and Probationers, female Termers tended to report meth use at a much higher rate than males. These rates will be used in calculations of the cost for Termers that can be associated with meth use.

Table 11: Inmate Drug Preferences Indicated by the LSI-R

	Female	Male	Total
Total Inmates	577	5,705	6,282
Portion with an LSI-R	100%	98%	98%
Portion With Substance Abuse Problem	84%	79%	79%
Portion With Drug Problem Specifying a Drug of Choice	85%	71%	72%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Meth Among Drugs of Choice	67%	52%	53%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Meth As Only Drug of Choice	53%	33%	35%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Marijuana Among Drugs of Choice	24%	36%	34%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Cocaine Among Drugs of Choice	5%	7%	7%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Heroin Among Drugs of Choice	4%	3%	3%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Prescriptions Among Drugs of Choice	8%	3%	4%
Estimated Portion With a Drug Problem and Alcohol Among Drugs of Choice	0%	1%	1%

Data for inmates incarcerated as of 12/1/2009

A Substance Abuse Domain Score 4 or greater indicates a substance abuse problem.

The sum of percents citing drugs of choice can exceed 100% because offenders frequently list multiple drugs of choice.

An analysis was completed in December 2009 that indicated that about 49% of IDOC's FY 2009 budget could be associated with incarcerating and supervising offenders who acknowledge substance abuse and cited meth among their drugs of choice. The estimate was based on the number of incarcerated and supervised offenders multiplied by the portion in each status that cited meth as a drug of choice multiplied by the average cost per day to incarcerate or supervise the offender. As might be expected from the patterns shown in Charts 56 and 57, this portion is down somewhat from the FY 2008 value of 55%. When the analysis was restricted to offenders who specified meth as their only drug of choice, the estimate dropped to 32% of IDOC's budget. This value did not change from FY 2008. Managing the rehabilitation needs for a substance abusing group of this size places a severe burden on IDOC's programming and offender supervision resources.

It is important to note that only a few offenders are committed to IDOC exclusively for meth abuse. Substance abuse, including Meth is only one indicator of criminal thinking or behavior. Further, many substance abusing offenders are poly-drug users. As we saw earlier, when reports of meth use went down, reports of other drug use, especially marijuana, went up in an almost completely compensating manner. Unless the mental health concerns and criminogenic thinking errors that brought on substance abusing

episodes are remedied, cessation of abuse of one drug will almost always be replaced by abuse of another drug.

Estimating the cost to the criminal justice system for abuse of any specific drug is problematic at best. This is true because the underlying assumption that “drug abuse leads to criminal thinking and behavior” does not adequately define the relationship. It is just as true that criminal thought patterns lead to substance abuse. In Idaho, substance abuse is highly associated with criminal thinking and behavior. As we saw in Chart 55, about 80% of all offenders committed to IDOC have substance abuse issues. But that does not mean that if we eliminate substance abuse, we could reduce our offender population by 80%. The problem with such an argument is that it reduces the characteristics of the offender population to a one dimensional categorization. An offender’s decision to commit a criminal act is based on their personal history, their attitude and emotional stability at the moment, and at least one critical thinking error. Substance abuse by itself is not the most important factor in a person’s decision to commit a criminal act.

Offenders are committed to IDOC because of criminal actions, not because of any specific substance abuse or addiction. If we could eliminate all meth abuse in Idaho, we would only expect to reduce the IDOC budget by a small portion of the meth associated cost value because meth use is only one of many criminogenic factors that lead to criminal thinking and behavior. Effective interventions must address all relevant factors in order to positively influence offender re-integration into the community. A stable living arrangement, a stable work environment, a positive peer support group and a healthy view of substance abuse are considered critical requirements for an offender to succeed in the community. The person who lacks even one of these items is less likely to become a contributing member of society.

Appendix 1
Standard Report, June 2009

Idaho Department of Correction Standard Reports For June 2009

This document contains the monthly Standard Reports for the Idaho Department of Correction. It is divided into three main sections.

Section 1 relates to the admissions and releases for the month.

Section 2 deals with incarcerated offenders. It provides information on what status offenders are in, what institution they are housed in, what the most severe crime is for which they are incarcerated, and demographics such as gender, ethnicity and age.

Section 3 is similar to section 2 but deals with offenders supervised in probation or parole status.

The glossary includes definitions for key terms used in this report.

CONTENTS	Page
Section 1: Admissions and Releases	
Incarcerated Admissions and Releases	1
Probation & Parole Caseload	2
Discharged Offender Information	3
Section 2: Incarcerated	
Incarcerated Count by Location and Worst Crime	4
Incarcerated Demographics	5
Incarcerated Count by Institution and Status	6
Incarcerated Summary by Location and Gender	8
Incarcerated Location by Crime Group and Gender	9
Section 3: Probation and Parole	
Probation & Parole Count by Location and Gender	10
Probation & Parole Count Detail	11
Probation & Parole Demographics by District	12
Probation & Parole Sentences by Crime Group and Gender	13
Glossary	
Definitions	14

Idaho Department of Correction Standard Reports

Incarcerated Admissions and Releases June 2009

	Incarcerated Offenders			Total
	Term	Rider	Violator	
Beginning Count	6,433	794	460	7,687
Admissions				
New Commitments	49	69	-	118
Revoked Probation	47	80	-	127
Revoked Parole	5	-	-	5
Failed Rider	18	-	-	18
Violated Parole	-	-	91	91
From Other Status	-	4	-	4
Total	119	153	91	363
Releases				
To Parole	106	-	19	125
To Parole Violator	-	-	-	-
To Probation	2	120	-	122
To Retained Jurisdiction	2	-	2	4
To Term Incarceration	-	18	5	23
To Community Rider	-	-	-	-
To Other Status	-	-	-	-
Discharged	40	-	-	40
Total	150	138	26	314
Net Admissions and Releases	(31)	15	65	49
Ending Count	6,402	809	525	7,736
Less Non Bed Offenders*	164	110	179	453
Net Count	6,238	699	346	7,283

* Some offenders are not reflected in the net count since they represent no financial obligation. This can occur when an offender is in another jurisdiction (county, federal, or state) by court order, agreement, or detained. See pages 7 and 8 for more information on these offenders.

Probation and Parole Caseload June 2009

	Parole	Probation	Total
Beginning Count	3,414	13,789	17,203
Admissions			
New Commitments	10	221	231
Successful Rider	0	119	119
Paroled	105	0	105
Reinstated Parole	19	0	19
From Other Status	3	18	21
Total	137	358	495
Releases			
To Probation/Parole*	1	2	3
To Parole Violator	91	0	91
To Retained Jurisdiction	0	80	80
To Term Incarceration	0	47	47
Discharged	39	225	264
Total	131	354	485
Net Admissions and Releases	6	4	10
Ending Count	3,420	13,793	17,213
Less Parole Commission	792	0	792
Less Bench Warrants	0	1,341	1,341
Less Court Probation	0	1,324	1,324
Ending Caseload	2,628	11,128	13,756

Note: Offenders in bench warrants, court probation and parole commission are excluded from the supervised caseload because they are supervised by other interests.

* Some offenders will move from probation to parole, or from parole to probation.

Discharged Offender Information June 2009

Offenders Discharged by Crime Group and Last Status

Crime Group	Offender Count	Status Released From				
		Probation	Parole	Parole Violator	Ret Juris	Term
Alcohol	22	16	1	1	-	4
Assault	37	24	2	-	-	11
Drug	121	100	16	-	-	5
Murder & Man	2	-	2	-	-	-
Property	95	70	11	1	-	13
Sex	20	9	4	-	-	7
Total	297	219	36	2	-	40

The table above shows only the last status prior to discharge.

Offenders Discharged by Crime Group and Average Months for each Status Served

Crime Group	Offender Count	Average Months in Status					Average Total Served
		Probation	Parole	Parole Violator	Ret Juris	Term	
Alcohol	22	40.0	8.6	6.3	5.6	34.7	56.4
Assault	37	49.7	15.7	8.8	6.8	63.0	69.0
Drug	121	45.1	32.8	7.6	6.2	30.4	55.5
Murder & Man	2	0.0	51.2	0.0	0.0	36.2	69.2
Property	95	47.8	25.6	8.0	6.2	36.4	61.1
Sex	20	80.6	28.5	3.8	7.9	60.7	92.3

There were 297 offenders discharged during June. Many served in more than one status before discharge. The table above shows all status types for each offender discharged during this period.

There were 2 non-Idaho, civil commitment or record tracking discharges in June. They are not included in these tables.

Offenders Discharged by Crime Group and Average Sentence Length by Months to Parole Eligible Date (PED) and Months to Full Term Release Date (FTRD)

Crime Group	Months to PED	Months to FTRD
Alcohol	20.0	46.5
Assault	31.7	61.4
Drug	22.6	57.8
Murder & Man	48.0	132.2
Property	21.1	50.8
Sex	38.5	92.6

Idaho offenders are incarcerated with a two-part sentence. The first part is the fixed or determinate portion of the sentence. The offender will typically serve all of the fixed sentence. The second part is the indeterminate portion of the sentence. The Idaho Parole Commission may grant parole for any portion of the indeterminate part of the sentence.

Idaho Department of Correction Standard Reports

Incarcerated Count by Location June 2009

Status	Location				Total
	Institutions	CWC's	Contract Beds	County Jails	
Civil	2	0	0	0	2
Non-Idaho	16	0	0	0	16
Parole Violator	198	0	0	148	346
Ret Juris	632	0	0	67	699
Term	5,338	448	120	314	6,220
Total	6,186	448	120	529	7,283

Incarcerated Count by Location, Worst Crime June 2009

Crime Group	Location				Total	% of Total
	Institutions	CWC's	Contract Beds	County Jails		
Alcohol	389	48	2	46	485	6.7%
Assault	1,428	54	31	106	1,619	22.2%
Drug	1,268	178	7	164	1,617	22.2%
Murder & Man	386	9	36	6	437	6.0%
No Crime Group	1	0	0	2	3	0.0%
Property	1,303	159	1	139	1,602	22.0%
Sex	1,411	0	43	66	1,520	20.9%
Total	6,186	448	120	529	7,283	100.0%

Idaho Department of Correction Standard Reports

Incarcerated Demographics June 2009

Gender	Institutions	CWC's	Contract Beds	County Jails	Total	% of Total
Female	576	99	0	99	774	10.6%
Male	5,610	349	120	430	6,509	89.4%
Total	6,186	448	120	529	7,283	100.0%

Ethnicity	Institutions	CWC's	Contract Beds	County Jails	Total	% of Total
Asian	32	1	0	1	34	0.5%
Black	151	8	4	13	176	2.4%
Hispanic	1,091	49	18	76	1,234	16.9%
Indian	236	16	6	23	281	3.9%
Other	37	4	4	2	47	0.6%
Unknown	72	2	5	30	109	1.5%
White	4,567	368	83	384	5,402	74.2%
Total	6,186	448	120	529	7,283	100.0%

Age Range	Institutions	CWC's	Contract Beds	County Jails	Total	% of Total
Juvenile	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
18-20	177	0	0	18	195	2.7%
21-25	996	32	4	112	1,144	15.7%
26-30	1,138	62	20	104	1,324	18.2%
31-35	937	72	18	96	1,123	15.4%
36-40	740	86	20	73	919	12.6%
41-45	717	91	15	49	872	12.0%
46-50	659	57	19	41	776	10.7%
51-55	377	36	9	24	446	6.1%
Over 55	445	12	15	12	484	6.6%
Total	6,186	448	120	529	7,283	100.0%

Average Age	36.8	38.7	40.9	33.6	36.7
-------------	------	------	------	------	------

Idaho Department of Correction Standard Reports

Incarcerated Count by Institution and Status June 2009

Institutions	Civil	Non-Idaho	Parole Violator	Ret Juris	Termer	Total
Idaho Maximum Security Institution	2	2	1	0	510	515
Idaho State Correctional Institution	0	8	175	110	1,362	1,655
South Idaho Correctional Institution	0	0	3	0	730	733
Idaho Correctional Institution--Orofino	0	3	8	3	532	546
North Idaho Correctional Institution	0	0	0	363	51	414
Pocatello Women's Correctional Center	0	0	8	31	253	292
St. Anthony Work Camp	0	0	0	0	238	238
Idaho Correctional Center	0	3	3	0	1,503	1,509
South Boise Women's Correctional Center	0	0	0	125	159	284
Total	2	16	198	632	5,338	6,186

Work Centers	Civil	Non-Idaho	Parole Violator	Ret Juris	Termer	Total
Nampa	0	0	0	0	85	85
Boise	0	0	0	0	99	99
Twin Falls	0	0	0	0	80	80
Idaho Falls	0	0	0	0	84	84
SICI CWC	0	0	0	0	100	100
Total	0	0	0	0	448	448

Contract Beds	Civil	Non-Idaho	Parole Violator	Ret Juris	Termer	Total
BCDC TEXAS	0	0	0	0	0	0
NFCF OK	0	0	0	0	120	120
County Jails - Jail Contract	0	0	0	0	50	50
Other Contract Beds	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Providers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	170	170

County Jails	Civil	Non-Idaho	Parole Violator	Ret Juris	Termer	Total
County Jails - Jail Housing	0	0	0	0	29	29
County Jail	0	0	4	65	229	298
County Jail Parole Violators Awaiting Transport	0	0	71	2	5	78
County Jail Parole Violators Awaiting Hearing	0	0	73	0	1	74
County Jails - Security Restrictions	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	148	67	264	479
Total Bed Offenders	2	16	346	699	6,220	7,283

Continued on next page

Idaho Department of Correction Standard Reports

Incarcerated Count by Institution and Status June 2009 Continued

Continued from previous page

Non Bed Offenders	Civil	Non-Idaho	Parole Violator	Ret Juris	Termer	Total
County Jails-Second	0	0	18	26	57	101
Correction Compact	0	0	0	0	15	15
Concurrent Sentence	0	0	0	0	57	57
Detainers	0	0	0	0	13	13
Hospitals	0	0	0	0	2	2
Fugitives	0	0	114	2	10	126
Other Record Tracking	0	0	0	2	7	9
Other Offenders Not Counted-Judicial Review	0	0	0	80	0	80
Miscellaneous Record Tracking	0	0	0	0	3	3
Other Offenders Not Counted-Detainer	0	0	20	0	0	20
Other Offenders Not Counted-Parole Violator	0	0	27	0	0	27
Total Non Bed Offenders	0	0	179	110	164	453
Total Inmate Count	2	16	525	809	6,384	7,736

*Other Record Tracking includes offenders on bond, that require special handling or in temporary housing.

**Miscellaneous Record Tracking includes offenders that are tracked but not accounted for on the count sheet, Court Stays of Execution and Consecutive Sentences.

Idaho Department of Correction Standard Reports

Incarcerated Summary by Location and Gender June 2009

Institutions	Civil	Non-Idaho	Violator	Ret Juris	Termer	Total
Female	0	0	8	156	412	576
Male	2	16	190	476	4,926	5,610
Total	2	16	198	632	5,338	6,186

CWC's	Civil	Non-Idaho	Violator	Ret Juris	Termer	Total
Female	0	0	0	0	99	99
Male	0	0	0	0	349	349
Total	0	0	0	0	448	448

Contract Beds	Civil	Non-Idaho	Violator	Ret Juris	Termer	Total
Female	0	0	0	0	0	0
Male	0	0	0	0	120	120
Total	0	0	0	0	120	120

County Jails	Civil	Non-Idaho	Violator	Ret Juris	Termer	Total
Female	0	0	18	18	63	99
Male	0	0	130	49	251	430
Total	0	0	148	67	314	529
Total Bed Offenders	2	16	346	699	6,220	7,283

Non Bed Offenders	Civil	Non-Idaho	Violator	Ret Juris	Termer	Total
Female	0	0	19	9	14	42
Male	0	0	160	101	150	411
Total	0	0	179	110	164	453
Total Offenders	2	16	525	809	6,384	7,736

Idaho Department of Correction Standard Reports

Incarcerated Location by Crime Group and Gender June 2009

Crime Group	Gender	Institutions	CWC's	Contract Beds	County Jails	Total	% of Total
Alcohol	Female	32	6	0	7	45	0.6%
	Male	357	42	2	39	440	6.0%
Assault	Female	84	9	0	9	102	1.4%
	Male	1,344	45	31	97	1,517	20.8%
Drug	Female	207	40	0	45	292	4.0%
	Male	1,061	138	7	119	1,325	18.2%
Murder & Man	Female	37	3	0	2	42	0.6%
	Male	349	6	36	4	395	5.4%
No Crime Reported	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
	Male	1	0	0	2	3	0.0%
Property	Female	198	41	0	31	270	3.7%
	Male	1,105	118	1	108	1,332	18.3%
Sex	Female	18	0	0	5	23	0.3%
	Male	1,393	0	43	61	1,497	20.6%
Total		6,186	448	120	529	7,283	100.0%

Probation & Parole Count by Location June 2009

Location	Probation	Parole	Total	% of Total
Districts	11,128	2,628	13,756	79.9%
Bench Warrants	1,341	0	1,341	7.8%
Court Probation	1,324	0	1,324	7.7%
Parole Commission	0	792	792	4.6%
Total	13,793	3,420	17,213	100.0%

Probation & Parole Count by Gender June 2009

Location	Gender	Probation	Parole	Total	% of Total
Districts	Female	3,051	420	3,471	20.2%
	Male	8,077	2,208	10,285	59.8%
Bench Warrants	Female	242	0	242	1.4%
	Male	1,099	0	1,099	6.4%
Court Probation	Female	330	0	330	1.9%
	Male	994	0	994	5.8%
Parole Commission	Female	0	75	75	0.4%
	Male	0	717	717	4.2%
Total		13,793	3,420	17,213	100.0%

Idaho Department of Correction Standard Reports

Probation & Parole Count Detail June 2009

Districts	Probation	Parole	Total	% of Total
D1	1,335	297	1,632	11.9%
D2	487	79	566	4.1%
D3	1,900	440	2,340	17.0%
D4	3,169	1,113	4,282	31.1%
D5	1,249	283	1,532	11.1%
D6	699	154	853	6.2%
D7	1,325	262	1,587	11.5%
Interstate	964	0	964	7.0%
Total	11,128	2,628	13,756	100.0%

Bench Warrants	Probation	Parole	Total	Total
Bench Warrants	1,341	0	1,341	100.0%

Court Probation	Probation	Parole	Total	Total
Court Probation	1,324	0	1,324	100.0%

Commission	Probation	Parole	Total	Total
Absconder	0	0	0	0.0%
Commission Warrants	0	0	0	0.0%
Federal Detainers	0	313	313	39.5%
Parole Commission Other	0	479	479	60.5%
State Detainers	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	0	792	792	100.0%
Report Total	13,793	3,420	17,213	100.0%

Idaho Department of Correction Standard Reports

Probation & Parole Demographics by District June 2009

Gender	District								Total	% of Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	IS		
Female	354	133	584	1,115	374	232	389	290	3,471	25.2%
Male	1,278	433	1,756	3,167	1,158	621	1,198	674	10,285	74.8%
Total	1,632	566	2,340	4,282	1,532	853	1,587	964	13,756	100.0%

Ethnicity	District								Total	% of Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	IS		
Asian	6	2	10	35	9	4	4	11	81	0.6%
Black	9	4	23	100	16	20	12	34	218	1.6%
Hispanic	31	9	539	310	291	76	166	81	1,503	10.9%
Indian	45	30	43	46	23	43	91	21	342	2.5%
Other	7	1	22	49	7	3	4	7	100	0.7%
Unknown	16	16	73	98	20	3	46	14	286	2.1%
White	1,518	504	1,630	3,644	1,166	704	1,264	796	11,226	81.6%
Total	1,632	566	2,340	4,282	1,532	853	1,587	964	13,756	100.0%

Age Group	District								Total	% of Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	IS		
Juvenile	2	0	0	4	1	0	1	0	8	0.1%
18-20	43	17	45	95	42	23	46	24	335	2.4%
21-25	308	107	362	672	275	164	295	160	2,343	17.0%
26-30	291	104	460	881	293	156	304	208	2,697	19.6%
31-35	229	67	372	664	234	136	267	148	2,117	15.4%
36-40	197	81	314	542	193	120	173	125	1,745	12.7%
41-45	174	58	276	504	164	81	178	113	1,548	11.3%
46-50	177	49	248	448	167	90	186	87	1,452	10.6%
51-55	107	36	126	265	88	40	67	51	780	5.7%
Over 55	104	47	137	207	75	43	70	48	731	5.3%
Total	1,632	566	2,340	4,282	1,532	853	1,587	964	13,756	100.0%

Average Age	36.2	36.4	36.4	36.0	35.8	35.6	35.3	35.5	35.9
-------------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Idaho Department of Correction Standard Reports

Probation & Parole Sentences by Crime Group June 2009


Crime	District								Total	Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	IS		
Alcohol	249	72	260	577	174	83	182	82	1,679	12.2%
Assault	312	88	378	786	271	117	232	150	2,334	17.0%
Drug	552	138	792	1,244	466	326	550	354	4,422	32.1%
Murder & Man	17	7	16	43	10	5	16	4	118	0.9%
No Crime Group	4	6	21	8	3	3	11	1	57	0.4%
Property	397	196	684	1,296	504	238	439	314	4,068	29.6%
Sex	101	59	189	328	104	81	157	59	1,078	7.8%
Total	1,632	566	2,340	4,282	1,532	853	1,587	964	13,756	100.0%

Probation & Parole Sentences by Crime Group & Gender June 2009

Crime	Sex	District								Total	% of Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	IS		
Alcohol	Female	35	10	40	96	25	9	30	13	258	1.9%
	Male	214	62	220	481	149	74	152	69	1,421	10.3%
Assault	Female	26	7	45	114	33	17	32	14	288	2.1%
	Male	286	81	333	672	238	100	200	136	2,046	14.9%
Drug	Female	162	49	237	411	147	122	168	132	1,428	10.4%
	Male	390	89	555	833	319	204	382	222	2,994	21.8%
Murder & Man	Female	3	3	3	11	1	2	3	0	26	0.2%
	Male	14	4	13	32	9	3	13	4	92	0.7%
No Crime Group	Female	1	3	4	2	0	1	1	0	12	0.1%
	Male	3	3	17	6	3	2	10	1	45	0.3%
Property	Female	124	59	250	473	164	79	146	129	1,424	10.4%
	Male	273	137	434	823	340	159	293	185	2,644	19.2%
Sex	Female	3	2	5	8	4	2	9	2	35	0.3%
	Male	98	57	184	320	100	79	148	57	1,043	7.6%
Total		1,632	566	2,340	4,282	1,532	853	1,587	964	13,756	100.0%

Appendix 2
Offender Forecast FY 2009-2012

**State of Idaho
Department of Correction**



Flow Model
Offender Forecast

Idaho Offender Population Forecast FY 2010 through 2013
August 28, 2009

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Forecast Overview	2
Historical and Forecast Admissions and Releases by Status	5
Term	5
Rider	5
Parole Violator	6
Total Incarcerated	6
Probation	6
Parole	7
Total Supervised	7
Total Incarcerated and Supervised	7
Methods	8
Idaho Criminal Justice Commission Population Forecast Advisory Committee	8
Purpose	8
Scope	8
Organization	8
Membership	8
Resources	9
Meeting Frequency	10
Forecast Preparation	10
Flow Model Description	10
Forecast Methods	10
Flow Model Concept	10
New Court Commitments	11
Cohorts	12
Flow Model Process	12
Method for Estimating New Court Commitments	12
Status Change Rates	13
Length of Stay Calculation	13
Completing the Forecast	14
Non-Bed and Non-Caseload Offenders	14
Tracking the Accuracy of the Forecast	14
Factors That Influence Forecast Accuracy	14
Appendix 1: Historical and Forecast Admissions and Releases for Males by Status, and Fiscal Year	16
Appendix 2: Historical and Forecast Admissions and Releases for Females by Status, and Fiscal Year	19
Appendix 3: Monthly Admissions and Releases by Status, FY 2010	22

Appendix 4: Monthly Admissions and Releases by Status for Males, FY 201025
Appendix 5: Monthly Admissions and Releases by Status for Females, FY 201028
Appendix 6: State Population Estimates by Gender.....31
Appendix 7: Court Commitment Rate Analysis32
Appendix 8: Status Change Rate and Length of Stay Analysis.....35
Appendix 9: Definitions37



IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

Forecast Advisory Committee

MEMORANDUM

Mary K. Stohr

FROM: Mary Stohr, Chair Forecast Advisory Committee
DATE: August 28, 2009
SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2010 to 2013 Offender Population Forecast

The attached report details the Idaho offender population forecast for fiscal years 2010 to 2013. The forecast is a collaborative product of the Forecast Advisory Committee and staff of the Idaho Department of Correction (IDOC). The Committee establishes court commitment rates for offenders to Probation, Rider and Term and status move rates and associated lengths of stay for offenders incarcerated or supervised by the Department. The court commitment rates determine the forecast number of court commitments to these statuses for forecast years. The status move rates and associated lengths of stay are used to calculate how many offenders will move from one status to another and when they will do so. IDOC staff provide historical data to the Committee to help in selecting appropriate court commitment rates and to set rates for status moves and lengths of stay. The forecast is influenced by two key factors: 1) offenders entering the system, and; 2) when offenders leave the system. IDOC staff use the rates and lengths of stay provided by the Committee to complete the forecast. The Committee reviews all assumptions and exercises oversight of the methods used by IDOC staff to complete the forecast.

The forecast method relies heavily upon the judgment of both the Committee and IDOC staff members. The forecast is the Committee's best estimate of the future commitments and releases of adult felony offenders. Even though every effort was made to ensure that the decisions, methods and assumptions of the forecast were reasonable and sound, these judgments may prove inaccurate due to unforeseen future circumstances or changes in business practices. If current practices in the Criminal Justice System (law enforcement, prosecution, courts, Department of Correction and the Parole Commission) continue, this forecast represents a reasonable estimate of future offender counts.

Executive Summary

Introduction

A forecast was prepared for Idaho offenders for the period FY 2010 - 2013. The Idaho Criminal Justice Commission Population Forecast Advisory Committee (PFAC) established court commitment rates and status change rates with associated lengths of stay for the forecast. The forecast provides an estimate of the number of incarcerated and supervised offenders over the next four years.

Assumptions for Future Growth

The forecast is influenced by two key factors: 1) offenders entering the system and 2) offenders leaving the system. The model relies on the judgment of the FAC members to set rates at which it is believed offenders will be committed to incarceration or supervision by the courts, and the rates for status changes and lengths of stay as offenders move through the system and are eventually discharged.

Conclusions

The forecast anticipates moderated growth of incarcerated and supervised offenders over the next four years when compared to historical averages. The forecast number of incarcerated offenders and the forecast number of offenders actively supervised by Community Corrections are listed in the table below along with the anticipated annual percent increase from the previous fiscal year.

	2010	2011	2012	2013
Incarcerated Offenders	7,556	7,880	8,242	8,608
Annual Percent Increase	3.7%	4.3%	4.6%	4.4%
Supervised Offenders	14,419	15,143	15,950	16,804
Annual Percent Increase	4.8%	5.0%	5.3%	5.4%
Total Offenders	21,975	23,023	24,192	25,412
Annual Percent Increase	4.4%	4.8%	5.1%	5.0%

The forecast anticipates about the same rates of increase for female offenders as for males. Historically, the number of incarcerated females had been increasing at almost twice the rate of increase for males. That pattern ended abruptly in 2007. The incarcerated female offender population experienced no growth or declined for 2007 through 2009. The forecast anticipates that the female incarcerated offender group will experience an average annual increase of 3.9% from FY 2010 to 2013, while the male incarcerated offender group will have an average increase of 4.3%. Supervised offenders show similar patterns. The number of supervised female offenders will increase at an average rate of 4.1% while males will increase at 5.5%. Growth rates for both genders are down from previous periods. The average annual rate of increase from FY 1996 through 2009 for incarcerated females was 10.2% while males increased at 5.7%.

Forecast Overview

Introduction

A forecast was made of Idaho offenders for the period FY 2010 - 2013. The Idaho Department of Correction (IDOC) developed the forecast based on guidance from the Forecast Advisory Committee (FAC), using the flow model method. The forecast provides an estimate of the number of incarcerated and supervised offenders for the next four years. The flow model method provides a detailed and useful forecast. It provides an improved ability to identify and quantify changes in growth patterns and attribute them to a specific component of offender management practices.

Method

The flow model method (the model) was used to produce the offender population forecast. This method estimates admissions and releases for each status by crime group and gender. The FAC, a committee of subject matter experts from all areas of the criminal justice system, established the rates for new court commitments and the rates and lengths of stay for status changes leading to the eventual discharge of offenders. IDOC staff used these court commitment rates and status change rates, with their associated lengths of stay, to complete the forecast. A more complete description of this process is provided in the "Methods" section of this report.

Assumptions for Future Growth

The forecast is influenced by two key factors: 1) offenders entering the system and 2) how long offenders stay before leaving the system. The model process relies on the judgment of FAC members to establish the rates at which it is believed offenders will be committed by the courts. A separate rate was established for each crime group, gender, and court commitment status. The model then anticipates when offenders will change status within the system or when they will be discharged based upon recent historical patterns of status change rates and lengths of stay selected by the FAC. Many factors that might influence future court commitment rates or status changes were considered and discussed while establishing the court commitment rate for each crime group and forecast year. The FAC considered changes in laws, changes in agency policy, changes in prosecution and court practices, and changes in state population trends when setting these rates and lengths of stay.

The FAC discussed each combination of crime group, commitment status, and gender, and searched for indications of changing court commitment trends. They noted a dramatic decline in court commitments to all gender, crime and status combinations beginning in FY 2008. This decline was attributed to a decline in reported crime in Idaho, which mirrored national trends. The flow model method compensates for this and as a result, forecast court commitments approximate the values seen from FY 2002 to 2005.

Conclusions

The model anticipates a moderate growth rate of incarcerated and supervised offenders over the next four years. The forecast indicates that the total number of incarcerated Idaho offenders will increase from 7,283 in FY 2009 to 7,556 in FY 2010, an increase of 3.7%. This number will increase to 7,880 in FY 2011, an increase of 4.3%. It will increase to 8,242 in FY 2012, an increase of 4.6%. And in FY 2013, it will increase to 8,608, an increase of 4.4%. The annual rate of increase for the entire forecast period is substantially lower than the historical rate of increase of 5.9% from FY 1996 through FY 2009. The number of offenders actively supervised by Community Corrections is expected to increase from 13,756 in FY 2009 to 14,419 in FY 2010, an increase of 4.8%. This number will increase to 15,143 in FY 2011, an increase of 5.0%. It will increase to 15,950 in FY 2012, an increase of 5.3%. And in FY 2013 it will increase to 16,804, an increase of 5.4%. The annual rate of increase for supervised offenders during the forecast period is lower than the historical rate of increase of 6.5% from FY 1996 through FY 2009. The details of forecast growth can be seen in the table "Historical and Forecast Admissions and Releases by Status" on pages 5 through 7.

The information in this table contains some subtle patterns. A review of historical admission and release patterns reveals the existence of several relationships. For example, the decrease in admissions to Term in 1998 is followed by a decrease in releases two years later. This pattern is consistent with the fact that the average period of incarceration is about two and a half years. As a result we see that releases from term incarceration tend to lag admissions by about two years. The model behaves in just this manner. So the relatively high rates of admission to Term in 1999, 2000, and 2001 tend to distribute through the model as relatively high rates of Parole in 2002, 2003, and 2004, and subsequently higher Parole Violator rates in the following years. Additionally, we anticipate that the decline in admissions to prison in 2008 will be followed by a decline in parole releases in 2010 as seen on page 5.

Finally, the trend of higher rates of increase for female offenders that began in FY 1999 is dramatically moderated in the FY 2010 through FY 2013 forecast. To illustrate this point compare the percent increase of incarcerated female offenders to that of male offenders for the forecast period. Female incarcerated offenders are anticipated to experience an annual average increase of only 3.9% from FY 2010 through FY 2013, while male incarcerated offenders are anticipated to experience an annual average increase of 4.3%. Both of these percentages are reduced from previous years, but the tendency for female offenders to increase at a higher rate than male offenders was dramatically reversed beginning in 2007. The number of incarcerated females experienced no growth at all in FY 2007 and 2008 and actually declined in 2009. The forecast anticipates this pattern will perpetuate through the forecast period. More "by gender" details can be found in Appendices 1 and 2 beginning on page 16.

Limitations

The flow model forecast was implemented to establish a credible and useful method for forecasting future admissions and subsequent status changes and discharges of felony offenders committed to the Idaho Department of Correction. The forecast reflects the court commitment rates and the subsequent status change rates and lengths of stay selected by the FAC. The FAC established the consensus method of selecting rates. The results fairly represent the opinions and judgments of FAC members who developed the model. There are three limitations that may have significant impacts on the forecast accuracy.

1) Forecast court commitments for new offenders are based on Idaho's population growth for persons between the ages of 20 and 34. The forecast uses U.S. Census Bureau estimates of population growth from 1995 to 2009 and their forecast for future years' growth. The Idaho population growth rate for the forecast period is 2.2% for males and 2.0% for females. Admissions for new offenders into the model will be in error to the same degree that the Census forecast is in error.

2) The Idaho Department of Correction has 14 years of usable historical data. Virtually all components of the model rely upon the historical patterns of offender commitments and status changes. During the last 14 years there have been several significant changes in practices that make historical averages over the whole period poor indicators of the immediate future. Where policy decisions or other factors have caused a change from historical patterns the accuracy of the model may be diminished. Ironically this limitation is also one of the model's strengths. If a significant change from these historical patterns does occur, it is immediately evident. This strength can be illustrated by recent departmental undertakings. In FY 2008 IDOC became concerned about the high number of Probation revocations. The Community Corrections Division implemented a Violation Matrix method to guide Probation Officers in dealing with probationers at risk of revocation. The matrix offered a progression of intermediate sanctions in lieu of revocation. As a result of this effort, probation revocations were 115 less than anticipated in FY 2008 and 172 less than anticipated in 2009. This effort is estimated to have forestalled growth in the incarcerated offender population by 287 over a two year period. This example shows how changes from historic patterns of status change rates can significantly influence patterns of incarcerated offender population growth.

Historical data also help to establish bounds for reasonable forecast growth rates. With no significant changes in business practices we would expect the forecast to be close to the average of historical annual growth rates and to be bounded by observed minimum and maximum growth values. Additionally, if we are aware of changes in business practices, the difference between the forecast and actual experience may allow us to estimate the magnitude of these impacts as in the example above.

3) The forecast method relies heavily upon the judgment of FAC members. The forecast is the FAC's best estimate of future court commitments and releases of adult felony offenders. Every effort was made to ensure that the decisions and assumptions for the forecast were reasonable, but these judgments could prove inaccurate due to unforeseen conditions in the future. Additionally, new policies and programs are frequently implemented and their influence has obviously not been included in the forecast. Further, even when we are aware of new programs or policy changes, it is nearly impossible to estimate their impact on future years without historical data to guide us. Since the forecast is made up of the sum of a number of elements, no specific confidence level can be ascribed to the forecast. However, we can say that if current practices in the Criminal Justice System (law enforcement, prosecution, courts, Department of Correction, and the Parole Commission) continue, this forecast represents a reasonable estimate of future offender counts.

Historical and Forecast Admissions and Releases by Status FY 1998 to 2013

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	
Term	Actual	Forecast	Forecast	Forecast	Forecast												
Beginning Admissions	3,402	3,500	3,899	4,502	4,848	5,014	5,122	5,469	5,762	6,205	6,461	6,435	6,402	6,634	6,946	7,285	
New Commitments	397	533	584	651	598	662	651	641	737	677	573	546	626	639	653	665	
Revoked Probation	433	516	586	581	593	628	728	788	803	802	723	571	663	658	702	714	
Revoked Parole	260	392	354	291	336	367	466	436	465	470	487	658	662	648	618	615	
Failed Rider	128	148	159	161	123	154	141	172	224	256	242	225	227	232	240	243	
Total	1,218	1,589	1,683	1,684	1,650	1,811	1,986	2,037	2,229	2,205	2,025	2,000	2,178	2,177	2,213	2,237	
Releases																	
Parole	827	800	704	905	935	1,116	1,051	1,104	1,180	1,330	1,429	1,448	1,363	1,307	1,355	1,401	
Discharged	293	390	376	433	549	587	588	640	606	619	622	585	583	558	519	508	
Total	1,120	1,190	1,080	1,338	1,484	1,703	1,639	1,744	1,786	1,949	2,051	2,033	1,946	1,865	1,874	1,909	
Net Admission & Releases	98	399	603	346	166	108	347	293	443	256	-26	-33	232	312	339	328	Historical
Ending	3,500	3,899	4,502	4,848	5,014	5,122	5,469	5,762	6,205	6,461	6,435	6,402	6,634	6,946	7,285	7,613	Average
Non Bed	163	167	170	164	159	165	163	172	183	181	163	164	165	172	180	189	Percent
Total Incarcerated	3,337	3,732	4,332	4,684	4,855	4,957	5,306	5,590	6,022	6,280	6,272	6,238	6,469	6,774	7,105	7,424	Increase*
Annual Percent Increase	1.4%	11.8%	16.1%	8.1%	3.7%	2.1%	7.0%	5.4%	7.7%	4.3%	-0.1%	-0.5%	3.7%	4.7%	4.9%	4.5%	7.1%
Rider																	
Beginning Admissions	658	582	612	583	659	781	783	1,003	894	867	961	820	809	843	866	900	
New Commitments	607	697	695	745	767	807	927	916	1,041	996	920	913	934	938	957	977	
Failed Probation	503	498	500	549	577	598	830	786	901	870	860	775	862	856	907	918	
Total	1,110	1,195	1,195	1,294	1,344	1,405	1,757	1,702	1,942	1,866	1,780	1,688	1,796	1,794	1,864	1,895	
Releases																	
Probation	1,058	1,017	1,065	1,061	1,093	1,249	1,392	1,640	1,745	1,516	1,679	1,474	1,535	1,539	1,590	1,625	
Term	128	148	159	157	129	154	145	171	224	256	242	225	227	232	240	243	
Total	1,186	1,165	1,224	1,218	1,222	1,403	1,537	1,811	1,969	1,772	1,921	1,699	1,762	1,771	1,830	1,868	
Net Admission & Releases	-76	30	-29	76	122	2	220	-109	-27	94	-141	-11	34	23	34	27	Historical
Ending	582	612	583	659	781	783	1,003	894	867	961	820	809	843	866	900	927	Average
Non Bed	78	96	64	84	91	103	177	159	135	123	133	110	119	123	128	132	Percent
Total Incarcerated	504	516	519	575	690	680	826	735	732	838	687	699	724	743	772	795	Increase*
Annual Percent Increase	-16.7%	2.4%	0.6%	10.8%	20.0%	-1.4%	21.5%	-11.0%	-0.4%	14.5%	-18.0%	1.7%	3.6%	2.6%	3.9%	3.0%	1.5%

Historical Average Percent Increase covers the period 1996 through 2009

Historical and Forecast Admissions and Releases by Status FY 1998 to 2013

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	
Parole Violator	Actual	Actual	Actual	Forecast	Forecast												
Beginning Admissions	348	424	417	394	401	466	369	350	381	377	398	562	525	547	547	550	
Releases																	
Parole	415	481	444	395	546	525	659	752	749	745	895	855	910	869	836	875	
Term	249	385	350	285	347	341	466	449	406	466	481	654	662	648	618	615	
Reinstated Parole	90	103	117	103	134	281	212	272	347	258	250	238	226	221	215	223	
Total	339	488	467	388	481	622	678	721	753	724	731	892	888	869	833	838	
Net Admission & Releases	76	-7	-23	7	65	-97	-19	31	-4	21	164	-37	22	0	3	37	
Ending	424	417	394	401	466	369	350	381	377	398	562	525	547	547	550	587	
Non Bed	265	243	243	208	209	181	170	180	155	159	183	179	184	184	185	198	
Total Incarcerated	159	174	151	193	257	188	180	201	222	239	379	346	363	363	365	389	
Annual Percent Increase	9%	9%	-13%	28%	33%	-27%	-4%	12%	10%	8%	59%	-9%	5%	0%	1%	7%	8.3%
Total Incarcerated	4,506	4,928	5,479	5,908	6,261	6,274	6,822	7,037	7,449	7,820	7,817	7,736	8,024	8,359	8,735	9,127	Historical Average
Non Bed	506	506	477	456	459	449	510	511	473	463	479	453	468	479	493	519	Percent Increase*
Total Beds Occupied	4,000	4,422	5,002	5,452	5,802	5,825	6,312	6,526	6,976	7,357	7,338	7,283	7,556	7,880	8,242	8,608	
Annual Percent Increase	-1.0%	10.6%	13.1%	9.0%	6.4%	0.4%	8.4%	3.4%	6.9%	5.5%	-0.3%	-0.7%	3.7%	4.3%	4.6%	4.4%	5.9%
Probation																	
Beginning Admissions	7,338	7,693	7,771	7,821	8,165	8,939	10,022	10,855	11,872	12,741	13,118	13,552	13,793	14,302	15,022	15,759	
New Commitments	2,028	2,098	1,924	2,089	2,189	2,501	2,575	2,778	2,886	2,860	2,715	2,828	2,952	3,041	3,106	3,171	
Successful Rider	1,052	1,005	1,056	1,056	1,125	1,260	1,429	1,663	1,756	1,508	1,665	1,459	1,531	1,539	1,590	1,625	
Total	3,080	3,103	2,980	3,145	3,314	3,761	4,004	4,441	4,642	4,368	4,380	4,287	4,483	4,580	4,696	4,796	
Releases																	
Revoked Probation	433	516	586	583	594	628	728	789	806	801	724	571	663	658	702	714	
Sentenced to Rider	490	487	486	518	551	569	791	754	877	868	855	773	862	856	907	918	
Discharged	1,802	2,022	1,858	1,700	1,395	1,481	1,652	1,881	2,090	2,322	2,367	2,702	2,449	2,346	2,350	2,422	
Total	2,725	3,025	2,930	2,801	2,540	2,678	3,171	3,424	3,773	3,991	3,946	4,046	3,974	3,860	3,959	4,054	
Net Admission & Releases	355	78	50	344	774	1,083	833	1,017	869	377	434	241	509	720	737	742	Historical Average
Ending	7,693	7,771	7,821	8,165	8,939	10,022	10,855	11,872	12,741	13,118	13,552	13,793	14,302	15,022	15,759	16,501	Percent Increase*
Non Caseload	1,348	1,455	1,429	1,443	1,850	2,321	2,659	2,786	2,898	2,793	2,694	2,665	2,693	2,828	2,967	3,106	
Probation Caseload	6,345	6,316	6,392	6,722	7,089	7,701	8,196	9,086	9,843	10,325	10,858	11,128	11,609	12,194	12,792	13,395	
Annual Percent Increase	4.1%	-0.5%	1.2%	5.2%	5.5%	8.6%	6.4%	10.9%	8.3%	4.9%	5.2%	2.5%	4.3%	5.0%	4.9%	4.7%	5.7%

Historical Average Percent Increase covers the period 1996 through 2009

Historical and Forecast Admissions and Releases by Status FY 1998 to 2013

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	
Parole	Actual	Forecast	Forecast														
Beginning Admissions	1,094	1,256	1,337	1,366	1,624	1,857	2,182	2,332	2,418	2,568	2,953	3,263	3,420	3,631	3,811	4,082	
Paroled*	857	846	768	935	996	1,191	1,118	1,146	1,267	1,396	1,447	1,477	1,439	1,385	1,436	1,484	
Re-instated Violator	84	82	105	91	144	213	211	281	268	277	298	255	221	221	215	223	
Total	941	928	873	1,026	1,140	1,404	1,329	1,427	1,535	1,673	1,745	1,732	1,660	1,606	1,651	1,707	
Releases																	
Parole Violator	428	493	449	397	544	523	662	751	732	738	883	852	906	869	836	875	
Discharged	351	354	395	371	363	556	517	590	653	550	552	723	543	557	544	507	
Total	779	847	844	768	907	1,079	1,179	1,341	1,385	1,288	1,435	1,575	1,449	1,426	1,380	1,382	
Net Admission & Releases	162	81	29	258	233	325	150	86	150	385	310	157	211	180	271	325	Historical
Ending	1,256	1,337	1,366	1,624	1,857	2,182	2,332	2,418	2,568	2,953	3,263	3,420	3,631	3,811	4,082	4,407	Average
Non Caseload	341	361	402	401	473	537	573	578	586	697	760	792	821	862	924	998	Percent
Parole Caseload	915	976	964	1,223	1,384	1,645	1,759	1,840	1,982	2,256	2,503	2,628	2,810	2,949	3,158	3,409	Increase*
Annual Percent Increase	19.0%	6.7%	-1.2%	26.9%	13.2%	18.9%	6.9%	4.6%	7.7%	13.8%	10.9%	5.0%	6.9%	5.0%	7.1%	7.9%	11.4%
Total Supervised	8,949	9,108	9,187	9,789	10,796	12,204	13,187	14,290	15,309	16,071	16,815	17,213	17,933	18,833	19,841	20,908	
Non Caseload	1,689	1,816	1,831	1,844	2,323	2,858	3,232	3,364	3,484	3,490	3,454	3,457	3,514	3,690	3,891	4,104	
Supervised Caseload	7,260	7,292	7,356	7,945	8,473	9,346	9,955	10,926	11,825	12,581	13,361	13,756	14,419	15,143	15,950	16,804	
Annual Percent Increase	5.8%	0.4%	0.9%	8.0%	6.6%	10.3%	6.5%	9.8%	8.2%	6.4%	6.2%	3.0%	4.8%	5.0%	5.3%	5.4%	6.5%
Total Incarcerated and Supervised	13,455	14,036	14,666	15,697	17,057	18,478	20,009	21,327	22,758	23,891	24,632	24,949	25,957	27,192	28,576	30,035	
Incarcerated & Supervised	13,455	14,036	14,666	15,697	17,057	18,478	20,009	21,327	22,758	23,891	24,632	24,949	25,957	27,192	28,576	30,035	
Non Bed/Caseload	2,195	2,322	2,308	2,300	2,782	3,307	3,742	3,875	3,957	3,953	3,933	3,910	3,982	4,169	4,384	4,623	
Total Beds & Caseload	11,260	11,714	12,358	13,397	14,275	15,171	16,267	17,452	18,801	19,938	20,699	21,039	21,975	23,023	24,192	25,412	
Annual Percent Increase	3.2%	4.0%	5.5%	8.4%	6.6%	6.3%	7.2%	7.3%	7.7%	6.0%	3.8%	1.6%	4.4%	4.8%	5.1%	5.0%	6.3%

Paroled* includes values for offenders Paroled plus those transferred into Idaho on Interstate Compact

Historical Average Percent Increase covers the period 1996 through 2009

Methods

A description of flow model methods used to forecast the offender population is included in this section. This section covers the FAC, an Overview of the Flow Model, the Flow Model Process, and Completion of the Forecast.

Idaho Criminal Justice Commission Population Forecast Advisory Committee

Purpose

The purpose of the Idaho Criminal Justice Commission Population Forecast Advisory Committee (PFAC) is to establish impartial and reasonable court commitment rates and status change rates with associated lengths of stay to be used in forecasting future offender populations. Committee involvement enhances the credibility, reliability, and usefulness of the forecast.

Scope

The FAC exercises oversight over all aspects of the forecast process. Its primary goal is to identify trends and policy changes that may impact admissions and oversee assumptions used to forecast offender population growth. The FAC meets to review historical patterns of supervision and incarceration and to establish the court commitment rates and status change rates with associated lengths of stay for the forecast period. The FAC does not consider construction or budgetary issues when preparing the forecast.

Organization

Mary Stohr, a professor from the Boise State University Department of Criminal Justice, served as chairperson for the FY 2010 forecast. The FAC reviewed historical data and staff recommendations and established court commitment rates, status change rates, and associated lengths of stay for the forecast. Decisions were made by consensus.

FAC Membership

Members of the Idaho Criminal Justice Commission form the core of the FAC and additional members are selected by the Chairman of the Idaho Criminal Justice Commission as the need arises. Consequently, the FAC benefits from the expertise of a wide spectrum of criminal justice system stakeholders. Members include representatives from a wide variety of organizations as well as at large members as indicated in the table below.

Idaho Criminal Justice Commission Population Forecast Advisory Committee Members for the FY 2010 Forecast

Committee Members

Amy Aaron*
Darrel Bolz*
Dick Burns*
Olivia Craven*
Ann Cronin*
Tim Fleming*
Justice Joel Horton*
Molly Huskey
Mike Jorgenson*
Vaughn Killeen
Brent Reinke*, Chair
Scott Ronan*
Leon Smith*
Dr. Mary Stohr*
Josh Tewalt
Jim Tibbs*
Judge Ron Wilper*

* - attended July 23, 2009 FAC meeting

Additional Attendees

Wes Greer
Carrie Parrish
Maureen Shea

Organization

Idaho Sheriffs Association
Idaho State Legislature, Joint Finance and Commerce Committee
Idaho Legislative Services Offices
Idaho Commission of Pardons and Parole
Idaho State Police
Canyon County Prosecutor's Office
Idaho Supreme Court
Idaho State Appellate Public Defender
Idaho State Legislature
Idaho Sheriffs Association
Idaho Department of Correction
Idaho Supreme Court
Idaho State Legislature
Boise State University
Idaho Division of Financial Management
Boise City Council
Idaho District Court

Organization

Idaho Commission of Pardons and Parole
Idaho Office of Performance Evaluations
Idaho Office of Performance Evaluations

Resources

IDOC provides research staff to assemble the model used to forecast offender populations and monitor the forecast's performance. The staff performs analyses of offender information to identify historical patterns in court commitments, status changes, and lengths of stay. They also highlight recent changes within those patterns. They provide technical assistance necessary to complete and evaluate the offender forecast. IDOC also provides administrative support for conducting FAC business pertaining to offender forecasts.

Meetings

The FAC met on July 23, 2009 to review the prior year forecast performance, select court commitment rates, select status change rates and lengths of stay and discuss policy impacts. The FAC set the forecast rates and lengths of stay at the meeting. The completed forecast was presented to FAC in August.

Forecast Preparation

Based on the rates and lengths of stay set by the FAC, the staff prepares and revises the offender forecast each year. The forecast is made for four years beginning with the current fiscal year. A forecast period of four years was chosen because research indicates that the flow model process begins to function as a linear trend after that time. This happens because forecast court commitments are based on Census Bureau population forecasts which are essentially linear and only a few status change lengths of stay exceed four years. As a result, the variations induced by historical actual commitment values tend to become smoothed into a linear pattern.

Flow Model Description

Forecast Methods


There are four methods commonly used in forecasting inmate population growth: mathematical, statistical, flow, and simulation. The mathematical model consists of averaging inmate growth over a given period of time and applying that average rate of growth to future periods. The statistical method uses trends to forecast future population based upon historical populations. The flow model and simulation models differ from the previous two methods by using both the number of offenders admitted and the number of offenders released (estimated using status change rates with associated lengths of stay) to forecast future populations. After reviewing the practices of several states of comparable size and proximity, IDOC staff determined that the most economical forecasting method would be the flow model. Some larger states utilize simulation models but that method was determined to be too costly.

Flow Model Concept

The flow model concept employs historical and forecast admissions by status and then moves offenders admitted to each status through the IDOC system based on historical rates of status change and their associated lengths of stay. The process is illustrated in the chart below. The chart shows the portion of New Commitments that go to each status and the portion that moves from each status to another status or are discharged. The chart below shows the rates and lengths of stay in months used in the 2010 forecast.

Flow of Offenders

Patterns of Court Commitments and Offender Flow through
the Idaho Department of Correction



New Court Commitments

IDOC jurisdiction over offenders begins with a felony conviction and a court commitment to Probation, Rider, or Term. The FAC uses historical court commitment data to establish the rate at which offenders will be committed to the custody or supervision of the IDOC with a new sentence. This rate is used to calculate the number of new court commitments that will occur annually by status, crime group, and gender. Rates of status movement and lengths of stay, set by FAC, are then used to estimate how many offenders will move to a new status and when they will move.

Cohorts

Separate New Court Commitment forecasts are made for 12 different cohorts. Cohorts were established based on combinations of crime group and gender. All crimes are grouped into one of six crime groups: Alcohol, Assault, Drug, Murder and Manslaughter, Property, and Sex. Each crime group is separated by gender.

Flow Model Process

Method for Estimating New Court Commitments

Forecast court commitments are estimated based on historical court commitments and the Idaho state population. Historical commitment data were grouped by commitment status, crime group, gender, and fiscal year. The commitment status types used for the model were Probation, Rider, and Term. The data cover fiscal years 1996 through 2009. Population data for both the historical and forecast period were derived from U.S. Census Bureau data. The age group 20 to 34 was selected for forecast purposes because this age group made up the largest portion of commitments and was the most highly correlated with commitment data. This population, grouped by gender was used to forecast new court commitments. Details of population growth can be found in Appendix 6.

Having established the population groups for new court commitments, the next task was to determine the historic rate of commitment for each cohort. To do this, staff divided the yearly commitments for each cohort by the appropriate population group value for each year to obtain an annual rate.

The historical annual commitment rates give the FAC a starting point to select a rate to use in the forecast. Staff calculated commitment rates based on a graduated weighted average method. The graduated weighted average was computed by incrementing the weight for each year's value when calculating the average. So 1996 has a weight of 1, 1997 a weight of 2, 1998 a weight of 3, and so on. This technique was preferred over the simple average because it assigns the most weight to the most recent values. The members of FAC considered these rates but did not limit themselves exclusively to this option. The FAC examined historic patterns to identify trends or significant patterns of change. The FAC also examined each crime group for non-statistical influences such as the impact of changes in law, the expansion of drug courts, or the impact a declining economy might have on property crimes. The FAC considered all these potential influences and then agreed on a court commitment rate for future years for each cohort. This year, they selected rates somewhat greater than the graduated weighted average for male and female commitments to Probation for Alcohol crimes. They selected rates somewhat lower than the graduated weighted average for male and female commitments to Rider for Drug crimes. And they selected rates somewhat lower than the graduated weighted average for male commitments to Term for Drug for Property crimes. The graduated weighted average for the last 14 years' commitment rates was chosen for all other cohorts. Appendix 7 provides a chart illustrating male commitments to prison by year and crime and details for historical and forecast court commitment rates by crime group and gender, along with the FAC selected rate for each gender status combination.

After the court commitment rates were established, staff multiplied these rates by the population indicator group values for each forecast year to obtain future year commitments for each cohort. These values are incorporated into the model as “New Court Commitments” as indicated in the tables on pages 5 through 7.

Status Change Rates

The model uses historical status change rates to calculate how many Probationers will discharge (or revoke), how many Riders will go to Probation (or fail the Rider program and go to Term), how many Term offenders will parole (or discharge), and how many paroled offenders will discharge (or revoke). Status change rates for the model are based on historical averages. For this year’s forecast the FAC chose to use Rider rates for FY 2007 through FY 2009, Probation rates for FY 2008 through FY 2009, Term rates for FY 2007 through FY 2009, Parole rates for FY 2007 through FY 2009, and Parole Violator rates for FY 2008 through FY 2009 to account for recognized changes in practices. Appendix 8 shows an illustration of the analysis used to select these periods.

Length of Stay Calculation (Survival)

Historical length of stay prior to status change data were grouped by status change type, gender, and fiscal year. The data covered fiscal years 1996 through 2009. The data were then used to develop a length of stay profile for each combination of status change type and gender. These profiles enable us to estimate how long it will take offenders to “flow” through the system. The FAC selected length of stay patterns based on recent historical averages. Periods used for length of stay are similar to those used for status change rates. For the 2008 forecast the FAC elected to use the Rider rates for FY 2007 through FY 2009, Probation rates for FY 2008 through FY 2009, Term rates for FY 2007 through FY 2009, Parole rates for FY 2007 through FY 2009, and Parole Violator rates for FY 2008 through FY 2009. Staff calculated length of stay profiles for the following status changes:

Probation to discharge,	Rider failures to Term,	Parole to Parole Violator,
Probation failures to Rider,	Term to discharge,	Parole Violator re-instated to Parole
Probation revocation to Term,	Term to Parole,	Parole Violator revocation to Term
Rider to Probation,	Parole to discharge	

The length of stay profile by gender and crime group was then applied to estimate anticipated status changes for each cohort to determine the number of offenders that would change from one status to another, and eventually discharge, by month. The flow model then sums these estimates from each old status and into each new status. For example, an offender may enter Term incarceration from a new court commitment, as a failed Rider, from a revoked Probation, or from a revoked Parole. The Term offender may go to Parole or be discharged. The chart on page 11 shows the court commitment and status change rates and associated lengths of stay used in the FY 2010 forecast.

The model estimates the flow of existing offenders and new court commitments through each status change to their eventual discharge. The rates described in the Status Change Rates section are used to determine how many will move from one status to another and the length of stay profiles are used to determine when these status moves will occur.

To calculate the number of offenders at the end of each forecast year the model starts with the existing population for each status, adds the new admissions from each contributing status change type and new court commitments, and then subtracts the releases for each month. The result of this arithmetic process is the forecast for the end of the year. The tables on pages 5 through 7 are organized in this manner. Finally, since the forecast was not completed until the middle of August, staff corrected for actual monthly values through July. The FY 2010 forecast includes actual values for July and forecast monthly values for the rest of the forecast period.

Completing the Forecast

Non-Bed and Non-Caseload Offenders

The model provides a forecast of offenders in Probation, Rider, Term, Parole, and Parole Violator status types. To complete the forecast, the number of offenders that will fall into Non-Bed or Non-Caseload categories is needed (definitions in Appendix 9). Non-Bed and Non-Caseload designations tend to change as a consequence of policy or programmatic decisions and can vary less predictably over time than other components of the model. This portion of the forecast is prepared separately based on historical patterns. These offenders are an important part of the completed model. The previously described portions of the model provide the total number of offenders by status. To complete the forecast, Non-Bed offenders are subtracted from the total incarcerated to determine how many will be under direct IDOC custody and Non-Caseload offenders are subtracted from the total supervised to determine how many will be directly supervised by Community Corrections. This gives the total number of beds required in Idaho prisons and the total caseload for Community Corrections. Policy decisions can dramatically impact Non-Bed and Non-Caseload numbers. Historic volatility in this data results in diminished confidence concerning what might happen with this Non-Caseload group. If the estimate for this group is too high the forecast for Probation will be too low, and vice versa.

Tracking the Accuracy of the Forecast

The forecast performance will be monitored monthly. IDOC staff determine the variance between forecast population and actual population each month and distribute the findings to members of the FAC and other interested stakeholders. This method of monthly analysis allows early detection of changes in historical patterns.

Factors That Influence Forecast Accuracy

Abrupt changes from historical patterns generally have adverse effects on forecast accuracy. In FY 2008 and 2009, the incarcerated offender population experienced three such incidents. The first was a dramatic decline in court commitments to all statuses. This decline was traced to a reduction in reported crime in Idaho. The second was a collaborative effort of IDOC and the courts to find community based alternatives to probation revocations. The final influence was the perpetuation of Parole Commission's accelerated paroles. Together, these three influences completely offset all anticipated growth in the incarcerated offender population. All of these influences appear to be permanent changes, each with an ongoing departure from previous historical patterns, so they have been incorporated into the forecast as the newly emergent pattern for their respective components of the forecast.

IDOC is currently implementing the Pathways offender programming scheme, intended to improve the efficiency of programming and education endeavors with the ultimate goal of paroling offenders sooner and reducing recidivism. The Legislature occasionally passes new laws that have substantial impacts on what crimes will result in imprisonment and/or how long offenders will be imprisoned. Other entities such as the courts and the Parole Commission also occasionally implement new methods to improve public safety. Finally, there may be other influences, not yet known to the FAC or Staff, which could affect some part of the correctional system process. Staff and FAC members will monitor admissions and releases for each status for identifiable changes from historical patterns with the expectation that new influences will be incorporated into future forecasts as a change in court commitment rates, status change rates, or lengths of stay.

Appendix 1 Historical and Forecast Admissions and Releases by Status and Fiscal Year Male Offenders FY 1998 to 2013

Term	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Forecast	Forecast			
Beginning Admissions	3,207	3,283	3,639	4,173	4,459	4,577	4,678	4,988	5,221	5,610	5,850	5,800	5,814	6,029	6,308	6,616	
New Commitments	373	496	544	581	536	606	588	573	678	623	523	498	572	584	598	609	
Revoked Probation	377	456	494	503	478	520	617	679	699	668	584	476	541	529	570	582	
Revoked Parole	244	358	327	259	310	332	413	359	395	416	430	599	598	588	560	558	
Failed Rider	116	129	143	139	106	128	122	147	169	220	212	199	193	196	204	207	
Total	1,110	1,439	1,508	1,482	1,430	1,586	1,740	1,758	1,941	1,927	1,749	1,772	1,904	1,897	1,932	1,956	
Releases																	
Parole	763	720	622	804	815	944	884	937	1,010	1,136	1,244	1,236	1,166	1,122	1,156	1,196	
Discharged	271	363	352	392	497	541	546	588	542	551	555	522	523	496	468	448	
Total	1,034	1,083	974	1,196	1,312	1,485	1,430	1,525	1,552	1,687	1,799	1,758	1,689	1,618	1,624	1,644	
Net Admission & Releases	76	356	534	286	118	101	310	233	389	240	-50	14	215	279	308	312	Historical
Ending	3,283	3,639	4,173	4,459	4,577	4,678	4,988	5,221	5,610	5,850	5,800	5,814	6,029	6,308	6,616	6,928	Average
Non Bed	154	161	156	148	145	149	146	148	162	158	147	150	149	155	162	171	Percent
Total Incarcerated	3,129	3,478	4,017	4,311	4,432	4,529	4,842	5,073	5,448	5,692	5,653	5,664	5,880	6,153	6,454	6,757	Increase*
Annual Percent Increase	0.2%	11.2%	15.5%	7.3%	2.8%	2.2%	6.9%	4.8%	7.4%	4.5%	-0.7%	0.2%	3.8%	4.6%	4.9%	4.7%	6.8%
Rider																	
Beginning Admissions	541	483	500	463	517	609	602	770	675	629	751	645	626	642	657	684	
New Commitments	513	561	558	604	629	639	738	702	803	803	763	738	754	758	773	789	
Failed Probation	391	383	385	424	428	461	637	611	663	669	666	612	665	654	706	712	
Total	904	944	943	1,028	1,057	1,100	1,375	1,313	1,466	1,472	1,429	1,350	1,419	1,412	1,479	1,501	
Releases																	
Probation Term	846	798	837	839	853	979	1,082	1,293	1,343	1,130	1,322	1,170	1,210	1,201	1,248	1,274	
Failed Probation	116	129	143	135	112	128	125	115	169	220	213	199	193	196	204	207	
Total	962	927	980	974	965	1,107	1,207	1,408	1,512	1,350	1,535	1,369	1,403	1,397	1,452	1,481	
Net Admission & Releases	-58	17	-37	54	92	-7	168	-95	-46	122	-106	-19	16	15	27	20	Historical
Ending	483	500	463	517	609	602	770	675	629	751	645	626	642	657	684	704	Average
Non Bed	73	85	54	72	76	90	149	126	99	100	115	101	98	102	106	109	Percent
Total Incarcerated	410	415	409	445	533	512	621	549	530	651	530	525	544	555	578	595	Increase*
Annual Percent Increase	-17.8%	1.2%	-1.4%	8.8%	19.8%	-3.9%	21.3%	-11.6%	-3.5%	22.8%	-18.6%	-0.9%	3.6%	2.0%	4.1%	2.9%	0.6%

Historical Average Percent Increase covers the period 1996 through 2009

Male Offenders FY 1998 to 2013

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	
Parole Violator	Actual	Forecast	Forecast														
Beginning	331	402	399	369	384	438	336	310	335	335	362	522	480	497	495	493	
Admissions																	
Parole	389	449	398	363	498	465	575	661	646	674	816	768	815	783	749	787	
Releases																	
Term	233	353	323	253	321	306	413	397	336	412	424	595	598	588	560	558	
Reinstated Parole	85	99	105	95	123	261	188	239	310	235	232	215	200	197	191	196	
Total	318	452	428	348	444	567	601	636	646	647	656	810	798	785	751	754	
Net Admission & Releases	71	-3	-30	15	54	-102	-26	25	0	27	160	-42	17	-2	-2	33	
Ending	402	399	369	384	438	336	310	335	335	362	522	480	497	495	493	526	
Non Bed	252	232	228	199	199	162	150	159	135	146	166	160	164	163	162	173	
Total Incarcerated	150	167	141	185	239	174	160	176	200	216	356	320	333	332	331	353	
Annual Percent Increase	7.9%	11.3%	-15.6%	31.2%	29.2%	-27.2%	-8.0%	10.0%	13.6%	8.0%	64.8%	-10.1%	4.1%	-0.3%	-0.3%	6.6%	8.5%
Total Incarcerated	4,168	4,538	5,005	5,360	5,624	5,616	6,068	6,231	6,574	6,963	6,967	6,920	7,168	7,460	7,793	8,158	Historical
Non Bed	479	478	438	419	420	401	445	433	396	404	428	411	411	420	430	453	Average
Total Beds Occupied	3,689	4,060	4,567	4,941	5,204	5,215	5,623	5,798	6,178	6,559	6,539	6,509	6,757	7,040	7,363	7,705	Percent
Annual Percent Increase	-1.9%	10.1%	12.5%	8.2%	5.3%	0.2%	7.8%	3.1%	6.6%	6.2%	-0.3%	-0.5%	3.8%	4.2%	4.6%	4.6%	Increase*
Probation																	
Beginning	5,742	5,969	5,972	5,917	6,159	6,732	7,481	8,006	8,681	9,242	9,505	9,943	10,170	10,604	11,162	11,710	
Admissions																	
New Commitments	1,526	1,589	1,402	1,548	1,597	1,802	1,819	2,004	2,009	2,079	2,019	2,076	2,214	2,279	2,327	2,373	
Successful Rider	841	788	830	834	884	992	1,118	1,287	1,353	1,122	1,309	1,157	1,206	1,201	1,248	1,274	
Total	2,367	2,377	2,232	2,382	2,481	2,794	2,937	3,291	3,362	3,201	3,328	3,233	3,420	3,480	3,575	3,647	
Releases																	
Revoked Probation	377	456	494	505	479	520	617	684	702	667	586	476	541	529	570	582	
Sentenced to Rider	379	374	376	397	412	440	603	578	642	667	660	610	665	654	706	712	
Discharged	1,384	1,544	1,417	1,238	1,017	1,085	1,192	1,354	1,457	1,604	1,644	1,920	1,780	1,739	1,751	1,834	
Total	2,140	2,374	2,287	2,140	1,908	2,045	2,412	2,616	2,801	2,938	2,890	3,006	2,986	2,922	3,027	3,128	
Net Admission & Releases	227	3	-55	242	573	749	525	675	561	263	438	227	434	558	548	519	Historical
Ending	5,969	5,972	5,917	6,159	6,732	7,481	8,006	8,681	9,242	9,505	9,943	10,170	10,604	11,162	11,710	12,229	Average
Non Caseload	1,087	1,203	1,136	1,149	1,452	1,816	2,073	2,140	2,214	2,150	2,125	2,093	2,084	2,193	2,301	2,403	Percent
Probation Caseload	4,882	4,769	4,781	5,010	5,280	5,665	5,933	6,541	7,028	7,355	7,818	8,077	8,520	8,969	9,409	9,826	Increase*
Annual Percent Increase	3.2%	-2.3%	0.3%	4.8%	5.4%	7.3%	4.7%	10.2%	7.4%	4.7%	6.3%	3.3%	5.5%	5.3%	4.9%	4.4%	4.9%

Historical Average Percent Increase covers the period 1996 through 2009

Male Offenders FY 1998 to 2013

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Forecast	Forecast			
Parole																	
Beginning	996	1,146	1,199	1,215	1,434	1,623	1,890	2,004	2,075	2,203	2,517	2,797	2,925	3,121	3,282	3,523	
Admissions																	
Paroled*	785	757	672	818	864	1,006	945	977	1,085	1,180	1,252	1,260	1,230	1,188	1,225	1,267	
Re-instated Violator	79	78	96	84	135	195	189	250	234	256	278	231	195	197	191	196	
Total	864	835	768	902	999	1,201	1,134	1,227	1,319	1,436	1,530	1,491	1,425	1,385	1,416	1,463	
Releases																	
Parole Violator	402	459	403	365	498	463	581	661	631	667	804	764	811	783	749	787	
Discharged	312	323	349	318	312	471	439	495	560	455	446	599	418	441	426	386	
Total	714	782	752	683	810	934	1,020	1,156	1,191	1,122	1,250	1,363	1,229	1,224	1,175	1,173	
Net Admission & Releases	150	53	16	219	189	267	114	71	128	314	280	128	196	161	241	290	
Ending	1,146	1,199	1,215	1,434	1,623	1,890	2,004	2,075	2,203	2,517	2,797	2,925	3,121	3,282	3,523	3,813	
Non Caseload	325	339	379	377	437	494	530	533	530	635	691	717	747	785	843	912	
Parole Caseload	821	860	836	1,057	1,186	1,396	1,474	1,542	1,673	1,882	2,106	2,208	2,374	2,497	2,680	2,901	
Annual Percent Increase	18.6%	4.8%	-2.8%	26.4%	12.2%	17.7%	5.6%	4.6%	8.5%	12.5%	11.9%	4.8%	7.5%	5.2%	7.3%	8.2%	10.7%
					129	210	78	68	131	209	224	102	166	123	183	221	
Total Supervised	7,115	7,171	7,132	7,593	8,355	9,371	10,010	10,756	11,445	12,022	12,740	13,095	13,725	14,444	15,233	16,042	
Non Caseload	1,412	1,542	1,515	1,526	1,889	2,310	2,603	2,673	2,744	2,785	2,816	2,810	2,831	2,978	3,144	3,315	
Supervised Caseload	5,703	5,629	5,617	6,067	6,466	7,061	7,407	8,083	8,701	9,237	9,924	10,285	10,894	11,466	12,089	12,727	
Annual Percent Increase	5.2%	-1.3%	-0.2%	8.0%	6.6%	9.2%	4.9%	9.1%	7.6%	6.2%	7.4%	3.6%	5.9%	5.3%	5.4%	5.3%	5.8%
Total Incarcerated and Supervised																	
Incarcerated & Supervised	11,283	11,709	12,137	12,953	13,979	14,987	16,078	16,987	18,019	18,985	19,707	20,015	20,893	21,904	23,026	24,200	
Non Bed/Caseload	1,891	2,020	1,953	1,945	2,309	2,711	3,048	3,106	3,140	3,189	3,244	3,221	3,242	3,398	3,574	3,768	
Total Beds & Caseload	9,392	9,689	10,184	11,008	11,670	12,276	13,030	13,881	14,879	15,796	16,463	16,794	17,651	18,506	19,452	20,432	
Annual Percent Increase	2.3%	3.2%	5.1%	8.1%	6.0%	5.2%	6.1%	6.5%	7.2%	6.2%	4.2%	2.0%	5.1%	4.8%	5.1%	5.0%	5.7%

Paroled* includes values for offenders Paroled plus those transferred into Idaho on Interstate Compact

Appendix 2: Historical and Forecast Admissions and Releases by Status and Fiscal Year Female Offender FY 1998 to 2013

Term	1996 Actual	1997 Actual	1998 Actual	1999 Actual	2000 Actual	2001 Actual	2002 Actual	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Forecast	2011 Forecast	2012 Forecast	2013 Forecast	
Beginning Admissions	124	151	195	217	260	329	389	437	444	481	541	595	611	635	588	605	638	669	
New Commitments	19	26	24	37	40	70	62	56	63	68	59	54	50	48	54	55	55	56	
Revoked Probation	38	62	56	60	92	78	115	108	111	109	104	134	139	95	122	129	132	132	
Revoked Parole	20	23	16	34	27	32	26	35	53	77	70	54	57	59	64	60	58	57	
Failed Rider	12	14	12	19	16	22	17	26	19	25	55	36	30	26	34	36	36	36	
Total	89	125	108	150	175	202	220	225	246	279	288	278	276	228	274	280	281	281	
Releases																			
Parole	53	60	64	80	82	101	120	172	167	167	170	194	185	212	197	185	199	205	
Discharged	9	21	22	27	24	41	52	46	42	52	64	68	67	63	60	62	51	60	
Total	62	81	86	107	106	142	172	218	209	219	234	262	252	275	257	247	250	265	
Net Admission & Releases	27	44	22	43	69	60	48	7	37	60	54	16	24	-47	17	33	31	16	Historical
Ending	151	195	217	260	329	389	437	444	481	541	595	611	635	588	605	638	669	685	Average
Non Bed	5	26	9	6	14	16	14	16	17	24	21	23	16	14	16	17	18	18	Percent
Total Incarcerated	146	169	208	254	315	373	423	428	464	517	574	588	619	574	589	621	651	667	Increase*
Annual Percent Increase	22%	16%	23%	22%	24%	18%	13%	1%	8%	11%	11%	2%	5%	-7%	3%	5%	5%	2%	13.7%
Rider																			
Beginning Admissions	83	102	117	99	112	120	142	172	181	233	219	238	210	175	183	201	209	216	
New Commitments	92	109	94	136	137	141	138	168	189	214	238	193	157	175	180	180	184	188	
Failed Probation	74	100	112	115	115	125	149	137	193	175	238	201	194	163	197	202	201	206	
Total	166	209	206	251	252	266	287	305	382	389	476	394	351	338	377	382	385	394	
Releases																			
Probation	135	180	212	219	228	222	240	270	310	347	402	386	357	304	325	338	342	351	
Term	12	14	12	19	16	22	17	26	20	56	55	36	29	26	34	36	36	36	
Total	147	194	224	238	244	244	257	296	330	403	457	422	386	330	359	374	378	387	
Net Admission & Releases	19	15	-18	13	8	22	30	9	52	-14	19	-28	-35	8	18	8	7	7	Historical
Ending	102	117	99	112	120	142	172	181	233	219	238	210	175	183	201	209	216	223	Average
Non Bed	4	11	5	11	10	12	15	13	28	33	36	23	18	9	21	21	22	23	Percent
Total Incarcerated	98	106	94	101	110	130	157	168	205	186	202	187	157	174	180	188	194	200	Increase*
Annual Percent Increase	23%	8%	-11%	7%	9%	18%	21%	7%	22%	-9%	9%	-7%	-16%	11%	3%	4%	3%	3%	6.1%

Historical Average Percent Increase covers the period 1996 through 2009

Female Offender FY 1998 to 2013

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Forecast	Forecast	Forecast	Forecast									
Parole Violator																			
Beginning Admissions	13	19	17	22	18	25	17	28	33	40	46	42	36	40	45	50	52	57	
Parole	31	28	26	32	46	32	48	60	84	91	103	71	79	87	95	86	87	88	
Releases																			
Term	20	22	16	32	27	32	26	35	53	52	70	54	57	59	64	60	58	57	
Reinstated Parole	5	8	5	4	12	8	11	20	24	33	37	23	18	23	26	24	24	27	
Total	25	30	21	36	39	40	37	55	77	85	107	77	75	82	90	84	82	84	
Net Admission & Releases	6	-2	5	-4	7	-8	11	5	7	6	-4	-6	4	5	5	2	5	4	
Ending	19	17	22	18	25	17	28	33	40	46	42	36	40	45	50	52	57	61	
Non Bed	7	10	13	11	15	9	10	19	20	21	20	13	17	19	20	21	23	25	
Total Incarcerated	12	7	9	7	10	8	18	14	20	25	22	23	23	26	30	31	34	36	
Annual Percent Increase	46%	-42%	29%	-22%	43%	-20%	125%	-22%	43%	25%	-12%	5%	0%	13%	15%	3%	10%	6%	15.1%
Total Incarcerated	272	329	338	390	474	548	637	658	754	806	875	857	850	816	856	899	942	969	Historical
Non Bed	16	47	27	28	39	37	39	48	65	78	77	59	51	42	57	59	63	66	Average
Total Beds Occupied	256	282	311	362	435	511	598	610	689	728	798	798	799	774	799	840	879	903	Percent
Annual Percent Increase	23.6%	10.2%	10.3%	16.4%	20.2%	17.5%	17.0%	2.0%	13.0%	5.7%	9.6%	0.0%	0.1%	-3.1%	3.2%	5.1%	4.6%	2.7%	Increase*
		26	29	51	73	76	87	12	79	39	70	0	1	-25	25	41	39	24	
Probation																			
Beginning Admissions	1,138	1,349	1,596	1,724	1,799	1,904	2,006	2,207	2,541	2,849	3,191	3,499	3,613	3,609	3,623	3,698	3,860	4,049	
New Commitments	548	601	502	509	522	541	592	699	756	774	877	781	696	752	738	762	779	798	
Successful Rider	134	178	211	217	226	222	241	268	311	376	403	386	356	302	325	338	342	351	
Total	682	779	713	726	748	763	833	967	1,067	1,150	1,280	1,167	1,052	1,054	1,063	1,100	1,121	1,149	
Releases																			
Revoked Probation	38	62	56	60	92	78	115	108	111	105	104	134	138	95	122	129	132	132	
Sentenced to Rider	73	97	111	113	110	121	139	129	188	176	235	201	195	163	197	202	201	206	
Discharged	360	373	418	478	441	462	378	396	460	527	633	718	723	782	669	607	599	588	
Total	471	532	585	651	643	661	632	633	759	808	972	1,053	1,056	1,040	988	938	932	926	
Net Admission & Releases	211	247	128	75	105	102	201	334	308	342	308	114	-4	14	75	162	189	223	Historical
Ending	1,349	1,596	1,724	1,799	1,904	2,006	2,207	2,541	2,849	3,191	3,499	3,613	3,609	3,623	3,698	3,860	4,049	4,272	Average
Non Caseload	180	229	261	252	293	294	398	505	586	646	684	643	569	572	609	635	666	703	Percent
Probation Caseload	1,169	1,367	1,463	1,547	1,611	1,712	1,809	2,036	2,263	2,545	2,815	2,970	3,040	3,051	3,089	3,225	3,383	3,569	Increase*
Annual Percent Increase	18.5%	16.9%	7.0%	5.7%	4.1%	6.3%	5.7%	12.5%	11.1%	12.5%	10.6%	5.5%	2.4%	0.4%	1.2%	4.4%	4.9%	5.5%	9.1%

Historical Average Percent Increase covers the period 1996 through 2009

Female Offender FY 1998 to 2013

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	
	Actual	Forecast	Forecast	Forecast	Forecast														
Parole																			
Beginning Admissions	67	83	98	110	138	151	190	234	292	328	343	365	436	466	495	510	529	559	
Paroled*	60	68	72	89	96	117	132	185	173	169	182	216	195	217	209	197	211	217	
Re-instated Violator	3	7	5	4	9	7	9	18	22	31	34	21	20	24	26	24	24	27	
Total	63	75	77	93	105	124	141	203	195	200	216	237	215	241	235	221	235	244	
Releases																			
Parole Violator	31	29	26	34	46	32	46	60	81	90	101	71	79	88	95	86	87	88	
Discharged	16	31	39	31	46	53	51	85	78	95	93	95	106	124	125	116	118	121	
Total	47	60	65	65	92	85	97	145	159	185	194	166	185	212	220	202	205	209	
Net Admission & Releases	16	15	12	28	13	39	44	58	36	15	22	71	30	29	15	19	30	35	Historical
Ending	83	98	110	138	151	190	234	292	328	343	365	436	466	495	510	529	559	594	Average
Non Caseload	20	21	16	22	23	24	36	43	43	45	56	62	69	75	74	77	81	86	Percent
Parole Caseload	63	77	94	116	128	166	198	249	285	298	309	374	397	420	436	452	478	508	Increase*
Annual Percent Increase	23.9%	22.2%	22.1%	23.4%	10.3%	29.7%	19.3%	25.8%	14.5%	4.6%	3.7%	21.0%	6.1%	5.8%	3.8%	3.7%	5.8%	6.3%	17.4%
Total Supervised	1,432	1,694	1,834	1,937	2,055	2,196	2,441	2,833	3,177	3,534	3,864	4,049	4,075	4,118	4,208	4,389	4,608	4,866	
Non Caseload	200	250	277	274	316	318	434	548	629	691	740	705	638	647	683	712	747	789	
Supervised Caseload	1,232	1,444	1,557	1,663	1,739	1,878	2,007	2,285	2,548	2,843	3,124	3,344	3,437	3,471	3,525	3,677	3,861	4,077	
Annual Percent Increase	18.8%	17.2%	7.8%	6.8%	4.6%	8.0%	6.9%	13.9%	11.5%	11.6%	9.9%	7.0%	2.8%	1.0%	1.6%	4.3%	5.0%	5.6%	9.8%
Total Incarcerated and Supervised																			
Incarcerated & Supervised	1,704	2,023	2,172	2,327	2,529	2,744	3,078	3,491	3,931	4,340	4,739	4,906	4,925	4,934	5,064	5,288	5,550	5,835	
Non Bed/Caseload	216	297	304	302	355	355	473	596	694	769	817	764	689	689	740	771	810	855	
Total Beds & Caseload	1,488	1,726	1,868	2,025	2,174	2,389	2,605	2,895	3,237	3,571	3,922	4,142	4,236	4,245	4,324	4,517	4,740	4,980	
Annual Percent Increase	19.6%	16.0%	8.2%	8.4%	7.4%	9.9%	9.0%	11.1%	11.8%	10.3%	9.8%	5.6%	2.3%	0.2%	1.9%	4.5%	4.9%	5.1%	10.0%

Paroled* includes values for offenders Paroled plus those transferred into Idaho on Interstate Compact

Appendix 3: Forecast Admissions and Releases by Month and Status for FY 2010

Monthly Admissions and Releases

Term	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Admissions												
New Commitments	53	52	49	54	50	49	55	49	54	55	52	54
Revoked Probation	39	57	54	56	58	60	59	55	58	56	57	54
Revoked Parole	115	42	46	52	53	53	46	45	48	54	55	53
Failed Rider	17	19	19	18	19	20	20	19	19	19	19	19
Total Admissions	224	170	168	180	180	182	180	168	179	184	183	180
Releases												
Paroled	111	123	127	131	116	117	115	107	102	109	100	105
Discharged	57	45	46	45	45	48	51	49	51	52	48	46
Total Releases	168	168	173	176	161	165	166	156	153	161	148	151
Net Admissions/Releases	56	2	-5	4	19	17	14	12	26	23	35	29
Beginning												
6,402	6,458	6,460	6,455	6,459	6,478	6,495	6,509	6,521	6,547	6,570	6,605	6,605
Net Admission & Releases												
56	2	-5	4	19	17	14	12	26	23	35	29	29
Ending												
6,458	6,460	6,455	6,459	6,478	6,495	6,509	6,521	6,547	6,570	6,605	6,605	6,634
Non Bed												
167	160	168	166	158	151	158	154	153	158	160	165	165
Net Term												
6,291	6,300	6,287	6,293	6,320	6,344	6,351	6,367	6,394	6,412	6,445	6,469	6,469
Rider												
Admissions												
New Commitments	88	78	72	71	72	72	78	71	84	86	81	81
Failed Probation	69	72	74	77	76	71	74	72	73	69	66	69
Total	157	150	146	148	148	143	152	143	157	155	147	150
Releases												
Probation	132	124	126	125	123	125	133	131	130	129	128	129
Term	17	19	19	18	19	20	20	19	19	19	19	19
Total	149	143	145	143	142	145	153	150	149	148	147	148
Net Admission & Releases	8	7	1	5	6	-2	-1	-7	8	7	0	2
Beginning												
809	817	824	825	830	836	834	833	826	834	841	841	841
Net Admission & Releases												
8	7	1	5	6	-2	-1	-7	8	7	0	2	2
Ending												
817	824	825	830	836	834	833	826	834	841	841	841	843
Non Bed												
101	145	133	129	133	116	132	129	115	115	123	119	119
Net Rider												
716	679	692	701	703	718	701	697	719	726	718	724	724

Appendix 3 Continued

		Monthly Admissions and Releases											
		Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Parole Violator													
Admissions													
Parole		86	72	65	79	85	89	83	76	71	65	66	73
Releases													
Term		115	42	46	52	53	53	46	45	48	54	55	53
Reinstated Parole		26	19	19	17	16	17	20	20	20	19	17	16
Discharged		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		141	61	65	69	69	70	66	65	68	73	72	69
Net Admission & Releases		-55	11	0	10	16	19	17	11	3	-8	-6	4
Beginning		525	470	481	481	491	507	526	543	554	557	549	543
Net Admission & Releases		-55	11	0	10	16	19	17	11	3	-8	-6	4
Ending		470	481	481	491	507	526	543	554	557	549	543	547
Non Bed		182	174	179	189	187	181	193	193	187	196	189	184
Net Parole Violator		288	307	302	302	320	345	350	361	370	353	354	363
Net Incarcerations		7,295	7,286	7,281	7,296	7,343	7,407	7,402	7,425	7,483	7,491	7,517	7,556
Probation													
Admissions													
New Commitments		210	242	239	251	237	251	251	221	274	258	266	252
Successful Rider		128	124	126	125	123	125	133	131	130	129	128	129
Total		338	366	365	376	360	376	384	352	404	387	394	381
Releases													
Revoked Probation		39	57	54	56	58	60	59	55	58	56	57	54
RevRJ		69	72	74	77	76	71	74	72	73	69	66	69
Discharged		216	216	207	207	211	207	195	206	197	193	196	198
Total		324	345	335	340	345	338	328	333	328	318	319	321
Net Admission & Releases		14	21	30	36	15	38	56	19	76	69	75	60
Beginning		13,793	13,807	13,828	13,858	13,894	13,909	13,947	14,003	14,022	14,098	14,167	14,242
Net Admission & Releases		14	21	30	36	15	38	56	19	76	69	75	60
Ending		13,807	13,828	13,858	13,894	13,909	13,947	14,003	14,022	14,098	14,167	14,242	14,302
Non Caseload		2,645	2,599	2,615	2,623	2,620	2,623	2,620	2,618	2,651	2,668	2,687	2,693
Net Probation Caseload		11,162	11,229	11,243	11,271	11,289	11,324	11,383	11,404	11,447	11,499	11,555	11,609

Appendix 3 Continued

Parole	Monthly Admissions and Releases											
	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Admissions												
Paroled	118	131	134	137	122	122	121	112	107	114	109	112
Re-instated Violator	21	19	19	17	16	17	20	20	20	19	17	16
Total	139	150	153	154	138	139	141	132	127	133	126	128
Releases												
Parole Violator	82	72	65	79	85	89	83	76	71	65	66	73
Discharged	61	44	45	46	46	44	44	44	43	42	41	43
Total	143	116	110	125	131	133	127	120	114	107	107	116
Net Admission & Releases	-4	34	43	29	7	6	14	12	13	26	19	12
Beginning	3,420	3,416	3,450	3,493	3,522	3,529	3,535	3,549	3,561	3,574	3,600	3,619
Net Admission & Releases	-4	34	43	29	7	6	14	12	13	26	19	12
Ending	3,416	3,450	3,493	3,522	3,529	3,535	3,549	3,561	3,574	3,600	3,619	3,631
Non Caseload	795	779	790	803	799	818	819	831	824	814	814	821
Net Parole Caseload	2,621	2,671	2,703	2,719	2,730	2,717	2,730	2,730	2,750	2,786	2,805	2,810
Net CC Caseload	13,783	13,900	13,946	13,990	14,019	14,041	14,113	14,134	14,197	14,285	14,360	14,419
Net Bed and Caseload	21,078	21,186	21,227	21,286	21,362	21,448	21,515	21,559	21,680	21,776	21,877	21,975

Appendix 4: Forecast Admissions and Releases for Males by Month and Status for FY 2010

Term	Monthly Admissions and Releases											
	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Admissions												
New Commitments	48	47	45	49	46	44	51	45	48	51	48	50
Revoked Probation	33	47	43	45	47	50	48	45	47	46	46	44
Revoked Parole	115	36	41	46	47	48	39	40	42	49	49	46
Revoked Rider	16	16	16	15	16	17	17	16	16	16	16	16
Total Admissions	212	146	145	155	156	159	155	146	153	162	159	156
Releases												
Paroled	95	106	111	114	102	103	99	91	86	91	81	87
Discharged	53	41	41	40	40	43	46	43	45	47	43	41
Total Releases	148	147	152	154	142	146	145	134	131	138	124	128
Net Admissions/Releases	64	-1	-7	1	14	13	10	12	22	24	35	28
Beginning	5,814	5,878	5,877	5,870	5,871	5,885	5,898	5,908	5,920	5,942	5,966	6,001
Net Admissions/Releases	64	-1	-7	1	14	13	10	12	22	24	35	28
Ending	5,878	5,877	5,870	5,871	5,885	5,898	5,908	5,920	5,942	5,966	6,001	6,029
Non Bed	152	145	151	150	141	135	140	138	135	142	143	149
Net Term	5,726	5,732	5,719	5,721	5,744	5,763	5,768	5,782	5,807	5,824	5,858	5,880
Rider												
Admissions												
New Commitments	74	62	59	58	57	59	63	57	67	68	65	65
Failed Probation	53	53	57	62	61	54	57	55	57	54	50	52
Total	127	115	116	120	118	113	120	112	124	122	115	117
Releases												
Probation	107	98	95	97	96	100	105	103	103	103	102	101
Term	16	16	16	15	16	17	17	16	16	16	16	16
Total	123	114	111	112	112	117	122	119	119	119	118	117
Net Admission & Releases	4	1	5	8	6	-4	-2	-7	5	3	-3	0
Beginning	626	630	631	636	644	650	646	644	637	642	645	642
Net Admissions/Releases	4	1	5	8	6	-4	-2	-7	5	3	-3	0
Ending	630	631	636	644	650	646	644	637	642	645	642	642
Non Bed	89	116	107	103	109	96	111	108	91	90	101	98
Net Rider	541	515	529	541	541	550	533	529	551	555	541	544

Appendix 4 Continued

Monthly Admissions and Releases

	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Parole Violator												
Admissions												
Parole	80	65	57	71	77	82	75	66	61	56	59	66
Releases												
Term	115	36	41	46	47	48	39	40	42	49	49	46
Reinstated Parole	26	17	17	15	14	15	18	18	17	16	14	13
Discharged	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	141	53	58	61	61	63	57	58	59	65	63	59
Net Admission & Releases	-61	12	-1	10	16	19	18	8	2	-9	-4	7
Beginning	480	419	431	430	440	456	475	493	501	503	494	490
Net Admissions/Releases	-61	12	-1	10	16	19	18	8	2	-9	-4	7
Ending	419	431	430	440	456	475	493	501	503	494	490	497
Non Bed	163	151	156	166	165	159	173	171	164	175	169	164
Net Parole Violator	256	280	274	274	291	316	320	330	339	319	321	333
Net Incarcerations	6,523	6,527	6,522	6,536	6,576	6,629	6,621	6,641	6,697	6,698	6,720	6,757
Probation												
Admissions												
New Commitments	157	182	176	186	179	187	190	164	208	194	202	189
Successful Rider	103	98	95	97	96	100	105	103	103	103	102	101
Total	260	280	271	283	275	287	295	267	311	297	304	290
Releases												
Revoked Probation	33	47	43	45	47	50	48	45	47	46	46	44
RevRJ	53	53	57	62	61	54	57	55	57	54	50	52
Discharged	154	156	150	147	155	151	141	151	146	142	142	145
Total	240	256	250	254	263	255	246	251	250	242	238	241
Net Admission & Releases	20	24	21	29	12	32	49	16	61	55	66	49
Beginning	10,170	10,190	10,214	10,235	10,264	10,276	10,308	10,357	10,373	10,434	10,489	10,555
Net Admissions/Rel	20	24	21	29	12	32	49	16	61	55	66	49
Ending	10,190	10,214	10,235	10,264	10,276	10,308	10,357	10,373	10,434	10,489	10,555	10,604
Non Caseload	2,071	2,004	2,019	2,026	2,022	2,024	2,020	2,018	2,048	2,063	2,080	2,084
Net Probation Caseload	8,119	8,210	8,216	8,238	8,254	8,284	8,337	8,355	8,386	8,426	8,475	8,520

Appendix 4 Continued

Parole	Monthly Admissions and Releases											
	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Admissions												
Paroled	101	113	117	119	107	107	104	96	89	95	89	93
Re-instated Violator	21	17	17	15	14	15	18	18	17	16	14	13
Total	122	130	134	134	121	122	122	114	106	111	103	106
Releases												
Parole Violator	76	65	57	71	77	82	75	66	61	56	59	66
Discharged	52	36	37	32	33	34	31	35	33	35	30	30
Total	128	101	94	103	110	116	106	101	94	91	89	96
Net Admission & Releases	-6	29	40	31	11	6	16	13	12	20	14	10
Beginning	2,925	2,919	2,948	2,988	3,019	3,030	3,036	3,052	3,065	3,077	3,097	3,111
Net Admissions/Releases	-6	29	40	31	11	6	16	13	12	20	14	10
Ending	2,919	2,948	2,988	3,019	3,030	3,036	3,052	3,065	3,077	3,097	3,111	3,121
Non Caseload	719	707	718	732	728	744	746	755	749	743	740	747
Net Parole Caseload	2,200	2,241	2,270	2,287	2,302	2,292	2,306	2,310	2,328	2,354	2,371	2,374
Net CC Caseload	10,319	10,451	10,486	10,525	10,556	10,576	10,643	10,665	10,714	10,780	10,846	10,894
Net Bed and Caseload	16,842	16,978	17,008	17,061	17,132	17,205	17,264	17,306	17,411	17,478	17,566	17,651

Appendix 5: Forecast Admissions and Releases for Females by Month and Status for FY 2010

Term	Monthly Admissions and Releases											
	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Admissions												
New Commitments	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	6	4	4	4
Revoked Probation	6	10	11	11	11	10	11	10	11	10	11	10
Revoked Parole	0	6	5	6	6	5	7	5	6	5	6	7
Revoked Rider	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total Admissions	12	24	23	25	24	23	25	22	26	22	24	24
Releases												
Paroled	16	17	16	17	14	14	16	16	16	18	19	18
Discharged	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	5
Total Releases	20	21	21	22	19	19	21	22	22	23	24	23
Net Admissions/Releases	-8	3	2	3	5	4	4	0	4	-1	0	1
Beginning	588	580	583	585	588	593	597	601	601	605	604	604
Net Admissions/Releases	-8	3	2	3	5	4	4	0	4	-1	0	1
Ending	580	583	585	588	593	597	601	601	605	604	604	605
Non Bed	15	15	17	16	17	16	18	16	18	16	17	16
Net Term	565	568	568	572	576	581	583	585	587	588	587	589
Rider												
Admissions												
New Commitments	14	16	13	13	15	13	15	14	17	18	16	16
Failed Probation	16	19	17	15	15	17	17	17	16	15	16	17
Total	30	35	30	28	30	30	32	31	33	33	32	33
Releases												
Probation	25	26	31	28	27	25	28	28	27	26	26	28
Term	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total	26	29	34	31	30	28	31	31	30	29	29	31
Net Admissions/Releases	4	6	-4	-3	0	2	1	0	3	4	3	2
Beginning	183	187	193	189	186	186	188	189	189	192	196	199
Net Admissions/Releases	4	6	-4	-3	0	2	1	0	3	4	3	2
Ending	187	193	189	186	186	188	189	189	192	196	199	201
Non Bed	12	29	26	26	24	20	21	21	24	25	22	21
Net Rider	175	164	163	160	162	168	168	168	168	171	177	180

Appendix 5 Continued

		Monthly Admissions and Releases											
		Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Parole Violator													
Admissions													
Parole		6	7	8	8	8	7	8	10	10	9	7	7
Releases													
Term		0	6	5	6	6	5	7	5	6	5	6	7
Reinstated Parole		0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
Discharged		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		0	8	7	8	8	7	9	7	9	8	9	10
Net Admissions/Releases		6	-1	1	0	0	0	-1	3	1	1	-2	-3
Beginning		45	51	50	51	51	51	51	50	53	54	55	53
Net Admissions/Releases		6	-1	1	0	0	0	-1	3	1	1	-2	-3
Ending		51	50	51	51	51	51	50	53	54	55	53	50
Non Bed		19	23	23	23	22	22	20	22	23	21	20	20
Net Parole Violator		32	27	28	28	29	29	30	31	31	34	33	30
Net Incarcerations		772	759	759	760	767	778	781	784	786	793	797	799
Probation													
Admissions													
New Commitments		53	60	63	65	58	64	61	57	66	64	64	63
Successful Rider		25	26	31	28	27	25	28	28	27	26	26	28
Total		78	86	94	93	85	89	89	85	93	90	90	91
Releases													
Revoked Probation		6	10	11	11	11	10	11	10	11	10	11	10
RevRJ		16	19	17	15	15	17	17	17	16	15	16	17
Discharged		62	60	57	60	56	56	54	55	51	51	54	53.0
Total		84	89	85	86	82	83	82	82	78	76	81	80
Net Admissions/Releases		-6	-3	9	7	3	6	7	3	15	14	9	11
Beginning		3,623	3,617	3,614	3,623	3,630	3,633	3,639	3,646	3,649	3,664	3,678	3,687
Net Admissions/Releases		-6	-3	9	7	3	6	7	3	15	14	9	11
Ending		3,617	3,614	3,623	3,630	3,633	3,639	3,646	3,649	3,664	3,678	3,687	3,698
Non Caseload		574	595	596	597	598	599	600	600	603	605	607	609
Net Probation Caseload		3,043	3,019	3,027	3,033	3,035	3,040	3,046	3,049	3,061	3,073	3,080	3,089


Appendix 5 Continued

		Monthly Admissions and Releases											
Parole		Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Admissions													
	Paroled	17	18	17	18	15	15	17	16	18	19	20	19
	Re-instated Violator	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
	Total	17	20	19	20	17	17	19	18	21	22	23	22
Releases													
	Parole Violator	6	7	8	8	8	7	8	10	10	9	7	7
	Discharged	9	8	8	14	13	10	13	9	10	7	11	13
	Total	15	15	16	22	21	17	21	19	20	16	18	20
	Net Admissions/Releases	2	5	3	-2	-4	0	-2	-1	1	6	5	2
Beginning		495	497	502	505	503	499	499	497	496	497	503	508
	Net Admissions/Releases	2	5	3	-2	-4	0	-2	-1	1	6	5	2
Ending		497	502	505	503	499	499	497	496	497	503	508	510
	Non Caseload	76	72	72	71	71	74	73	76	75	71	74	74
Net Parole Caseload		421	430	433	432	428	425	424	420	422	432	434	436
Net CC Caseload		3,464	3,449	3,460	3,465	3,463	3,465	3,470	3,469	3,483	3,505	3,514	3,525
Net Bed and Caseload		4,236	4,208	4,219	4,225	4,230	4,243	4,251	4,253	4,269	4,298	4,311	4,324

Appendix 6: State Population Estimates by Gender

The chart below shows the number of Idaho citizens from 20 to 34 years of age by gender and fiscal year. It is based on Census data and shows an average annual increase of 2.3% for males and 2.0% for females over the forecast period. This is the indicator group for new court commitments.


Idaho Population Age 20 to 34



Appendix 7: Court Commitment Rates

The chart below illustrates historical and forecast court commitment rates for males to prison by year and crime group. The chart shows both volatility from year to year and clear changes in historic patterns. The diamonds represent the FAC selected forecast rates. The GWA value is the starting point for FAC deliberations regarding what rate to use to estimate future court commitments. For the FY 2010 forecast, the FAC chose to use a slightly lower than GWA rate for male commitments for Drug and Property crimes and the GWA for all other crimes.

Male Court Commitment Rates to Term



Appendix 7 Continued, Historical Court Commitment Rates with Calculated GWA by Gender Status and Crime

The table below shows the annual commitment rate and the calculated GWA by commitment type and gender and FAC selected rates.

Court Commitment Rates for Males to Probation. FAC elected to use a rate of 17.0 for Alcohol crimes for the 2010 Forecast

	Year																	
Crime Group	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Alcohol	13.0	13.8	10.1	10.0	9.1	10.3	10.2	10.5	8.8	7.7	10.0	13.4	21.7	24.6	13.7	13.7	13.7	13.7
Assault	15.7	14.7	14.4	19.6	15.1	17.1	18.8	22.3	18.1	21.8	20.3	25.5	21.3	20.6	20.4	20.4	20.4	20.4
Drug	41.7	35.2	38.1	40.0	35.1	40.0	37.2	41.5	43.8	52.1	47.6	46.0	37.2	35.7	41.7	41.7	41.7	41.7
Murder & Man	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Property	59.8	57.8	46.5	39.6	34.7	33.8	34.4	38.2	37.3	37.5	37.0	34.3	32.4	35.3	36.7	36.7	36.7	36.7
Sex	6.8	6.4	7.3	7.0	7.3	7.6	7.8	9.7	8.6	8.2	7.7	5.4	7.7	6.0	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5
Total	137.6	128.6	116.9	116.6	101.7	109.3	109.0	122.6	116.8	127.7	123.1	125.2	120.5	122.7	120.6	120.6	120.6	120.6

Court Commitment Rates for Females to Probation. FAC elected to use a rate of 5.0 for Alcohol crimes for the 2010 Forecast

	Year																	
Crime Group	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Alcohol	1.7	2.6	1.2	1.7	2.3	1.1	1.4	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.5	2.2	3.6	6.4	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
Assault	1.6	2.8	1.9	2.6	2.9	2.4	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.7	3.5	4.2	4.1	4.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Drug	16.4	16.2	14.4	17.5	18.6	19.6	19.8	21.4	24.9	26.9	30.1	24.4	20.3	17.6	22.0	22.0	22.0	22.0
Murder & Man	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Property	27.3	28.4	23.2	18.5	16.5	17.3	19.7	23.3	22.4	22.4	22.7	20.1	18.2	19.2	20.6	20.6	20.6	20.6
Sex	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Total	47.7	50.8	40.9	40.9	40.7	40.8	44.3	50.4	53.0	55.4	59.1	51.2	46.3	48.5	49.3	49.3	49.3	49.3

Court Commitment Rates for Males to Rider. FAC elected to use a rate of 11.0 for Drug crimes for the 2010 Forecast

	Year																	
Crime Group	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Alcohol	3.9	4.4	2.7	3.6	3.2	3.3	3.6	4.2	3.7	3.5	3.3	5.6	7.0	7.7	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Assault	8.5	6.9	7.0	9.0	7.8	9.0	9.4	9.0	9.2	10.0	11.8	11.9	10.6	11.6	10.3	10.3	10.3	10.3
Drug	12.0	10.0	8.4	10.5	12.0	13.5	11.1	12.2	16.2	14.5	16.5	13.8	11.4	8.6	12.7	12.7	12.7	12.7
Murder & Man	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Property	19.2	15.1	14.8	14.1	14.0	11.6	13.5	11.9	14.5	12.8	13.2	12.2	9.7	10.4	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5
Sex	5.7	7.9	6.6	4.9	3.7	5.3	5.1	5.5	5.1	4.8	4.7	5.2	4.7	4.7	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.1
Total	49.8	44.9	40.0	42.3	40.9	42.9	43.1	42.9	49.0	45.6	49.6	49.0	43.5	43.6	45.9	45.9	45.9	45.9

Appendix 7 Continued, Historical Court Commitment Rates with Calculated GWA by Gender Status and Crime

Court Commitment Rates for Females to Rider. FAC elected to use a rate of 4.0 for Drug crimes for the 2010 Forecast

Crime Group	Year																	
	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Alcohol	0.5	0.7	0.2	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.9	1.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
Assault	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.8	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.1	0.9	1.4	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
Drug	2.6	3.9	3.2	4.5	5.2	5.5	4.8	4.7	6.1	7.1	8.1	5.6	4.1	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Murder & Man	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Property	3.7	3.4	3.4	4.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.8	4.7	3.2	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
Sex	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Total	8.0	9.2	7.7	10.9	10.7	10.6	10.4	12.1	13.3	14.5	16.3	12.3	9.5	11.4	10.4	10.4	10.4	10.4

Court Commitment Rates for Males to Term. FAC elected to use a rate of 9.0 for Drug crimes and 5.0 for Property crimes

Crime Group	Year																	
	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Alcohol	2.8	2.7	1.7	2.3	3.3	3.8	3.2	3.2	2.6	3.0	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Assault	7.7	5.3	6.4	7.1	8.1	7.0	6.4	6.9	6.6	7.7	10.2	7.2	7.1	5.7	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.3
Drug	7.8	8.5	9.6	11.9	12.2	15.0	12.5	14.0	12.0	11.1	13.3	11.1	8.9	8.0	11.3	11.3	11.3	11.3
Murder & Man	1.9	2.4	2.3	2.6	1.9	1.7	1.0	1.9	1.6	1.3	1.8	1.9	1.3	1.4	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
Property	8.7	9.1	6.2	7.9	7.1	7.1	6.6	6.9	7.8	5.9	6.1	5.3	4.5	4.0	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.1
Sex	4.2	4.5	2.8	5.7	7.0	5.4	6.8	6.7	7.0	6.9	6.8	7.6	6.2	6.8	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7
Total	33.1	32.5	29.0	37.4	39.5	40.1	36.4	39.6	37.7	35.8	41.8	36.3	31.4	29.4	36.5	36.5	36.5	36.5


Court Commitment Rates for Females to Term. FAC elected to use GWA rates for all crimes for the 2010 Forecast

Crime Group	Year																	
	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Alcohol	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Assault	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Drug	0.5	0.9	0.7	0.8	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.2	2.0	1.9	1.5	1.1	0.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Murder & Man	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Property	0.9	0.6	0.7	1.4	0.3	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.0	0.7	0.9	0.7	1.2	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
Sex	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Total	1.7	2.2	1.9	3.0	3.1	5.3	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.5	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3

Appendix 8: Status Change Rates and Lengths of Stay

The FAC selected recent historical periods to calculate status change rates and their associated lengths of stay. A recent stable period for either the status change rate or the length of stay is considered a sufficient reason to select a period. That period is then used to calculate both status change rate and the length of stay for the forecast period. The chart below illustrates the method using Rider releases as an example. For Rider releases, the FAC selected the period FY 2007 through 2009.


Historical Rider Releases



Data represents historical releases from offenders' first commitment to Rider

The chart below shows the Rider length of stay example. The period FY 2007 through 2009 was chosen because it represents a relatively stable period for length of stay and it is consistent with the status change rates observed in the previous chart. Staff used this period to calculate both the status change rates and the lengths of stay for each cohort.

Historical Rider Length of Stay Prior to Release



Appendix 3
Programs and Education
Report, FY 2009



Offender Programs and Education Report

Fiscal Year 2009

Idaho Department of Correction

Executive Summary

This report provides an analysis of selected program and education services within the Idaho Department of Correction. It includes education services enabling offenders to obtain a high school education and employment skills and the program areas of Cognitive Self-Change (CSC), Therapeutic Communities (TC), and New Directions (ND). The goal is to examine program achievement and help program managers determine how programs are performing.

The analyses describe offender participation and completion rates as well as the overall impact represented by recidivism. Recidivism data is included for offenders completing programs through FY 2007 but not for offenders completing programs in FYs 2008 or 2009 because not enough time has elapsed for these offenders to be released and return. Using data from FYs 2008 and 2009 would cause us to understate the magnitude of the recidivism problem.

The report is not an exhaustive examination of all program and education services. In the education area, it focuses on attainment of a high school education and job skills since these are nationally recognized as important contributors to offender success. In the programs area, it focuses on CSC, TC, and ND because these are widely recognized core treatment programs.

This report analyzes participation, completions, and outcomes for TC and high school education programs delivered from FYs 1999 through 2009. CSC program data allows for reporting only since FY 2002 and ND program data allows for reporting only since FY 2003. Data for Vocation Education allows for reporting since FY 2005.

From FYs 2002 through 2009, 8,608 incarcerated offenders completed CSC programs. Riders have a historical completion rate of 84%. Riders who completed CSC between FYs 2002 and 2007 revoked Probation at a rate of 34%, while those who needed CSC, but who did not complete revoked at a rate of 41%. Term offenders have a 55% completion rate. Termers who completed CSC between FYs 2002 and 2007 revoked Parole at a rate of 34%, while those who needed CSC, but did not complete revoked at a rate of 40%.

From FYs 1999 through 2009, 5,522 incarcerated offenders completed a high school education. Riders seeking a high school education during this period had a 50% completion rate while Term offenders had a 15% completion rate. For the period FYs 1999 through 2007, 42% of offenders who completed a high school education during their Rider revoked Probation. During the same period, offenders who had completed a Rider but did not complete a high school education during their Rider, revoked at a rate of 51%. Term offenders who completed their high school education while incarcerated revoked Parole at a rate of 37%. Lack of data on high school attainment for Termers prior to incarceration precludes recidivism comparison for Termers who entered prison without an education and failed to complete while incarcerated.

From FYs 1999 through 2009, 3,684 Term offenders completed TC programming. The completion rate was 68%. Of offenders who completed a TC between FYs 1999 and 2007, 47% revoked Parole. During the same period, offenders who participated in but did not complete TC programming, revoked Parole at a rate of 53%.

From FYs 2003 through 2009, 1,959 Riders completed ND. The completion rate was 90%, and 97% went to Probation. For Riders who completed ND from FYs 2003 through 2007, 47% revoked Probation. For the same period, 51% of the Riders who participated, but did not complete ND revoked Probation.

Of the 433 inmates who earned a carpentry, plumbing, or welding certificate since FY 2005, 189 had paroled by 09/01/2009 and 67% (126) were employed at that time. This compares to 63% (51 out of 81) for those who participated in job skills training, but did not earn a certificate.

C.L. "Butch" Otter
Governor

Robin Sandy
Jay Neilsen
Board of Correction

Brent Reinke
Director



Section 1

Cognitive Self-Change Programs

Idaho Department of Correction

C.L. "Butch" Otter
Governor

**Robin Sandy
Jay Nielsen**
Board of Correction

Brent Reinke
Director

Cognitive Self-Change (CSC) programming is designed to change the criminal thinking patterns of offenders in order to reduce negative behavior. During FYs 2002 and 2003, the Idaho Department of Correction (IDOC) offered a three-phase cognitive program. CSC-1 and CSC-2 were offered system-wide and CSC-3 was offered for offenders in the community. There was no pre-determined course length. Completion was based on demonstrated competency.

During 2003 IDOC implemented an enhanced program called Cognitive Self-Change, Idaho Model (CSCIM). It is similar to CSC but provides improved organizational structure for incarcerated offenders. It teaches the connection between thinking, feeling, behavior, and how patterns of thinking can drive habitual or automatic ways of behaving. CSCIM facilitates self-change by enabling the offender to learn about, as well as practice, changing faulty patterns of thinking and feeling which lead to negative behaviors. CSCIM is a singular program consisting of a brief orientation followed by two stages. CSCIM Stage 1 programming typically lasts six months and is implemented using 2-hour sessions twice per week until complete. Progress is measured in six levels. The Offender Management Plan for incarcerated offenders whose assessment indicates a need for cognitive restructuring generally includes an objective for completing Stage 1 while in prison. CSCIM Stage 2 participation begins when the offender transitions into the community. CSCIM Stage 2 includes weekly 2-hour sessions for 6-12 months. Full completion is recognized at the end of Stage 2.

The Rider program uses courseware developed by National Institute of Corrections titled "Thinking for a Change". Inmates receive CSC-1, or CSCIM Stage 1. These programs are similar and each provides the minimum level of programming needed to prepare an incarcerated offender to succeed in the community. Data for the programs will be grouped together and referred to as CSC.

Data for the CSC analysis goes back only to FY 2002. Data for outcome measures, such as the number of CSC completers who have revoked, tend to understate the eventual revocation rates because not enough time has elapsed for most of these offenders to revoke. The analysis is intended to help guide development of offender management strategies. Completion rates are a valuable indicator of a successful system and it remains important to monitor release rates as the parole preparation process is continually improved.

Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT) has also been included beginning with last year's analysis. MRT is a cognitive-behavioral program that was implemented in FY 2005. It was designed to promote positive self-image and identity to help clients learn positive social behaviors and beliefs, and to begin to make decisions from higher levels of moral judgment. It is a systematic treatment system which employs active group participation, written exercises, and homework. Recently MRT has been recognized in the National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices (NREPP). It is currently being used in approximately 42 states.

For this analysis an offender was counted only once, as either a participant or a completer, regardless of the number of times they had enrolled. Some offenders completed CSC more than once but are only counted once as a completion. The completion rate is based on the number of offenders that completed compared to the number of offenders that participated. The data also includes the number of offenders that were released to community supervision after successful completion of CSC. Cognitive programming is an important precursor to community re-integration and is often required by the Parole Commission prior to parole approval.

Chart 1:

CSC Offender Participation, Completion and Release




Chart 1 shows Rider participation and completions. Historically about 93% of Riders completing CSC programming are subsequently released to probation (Table 1). The drop in Rider participants in FY 2004 resulted from a change in Rider programming. The New Direction program was implemented at NICI about half way through FY 2003. Since the New Direction program includes a robust Cognitive Self-Change component, only offenders who are not enrolled in New Direction complete their cognitive restructuring needs with CSC. Of the Riders who completed CSC and went to Probation between FY 2002 and 2007, 34% have revoked Probation. A group of 329 Riders who participated in CSC during the same period, but did not complete revoked Probation at a rate of 41.3%. The difference between rates is statistically significant, $\chi^2 = 6.78$, $p=0.009$, odds ratio = 1.36, 95% confidence interval 1.08 to 1.72. The group that failed to complete CSC also had a much higher Rider failure rate than those who completed CSC, with only 81% being released to Probation.

Chart 2 shows Inmate participation, completions, and releases by fiscal year. Historically, about 71% of Inmates completing CSC programming are subsequently released to parole (Table 1). The completion and release rate for Inmates is lower than for Riders. Also, Inmates typically take about twice as long to complete CSC as Riders. Of Inmates who completed CSC and went to Parole between FYs 2002 and 2007, 34% have revoked. Inmates who participated in CSC, but did not complete, paroled at a rate of 68%. This is about the same as the 71% rate for completers but their paroles typically occur after a substantially longer period of incarceration. A group of 1,968 CSC non-completer Inmates who paroled between FYs 2002 and 2007 was also tracked. That group revoked at a rate of 39.6% (compared to the revocation rate of completers of 34%, difference between rates is statistically significant, $\chi^2 = 11.78$, $p=0.004$, odds ratio = 1.25, 95% confidence interval 1.10 to 1.42).

Chart 2:

CSC Inmate Participation, Completion and Release




Table 1
Cognitive Self Change Participation for FY09

Incarceration Status	Individual Participation			Outcome by Offender Completions			
	Individuals	Completions to Date		Release to Community Supervision		Return to Incarceration	
		#	#	% ¹	#	% ¹	#
FY 2002							
Rider	587	500	85%	462	92%	200	43%
Inmate	383	257	67%	181	70%	78	43%
Total	970	757	78%	643	85%	278	43%
FY 2003							
Rider	692	603	87%	573	95%	241	42%
Inmate	557	392	70%	276	70%	102	37%
Total	1,249	995	80%	849	85%	343	40%
FY 2004							
Rider	423	314	74%	302	96%	105	35%
Inmate	597	268	45%	213	79%	72	34%
Total	1,020	582	57%	515	88%	177	34%
FY 2005							
Rider	448	366	82%	346	95%	103	30%
Inmate	1,183	474	40%	397	84%	143	36%
Total	1,631	840	52%	743	88%	246	33%
FY 2006							
Rider	538	460	86%	424	92%	126	30%
Inmate	1,248	529	42%	431	81%	148	34%
Total	1,786	989	55%	855	86%	274	32%
FY 2007							
Rider	487	443	91%	412	93%	83	20%
Inmate	1,585	756	48%	624	83%	187	30%
Total	2,072	1,199	58%	1,036	86%	270	26%
FY 2008						Not enough time has elapsed to provide meaningful revocation information.	
Rider	406	338	83%	321	95%		
Inmate	1,990	1,288	65%	966	75%		
Total	2,396	1,626	68%	1,287	79%		
FY 2009							
Rider	469	388	83%	336	87%		
Inmate	1,856	1,232	66%	597	48%		
Total	2,325	1,620	70%	933	58%		
Grand Totals							
Rider	4,050	3,412	84%	3,176	93%	858	34%
Inmate	9,399	5,196	55%	3,685	71%	730	34%
Total	13,449	8,608	64%	6,861	80%	1,588	34%

¹The percent of individuals paroled is based on offenders who completed the program, while the percentage revoked is calculated on those who were paroled



Section 2

Education Report

Idaho Department of Correction

C.L. "Butch" Otter
Governor

Robin Sandy
Jay Neilsen
Board of Correction

Brent Reinke
Director

In Idaho about 12%¹ of the adult population has not achieved a high school education while nationally the number is about 16%¹. Among Idaho's commitments in FY 2009, about 65% of Riders and 75% of Inmates reported completing a high school education prior to incarceration. Among Inmates, 26% had completed their high school education during a prior period of IDOC incarceration. Research points to educational deficiencies as a major factor in criminal behavior and recidivism. Employment opportunities are limited for those without a high school education, and jobs that do not require a high school education tend to pay less. National research also indicates that offenders without a high school education recidivate at a significantly higher rate than those with a high school education. Since those without a high school education are over-represented in incarceration and recidivism, educational services have become a major focus for IDOC.

This analysis will deal with two types of incarcerated offenders: Inmates and Riders. Riders are offenders sentenced to a period of incarceration for assessment and intensive programming. Inmates are offenders sentenced to prison. The average length of stay for Inmates is about 2.5 years. Though both groups are incarcerated in IDOC facilities there are differences in their environments, programming opportunities, and program intensity. We will focus on attainment of a high school education in the form of a general equivalency degree (GED), a high school equivalency (HSE), or a high school diploma (HSD) as the primary measure for education.

The Rider program is isolated at separate institutions where offenders are exposed to intensive programming and education. Each year more than 500 offenders are enrolled in classes that can enable them to complete a high school education.

Chart 1 shows the number of Rider education class participants and completers by fiscal year. Among the Rider population both annual participation and completions had shown a reasonably steady increase over time, although there was a slight decrease in completions during FY 2007, but there has been a rather dramatic decrease in both participation and completions for FY 2009. The dramatic increase in participants in FYs 2004 through 2006 reflects a similar increase in commitments to the Rider program during that time. The decline in participation in FY 2007 mirrors the decline in commitments that year. Over the past eleven years, Riders had an average education completion rate of just over 50%.

Chart 2 shows the number of Inmate education participants, and the number of those that completed, by fiscal year. Although the same educational services are offered to the Inmate population, their completion rate is much lower than that for Riders. The average completion rate for Inmates taking high school education classes over the past eleven years is about 15%.

The difference in Rider and Inmate completion rates may be explained by the clear incentive for those in the Rider program to demonstrate achievement. This tends to positively influence the court so as to increase the likelihood that the offender is sentenced to Probation rather than prison at the completion of the Rider. This seems to be supported by the fact that about 93% of those completing a high school education while on Rider received Probation while only 88% of the general Rider population received Probation (Table 1). Comparison of completion rates is also complicated by the fact that many Inmates take high school education classes over a period of several years before completing. As a result they are counted as participants in multiple years. Additionally, some Inmates already have a high school education and are only participating in classes to improve their literacy level so as to meet the entry criteria for more intensive programming. These two factors dilute the Inmate completion rate.

**Chart 1:
Rider High School Education Participation**




Chart 2 shows the number of Inmate education course participants and the number of those participants who completed. Interestingly, the completions have remained relatively stable. This observation supports the notion that there are inmates who take classes each year with the intention of improving reading and math skills rather than of completing a high school education.

**Chart 2:
Inmate High School Education Participation**





Chart 3 shows the number of Riders who completed a high school education while incarcerated, the number released to Probation, and the number revoked to Term, by fiscal year of completion.

**Chart 3:
Releases and Returns for Rider High School Completers**



Though it appears that there has been a reduction in general population revocations in recent years it is important to realize that this group has not had as much time to revoke as offenders from earlier years.

**Chart 4:
Comparison of Probation Revocations for Rider High School Completers and General Population**




Chart 4 compares the Probation revocation percentages of Riders who completed a high school education while incarcerated with those of the general Rider population.

As previously mentioned, offenders who do not have a high school education are more likely to recidivate than those who have obtained one. We typically compare revocation rates for Riders who complete a high school education with the revocation rates of the general population. Riders who completed a high school education and who were subsequently released to Probation revoked at a rate similar to the general population of Riders released to Probation. We would expect Riders who arrived without a high school education to have greater criminal tendencies than the general population. Had these offenders not obtained an education, they would be expected to revoke at a substantially higher rate than the general population. Perhaps the most useful comparison is of Riders who arrived without a high school education, participated in education classes, failed to complete a GED, and were then released to Probation. Those offenders who completed a Rider during the period FYs 1999 through 2007 without completing their high school education, revoked Probation at a rate of 51%, while the similar group who completed a GED while on Rider revoked at a rate of 42% (difference between rates is statistically significant, $\chi^2 = 27.87$, $p < 0.001$, odds ratio = 1.39, 95% confidence interval 1.23 to 1.57).

Chart 5 shows the number of Inmates who completed a high school education while incarcerated, the number of those who paroled, and the number of those who subsequently revoked. Though it appears there have been reductions in revocations after FY 2005 note that this group has not had as much time to revoke as offenders paroled earlier.





Chart 6 compares the percentage of parole revocations between Inmates who completed a high school education while incarcerated and the general Inmate population. From FYs 1999 through 2007, offenders who completed a high school education with IDOC have lower revocation rates than the general population of parolees. Offenders who completed a high school education while incarcerated revoked at a rate of 37%, while the general population revoked at a rate of about 43%. Lack of data on the offenders who entered Term incarceration without a high school education precludes a comparison of revocation rates.

**Chart 6:
Comparison of Parole Revocations for Inmate High School Completers and
General Population**



Among Inmates who entered prison during FY 2009, 75% arrived with a high school education. In that group, 26% had completed a high school education during a previous period of incarceration with IDOC. This pattern has been relatively constant over the last several years.

The final measure is the portion of Inmates paroled in FY 2009 that had a high school education by the time they were paroled. Of Inmates paroled in FY 2009, 9% completed a high school education during their incarceration period. About 75% of all Inmates paroled in FY 2009 had completed a high school education either through normal channels or with IDOC.

¹ R1501. Percent of People 25 Years and Over Who Have Completed High School (Includes Equivalency): 2007. Issued: October 2008. Internet. Available from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GRTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=01000US&-box_head_nbr=R1501&-ds_name=ACS_2007_1YR_G00_&-redoLog=false&-format=US-30&-mt_name=ACS_2006_EST_G00_R1501_US30 accessed September 11, 2009.

Table 1
High School Education Completions by Fiscal Year

Completion Year	Incarceration Status		Offender Participation			Outcome for Offenders Completing GED ⁴			
			Individuals	Completions		Rider to Probation/ Term to Parole ²		Probation/Parole Revocation ³	
				#	#	%	#	%	#
FY 99	General Pop ¹	4,422	1,053	347			87% / 65%		41% / 46%
	Rider		482	237	49%	226	95%	93	41%
	Inmate		571	110	19%	58	53%	29	50%
FY 00	General Pop	5,002	1,597	391			88% / 63%		44% / 44%
	Rider		476	285	60%	261	92%	134	51%
	Inmate		1,121	106	9%	61	58%	17	28%
FY 01	General Pop	5,452	1,409	406			87% / 65%		44% / 45%
	Rider		493	285	58%	270	95%	130	48%
	Inmate		916	121	13%	79	65%	33	42%
FY 02	General Pop	5,802	1,190	464			90% / 65%		42% / 40%
	Rider		457	287	63%	277	97%	142	51%
	Inmate		733	177	24%	112	63%	46	41%
FY 03	General Pop	5,825	1,639	529			89% / 67%		43% / 41%
	Rider		610	341	56%	330	97%	160	48%
	Inmate		1,029	188	18%	131	70%	44	34%
FY 04	General Pop	6,312	1,835	533			90% / 65%		42% / 44%
	Rider		754	349	46%	334	96%	145	43%
	Inmate		1,081	184	17%	114	62%	45	39%
FY 05	General Pop	6,526	2,142	579			89% / 64%		40% / 43%
	Rider		809	410	51%	380	93%	160	42%
	Inmate		1,333	169	13%	113	67%	49	43%
FY 06	General Pop	6,976	2,229	601			87% / 67%		34% / 44%
	Rider		873	416	48%	384	92%	130	34%
	Inmate		1,356	185	14%	117	63%	43	37%
FY 07	General Pop	7,357	2,070	575			86% / 70%		25% / 39%
	Rider		843	389	46%	348	89%	100	29%
	Inmate		1,227	186	15%	112	60%	25	22%
FY 08	General Pop	7,338	2,162	597			88% / 71%		Not enough time has elapsed to provide meaningful revocation information
	Rider		900	399	44%	365	91%		
	Inmate		1,262	198	16%	86	43%		
FY 09	General Pop	7,283	2,103	500			87% / 73%		
	Rider		663	306	46%	274	90%		
	Inmate		1,440	194	13%	37	19%		
Totals	Rider		7,360	3,704	50%	3,449	93%	1,194	42%
	Inmate		12,069	1,818	15%	1,020	56%	331	37%
	Total		19,429	5,522	28%	4,469	81%	1,525	41%

¹General population is the total number of incarcerated offenders. These offenders are eligible for educational services. They may receive a range of services from literacy improvement to a high school diploma. Participation refers to all educational services.

²The percent of individuals released from Rider to Probation or from Prison to Parole is based on those offenders that received educational services allowing them to complete a GED, HSE, or HSD while incarcerated.

³Revocation rates are based on a commitment to Term incarceration for both probationers and parolees.

⁴Not all of the offenders who completed GEDs in FYs 2008 and 2009 have been paroled yet. It takes about 24 months to get a complete picture of revocation actions, so many of these offenders have not had enough time to revoke. Therefore the information for violations in FYs 2008 and 2009 is blank and the data for FY 2007 may be incomplete. It also takes about 30 months for revocation from probation, so revocation data is incomplete for FYs 08-09.



Section 3

Therapeutic Community Programs

Idaho Department of Correction

Therapeutic Community (TC) programs establish treatment communities for incarcerated offenders with chronic criminal and substance abuse histories. These programs provide a drug-free correctional residential setting that uses a hierarchical model with treatment stages that reflect increased levels of personal and social responsibility. Peer influence, mediated through a variety of group processes, is used to help offenders learn and assimilate social norms and develop more effective problem solving skills. TCs differ from other treatment approaches principally in their use of the community model where both treatment-staff and those in recovery act as key agents of change. TC members interact in both structured and unstructured ways to influence attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors, associated with drug use, in a comprehensive holistic approach. TCs are the most intensive interventions available for moderate and high-risk offenders with chemical dependency issues. National research indicates they offer the best hope of moderating recidivism for these offenders.

Therapeutic Community programs are offered at ICIO, SICI, SBWCC, and ICC. IDOC has a total capacity of 412 TC beds. There are three TCs offered for the male Inmate population. The SICI TC is referred to as the TEAM program and is operated out of the Parole Release Center (PRC). It originally opened with 48 beds. An additional 48 beds were added in June 2001. It has since been expanded to form a 100-bed TC. The FRIENDS program at ICIO opened as a 39-bed unit and was increased to a 51-bed unit in October 2001. The TC at ICC has 177 participants divided into four separate living units. The program length at all three facilities is 9 to 12 months.

The women's therapeutic community began in 1999 at PWCC with 12 beds. It increased in August 2001 to 18 beds, increased again in October 2001 to 51 beds, and again in April 2002, to its current capacity of 60. In January 2006 the women's TC moved to SBWCC as a six-month program with a capacity of 63 offenders. It was expanded to 84 offenders in May 2007 and then reduced to 72 in October 2009.

Offenders who participate in TCs are frequently difficult to manage because of disciplinary and motivational issues and many are terminated from the program. In FY 2009, 23% of TC participants were terminated from the program and an additional 5% withdrew. Offenders with substance abuse issues, low education levels, and poor job skills, are more likely to revoke parole or commit a new crime. There are obviously many other factors to consider but TC completion is generally expected to reduce the likelihood of offender recidivism.


In this report we examine yearly TC accomplishments and compare the parole release rate and revocation rate for TC completers to that of non-completer participants. The non-completer comparison group includes TC participants from FY 1999 through FY 2007 who participated in a TC without completing. The exit reasons for the non-completer group included voluntary withdrawals, behavioral drops, performance drops, and class failures. The non-completers make a useful comparison group to help estimate the benefits of TCs because we can assume they had risks and needs similar to offenders who completed. Data for the unsuccessful participant group are aggregate numbers for the period FYs 1999 through 2007. This comparison indicates a higher level of success for TC completers than for non-completers. Chart 1 shows the total number of participants, completers, and completers who have paroled. Since FY 1999, TC participation has greatly increased and approximately 68% of participants have completed the program (Table 1). Of offenders who completed between FYs 1999 and 2007, 94% have since been paroled to the community. There are still some FYs 2008 and 2009 completers who have not yet completed other parole release requirements and have therefore not yet been released to parole. They were not included in this part of the analysis.

C.L. "Butch" Otter
Governor

Robin Sandy
Jay Neilsen
Board of Correction


Brent Reinke
Director

Chart 1
TC Participants, Completers and Paroled Completers
by Fiscal Completion Year



The parole rate for TC completers from FYs 1999 through FY 2009 is 94%. Chart 2 shows a 51% parole rate for the non-completer comparison group. This is significantly lower than the annual parole rate for the TC completer population. Offenders who complete a TC have a dramatically higher parole rate.

Chart 2
Comparison of TC Completer Parole Rates
to Comparison Group Parole Rates



Offenders who need a TC, but who do not complete are much more likely to top their sentence or be paroled after a substantially longer period of incarceration than those who do complete a TC. The improved parole rate of TC completers results in cost-avoidance for the department as more offenders are paroled than would have been expected without TC programming.

Chart 3
Comparison of TC Completer Revocation Rates
to Comparison Group Revocation Rates




Chart 3 compares the annual revocation rates of TC completers to the rate for the TC comparison group for the period FYs 1999 through 2007. This analysis does not consider years after FY 2007 because not enough time will have passed for offenders who will eventually revoke to do so. For the non-completers comparison group the totals from those nine years have been combined since the number who parole and subsequently revoke is so small that large apparent variances are induced in yearly rates. Combining the years allows us to smooth those variances and arrive at a suitable comparison value. The blue bars represent the revocation rate of the comparison group, which is constant for all fiscal years. The maroon bars represent the revocation rate of TC completers by year of completion. For the period FYs 1999 through 2007, the non-completer comparison group revoked at a rate of 53%. The TC completers revocation rate is much lower, averaging 47% over the nine year period. Overall the TC completers have revoked at a significantly lower rate than the non-completers. More details are available in Table 1. The lower revocation rate may indicate that TC programming is providing offenders skills necessary to succeed in the community.

Only 47% of TC completers revoked parole while 53% of the non-completers revoked parole (difference between rates is statistically significant, $\chi^2 = 4.77$, $p = 0.0290$, odds ratio = 1.3, 95% confidence interval 1.0 to 1.6). Offenders who complete a TC have a substantially higher likelihood of being paroled and a higher level of success in the community than offenders with similar needs who do not complete a TC. This, of course results in a substantial cost-avoidance for the department as more offenders are released sooner and fewer return.

Table 1
Therapeutic Community Participation By Fiscal Year

Program Exit Year	Facility	Individual Participation			Outcome by Offender Completions				Offender Exits							
		Individuals		Completions	Parole		Revocation		Completions		Withdrawals		Terminations		Total ²	
		#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	
FY 99	Comparison ³					32%		58%								
	ICIO	40	13	33%	11	85%	6	55%	13	33%	7	18%	20	50%	40	
	PWCC	47	44	94%	36	82%	13	36%	44	94%	0	0%	3	6%	47	
	SICI	79	38	48%	37	97%	18	49%	38	48%	12	15%	29	37%	79	
	Total	166	95	57%	84	88%	37	44%	95	57%	19	11%	52	31%	166	
FY 00	Comparison					32%		58%								
	ICIO	65	28	43%	24	86%	16	67%	28	43%	14	22%	23	35%	65	
	PWCC	54	50	93%	47	94%	19	40%	50	93%	4	7%	0	0%	54	
	SICI	72	38	53%	38	100%	26	68%	38	53%	14	19%	20	28%	72	
	Total	191	116	61%	109	94%	61	56%	116	61%	32	17%	43	23%	191	
FY 01	Comparison					32%		58%								
	ICIO	53	39	74%	36	92%	14	39%	39	74%	3	6%	11	21%	53	
	PWCC	61	59	97%	57	97%	19	33%	59	97%	2	3%	0	0%	61	
	SICI	76	39	51%	38	97%	19	50%	39	51%	18	24%	19	25%	76	
	Total	190	137	72%	131	96%	52	40%	137	72%	23	12%	30	16%	190	
FY 02						32%		58%								
	ICIO	69	44	64%	44	100%	17	39%	44	64%	2	3%	23	33%	69	
	PWCC	87	54	62%	53	98%	13	25%	54	62%	14	16%	19	22%	87	
	SICI	139	68	49%	66	97%	39	59%	68	49%	23	17%	48	35%	139	
	Total	295	166	56%	163	98%	69	42%	166	56%	39	13%	90	31%	295	
FY 03						32%		58%								
	ICIO	71	48	68%	47	98%	26	55%	48	68%	8	11%	15	21%	71	
	PWCC	257	111	43%	106	95%	39	37%	111	43%	95	37%	51	20%	257	
	SICI	155	98	63%	95	97%	50	53%	98	63%	4	3%	53	34%	155	
	Total	483	257	53%	248	96%	115	46%	257	53%	107	22%	119	25%	483	
FY 04						32%		58%								
	ICIO	79	55	70%	55	100%	22	40%	55	70%	8	10%	16	20%	79	
	PWCC	125	78	62%	78	100%	35	45%	78	62%	11	9%	36	29%	125	
	SICI	177	115	65%	112	97%	53	47%	115	65%	13	7%	49	28%	177	
	ICC	199	190	95%	166	87%	86	52%	190	95%	0	0%	9	5%	199	
	Total	580	438	76%	411	94%	196	48%	438	76%	32	6%	110	19%	580	
FY 05						32%		58%								
	ICIO	78	60	77%	59	98%	26	44%	60	77%	1	1%	17	22%	78	
	PWCC	142	84	59%	76	90%	36	47%	84	59%	25	18%	33	23%	142	
	SICI	199	107	54%	105	98%	58	55%	107	54%	2	1%	90	45%	199	
	ICC	231	187	81%	157	84%	86	55%	187	81%	36	16%	8	3%	231	
	Total	650	438	67%	397	91%	206	52%	438	67%	64	10%	148	23%	650	
FY 06																
	ICIO	74	61	82%	61	100%	28	46%	61	82%	2	3%	11	15%	74	
	PWCC/SBWCC	175	105	60%	92	88%	40	43%	105	60%	51	29%	19	11%	175	
	SICI	241	148	61%	145	98%	69	48%	148	61%	3	1%	90	37%	241	
	ICC	248	233	94%	202	87%	114	56%	233	94%	7	3%	8	3%	248	
	Total	738	547	74%	500	91%	251	50%	547	74%	63	9%	128	17%	738	
FY 07																
	ICIO	79	60	76%	60	100%	32	53%	60	76%	1	1%	18	23%	79	
	SBWCC	97	74	76%	72	97%	13	18%	74	76%	2	2%	21	22%	97	
	SICI	256	133	52%	132	99%	54	41%	133	52%	52	20%	71	28%	256	
	ICC	244	203	83%	194	96%	87	45%	203	83%	11	5%	30	12%	244	
	Total	676	470	70%	458	97%	186	41%	470	70%	66	10%	140	21%	676	
FY 08																
	ICIO	92	72	78%	72	100%			72	78%	1	1%	19	21%	92	
	SBWCC	150	95	63%	93	98%			95	63%	9	6%	46	31%	150	
	SICI	226	133	59%	118	89%			133	59%	5	2%	88	39%	226	
	ICC	286	243	85%	239	98%			243	85%	9	3%	34	12%	286	
	Total	754	543	72%	522	96%			543	72%	24	3%	187	25%	754	
FY 09																
	ICIO	69	56	81%	55	98%			56	81%	2	3%	11	16%	69	
	SBWCC	162	106	65%	90	85%			106	65%	12	7%	44	27%	162	
	SICI	162	111	69%	102	92%			111	69%	9	6%	42	26%	162	
	ICC	263	204	78%	192	94%			204	78%	8	3%	51	19%	263	
	Total	656	477	73%	439	92%			477	73%	31	5%	148	23%	656	
Grand Totals		5,379	3,684	68%	3,462	94%	1,173	47%	3,684	68%	500	9%	1195	22%	5379	

¹The percent of individuals paroled is a percentage of those who completed the program, while the percentage of those revoked is calculated on those who paroled.

²The potential exists for the total number of exits to exceed the number of participants because some individuals participated in the program more than once.

³Comparison group is made up of TC participants during the period FYs 1999 through 2007 that did not complete.



Section 4

A New Direction

Idaho Department of Correction

C.L. "Butch" Otter
Governor

**Robin Sandy
Jay Nielsen**
Board of Correction

Brent Reinke
Director

A New Direction (ND) is an intensive substance abuse program developed by Hazelden Publishing and Educational Services and the Minnesota Department of Correction specifically for incarcerated offenders. ND is a comprehensive cognitive-behavioral therapy treatment program that trains chemically dependent offenders to challenge their thinking in order to change criminal and addictive behavior patterns. This cognitive-behavioral approach helps inmates understand how their attitudes and assumptions fuel destructive behaviors.

The Idaho Department of Correction began using ND at the North Idaho Correctional Institution (NICI) in October 2002 and offenders began completing the program by the end of February 2003. NICI provides a short term incarcerated intensive programming environment for offenders sentenced to retained jurisdiction (Riders). The program includes the following modules: Intake and Orientation, Criminal and Addictive Thinking, Drug and Alcohol Education, Socialization, Relapse Prevention, and Release and Reintegration. The offender spends 16 hours per week in facilitated groups and another 16 hours working on classroom assignments and homework. Offenders in this program are isolated from other offenders to enhance their change process. Due to program-staff limitations only the highest risk offenders receive ND programming. There are 116 beds available for offenders in the ND program. Staff at NICI use LSI-R scores to screen offenders and make programming assignments. Entry criteria for ND include an LSI-R total score of 31 or greater and a Substance Abuse domain score of 0.6 or greater. These scores are quite high so only the very highest risk offenders participate in ND. Even so the number of qualifying offenders frequently exceeds existing bed space. Once available bed space is used, excess offenders with identified ND needs were assigned to other cognitive based programs.

Chart 1 shows Rider participation and completion. Historically about 97% of Riders completing ND programming are subsequently released to probation (Table 1). This is substantially higher than the normal rate for all Riders of approximately 90%. Clearly the courts consider ND completion a very positive indicator of an offender's ability to succeed in the community, even for offenders whose LSI indicates high risk of re-offense. Of Riders who completed ND and went to Probation during the period FYs 2003 through 2007, 47% have revoked Probation. A group of 1,192 Riders with similar needs, as indicated by LSI-R scores, who did not complete ND during the same period (generally because of limited capacity), revoked Probation at a rate of 51% (difference between rates is statistically significant, $\chi^2 = 5.12$, $p=0.0237$, odds ratio = 1.19, 95% confidence interval 1.03 to 1.39). This is still a preliminary comparison as IDOC's implementation of the ND program and its associated aftercare process is still evolving. Revocation analysis excludes offenders who have had less than 30 months on Probation. Completing a revocation analysis before the study group offenders have been on Probation for at least 30 months will result in understating the actual size of the revocation problem.

Table 1 shows the number of participants and completers by year. The completion rate is based on the number of offenders who completed compared to the number of offenders who participated. Since IDOC began using the ND program, 90% of all participants have successfully completed the program. Completion rates are a valuable indicator of a successful system. It is also important to monitor release rates as the Probation preparation process is continually improved. Table 1 also includes the number of offenders released to community supervision after successful completion of ND and associated Probation revocations, as well as exit reasons for those who do not complete the ND Program.

Chart 1

New Direction Rider Participation, Completion and Release




Table 1
A New Direction Participation By Fiscal Year

Program Exit Year	Facility	Individual Participation			Outcome by Offender Completions				Offender Exits						
		Individuals	Completions		Probation		Revocation		Completions		Withdrawals		Terminations		Total
		#	#	%	#	% ¹	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
FY 03	NICI	106	94	89%	90	96%	51	57%	94	89%	6	6%	6	6%	106
FY 04	NICI	404	378	94%	370	98%	200	54%	378	94%	10	2%	16	4%	404
FY 05	NICI	460	436	95%	422	97%	206	49%	436	95%	15	3%	9	2%	460
FY 06	NICI	474	432	91%	420	97%	180	43%	432	91%	13	3%	29	6%	474
FY 07	NICI	361	308	85%	300	97%	111	37%	308	85%	15	4%	38	11%	361
FY 08	NICI	246	205	83%	203	99%	Not enough time has elapsed to provide meaningful revocation information for this time period		205	83%	13	5%	28	11%	246
FY 09	NICI	129	106	82%	105	99%			106	82%	18	14%	6	5%	130
Grand Totals		2,180	1,959	90%	1,910	97%	748	47%	1,959	90%	90	4%	132	6%	2,181

¹The percent of individuals receiving Probation is a percentage of those individuals who completed the program, while the percentage of those who revoked is calculated based on those who were placed on Probation



Section 5

Vocational Education

Idaho Department of Correction

Vocational Education programs are available throughout the Department of Correction for incarcerated offenders who have been identified as needing job skills and/or job seeking skills. These courses provide training in several different areas:

1. Workforce Readiness: Soft skills including:
 - Ethics, Resume Writing, Interviewing, Vocational Math, Vocational Safety, Customer Service, Self-Care, Business Communication, and Personal Finance. The total course is 180 hours and certificated through IDOC.
2. Workforce Skills: Hard skills for the workplace.
 - Welding (160 hours), Carpentry (80 hours), Plumbing (72 hours), Electrical (11 weeks), Commercial Cleaning (8 weeks), and Office Management (100 hours). These courses are certificated through the National Center for Construction Education and Research (NCCER) and/or Boise State University, Lewis Clark State University, Eastern Idaho Technical College, and Idaho State University.
 - The carpentry staff collaborates with Habitat for Humanity for practical experience, and has been a part of twelve housing builds in the past five years. Boise State University, Habitat for Humanity, and the Idaho Department of Correction have developed a memorandum of understanding to deliver the services for this non-profit organization.
 - Welding at the Boise prisons has come about through a collaborative effort between Boise State University, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Correction, Correctional Work Centers, Boise School District, Treasure Valley Metals Manufacturing Industries Council, US Department of Labor, Idaho Department of Labor, and the Division of Professional Technical Education. Welding in the Orofino Prison is through a collaborative effort between ICIO and Lewis Clark State College.
3. Workforce Experience: Institutional jobs, including Correctional Industries and work-projects, make up the largest portion of the work experience component.

This analysis reviews the accomplishments of selected programs available to offenders within the Vocational Education Program at the Idaho Department of Correction. This analysis will look at several measures of each program for FYs 2005 through 2009. These will include the number of participants in each program, the number of those participants who earned certificates in each program, the number of those earning certificates who subsequently paroled, and the number of those who paroled who later revoked their parole. This information is presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3. Analyses were completed for the carpentry, plumbing, and welding programs. Analysis of other programs within the vocational education program has not been presented as there were an insufficient number of certificates awarded during this time period in these programs to be able to perform a meaningful analysis.

C.L. "Butch" Otter
Governor

Robin Sandy
Jay Nielsen
Board of Correction

Brent Reinke
Director

	Participation			Outcome by Offender Certificates Earned			
	Individuals	Certificates Earned		Parole		Revocation	
	#	#	%	#	% ¹	#	%
FY 05	92	69	75%	36	52%	15	42%
FY 06	79	38	48%	22	58%	9	41%
FY 07	102	81	79%	31	38%	8	26%
FY 08	103	13	13%	6	46%	0	0%
FY 09	132	24	18%	3	13%	1	33%
Totals	508	225	44%	98	44%	33	34%

¹The percent of individuals receiving parole is calculated as a percent of the number of individuals who earned certificates, while the percent of those who revoked is calculated as a percent of the number of individuals placed on parole.

	Participation			Outcome by Offender Certificates Earned			
	Individuals	Certificates Earned		Parole		Revocation	
	#	#	%	#	% ¹	#	%
FY 05	20	19	95%	11	58%	4	36%
FY 06	24	24	100%	22	92%	8	36%
FY 07	20	18	90%	11	61%	0	0%
FY 08	47	43	91%	27	63%	1	4%
FY 09	26	13	50%	1	8%	0	0%
Totals	137	117	85%	72	62%	13	18%

¹The percent of individuals receiving parole is calculated as a percent of the number of individuals who earned certificates, while the percent of those who revoked is calculated as a percent of the number of individuals placed on parole.

	Participation			Outcome by Offender Certificates Earned			
	Individuals	Certificates Earned		Parole		Revocation	
	#	#	%	#	% ¹	#	%
FY 05	7	5	71%	3	60%	0	0%
FY 06	65	33	51%	10	30%	2	20%
FY 07	73	19	26%	2	11%	0	0%
FY 08	74	12	16%	4	33%	1	25%
FY 09	60	22	37%	0	0%	0	0%
Totals	279	91	33%	19	21%	3	16%

¹The percent of individuals receiving parole is calculated as a percent of the number of individuals who earned certificates, while the percent of those who revoked is calculated as a percent of the number of individuals placed on parole.

The employment rate of paroled inmates who participated in carpentry, welding, or plumbing classes but who did not earn a vocational certificate was 67% and the employment rate of paroled inmates who did earn a carpentry, welding, or plumbing vocational education certificate was 63%. The difference between these rates is not statistically significant at the 95% confidence level ($\chi^2 = 0.20$, $p = 0.6548$).

Another useful measure is improvement in earnings as it relates to attainment of a vocational certificate. We compared the average hourly wage of parolees who did not earn a vocational certificate with the average for those who did earn a certificate. The average hourly wage of parolees who earned a vocational certificate was \$10.81 while the average hourly wage of paroled inmates who did not earn a vocational education certificate was \$9.98. The difference in average hourly wage between these two groups is not statistically significant at the 95% confidence level ($t = 1.12$, $p = 0.2662$).

We also attempted to correlate the type of vocational training certificate earned with the types of employment offenders were able to obtain upon release. For the vast majority of offenders there appears to be little correlation between the type of vocational training certificate earned and the type of employment obtained after being released. During the period of interest, FYs 2005 through 2009, there were only ten such instances. Four offenders with carpentry certificates obtained employment relating to carpentry, two with plumbing certificates obtained employment relating to plumbing, and four with welding certificates obtained employment relating to welding.

Table 1
A New Direction Participation By Fiscal Year

	Participation			Outcome by Offender Certificates Earned			
	Individuals	Certificates Earned		Parole		Revocation	
	#	#	%	#	% ¹	#	%
FY 05	200	138	69%	92	67%	30	33%
FY 06	401	265	66%	115	43%	30	26%
FY 07	395	206	52%	61	30%	12	20%
FY 08	452	177	39%	63	36%	7	11%
FY 09	497	166	33%	25	15%	2	8%
Totals	1,945	952	49%	356	37%	81	23%

¹The percent of individuals receiving parole is calculated as a percent of the number of individuals who earned certificates, while the percent of those who revoked is calculated as a percent of the number of individuals placed on parole

Compare revocation % to historical general revocation rate of ~40%

Appendix 4

Definitions

Appendix 4, DEFINITIONS

Admission – 1. An offender who has been committed by the courts to the Idaho Department of Correction. The offender may enter the department's jurisdiction in Probation, Rider or Term status. 2. A change from one status to another. For example, a status change from Probation or Rider to Term is typically referred to as an admission to Term.

Bed Offender - An offender in Term, Rider or Parole Violator status, under the jurisdiction of the Idaho Department of Correction, incarcerated in a state institution or other facility, for which the department pays the cost of incarceration on a per diem basis.

Caseload Offender - An offender in Probation or Parole status, under the jurisdiction of the Idaho Department of Correction, who is actively supervised by Community Corrections.

Civil Commitment - A form of confinement for offenders who are mentally ill, incompetent, alcoholic or drug addicted, as contrasted with the criminal commitment for their offense. Since they represent a per diem obligation to the Department, they are grouped with Term offenders.

Court Commitment – An action of the courts when an offender is convicted and sentenced to supervision or incarceration by the Idaho Department of Correction. The offender may enter the department's jurisdiction in Probation, Rider or Term status.

Discharged Offender - Offenders whose court commitment is satisfied or who die while under the jurisdiction of the Idaho Department of Correction. Offenders may be discharged from Probation, Rider, Term, Parole or Parole Violator status.

Failed Rider – An offender who was committed by the courts to the Rider program, but upon completion of the program, the court decided to incarcerate in prison. The offender's status will change to Term.

Incarcerated - An offender who has been committed by the courts to one of the Idaho Department of Correction institutions. Riders, Term offenders and Parole Violators are considered incarcerated.

New Commitment - An offender who has been committed by the courts to the Idaho Department of Correction for the first time, or after satisfying a previous court commitment has been committed for a new crime. They may enter in a Probation, Rider, or Term status.

Non Bed Offender - An offender who is under the jurisdiction of the Idaho Department of Correction, but is not housed in a state institution or other facility for which the department pays the cost of incarceration on a per diem basis. They could be in a county testifying, on detainer to another governmental entity, an escapee, or in a record tracking status.

Non Caseload Offender - An offender who has been placed on Probation or Parole status, but is not actively supervised by Community Corrections. They may have been deported, placed under court supervision, on detainer, or bench warrant. They will be kept on Community Corrections records until their sentence is satisfied and then be discharged.

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

Non Idaho Offender - An offender who is sentenced by a jurisdiction other than Idaho, but is housed by the Idaho Department of Correction for security reasons. Since they represent a per diem obligation to the Department, they are grouped with Term offenders.

Offender – A person under the legal care, custody or supervision, or the authority of the Board of Correction, including any person within or outside the state, pursuant to agreement with another governmental entity or a contractor.

Parole Violator - An offender who has been placed on Parole and then violates the conditions of their parole. Parole Violator status is usually a temporary status until a hearing can be conducted to determine if the offender will be returned to Term or Parole status. It is considered an incarcerated status.

Paroled Offender - An offender that the parole commission has decided to place in society after serving a portion of their sentence. They are supervised by a Parole Officer until their court commitment is satisfied. The offender is referred to as a Parolee.

Probation - The status of an offender that the courts have decided to allow to serve their sentence while living in society. They are not incarcerated, but are supervised by a Probation Officer until their sentence is satisfied. The offender is referred to as a Probationer.

Reinstated Parole – The action that results when an offender has violated their parole but the Parole Commission subsequently decides to reinstate them in Parole status instead of returning them to prison.

Retained Jurisdiction – The status of an offender that the courts have decided to send to the Rider program. The courts retain jurisdiction until the offender completes the program. The courts will subsequently determine whether to place the offender in Probation or Term status or to withhold judgment. Also referred to as Rider.

Revoked Parole – The condition resulting when an offender who, while on parole, violates the conditions of their parole and is placed back in prison by the Parole Commission. When an offender revokes parole they again become a Termer.

Revoked Probation - An offender who, while serving probation, violates the conditions of their probation and the court changes their sentence to incarceration. The offender's status changes from Probation to Term, or sometimes Rider.

Rider – see Retained Jurisdiction.

Term – The status of an offender who the courts or the Parole Commission has committed to prison. The offender is referred to as an inmate or a Termer.

FY 2009 Annual Statistical Report

This document is intended to be distributed primarily in electronic form.

For Inquiries regarding this report contact:

Gregory J. Sali
Review and Analysis
Idaho Department of Correction
1299 N. Orchard
Boise Idaho 83720

Phone (208) 658-2145
E-mail gsali@corr.state.id.us