FINDINGS FROM THE APAI INTERNATIONAL SURVEY OF RELEASING AUTHORITIES

Submitted by

Susan C. Kinnevy, PhD

Joel M. Caplan, MA

University of Pennsylvania

April, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		List of Tables……...	ii
		Key Findings……...	1
		Executive Summary……	2
I.		Introduction…….	4
II.		Acknowledgements…….	4
III.		Survey Design and Implementation……	5
		Response Rates……	6
IV.		Survey Results – State Agencies Only……	7
	A.	Structure of Releasing Authorities…….	7
	B.	Scope of Releasing Authorities…….....	9
	C.	Release Decision Process……	12
	D.	Time Served and Early Release……..	19
	E.	Supervision……..	24
	F.	Violations of Supervision Conditions…….....	30
	G.	Revocations…….....	32
	H.	Statistics and Recidivism……	34
V.		Summary of Findings……..	37
VI.		Appendices	
	A.	Findings from Federal and Other Country Releasing Authorities……..	41
	B.	Survey Questionnaire …….	70

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Survey Response Rate……..……....	6
	STRUCTURE	
Table 2.	Membership, Confirmation and Terms…….……..	7
Table 3.	Appointments and Organizational Location…….……..	8
Table 4.	Statutorily Mandated Presumption of Parole……..……	9
	SCOPE	
Table 5.	Contextual Statistics……..……..	9
Table 6.	Responsibilities, Jurisdiction and Framework…….……...	10
Table 7.	Authority to Release…….……..	11
Table 8.	Release Prior to Maximum Time Served…….……..	11
Table 9.	Authority to Set Minimum Time in Prison…..……...…….	12
	RELEASE DECISION PROCESS	
Table 10.	Use of Decision-Making and Risk Assessment Instruments…..	13
Table 11.	Role of Case/Hearing Officer……..……	14
Table 12.	Interviews……..……..	15
Table 13.	Voting……..…	16
Table 14.	Input Considered in Release Decisions…….….	16
Table 15.	Permissible Types of Input From Victim and Non-Victims..….	17
Table 16.	Required Victim and Non-Victim Input…….……	17
Table 17.	Impact of Victim and Non-Victim Input…….……...	18
Table 18.	Factors Impacting Decision to Release…..…….	19
	TIME SERVED AND EARLY RELEASE	
Table 19.	Minimum Time to Serve…….……	20
Table 20.	Required Community Service…….……	20
Table 21.	Factors Delaying Release…….……..	21
Table 22.	Options for Early Release……...	22
Table 23.	Time Off Credits…….…	23

SUPERVISION

Table 24. Supervision – Jurisdiction…….. 25

Table 25. Supervision – Conditions……..... 26

Table 26. Power to Set Conditions…… 26

Table 27. Influence of Input on Conditions……..….. 27

Table 28. Supervision – Levels……..…. 28

Table 29. Administrative Supervision…… 29

Table 30. Authority to Terminate Supervision…..……..… 29

Table 31. Management of Community-Based Facilities……..... 30

VIOLATIONS OF SUPERVISION CONDITIONS

Table 32. Available Responses to Conditions Violations…….. 31

Table 33. Authority to Impose Responses……... 31

Table 34. Decision Matrix and Approvals…….. 32

REVOCATIONS

Table 35. Authority over Revocations……..... 33

Table 36. Decision Matrix for Revocations…… 33

Table 37. Options for Revocations…….. 34

STATISTICS AND RECIDIVISM

Table 38. Difficulty Producing Statistics……..... 35

Table 39. Recidivism Rates……..... 36

Table 40. Alternatives to Incarceration……..... 37

Key Findings

- Members of 34 U.S. RAs are confirmed by legislative process and members of 41 U.S. RAs serve a fixed term of office averaging five years.
- Governors appoint members for 85% of the U.S. RAs.
- Over 75% the U.S. RAs are independent agencies, either standing alone or attached to another entity.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, all were confirmed by their legislative bodies, serve terms ranging from three - six years.

Scope of Releasing Authorities

- Over a third (34.0%) of U.S. RAs operate within a determinate sentencing framework; under a quarter (21.3%) operate within an indeterminate framework; the remaining (44.7%) use both determinate and indeterminate sentencing.
- 75% percent of U.S. RAs in jurisdictions with determinate sentencing frameworks indicate that they have some authority to release prior to sentence completion, illustrating that even determinate sentencing structures incorporate a discretionary release determination.
- 32% of U.S. RAs have the authority to make pardon release decisions that alter the original sentence.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, four have both determinate and indeterminate sentencing structures, one did not respond and one has determinate only.

Factors Delaying Release

- 44 U.S. RAs indicate they require program completion as a condition of release and only two U.S. RAs report having enough programs.
- The most commonly ranked factor was “delays in program completion.”
- The next most frequently cited factors that delay release are: “offenders not available for interviews,” “reports (post sentence and other investigations) not completed on time” and “waiting for victim input.”
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, four did not respond, one reported delay in program completion and one reported inadequate staffing as primary reasons of delay.

Release Decision Process

- Over 80% of the U.S. RAs report using decision-making instruments or parole guidelines; over 88% of those that do use instruments include a scoring process.
- Thirty-two out of 37 U.S. RAs responding reported that they use a risk assessment instrument; the most frequently used instruments are those developed in-house, Static-99 (sex offenders only) and LSI-R.
- When U.S. RAs were asked to rank the sources of input they consider in deciding release, in addition to official records on the offender and the crime, the most often cited were the victim (44), the offender’s family (42) and the district attorney (41), respectively.
- Depending on the crime, between 60 - 81% of U.S. RAs are required to consider victim input when making release decisions. 87% permit in-person interviews, which are considered to have the most impact by 34 RAs.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, five reported that they possess the final authority to release for all cases.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, three reported use of parole guidelines, three do not use guidelines and three report use of other risk assessments.

Time Served

- Just under 50% of the U.S. RAs use a “percent of the sentence” to determine the minimum to serve for violent, sex, drug and public order crimes. Just over 50% use the same guide to determine the minimum for property crimes.
- Approximately one third of the U.S. RAs have fixed minimums for property, drug and public order crimes.
- Between 35 - 40% of U.S. RAs have fixed minimums for violent and sex crimes.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, for all offense categories, three respondents reported a requirement for a percent of minimum served and one reported a fixed portion of time served.
  — Throughout this document, the term ‘releasing authority’ (RA) refers to parole boards or other releasing entities.
  — Six non-U.S. respondents replied to this survey: National Parole Board of Canada, Ontario Parole and Earned Release Board, Parole Board of Bermuda, New Zealand Parole Board, Parole Board of Puerto Rico, and England and Wales Parole Board.
  — When the term “U.S. RAs” is used, it is referring to state jurisdictions and does not include responses of the responding Federal entities: U.S. Parole Commission, or the U.S. Army, U.S. Navy and U.S. Air Force Clemency and Parole Boards.
  — For complete comparative data, see the full report.

Time Credits

- Over 72% of U.S. RAs (n=34) reported the availability of time-off credits for property, drug and public order offenses.
- Slightly fewer U.S. RAs offered credits for sex offenses (n=28 or 60%) and violent offenses (n=29 or 62%).
- For all crime categories, statutory good time and meritorious good time (program completion) were the two most

common circumstances under which credits are offered.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, four respondents reported time-off credits are not available and one respondent indicated time-off credits are available for all categories.

Interviews
- Almost three-quarters of the responding U.S. RAs report that inmate interviews are required as part of the release decision process.
- A higher percentage of U.S. RAs use in-person interviews during the release decision process across crime categories, with videotaped interviews being used secondarily.
- In 70% of the U.S. jurisdictions, a panel of RA members conducts inmate interviews, with most being a panel of three, or a panel of two with the third as a tie-breaker.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, three indicated personal interviews are required, one responded that an individual authority member interview is required and five indicated the use of a panel.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, four indicated a requirement to seek victim input.

Supervision Policy and Practice
- 68% of U.S. RAs have at least some authority over supervision.
- 27 U.S. RAs use a risk assessment instrument to determine conditions of parole.
- 22 U.S. RAs use a risk assessment instrument to determine levels of supervision.
- Over half the U.S. RAs have authority to terminate supervision prior to maximum sentence for all offenders across crime categories.
- Over one third of the U.S. RAs report having no authority to terminate parole for offenders under their jurisdiction regardless of crime categories.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, four reported no authority over parole and probation jurisdictional or federal populations and one reported partial authority over parole and jurisdictional populations.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, four reported authority to determine conditions of release for all crime categories and one reported partial authority to set conditions for all crime categories.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, two indicated use of an assessment instrument to establish levels of supervision.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, four reported authority to terminate supervision and two reported no authority to terminate supervision.

Violations of Conditions and Revocations
- 19 U.S. RAs (44%) use a decision matrix for intermediate sanctions short of revocation to prison; 12 use a matrix for revocation to prison decisions; 11 use time setting guidelines for revocation decisions.
- Over 90% of the U.S. RAs indicated that they respond to violations using treatment programs, electronic monitoring or house arrest.
- Over 50% of the U.S. RAs indicated that they respond to violations using day reporting centers, brief jail stays, and halfway back residential centers.
- Over 90% of the U.S. RAs can opt to revoke parole and send offenders back to prison.
- Over 70% of the U.S. RAs can revoke parole and send offenders to in-prison treatment programs.
- Over 80% of the U.S. RAs can choose not to revoke parole, but do place offenders in community-based facilities. Over 60% choose not to revoke parole, but do send offenders to intermediate sanction facilities.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, three reported limited responses available for conditions violations.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, five reported management of violations with authority to revoke and two reported authority to set time served. However, three hold the authority to revoke, two have the option to send violators to community facilities.

Statistics and Recidivism
- 19 U.S. RAs (44%) reported some level of difficulty in producing statistics for “number of offenders paroled.”
- 29 U.S. RAs provided recidivism rates over periods ranging from one to over three years.
- 14 U.S. RAs reported that their one-year average recidivism rate grew by 25%, 4 RAs reported two-year rates of 35% and 11 RAs reported three or more year rates of 43.4%.
- The most cited events included in recidivism rates were new convictions (29), revocation for new criminal activity (28) and technical violations (28), all of which resulted in a return to prison.
- 19 U.S. RAs reported having secure alternative facilities that can be used in place of incarceration. Of these, 15 reported that violators could be held in these facilities for several months or longer without being counted in the recidivism rate.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, two reported moderate to high difficulty in reporting statistics and two reported high to impossible in reporting statistics.
- Of the non-U.S. respondents, three respondents reported a one year recidivism rate between .5% - 8.5%.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

APAI partnered with the Center for Research on Youth and Social Policy (CRYSP) at the University of Pennsylvania, the Pew Foundation, and the Georgia State Board of Pardons and Paroles to design and implement an international survey of releasing authorities.[1] The survey was sent to the administrative head of every releasing authority (RA) that was a member of APAI as of November 2007 (n=67). Respondents were asked a series of questions related to the structure and scope of the RA, the release decision process, time served and early release, supervision, violations of supervision, and revocation. RAs were also asked about decision-making instruments and to provide statistics on their offender populations. The response rate was 87.7%, with 47 of 50 states participating.

Most RAs are appointed by the Governor and serve an average of five years. They are most often independent agencies or affiliated with the Department of Corrections. A majority of states have the authority to make final release decisions and make those decisions with mixed determinate and indeterminate sentencing structure. Over half the RAs require interviews with parole eligible offenders prior to release, with most interviews conducted in-person by a panel of RA members. A minimum of three panel members and three votes are needed to decide release.

The top three sources of input considered by RAs in their decision release process are from the victim, the offender's family and the district attorney. Other factors that impact most heavily on the decision to release are crime severity, crime type, and offender criminal history respectively. The most frequently cited factor in delayed release is a delay in program completion. Program completion is a prerequisite for release in most states; almost all states report that they do not have enough available programs. Most states do give time off credits (TOC), the most common one being statutory good time.

More than half of RAs have full authority over supervision and most have the power to set conditions of supervision for all their offenders across crime categories. More than half the RAs also have the authority terminate supervision prior to maximum sentence for all offenders across crime categories. The most often cited responses to violations of supervision are outpatient and inpatient treatment programs, electronic monitory, and house arrest. Most RAs can approve motions to revoke parole and over half can issue arrest warrants. Almost all RAs have the authority to manage or adjudicate violations, although only 75% can set the time to serve for revocation.

Over 90% of RAs can revoke supervision for all offenders across crime categories. Options for revocation for most RAs include both revocation options that return offenders to prison with or without treatment and non-revocation options that place offenders in intermediate sanctions or community-based facilities. Management of community-based facilities usually resides with the states Correctional Authority. With regard to instruments used to guide the parole process, the most commonly cited are Static-99,

[1] The project was funded by JEHT Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts

LSI-R, and instruments developed in-house. However, the only instruments that are routinely validated are those developed in-house.

The most easily produced and regularly published statistic is the number of offenders paroled in a given calendar year. Other statistics seem to be difficult to produce, perhaps because the RAs are not always the entity that manages statistics. Only 29 RAs provided recidivism rates, with averages ranging from 25.1% calculated for one year to 4.28% calculated for over three years. The offender population used to calculate rates varied too much to report a pattern. The events used to calculate recidivism were generally those that resulted in incarceration. Only 19 RAs reported having secure facilities that can be used in place of incarceration.

Overall, the APAI survey was successful in gathering a great deal of information about the policies and protocols of the RAs domestically and, to a lesser extent, internationally. Full findings from the state RAs are presented in the body of this report. Findings from federal and other country RAs are tabulated in *Appendix A*.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Association of Paroling Authorities International (APAI) is the recognized voice for the highest professional standards of responsible parole practices. The APAI came to life in the early 1970s when a group of international colleagues in the field of parole expressed a strong interest in discussing best practices and current issues surrounding early release, reentry into the community and public safety. The association is dedicated to the professional development of those involved in the parole process in an effort to create an environment to guide, influence and facilitate best practices. The mission of APAI is "to demonstrate, through embracing APAI's established values, that the parole process of the criminal justice system is an essential element for making our society a safer, better place to live." APAI membership is comprised of both individuals and organizations from more than 38 countries.

The APAI has conducted surveys of paroling authorities since 1997. Each annual survey focused on different topics including parole board authority, policies and practices. Responses were adequate, but final reports were often not comprehensive nor were they consistent from year to year.

Taking into account the current mission of the APAI, this study improved upon past surveys in three ways. First, it was designed and vetted by parole practitioners and university researchers in an effort to ask meaningful questions that would encourage respondents to give valid and reliable answers. Second, it was the first survey to be administered online. This increased response rates and improved the collection and management of response data. Finally, quantitative data was analyzed to provide more detailed and comprehensive findings than in past reports.

II. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was a joint collaboration by the APAI with the Center for Research on Youth and Social Policy (CRYSP) at the University of Pennsylvania, The Pew Charitable Trusts, the Georgia State Board of Pardons and Paroles, and the Pennsylvania Parole Board, with funding from the JEHT Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts. The goal was to examine and compare the current states of parole authority, discretion and practices among releasing authorities from the 50 states, the federal government, and APAI member countries outside the United States. A survey was developed to address these issues and was administered to a total of 67 releasing authorities. A “releasing authority” was defined as an organizational entity in government whose function was to consider offenders for parole, render decisions for release from prison, and/or supervise released offenders. The survey was administered online via SurveyMonkey, an online survey design tool. This provided respondents with a user-friendly interface to complete the survey and it streamlined the collection and management of response data.

III. SURVEY DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

The survey was sent to the administrative head of 67 releasing authorities that were members of APAI as of November 2007, including all 50 states. The administrative head (i.e. chairperson, director) was asked to complete the survey him or herself, or to designate an appropriate representative to do so in his or her place. Respondents were asked to consult whatever resources were available to them to ensure that the answers provided were accurate and up-to-date.

The survey had 13 sections with a total of 112 questions. Section 1 was an introduction and the other sections covered the following topics, respectively: 2) demographics, 3) the structure of the releasing authority, 4) the general sentencing framework within which the releasing authority operates, 5) time-off credits, 6) parole release decision-making processes, 7) information about offenders in the community, 8) conditions of supervision, 9) supervision levels, 10) paroling authority's role (if any) with offenders who were supervised in the community, 11) paroling authority's role and process (if any) in responding to violations of community supervision and revoking conditional release, 12) counting and quantitative questions, and 13) recidivism. Unless questions indicated otherwise, respondents were asked to answer questions from the perspectives of their jurisdiction's current sentencing laws.

Survey respondents were provided with the following Glossary of Terms:

> *Administrative Supervision*- a level of established parole supervision in which the parolee only reports in annually or some other infrequent basis to note changes in residency and work.
>
> *Revocation*- a decision by a releasing authority to revoke a parolee's conditional release and return the offender to prison.
>
> *Releasing Authority Member*- an individual within a releasing authority who is in power by law to make parole decisions and/or revocation decisions.
>
> *Releasing Authority Case Examiner*- also known as a hearing examiner, parole commissioner or hearing officer. Depending on the jurisdiction these individuals have varying levels of responsibility and authority from voting privileges to release or revoke in support of, or in conjunction with Board Members. Their authority may be only to make recommendations to Board Members, analyze cases, hold parole release hearings or hold violation hearings.
>
> *Risk and Needs Assessment*- a formal process of evaluating cases from a standard set of questions that have predictive validity in evaluating the risk or likelihood of re-offending and identifying criminogenic needs.

Parole Decision Making Guideline - a formal process of evaluating cases under parole consideration using a standard tool or screening instrument. Typically, a decisional guideline rates the offender with validated factors and scores the likelihood of a parole decision for a case within the norms of the decision-making process.

Survey Responses Rates

The survey was distributed to 67 Releasing Authorities (RA) within and outside the United States. Over 85% of RA's responded, with the majority of them providing complete or nearly complete data (*Table 1*). Over 90% of the states that were asked to respond did so; the only states that did not respond were California, Indiana, and Mississippi. As it would be difficult to compare states with non-states, this report presents comparative results from the 47 states only. Results for the non-states are presented in *Appendix A*.

Table 1. Survey Response Rate

	# Distributed	# Responded	% Responded
US - States	50	47	94.0%
US - Federal	4	4	100.0%
Canada (Nat'l PB & 2 Provincial PBs)	3	2	66.7%
Other Countries (inc. Puerto Rico)	8	4	50.0%
Total	**65**	**57**	**87.7%**

IV. SURVEY RESULTS – STATE AGENCIES ONLY

A. STRUCTURE OF RELEASING AUTHORITY

As *Table 2* indicates, the State Releasing Authorities tend to have more full time than part-time members and more Case/Hearing Examiners than actual members. Over 60% of the responding states reported that their members are confirmed by the state legislature; over 90% reported that the membership term is fixed. The average length of that fixed term is five years.

Table 2. Membership, Confirmation and Terms

Participants	**Average**
# Full-Time Members (n=42)	5.5
# Part-Time Members (n=34)	3.4
# Full-Time Case/Hearing Examiners (n=44)	9.5
# Part-Time Case/Hearing Examiners (n=31)	1.2
Confirmation/Terms	**Frequency**
# Confirmed by Legislature (n=46)	34 (60.7%)
# w/Fixed Term of Office (n=45)	41 (91.1%)
Length of Term (n=40)	5 years

Table 3 demonstrates that Governors appoint members for 85% of the RAs. Over 75% the RAs are independent agencies, either standing alone or attached to another entity. Those that report being attached are all affiliated with the state Department of Corrections. Over 60% of states report that there is no presumption of parole for any type of crime (*Table 4*). Where there is a mandated presumption, it most often applies to property, drug and public order crimes.

Table 3. Appointments and Organizational Location

Type of Appointments (n=46)	**Frequency**
Civil Service	2
Appointed by Governor	39 (84.8%)
Appointed by Other Official	5
List of Other Officials Making Appointments	
Governor and Cabinet	1
Director, MI Dept. of Corrections	1
Director of Department of Rehabilitation and Correction	1
Governor (3)/ Chief Justice Supreme Court (1) / Presiding Judge Court of Criminal Appeals (1)	1
3 by Governor, 3 by State Attorney General and 3 by the Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court	1
Organizational Location (n=47)	
Within Dept. of Corrections	6
Within Another Agency	4
Independent/attached to another entity	15
Independent/stand alone	22
List of Other Affiliated Agencies (n=17)	
Department of Corrections	13
Department of Criminal Justice	1
Department of Public Safety	1

Table 4. Statutorily Mandated Presumption of Parole

	Crime Category				
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
	n=47	n=47	n=47	n=47	n=47
Portion of Crimes	**Valid Percent of States**				
all	14.9	17.0	27.7	27.7	27.7
some	21.3	21.3	6.4	8.5	4.3
none	63.8	61.7	66.0	63.8	68.1

B. SCOPE OF RELEASING AUTHORITIES

Respondents were asked for general statistics, if available, to provide a context for understanding the scope of responsibilities handled by the RAs. There appeared to be some difficulty in some RAs ability to provide the statistics. The most commonly provided statistic was the number of offenders eligible for parole in the last calendar year.

As *Table 5* documents, with 90% of states reporting, the mean number of offenders considered for parole in 2006 was 8,355. With regard to supervision of parolees and reparolees, almost 75% of states reported a mean of 10,754 offenders in this category.

Far fewer states responded to questions on the supervision of other offenders, including probationers. Those that did reported averages in excess of 20,000 offenders. It seems that if a RAs authority includes other offenders as well as parolees and reparolees, the scope of their authority doubles. The survey did not ask the number of officers available to supervise in states with this extended scope.

Table 5. Contextual Statistics

Relevant Statistics	**mean**
# offenders considered for release (n=42)	8,355
# parolees and reparolees under RA supervision (n=35)	10,754
	Valid Percent
officers supervise other offenders? (n=43)	69.8
	mean
# other offenders under RA supervision (n=18)	20,581
# probationers under RA supervision (n=10)	25,659

Over half the responding RAs (51.1%) do not have the authority to commute the death sentence, alter original sentences or restore rights to offenders when they are released (*Table 6*). With regard to the RAs that do have authority, it is interesting to note that more of them have the ability to affect the sentence than to affect the rights of offenders. Only 17% of RAs have authority over offenders from the county; 12.8% have authority over juveniles as well as adults. Over a third (34.0%) of states operate within a determinate sentencing framework; under a quarter (21.3%) operate within an indeterminate framework; the remaining (44.7%) use both determinate and indeterminate sentencing.

Table 6. Responsibilities, Jurisdiction and Framework

Responsibilities	**Frequency**	**Valid Percent**
Commuting less than death sentence	16	34.0
Making pardon release decisions that alter original sentence	15	31.9
Restoring right to vote	11	23.4
Restoring right to hold public office	10	21.3
Restoring right to carry firearm	12	25.5
Restoring right to hold certain licenses/occupy certain jobs	11	23.4
None of the above	24	51.1
Jurisdiction - Geographic		
State	44	93.6
County	8	17.0
Jurisdiction - Population		
Adults	46	97.9
Juveniles	6	12.8
Sentencing Framework		
Determinate Only	16	34.0
Indeterminate Only	10	21.3
Both	21	44.7

As *Table 7* indicates, 43 of the 47 (93.3%) responding RAs reported that they have the authority to release eligible offenders; 38 RAs (86.4%) report that their decisions are final for all cases. *Table 8* further documents RAs authority with regard to releasing offenders prior to serving maximum sentence time. Over half of the responding states have the authority to release all offenders for all crime categories before they serve maximum time, with the exception of violent crimes. It is noteworthy that some determinate states appear to have discretion to release.

Table 7. Authority to Release

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Overall Authority	**43**	**93.3**
Decision Finality		
final for all cases	38	86.4
final for majority of cases	3	6.8
require approval for all cases	3	6.8

Table 8. Release Prior to Maximum Time Served

Prior to Max Time	**Crime Category**				
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
	n=46	n=46	n=46	n=46	n=45
Portion of Offenders	**Valid Percent of States**				
all	45.7	52.2	65.2	60.9	68.9
more than half	19.1	17.4	8.7	13.0	6.7
less than half	23.4	19.6	4.3	4.3	0.0
none (determinate)	10.6	10.9	21.7	21.7	24.4

Between 42 and 48 percent of states report that the power to set minimum time in prison is determined by statute across all crime categories (*Table 9*). In approximately one-third of the states, the courts have the power to set minimum time across crime categories. Relatively few states report that their RAs have similar power, ranging across crime categories from 18 to 25 percent.

Table 9. Authority to Set Minimum Time in Prison

	Crime Category				
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
	n=44	n=44	n=43	n=43	n=40
Type of Authority	**Valid Percent of States**				
releasing authority	18.2	20.5	23.3	23.3	25.0
courts	34.1	34.1	32.6	32.6	32.5
statute	47.7	45.5	44.2	44.2	42.5
Comments:					
both court and statute	3				
both RA and statute	2				
both RA and court	1				

C. RELEASE DECISION PROCESS

Over 80% of the RAs report using decision-making instruments (*Table 10*). Over 88% of those that do use instruments include a scoring process; over 65% include periodic review; and only 3 RAs need outside approval for these instruments.

Thirty-two out of 37 states responding reported that they use a risk assessment instrument. The most frequently used instruments are those developed in-house, Static-99 (sex offenders only), and LSI-R. Interestingly, a higher percentage of RAs that use in-house instruments report validating them (77.8%); the other two instruments are validated by only 58% of the RAs.

Table 10. Use of Decision-Making and Risk Assessment Instruments

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Use decision making instruments (n=44)	**36**	**81.8**
Instrument include:		
scoring process	32	88.9
periodic revalidation/review	23	68.9
formal approval from external groups	3	8.3
Use risk assessment instrument (n=37)	**32**	**86.5**
Instrument include:	**Use**	**Validated**
Level of Service - Revised (LSI-R)	12	7
COMPAS	3	1
Client Management Classification (CMC)	1	1
Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSS)	2	1
Static-99 (sex offenders only)	17	10
Salient Factor Score	6	6
Instrument Developed In-House	18	14
Other Instruments:	8	5
ABLE		
MSOST		
Corrective Thinking		
Pscan		
PREA		
Colorado Actuarial Risk Assessment Scale		
GAIN Substance Abuse Instrument		
NIC		
Louisiana Risk Needs Assessment		
MnSoSt-R RRAS)R		
PCL-R		
Parole Guidelines		
TCU		
Iowa Risk Assessment Model		
Contract with service providers for evaluation		

As *Table 11* indicates, only 39-40 states responded to questions about the authority of their Case/Hearing Officers. Those that did respond uniformly reported that these officers rarely if ever have power identical to RA members in the decision to release. These officers do have the responsibility for making recommendations and preparing case summaries to assist RA members in approximately 50% of the states, across crime categories.

Table 11. Role of Case/Hearing Officer

Case/Hearing Officer Authority Identical to RA Members	**Violent (n=39)**	**Sex (n=39)**	**Property (n=40)**	**Drug (n=39)**	**Public Order (n=40)**
all releases	0	0	1	1	3
some releases	1	1	3	3	2
no releases	38	38	36	35	35
Duties of Case/Hearing Officers (n=47)					
make recommendations for release	17	18	21	21	21
prepare case summaries for RA members	24	24	23	23	22

Almost three-quarters of the responding RAs report that inmate interviews are required as part of the release decision process (*Table 12*). A higher percentage of states use in-person interviews during the release decision process across crime categories, with videotaped interviews being used secondarily and telephone interviews used by a relatively small percentage of states. In over 70% of the states, a panel of RA members conducts the inmate interviews, while in almost 30% of the other states an RA member or a Case/Hearing Examiner conducts the interview individually.

Table 12. Interviews

Interview Requirements (n=39)	**Frequency**	**Valid Percent**			
required	29	74.4			
not required, but do occur	10	25.6			
Interview Type (n=47)	**Violent**	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drug**	**Public Order**
in person	80.9	78.7	70.2	70.2	68.1
video	68.1	63.8	57.4	57.4	57.4
telephone	27.7	23.4	19.1	19.1	19.1
Interview Process (n=47)	**Frequency**	**Valid Percent**			
individually by RA member	14	29.8			
individually by RA case/hearing examiner	13	27.7			
panel of RA members	33	70.2			
panel of R members w/hearing examiners	6	12.8			
other RA staff	6	12.8			
corrections staff	1	2.1			
other	5	10.6			
Specify other:					
parole officer employed by RA					
full Board of RA members					
use Risk Assessment					
institutional parole officers					
parole staff during diagnostic					
intake examiners who are w/corrections					
some interviews by contract persons					
pre-parole sometimes inc. summary by prob/parole officer					
full hearing for higher category crimes					

With regard to voting as part of the release decision process, over 90% of RAs indicate that they work within a panel structure (*Table 13*). RAs report that an average of three panel members are required to vote on a release decision involving property, drug and public order crimes. An average of four panel members are required for violent and sex crimes. Across all crime categories, an average of three votes are required to release most offenders.

Table 13. Voting

	Frequency	Valid Percent			
Work within panel structure (n=43)	39	90.7			
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drug**	**Public Order**
Avg. # of panel members required to vote (n=36)	3.8	3.6	3.1	3.1	3.1
	n=41	**n=41**	**n=39**	**n=39**	**n=36**
Minimum # of votes required to release most offenders	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8

During the release decision process, most RAs consider input from a variety of sources in addition to the official records about the offender and the crime. More states consider input from the victim (93.6%) than any other source, although the differences reported across sources are very small (*Table 14*). In general, it seems that RAs are willing to listen to anyone with knowledge of or interest in the offender's case.

Table 14. Input Considered in Release Decisions

Input from…	**Frequency**	**Valid Percent**
Victim	44	93.6
Offender's Family	42	89.4
District Attorney	41	87.2
Law Enforcement	38	80.9
Judge	36	76.6
Non-Victim	35	74.5
Other	25	53.2
Specify Other:		
any interested party/citizen		
anyone, but only in writing if not victim		
attorneys, DOC		
correctional professionals, e.g. psychologist, security staff, treatment staff		
probation/parole		
employer		
religious group		
inmate		

Over 80% of the RAs permit written correspondence and telephone or in-person interviews with victims to be considered in the release decision process (*Table 15*). Over 80% of RAs permit written correspondence from non-victims to be considered, with smaller percentages permitting other types of non-victim input. However, between 60 and 81 percent of RAs require that victim input be considered -- if submitted -- across crime types prior to releasing offenders; under 50% require non-victim input (*Table 16*).

Table 15. Permissible Types of Input from Victims and Non-Victims

Type of Input	**Valid Percent**	
	Victim	**Non-Victim**
written correspondence	91.5	87.2
telephone interviews	80.9	51.1
in-person interviews	87.2	53.2
videotaped correspondence	70.2	40.4
other	21.3	14.9
Specify other:		
public comment at 'open meetings'		
any correspondence		
anyone can make appearance		
Attorney General		
E-mail		
no specific language regarding non-victims		
input method not specific by law		
victim and DA statement to Board		
videoconferencing		

Table 16. Required Victim and Non-Victim Input

	Valid Percent	
	Victim	**Non-Victim**
Violent	80.9	44.7
Sex	80.9	44.7
Property	63.8	34.0
Drug	57.4	34.0
Public Order	59.6	31.9
None	17.0	8.5

With regard to the impact of victim and non-victim input, the majority of RAs consider input from both to be 'somewhat influential' and 40% consider victim input to be 'very influential' in their decision-making process (*Table 17*). In-person interviews with both victims and non-victims were reported to have the most impact on release decisions, while other types of input had the least impact

Table 17. Impact of Victim and Non-Victim Input

Impact of Input	**Victim (n=40)**	**Non-Victim (n=37)**
not influential	0	1
somewhat influential	24	32
very influential	16	4
Most Impact	**(n=41)**	**(n=37)**
written correspondence	1	12
in-person interviews	34	19
other	6	5
Least Impact	**(n=37)**	**(n=33)**
written correspondence	9	6
telephone interviews	7	7
videotaped correspondence	2	1
in-person interviews	0	1
other	18	14

Respondents were asked to rate other factors for impact on a scale of one to five, with five indicating the highest level of impact. *Table 18* demonstrates that crime severity and type have the most impact, while the gender of both victims and offenders has the least impact.

Table 18. Factors Impacting Decision to Release (n=40)

Factor	mean (scale 1-5)
Crime Severity	4.8
Crime Type	4.7
Offender Criminal History	4.5
Number of Victims	4.4
Age of Victims	4.3
Offender Institutional Behavior	4.2
Offender Mental Illness	3.5
Age of Offender (at time of crime)	3.4
Gender of Victims	2.4
Gender of Offender	1.8

D. TIME SERVED AND EARLY RELEASE

As *Table 19* indicates, there is more variance on the issue of minimum requirements for time served than there has been on other issues. Just under 50% of the states use 'percent of the sentence' to determine the minimum to serve for violent, sex, drug and public order crimes; just over 50% use the same guide to determine the minimum for property crimes. Approximately a third of the states have fixed minimums for property, drug and public order crimes. Between 35 and 40 percent of states have fixed minimums for violent and sex crimes.

Most of the states that use percent as a minimum report the minimum to be over 66% of the sentence for violent and sex crimes and under 33% for property, drug and public order crimes. This distribution makes intuitive sense in that more serious crimes require the percent of sentence to be higher than less serious crimes.

Table 19. Minimum Time to Serve

	Crime Category				
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
	n=45	n=45	n=45	n=47	n=47
Type of Minimum	**Valid Percent of States**				
fixed	40.0	35.6	28.9	31.1	28.9
percent	48.9	46.7	51.1	48.9	48.9
no minimum	11.1	17.8	20.0	20.0	22.2
	Crime Category				
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
	n=24	n=23	n=23	n=22	n=20
Percent Time to Serve	**Number of States**				
33% and under	6	9	11	10	10
34-66%	4	4	8	8	7
Over 66%	14	10	4	4	3

Between 36 and 48 percent of states do not require any community supervision regardless of release method (*Table 20*). While supervision was not required, the question did not address whether they received supervision. Over 50% of the states do require community supervision, although not always for all of their offenders. The portion of offenders subject to required community supervision varies by crime category.

Table 20. Required Community Supervision (Regardless of Release Method)

	Crime Category				
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
	n=47	n=47	n=46	n=46	n=46
Portion of Offenders	**Valid Percent of States**				
all	23.4	25.5	15.2	15.2	13.0
more than half	34.0	31.9	34.8	34.8	28.3
less than half	2.1	6.4	6.5	8.7	10.9
none (determinate)	40.4	36.2	43.5	41.3	47.8

There are other factors that play a much larger part in the decision to release. RAs were asked to rank order the factors most likely to delay release. *Table 21* lists the number of states that ranked each factor in the top three. The most commonly ranked factor was 'delays in program completion'. This makes sense given that 44 states indicate they require program completion as a condition of release and only two states report having enough programs. Clearly, this is a systemic problem that needs more attention as both a practice and policy issue.

There are other systemic issues worth mentioning as factors that delay parole release. The second highest ranked factor is 'offenders not available for interviews'. Paperwork delays are also systemic and may be related to inadequate staffing. The issue of victim input, although not impacting as many states, could be explored further given that victim input is a requirement in well over half the states and for all crime categories, as discussed previously.

Table 21. Factors Delaying Release

Ranked in Top 3 (n=47)	**# States**	**Valid Percent**
Delays in program completion	20	42.6
Offenders not available for interviews	11	23.4
Reports (post sentence and other investigations) not completed on time	10	21.3
Waiting for victim input	10	21.3
Delays in completing assessments specifically for parole decisions	9	19.1
Inadequate staffing in parole agency to manage workload	8	17.0
Other	6	12.8
Delays in completing the prison admission diagnostic process	5	10.6
Delays in moving offenders from local jails to prisons	3	6.4
Program Requirements and Availability		
Program Completion Required Prior to Release (n=44)	39	88.6
Enough Programs? (n=42)	2	4.8

In terms of early release, there do not seem to be that many options other than parole. *Table 22* indicates that the most common option, identified by 46.8% of the states, is 'other release to community supervision', which included work release and electronic monitoring. On the other hand, between 61 and 73 percent of states report that they do have time off credits available across crime categories (*Table 23*).

More states award statutory good time credits than any other type of TOC (40-49%). The second most commonly cited TOC option is for meritorious good time or successful program completion. As discussed previously, this option is compromised by the lack of available programs.

There are only a few states currently pursuing legislative action to make TOC available. Only 13 states indicate that their offenders are eligible for credits that would shorten their maximum sentence is served.

Table 22. Options for Early Release

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Boot Camp Graduation	15	31.9
Program Completion	11	23.4
House Arrest	10	21.3
Due to Capacity Problem	7	14.9
Other Release to Community Supervision	22	46.8
Alternative Incarceration Programs		
Work Release (non-violent drug offenders)		
Electronic Monitoring/GPS		
Halfway House/Transition Center		
Good Time TOC		
Outside jurisdiction: medical furlough		
Presumptive release (DOC)		
Legislative release		
Court releases		
Federal release programs		

Table 23. Time Off Credits

Time Off Credits Available	Frequency	Valid Percent			
Violent Offenses	29	61.7			
Sex Offenses	28	59.6			
Property Offenses	34	72.3			
Drug Offenses	34	72.3			
Public Order Offenses	34	72.3			
Type of TOC Available, Percent of States (n=47)	**Violent**	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Statutory Good Time (lost only for infractions)	44.7	42.6	48.9	48.9	40.4
Meritorious Good Time (successful program completion)	38.3	38.3	44.7	44.7	42.6
Extraordinary Credits (for special acts)	19.1	19.1	19.1	21.3	19.1
Emergency Credits (system at or above capacity)	4.3	6.4	8.5	8.5	8.5
Other TOC	8.5	8.5	100.0	100.0	19.1
Legislation Pending to Make TOC Available	**Frequency**				
Statutory Good Time (lost only for infractions)	4				
Meritorious Good Time (for extra effort)	1				
Risk Reduction Credit (successful program completion)	3				
Extraordinary Credits (for special acts)	0				
Emergency Credits (system at or above capacity)	0				
Other TOC	2				
Eligibility for Credits to Shorten Time Served (n=13)	**Frequency**				
Can shorten parole end date prior to granting parole, but not after	1				
Early discharge by statute if conditions are met (not tied to credits)	3				
Discharge after one year on parole	1				
Terminated from supervision after 90 days if programs completed	1				
Court can order discharge/termination	2				
Can earn parole reduction of 5 days per month	1				
Can earn parole reduction of 2 days per month	1				
If in compliance with parole conditions and recommended by parole officer (except for sex offenses)	1				
Move to annual supervision for good behavior	1				
Termination at 3 or 10 years if no revocations	1				

E. SUPERVISION

Respondents were asked a series of questions regarding their supervisory authority. *Table 24* demonstrates that 53.2% of RAs have full authority over parole supervision while 31.9% have no authority over parole supervision.

With regard to probation, only 7.5% have partial authority over probation supervision. Supervisory authority is concentrated on state offenders, with only a small percentage of states responsible for county offenders.

Almost 60% of RAs calculate supervisory time served as the time between parole release and sentence maximum. Only three RAs calculate specifically by statute, although eight RAs note that they calculate using a combination of both criteria, based on crime categories. Four states consider TOC and other earned credits when determining supervisory time served.

Table 24. Supervision - Jurisdiction

Type	**Parole (n=47)**	**Probation (n=40)**	
Full	53.2	0.0	
Partial	14.9	7.5	
None	31.9	92.5	
Population	**State (n=47)**	**County (n=39)**	**Federal (n=38)**
Full	63.8	12.8	0.0
Partial	12.8	10.3	0.0
None	23.4	76.9	100.0
Time Served under Supervision (n=46)	**Frequency**	**Valid Percent**	
Time between parole release date and sentence maximum	27	58.7	
Determined by statute requiring a specific amount of time	3	6.5	
Other	16	34.8	
Specify other:			
both (combination statute and Board authority)	8		
discretion of the Board	2		
can discharge after one years	2		
determined based on TOC and other earned credits	4		
Fixed Time: Length of Supervision Differs by Offense	**Frequency**		
Violent (n=14)	10		
Sex (n=14)	10		
Property (n=12)	8		
Drug (n=12)	8		
Public Order (n=11)	7		

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they use risk assessment instruments to help determine conditions of supervision (*Table 25*). Twenty-seven RAs indicated that they use risk assessments and 19 indicated that they do not. The most commonly indicated risk assessment instruments are Static-99 (sex offenders only), LSI-R, and instruments developed in-house. These instruments are validated by 39%, 56%, and 73% of RAs respectively.

Table 25. Supervision - Conditions

Authority	Frequency	Valid Percent
Use Risk Assessment	27	57.4
Instruments	**Use**	**Validated**
Level of Service - Revised (LSI-R)	18	10
COMPAS	8	1
Client Management Classification (CMC)	5	1
Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSS)	4	1
Static-99 (sex offenders only)	23	9
Salient Factor Score	8	4
Instrument Developed In-House	15	11
Other Instruments:	8	3
ACUTE, STABLE		
Colorado Actuarial Risk Assessment		
Community Risk Assessment		
GAIN Substance Abuse Assessment		
Louisiana Risk/Needs Assessment		
MN-SOST-R (sex offenders), Hare psychopathology checklist		
TCU		
Iowa Risk Assessment Model		

As *Table 26* indicates, over 80% of RAs that do have some supervisory authority over the conditions of parole indicate that they set conditions for all offenders across crime categories. More RAs (21 out of 40) report that victim input rather than non-victim input (3 out of 41) is 'very influential', although 34 out of 41 do report that non-victim input is 'somewhat influential'. In-person interviews from both victims and non-victims have the most impact and the least influential factor influencing conditions is the age of the offender at the time of the crime.

Table 26. Power to Set Conditions

Portion of Offenders (valid percent)	Violent (n=45)	Sex (n=45)	Property (n=44)	Drug (n=43)	Public Order (n=43)
all	86.7	86.7	84.1	83.7	86.0
more than half	2.2	2.2	6.8	7.0	7.0
less than half	8.9	8.9	6.8	7.0	4.7
none	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3

Table 27. Influence of Input on Conditions

Level of Influence	Victim Input (n=40)	Non-Victim Input (n=41)
not influential	1	4
somewhat influential	18	34
very influential	21	3
Most Impact	**(n=39)**	**(n=39)**
written correspondence	2	10
in-person interviews	29	18
other	6	5
no impact	2	6
Least Impact	**(n=33)**	**(n=32)**
written correspondence	7	7
telephone interviews	6	7
in-person interviews	1	1
videotaped correspondence	1	1
other	14	11
no impact	4	5
Factors Influencing Conditions of Supervision	**Valid Percent**	
Number of victims	61.7	
Age of victims	85.1	
Type of crime	87.2	
Age of offender (at time of crime)	51.1	

Respondents were not asked directly whether they have authority over the levels of supervision. They were asked to indicate whether they use risk assessment instruments to help determine those levels, with one of the options being 'no authority' (*Table 28*). Thirteen RAs checked that option, while 48.9 % indicated that they used risk assessments and 22.2% indicated that they did not.

When they are employed to determine levels of supervision, the most commonly indicated risk assessment instruments are Static-99 (sex offenders only), LSI-R, and instruments developed in-house. The instrument breakdown is similar to that reported for use in setting the conditions of release and again, Static-99 (sex offenders only) is validated by fewer states (47.1%) than either LSI-R (58.3%) or in-house instruments (81.8%).

Table 28. Supervision - Levels

Authority	Frequency	Valid Percent
Use Risk Assessment	22	48.9
Instruments	**Use**	**Validated**
Level of Service - Revised (LSI-R)	12	7
COMPAS	4	1
Client Management Classification (CMC)	3	2
Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSS)	1	0
Static-99 (sex offenders only)	17	8
Salient Factor Score	3	3
Instrument Developed In-House	11	9
Other Instruments:	7	2
ACUTE, STABLE		
NIC developed		
Community Risk Assessment		
Louisiana Risk/Needs Assessment		
Mn-SOST-R (sex offenders), Hare psychopathology checklist		

When asked about the eligibility of their offenders for administrative supervision (*Table 29*), responses were varied. Over 50% of RAs reported that none of their sex offenders were eligible; between 30 and 40 percent reported that none of their offenders in the other crime categories were eligible either.

On the other hand, between 25 and 40 percent of states indicated that all of the offenders were eligible, with the exception of sex offenders. Only 10 states were able to report on the percent of their supervised population currently under administrative supervision; the average reported was 20.5.

Table 29. Administrative Supervision

Offenders Eligible for Admin Supervision (valid percent)	Violent (n=43)	Sex (n=45)	Property (n=44)	Drug (n=43)	Public Order (n=43)
all	25.6	18.6	37.2	37.2	35.7
more than half	2.3	2.1	4.7	4.7	4.8
less than half	11.6	4.7	9.3	9.3	7.1
none	39.5	55.8	30.2	30.2	31.0
don't know	20.9	18.6	18.6	18.6	21.4
Percent under Admin Supervision (n=10)	**avg. 20.5**				

Over half the RAs do have authority to terminate supervision prior to maximum sentence for all offenders across crime categories (*Table 30*). If they do not have authority over all offenders, they tend to have no authority. Over one third of the RAs report having authority to terminate parole for none of their offenders regardless of crime categories.

Table 30. Authority to Terminate Supervision (Prior to Maximum Sentence)

Portion of Offenders	Violent (n=44)	Sex (n=45)	Property (n=44)	Drug (n=43)	Public Order (n=43)
all	54.5	53.5	56.8	56.8	52.4
more than half	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	4.8
less than half	4.5	7.0	4.5	4.5	4.8
none	38.6	37.2	36.4	36.4	38.1

Referral to community-based facilities is the norm in terms of parole release alternatives. Halfway out or transitional facilities are the most commonly cited alternatives. For approximately 50% of the states, the correctional authority or a non-profit agency manages these facilities (*Table 31*). Overall, management of all facilities falls under the control of the correctional authority more often than other entities.

Table 31. Management of Community-Based Facilities (n=47)

	Parole Auth	Corr Auth	Non-Profit	Other	N/A
Halfway out facilities	2	22	23	4	6
Halfway back facilities	2	15	14	3	13
Intermediate sanction facilities	4	23	9	5	10
Secure community confinement	2	20	5	9	11
Day reporting centers	4	23	9	5	8
Other Facilities:	1	1	5	2	5
alternatives to correction centers					
local jails for community custody					
county community corrections					
private for-profit agencies					
probation & office of corrections					
inmate transition centers					
work release facilities					

F. VIOLATIONS OF SUPERVISION CONDITIONS

Respondents were asked a series of questions regarding RA response to conditions' violations. Over 90% of the RAs indicated that they respond using treatment programs, electronic monitoring or house arrest. Over 50% indicated that they respond using day reporting centers, brief jail stays, and halfway back residential centers. Other options include various treatment options as well as work release (*Table 32*). The supervising parole officer has authority to impose responses in a greater percent of states across all response options than the unit supervisor, regional manager, or case/hearing officer (*Table 33*). In states where the authority does not lie with the supervising parole officer, it is split rather evenly among the other three positions.

Table 32. Available Responses to Conditions Violations

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Outpatient treatment programs	44	93.6
Inpatient treatment programs	44	93.6
Electronic monitoring	44	93.6
Curfew/house arrest	43	91.5
Day reporting centers	28	59.6
Brief stay (few days) in local jail	26	55.3
Halfway back residential centers	25	53.2
Other Options:		
graduated sanctions		
increased level of supervision		
progressive counseling		
community service/work crew		
revocation/return to prison		
secure treatment centers		

Table 33. Authority to Impose Responses

	Supervising PO	Unit Supervisor	Regional Manager	Case/Hearing Officer
Outpatient treatment	68.1	40.4	29.8	34.0
Inpatient treatment	61.7	36.2	25.5	29.8
Day reporting center	48.9	27.7	21.3	25.5
Electronic monitoring	53.2	29.8	21.3	29.8
Curfew/house arrest	55.3	27.7	21.3	29.8
Halfway back residential center	27.7	23.4	14.9	21.3
Brief stay (few days) in local jail	29.8	17.0	12.8	14.9
Other Options	19.1	12.8	10.6	10.6

Only 19 states use a decision-making instrument to guide decisions on intermediate sanctions as a response to violations (*Table 34*). The use is mandatory in only six states, but encouraged in 12. Whether or not a matrix is used, the RA must approve the motion to revoke in 33 states and the unit manager in 11. Similarly, the RA can issue arrest warrants for violations of supervision conditions in 30 states. The non-RA supervision agency can do the same in 21 states.

Table 34. Decision Matrix and Approvals

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Decision matrix used for sanction decisions (n=45)	19	42.2
Use of matrix:		
voluntary- not required	1	5.3
presumptive - encouraged, but not required	12	63.1
mandatory - response specific to violations	6	31.6
Must approve motion to revoke to jail or prison:		
Unit manager	11	23.4
Regional manager	8	17.0
Agency chief/head	4	8.5
Case/hearing officer	7	14.9
Releasing Authority	33	70.2
No one	0	0.0
Issues arrest warrants:		
Releasing Authority	30	63.8
Supervision agency (if other than Parole Auth)	21	44.7
Court	6	12.8
Local law enforcement	2	4.3

G. REVOCATIONS

Most of the RAs (95.7%) have the authority to manage and/or adjudicate violations (*Table 35*). In 75% of the states, the RA also can also set the amount of time to serve for revocation. Only one quarter of the RAs use guidelines to determine the amount of time to be served for a revocation. Over 90% of RAs have the power to revoke supervision. Only 12 states use a decision matrix to guide revocation decisions, with the LSI-R and Static-99 (sex offenders only) being the most frequently used (*Table 36*).

Table 35. Authority over Revocations

	Frequency	Valid Percent			
Authority to manage/adjudicate violations (n=46)	44	95.7			
RA sets amount of time to serve for revocation (n=44)	33	75.0			
Time setting guidelines used for revocation (n=43)	11	25.6			
Power to revoke supervision (portion of offenders)	**Violent**	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
all	90.9	93.2	93.2	93.2	93.1
more than half	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
less than half	4.5	4.5	2.3	2.3	2,3
none	23	2.3	4.5	4.5	45.0

Table 36. Decision Matrix for Revocations

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Decision matrix used for revocation decisions (n=44)	12	27.3
Instruments	**Use**	**Validated**
Level of Service - Revised (LSI-R)	8	4
COMPAS	2	0
Client Management Classification (CMC)	0	0
Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSS)	1	0
Static-99 (sex offenders only)	9	3
Salient Factor Score	3	3
Instrument Developed In-House	5	3
Other Instruments:	2	0
Iowa Risk Assessment		
Substance Abuse Classification Assessment		
Community Risk Assessment		
Louisiana Risk/Needs Assessment		
Mn-SOST-R (sex offenders), Hare psychopathology checklist		

As documented in *Table 37*, over 90% of the states can opt to revoke parole and send offenders back to prison. Over 70% can revoke parole and send offenders to in-prison treatment programs. Over 80% do not revoke parole, but do place offenders in community-based facilities. Over 60% do not revoke parole, but do send offenders to intermediate sanction facilities.

In over 50% of the states, case/hearing officers can make revocation recommendations across crime categories, although they can make final revocation decisions in only 11% of the states regardless of crime category.

Table 37. Options for Revocations

	Frequency	Valid Percent			
Revoke parole and send to prison	44	91.5			
Revoke parole and send to in-prison treatment program	34	72.3			
Do not revoke but place in intermediate sanction facility	30	63.8			
Do not revoke but place in community-based facility	39	83.0			
Authority of Case/Hearing Officer over Revocation	**Violent**	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drug**	**Public Order**
Make revocation recommendations	59.6	59.6	55.3	57.4	57.4
Make final revocation decisions	10.6	10.6	10.6	10.6	10.6
Hold revocation hearings in absence of RA members	29.8	29.8	29.8	29.8	31.9

H. STATISTICS AND RECIDIVISM

Respondents were asked about the level of difficulty they would experience if asked to produce certain statistics. Overall, this situation represents difficulties for most of the states (*Table 38*). The most easily produced and regularly published statistic is the number of offenders paroled in a given calendar year. However, only 24 states feel that retrieving that number is relatively easy and only 37 publish that number on a regular basis. With regard to the other statistics, most RAs indicate that retrieving the statistics represents a moderate or high level of difficulty, which is probably why they seldom publish the statistics.

Table 38. Difficulty Producing Statistics

Level of Difficulty Producing Statistics	None	Moderate	High	Impossible	Publish regularly (n=47)
Avg. sentence length for all offenders (n=44)	9	12	18	5	23
Avg. sentence length by for all offenders by offense category (n=44)	7	14	17	6	19
Avg. time served for all offenders released from prison (n=43)	9	12	15	7	18
Avg. time served for all offenders released from prison by offense category (n=43)	7	13	16	7	15
# offenders paroled (n=43)	24	9	9	1	37
# offenders leaving supervision who successfully completed parole (n=43)	12	14	14	3	29
# offenders leaving supervision whose parole was revoked (n=44)	14	16	12	2	32
Avg. time under supervision for offenders leaving parole who successfully completed parole (n=43)	7	17	14	5	15
Avg. time under supervision for offenders leaving parole whose parole was revoked (n=43)	6	15	17	5	13

As *Table 39* demonstrates, only 39 RAs provided recidivism rates: 15 calculated an average rate of 25.1 for one year; four calculated an average rate of 34.7 for two years; six calculated an average rate of 43.9 for three years; and five calculated an average rate of 42.8 for over three years. It appears that the probability of recidivating increases over time, although the low number of responses in each time frame makes it difficult to actually interpret these rates.

The recidivism picture is further compromised because only 29 RAs indicated which offenders were used to calculate their rates. Those that did report were most likely to count all offenders released by the RA from prison to supervision by the RA. Again, it is difficult to interpret these findings because of the low response level on the question.

Only 29 states indicated which events were included in the recidivism rate, although these states were able to indicate more than one event. Almost all counted new convictions, new criminal activities, and technical violations. Twenty-seven states reported the data they used to measure recidivism, with 14 indicating the date of incarceration.

Table 39. Recidivism Rates

	1 Year		2 years		3 Years		Over 3 Years	
	#	Avg.	#	Avg.	#	Avg.	#	Avg.
Rates	14	25.1	4	34.7	6	43.9	5	42.8
Offenders included in Recidivism Rate (n=29)								
All offenders released from prison	4		2		2		4	
All offenders released from prison to supervision	2				1		1	
All offenders released by the releasing authority from prison					1			
All offenders released by the releasing authority from prison to supervision	5		1		1			
All offenders released from prison to supervision who were supervised by RA	3		1		1			
Events included in Recidivism Rate (n=29)								
Prison - new conviction	29							
Prison - revocation for new criminal activity	28							
Prison - technical violation	28							
Return to jail	7							
Placement - outpatient treatment	2							
Placement - inpatient treatment	3							
Placement - day reporting center	3							
Placement - electronic monitoring	3							
Placement - curfew/house arrest	3							
Placement - halfway back residential	3							
Placement - intermediate (corrections)	4							
Placement - intermediate (parole)	3							
Date to Measure Recidivism (n=27)								
Date of incarceration	14							
Date of revocation decision	6							
Date of technical violation	2							
Date of criminal conviction	2							
Date of arrest	3							

Of the 39 RAs that responded to the final question about the availability of alternatives to incarceration for violations, 19 indicated that these alternatives existed (*Table 40*). Of those, 15 reported that they could use these alternatives for offenders without counting them in their recidivism rate.

Table 40. Alternatives to Incarceration

Secure alternative facilities (n=39)	19	48.7
Hold w/o counting in recidivism rate (n=17)	15	88.2
Description of facilities:		
Half-Way Back Centers		
Electronic Monitoring		
Driving While Impaired Facility		
Community Transition Program		
Drug Treatment Campus- 90 days		
County jail		
Residential facilities		
Work release programs		
Parolee Residential Treatment Program;		
Technical Rule Violator Centers		
Domestic Violence Center		
Revocation Center		
Cognitive behavioral programs		

V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Following is a summary of the findings from the survey divided by sections of this report.

STRUCTURE

- Most RAs are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the legislature. Their members serve fixed terms of office averaging five years; a majority of members and case hearing examiners work full-time.
- Most RAs consider themselves to be independent entities. If there is an outside affiliation, it is usually with the Department of Corrections.
- Most states do not have a statutorily mandated presumption of parole

SCOPE

- 38 RAs have the authority to make final release decisions for all cases.
- 16 RAs have authority to commute less than the death sentence and 15 can alter the original sentence.
- Only 8 RAs have jurisdiction over county offenders and only 6 have jurisdiction over juveniles.
- Most states use a mixed sentencing framework, including both determinate and indeterminate structures.

- Although 16 RAs reported that their state uses a determinate sentencing framework; at least 75% percent indicate that they have authority to release prior to sentence completion.
- Statute or courts, rather than the releasing authority, most often set the minimum time in prison.

RELEASE DECISION PROCESS

- Over three-quarters of the RAs use some type of instrument to guide release decisions; the most commonly used instruments are in-house, Static 99, or LSI-R. In-house instruments are validated by more RAs than the others, 78% compared with 58%.
- Approximately 50% of the states use a case/hearing officer to prepare case summaries and/or make recommendations for release
- 29 RAs indicate that they require interviews with parole eligible offenders.
- Most interviews are conducted in person or via video by a panel of RA members.
- 39 RAs work within a panel structure, have an average of three members on the panel, and require an average of three votes to decide release.
- Most RAs consider input from outside sources during the release decision process; the top three sources of input are from victim, the offender's family and the district attorney respectively.
- Written correspondence from victims and non-victims is permitted by more states than in-person interviews, telephone interviews, or videotaped correspondence. However, RAs report that in-person interviews have the most impact on release decisions.
- Of the factors that impact release decisions, the top three are crime severity, crime type, and offender criminal history.

TIME SERVED AND EARLY RELEASE

- Approximately half of the states use 'percent of sentence' to establish the minimum time to serve. For violent and sex crimes, the minimum time to serve is most often over 66%. For property, drugs and public order, the minimum is usually under 33%.
- The most frequently cited factor in delayed release is 'delay in program completion'. A total of 90% of RAs require offenders in programs to complete the programs as a prerequisite for release; however, only two RAs report that they have enough programs to accommodate the need.
- More than half of all RAs reported that time off credits (TOC) are available regardless of crime category. The most common type of TOC is statutory good time. Less than 10% assign 'emergency credits when the system is at or above capacity'.

SUPERVISION

- Slightly more than half the RAs have full authority over parole supervision.
- Only 8% have partial authority over probation supervision.
- Most RAs have the power to set *conditions* for all of their offenders across crime categories. Only 27 use a risk assessment instruments to guide them in the process. The top three instruments used are Static-99 (sex offenders only), LSI-R and in-house. Although the Static-99 (sex offenders only) is the most popular instrument, only 39% of the RAs that use this instrument validate it.
- 21 RAs consider victim input 'very influential' in setting conditions for supervision, while 18 consider it 'somewhat influential'. In-person interviews with both victims and non-victims have the most impact in the most states.
- Less than half the RAs use a risk assessment instrument to determine *levels* of supervision. Static-99 (sex offenders only) is used by more RAs (n=17), but is only validated by 47% of those RAs.
- Approximately 20% of the RAs do not know what portion of offenders is eligible for administrative supervision. Ten RAs reported an average of 20.5% of their offenders are currently under admin supervision.
- Over half the RAs have the authority to terminate parole prior to maximum sentence.
- Management of community-based facilities falls under the control of the correctional authority more often than other entities.

VIOLATIONS OF SUPERVISION CONDITIONS

- Almost all states have outpatient and inpatient treatment programs for offenders who violate the conditions of supervision, as well electronic monitoring and house arrest.
- Most RAs report that the supervising parole officer has the authority to impose responses to violations of conditions, with fewer RAs citing the same authority for unit supervisors, regional managers, or case/hearing officers. However, the list available for the respondents to choose from may not have been exhaustive as these were the only four options. The largest percentage of RAs reporting that any of these officials had authority was 68.1%. If there were more choices, another option might have attracted a higher percentage.
- Only 19 states use a decision-making instrument to guide decisions on intermediate sanctions as a response to violations and only six states require it as a mandatory response to specific violations.
- The RA is the most often cited entity to approve motions to revoke parole and over 60% of RAs can issue arrest warrants.

REVOCATIONS

- RA members have power to revoke supervision in over 90% of the states across all crime categories. Three-quarters of the RAs can set the time to serve for revocation, but 26% use time-setting guidelines.
- Only 12 RAs report that they use a decision matrix for revocation decisions, primarily the Static-99 (sex offenders only) and LSI-R. However, only 3 and 4 respectively reported validating these instruments.
- When offenders are being considered for revocation, alternatives to revocation such as placement in intermediate sanction or community-based facilities exist in 63 to 83 percent of the states.
- In approximately 30% of states, the case/hearing officers can hold revocation hearings in the absence of RA members; in 10% of states, they can make final revocation decisions.

STATISTICS AND RECIDIVISM

- The most easily produced and regularly published statistic is the number of offenders paroled in a given calendar year.
- Overall, the most regularly published statistics appear to coincide with those reported to be least difficult to produce.
- Difficulties associated with producing statistics may be a result of the repository agency for the statistics. It may be that some RAs have limited access to relevant statistical data.
- 29 RAs provided recidivism rates over periods ranging from one to over three years.
- The offender population included in recidivism rates varied greatly, with no one population being prominent.
- The most cited events included in recidivism rates were new convictions, revocation for new criminal activity, and technical violations, all of which resulted in a return to prison. This is a conservative view of recidivism because it does not count any event that does not result in incarceration.
- 19 RAs reported having secure alternative facilities that can be used in place of incarceration; of these, 15 reported that violators could be held in these facilities for several months or longer without being counted in the recidivism rate.

APPENDIX A

Findings from Federal and Other Country Releasing Authorities

SURVEY RESULTS – FEDERAL AND COUNTRY AGENCIES

Table 1. Respondents

Army	USA
Air Force	
Navy	
US Parole	
NPB Canada	Canada
Ontario Canada	
Bermuda	Other Countries
England/Wales	
New Zealand	
Puerto Rico	

STRUCTURE

Table 2. Membership, Confirmation and Terms

	#Full-Time Members	#Part-Time Members	# Full-Time Case Hearing Examiners	# Part-Time Case Hearing Examiners	Confirmed by Legislature	Fixed Term	Length of Term
Army	1	15	4				
Air Force	1	4					
Navy	1	5	1				
US Parole	5	0	11		yes	yes	6
NPB Canada	42	40	0	0		yes	5
Ontario Canada	3	24	0	0	yes	yes	3
Bermuda	0	5		5	yes	yes	3
England/Wales	3	172			yes	yes	3
New Zealand	5	32	0	0	yes	yes	3
Puerto Rico	4		9		yes	yes	6

Table 3. Appointments and Organizational Location

	Appointments	Location
Army	Nominated/Appointed by some other official	Independent but administratively
Air Force	Nominated/Appointed by some other official	Within another agency/organization
Navy	Civil Service	An independent/stand alone agency
US Parole	Nominated/Appointed by some other official	Independent but administratively
NPB Canada	Nominated/Appointed by some other official	Independent but administratively
Ontario Canada	Nominated/Appointed by some other official	Independent but administratively
Bermuda	Nominated/Appointed by some other official	Independent but administratively
England/Wales	Nominated/Appointed by some other official	An independent/stand alone agency
New Zealand		Independent but administratively
Puerto Rico	Nominated/Appointed by the Governor	Independent but administratively

Table 4. Statutorily Mandated Presumption of Parole

	Violent	Sex	Property	Drugs	Public Order
Army	All Crimes				
Air Force	No Crimes	No Crimes	No Crimes	No Crimes	No Crimes
Navy	No Crimes	No Crimes	No Crimes	No Crimes	No Crimes
US Parole					
NPB Canada	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes
Ontario Canada					
Bermuda	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes
England/Wales	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes
New Zealand	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes	All Crimes
Puerto Rico					

SCOPE

Table 5. Contextual Statistics

	# offenders eligible for parole	# parolees & reparolees under RA	# officers supervising parole & reparole	officers supervise other offenders?	# other offenders under RA supervision	# probationers under RA supervision
Army	253	149	unknown	yes	140	
Air Force	144	116		yes	13	
Navy						
US Parole	2700	14100	500	yes		
NPB Canada	5757		581	no		
Ontario Canada	1028	150		yes		
Bermuda	61		3	no		
England/Wales	6923					
New Zealand	5939					
Puerto Rico	12658	1400		yes		

Table 6. Responsibilities, Jurisdiction and Framework

	Commuting less than death sentences	Making pardon decisions	Restoring right to vote	Restoring right to hold public office	Restoring right to carry firearm	Restoring right to license/jobs	None of above
Army	yes	yes					
Air Force	yes						
Navy	yes						
US Parole							yes
NPB Canada							yes
Ontario Canada							yes
Bermuda							yes
England/Wales							yes
New Zealand							yes
Puerto Rico		yes		yes	yes	yes	

	Jurisdiction				Sentencing Structure
	State	Country	Adults	Juveniles	
Army		yes	yes	yes	Determinate only
Air Force	.	yes	yes		Determinate only
Navy	.		yes		Both
US Parole	yes	yes	yes	yes	Both
NPB Canada	yes	yes	yes		Both
Ontario Canada	yes		yes		Both
Bermuda		yes	yes	yes	
England/Wales	.	yes	yes	yes	Both
New Zealand		yes	yes		Both
Puerto Rico	yes		yes		Determinate only

Table 7. Authority to Release

Army	final for less than half the cases
Air Force	final for all cases
Navy	final for the majority of cases
US Parole	.
NPB Canada	final for all cases
Ontario Canada	
Bermuda	final for all cases
England/Wales	final for all cases
New Zealand	final for all cases
Puerto Rico	final for all cases

Table 8. Release Prior to Maximum Time Served (portion of offenders)

	Violent	Sex	Property	Drugs	Public Order
Army	All				
Air Force	All	All	All	All	All
Navy	All	All	All	All	All
US Parole	All	All	All	All	
NPB Canada	All	All	All	All	All
Ontario Canada	All	All	All	All	
Bermuda	All	All	All	All	All
England/Wales					
New Zealand	All	All	All	All	All
Puerto Rico	All	All	All	All	All

Table 9. Authority to Set Minimum Time in Prison

	Violent	Sex	Property	Drugs	Public Order
Army	Courts	Courts	Courts	Courts	Courts
Air Force	RA	RA	RA	RA	RA
Navy	Statute	Statute	Statute	Statute	Statute
US Parole	.	.	.	.	.
NPB Canada	Statute	Statute	Statute	Statute	Statute
Ontario Canada	.	.	.	.	.
Bermuda	Courts	Courts	Courts	Courts	Courts
England/Wales	Courts	Courts	Courts	Courts	Courts
New Zealand	Courts	Courts	Courts	Courts	Courts
Puerto Rico	.	.	.	.	.

RELEASE DECISION PROCESS

Table 10. Use of Decision-Making Guides in Release Decisions

	Use Guides	Scoring Process	Periodic Review	Approval from External Group	Risk Assessments
Army	yes	yes			yes
Air Force	yes	yes	yes		yes
Navy	yes		yes		yes
US Parole	yes	yes	yes		yes
NPB Canada	no				
Ontario Canada	yes				yes
Bermuda	yes		yes		
England/Wales	no				
New Zealand	no				
Puerto Rico	yes		yes		yes

	LSI-R		Static-99 (sex offenders only)		Salient Factor Score		In-House	
	Use	Validated	Use	Validated	Use	Validated	Use	Validated
Army	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes			
Air Force					yes	yes		
Navy					yes			
US Parole							yes	yes
NPB Canada	yes	yes	yes	yes				
Ontario Canada	yes							
Bermuda								
England/Wales								
New Zealand	yes	yes						
Puerto Rico								

Table 11. Role of Case/Hearing Officer

Authority Identical to RA Members					
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army	For no releases				
Air Force	For no releases	For no releases	For no releases	For no releases	For no releases
Navy	For no releases	For some releases	For all releases	For all releases	For all releases
US Parole					
NPB Canada	For no releases	For no releases	For no releases	For no releases	For no releases
Ontario Canada					
Bermuda	For some releases	For some releases	For some releases	For some releases	For some releases
England/Wales	For some releases	For some releases	For some releases	For some releases	For some releases
New Zealand					
Puerto Rico	For no releases	For no releases	For no releases	For no releases	For no releases
Make Recommendations for Release					
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Air Force	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Navy			yes	yes	yes
US Parole					
NPB Canada					
Ontario Canada					
Bermuda					
England/Wales					
New Zealand					
Puerto Rico	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Prepare Case Summaries					
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army	yes				
Air Force	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Navy	yes	yes			
US Parole					
NPB Canada	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Ontario Canada					
Bermuda					
England/Wales					
New Zealand					
Puerto Rico	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Table 12. Interviews: Requirements, Process, and Type

	Required	Individual RA Member	Individual Case/Hearing Officer	Panel of RA Members	By Corrections Staff
Army	yes				yes
Air Force	yes				yes
Navy					Yes
US Parole					
NPB Canada		yes		yes	
Ontario Canada					
Bermuda	yes			yes	
England/Wales	yes			yes	
New Zealand				yes	
Puerto Rico	yes		yes	yes	
			In-Person		
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Air Force	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
NPB Canada	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bermuda	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
England/Wales	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
New Zealand	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Puerto Rico	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
			Video		
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
NPB Canada	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Puerto Rico	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

*** No telephone interviews at all**

Table 13. Voting

	Panel Structure	# Panel Members Required to Vote					Minimum # Votes Required to Release
		Violent	Sex	Property	Drugs	Public Order	All Crimes
Army	yes	5	5	5	5	5	3
Air Force	yes	5	5	5	5	5	3
Navy	yes	5	5	5	5	5	
US Parole					2	2	2
NPB Canada	yes	3	3	2	2	2	2
Ontario Canada					2	2	2
Bermuda	yes	5	5	5	5	5	3
England/Wales	yes	5	5	5	3	3	
New Zealand	yes			3	3	3	
Puerto Rico	yes	3	3	3	3	3	3

Table 14. Input Considered in Release Decisions

	Victim	Non-Victim	Judge	DA	Law Enforcement	Offender's Family	Other
Army	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	.
Air Force	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Navy	.	.	.	.	.	.	yes
US Parole	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
NPB Canada	yes	.	yes	.	yes	.	yes
Ontario Canada	yes	yes	yes	.	yes	yes	yes
Bermuda	yes	.	yes	.	.	.	.
England/Wales	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	.
New Zealand	yes	.	.	.	.	.	.
Puerto Rico	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	.

Table 15. Permissible Type of Victim and Non-Victim Input

	Written		Telephone		In-Person		Videotaped		Other	
	Victim	Non-Victim	Victim	Non-Victim	Victim	Non-Victim	Victim	Non-Victim	Victim	Non-Victim
Army	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		
Air Force	yes	yes					yes	yes	yes	yes
Navy	yes	yes			yes	yes	yes	yes		
US Parole	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		
NPB Canada	yes	yes					yes		yes	yes
Ontario Canada	yes	yes			yes		yes			
Bermuda	yes									
England/Wales										
New Zealand	yes		yes		yes				yes	
Puerto Rico	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		

Table 16. Required Type of Victim and Non-Victim Input

	Violent		Sex		Property		Drugs		Public Order	
	Victim	Non-Victim	Victim	Non-Victim	Victim	Non-Victim	Victim	Non-Victim	Victim	Non-Victim
Army	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Air Force	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Navy										
US Parole	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
NPB Canada	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Ontario Canada	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bermuda	yes		yes							
England/Wales										
New Zealand										
Puerto Rico	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Table 17. Impact of Victim and Non-Victim Input

	Degree of Influence Scale 1-5 1 = not influential at all 5 = very influential		Most Impact		Least Impact	
	Victim	**Non-Victim**	**Victim**	**Non-Victim**	**Victim**	**Non-Victim**
Army	5	5	In person		Written	
Air Force	5	4	Written	Written	Video	Video
Navy	2	1	In person	In person	No Impact	No Impact
US Parole	5	5	In person	In person	Telephone	Telephone
NPB Canada	3	4	In person	In person	Written	Written
Ontario Canada	5	5	In person	In person	Telephone	Telephone
Bermuda	3		Written			
England/Wales						
New Zealand	4		In person			
Puerto Rico	4	3	In person	Written	Video	Video

Table 18. Factors Impacting Decision to Release

	Scale 1 to 5 1 = not at all 5 = quite a lot				
	Crime Severity	**Crime Type**	**Criminal History**	**# of Victims**	**Age of Victims**
Army	5	5	5	5	1
Air Force	5	5	5	5	3
Navy	5	5	1	4	1
US Parole	3	5	5	5	3
NPB Canada	5	5	4	5	1
Ontario Canada	5	5	4	4	4
Bermuda	1	2	2	4	1
England/Wales					
New Zealand	4	5	3	4	4
Puerto Rico	5	5	5	5	5
	Institutional Behavior	**Offender Mental Illness**	**Age of Offender (at time of crime)**	**Gender of Victims**	**Gender of Offenders**
Army	4	1	5	4	5
Air Force	3	2	4	5	5
Navy	2	1	2	3	4
US Parole	4	3	4	4	5
NPB Canada	4	1	3	5	5
Ontario Canada	4	4	4	5	5
Bermuda	3	2	4	4	4
England/Wales					
New Zealand	4	4	4	4	4
Puerto Rico	4	4	5	4	5

TIME SERVED AND EARLY RELEASE

Table 19. Minimum Time to Serve

	Type of Minimum				
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army		Fixed			
Air Force	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Navy	No Minimum	No Minimum	No Minimum	No Minimum	No Minimum
US Parole					
NPB Canada	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Ontario Canada					
Bermuda	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
England/Wales	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed
New Zealand	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Puerto Rico					
	Percent of Time Served				
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army					
Air Force	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%
Navy	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
US Parole	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%
NPB Canada	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%
Ontario Canada					
Bermuda	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%
England/Wales					
New Zealand	34-66%	34-66%	34-66%	34-66%	34-66%
Puerto Rico					

Table 20. Required Community Service: Portion of Offenders

	Violent	Sex	Property	Drugs	Public Order
Army	None	None	None	None	None
Air Force	None	None	None	None	None
Navy	More than half	None	More than half	All	All
US Parole	All	All	All	All	All
NPB Canada	All	All	All	All	All
Ontario Canada	More than half	More than half	More than half	More than half	Less than half
Bermuda	All	All	All	All	All
England/Wales					
New Zealand	All	All	All	All	All
Puerto Rico					

Table 21. Factors Delaying Release (Ranked in Top 3)

	Delays in Program Completion	Reports Not Completed on Time	Waiting for Victim Input	Inadequate Staffing	Other	Delays on Completing Diagnostic Process	Delays in Moving Offenders from Jail to Prison
Army	3	2		1			
Air Force	1	2					
Navy				.			2
US Parole			2		1	3	
NPB Canada	1	2	3				
Ontario Canada				1		2	
Bermuda							
England/Wales							
New Zealand							
Puerto Rico							

No Table 22. Options for Early Release

Only New Zealand indicated they had options for early release: program completion, house arrest, and community supervision

Table 23. Time Off Credits

TOC Not Available					
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army					
Air Force					
Navy	x				
US Parole	x	x	x	x	x
NPB Canada	x	x	x	x	x
Ontario Canada					
Bermuda		x	x	x	x
England/Wales	x	x	x	x	x
New Zealand					
Puerto Rico	x	x	x	x	x
Statutory Good Time Available					
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army	x				
Air Force		x	x	x	x
Ontario Canada	x	x	x	x	x
Meritorious Good Time Available					
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army	x	x	x	x	x
Air Force	x	x	x	x	x
Bermuda	x				
Extraordinary Credits Available					
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army	x		x	x	x
Air Force	x	x	x	x	x
Navy		x	yes	yes	yes
Emergency Credits (system above capacity) Available					
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army		yes			
Other TOC Available					
	Violent	**Sex**	**Property**	**Drugs**	**Public Order**
Army	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

SUPERVISION

Table 24. Jurisdiction

	Population		Scope			Length
	Parole	Probation	State	County	Federal	
Army	Full Authority	.	.	.	Full Authority	Time btwn release and max
Air Force	Full Authority	.	.	.	Full Authority	Time btwn release and max
Navy	Full Authority	Full Authority	Full Authority	Partial Authority	Full Authority	Time btwn release and max
US Parole	Partial Authority	No Authority	Partial Authority	No Authority	Partial Authority	Time btwn release and max
NPB Canada	No Authority	No Authority	No Authority	No Authority	No Authority	Time btwn release and max
Ontario Canada	Partial Authority	No Authority	Partial Authority	No Authority	No Authority	Time btwn release and max
Bermuda	Full Authority	Partial Authority	No Authority	No Authority	No Authority	Time btwn release and max
England/Wales	No Authority	No Authority	No Authority	No Authority	No Authority	Time btwn release and max
New Zealand	No Authority	No Authority	No Authority	No Authority	No Authority	Time btwn release and max
Puerto Rico	No Authority	No Authority	Partial Authority	Partial Authority	No Authority	Time btwn release and max

Table 25. Setting Conditions of Supervision – Use of Risk Assessment Instruments

	LSI-R		Static-99 (sex offenders only)		Salient Factor Score		PCL-R	
	Use	Validated	Use	Validated	Use	Validated	Use	Validated
Army					yes			
Air Force	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Ontario Canada	yes	yes	yes	yes				
Bermuda	yes							
Puerto Rico	yes	yes						

Table 26. Power to Set Conditions (portion of offenders)

	Violent	Sex	Property	Drugs	Public Order
Army	All	All	All	All	All
Air Force	All	All	All		All
Navy	All	All	All	All	None
US Parole	All	All	All	All	All
NPB Canada	All	All	All	All	All
Ontario Canada	All	All	All	All	All
Bermuda	All	All	All	All	All
England/Wales					
New Zealand	More than Half	More than Half	Less than Half	Less than Half	Less than Half
Puerto Rico	All	All	All	All	All

Table 27. Influence of Input on Conditions

	Degree of Influence Scale 1 to 5 1 = not influential at all 5 = very influential		Most Impact Type of Input		Least Impact Type of Input	
	Victim	Non-Victim	Victim	Non-Victim	Victim	Non-Victim
Army	5		In person		Telephone	
Air Force	5	3	Written	Written	Video	Video
Navy	2	1	In person	In person	No Impact	No Impact
US Parole	5	5	In person	In person	Telephone	Telephone
NPB Canada	4	4	Other	Written	Written	Written
Ontario Canada	4	4	In person	Written	Telephone	
Bermuda	3	1	Written	Written	Other	Other
England/Wales						
New Zealand	5		In person			
Puerto Rico	5	4	In person	In person	Telephone	Telephone

Table 28. Setting Levels of Supervision – Use of Risk Assessment Instruments

	LSI-R		Static-99 (sex offenders only)		Salient Factor Score		PCL-R	
	Use	Validated	Use	Validated	Use	Validated	Use	Validated
Army	.	.			yes			
Air Force	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bermuda	yes	yes						
Puerto Rico	yes	yes						

Table 29. Administrative Supervision (portion of offenders eligible)

	Violent	Sex	Property	Drugs	Public Order
Army	All	All	All	All	All
Air Force	All	All	All	All	All
Navy	All	All	All	All	None
US Parole	All	All	All	All	All
NPB Canada	None	None	None	None	None
Ontario Canada					
Bermuda	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
England/Wales					
New Zealand					
Puerto Rico					

Table 30. Authority to Terminate (prior to maximum sentence served)

	Violent	Sex	Property	Drugs	Public Order
Army	All	All	All	All	All
Air Force	All	All	All	All	All
Navy	More than half	Less than half	More than half	None	
US Parole	All	All	All	All	All
NPB Canada	All	All	All	All	All
Ontario Canada	All	All	All	All	All
Bermuda	None	None	None	None	None
England/Wales	None	None	None	None	None
New Zealand	All	All	All	All	All
Puerto Rico	All	All	All	All	All

Table 31. Management of Community-Based Services

	Halfway Out	Halfway Back	Intermediate Sanction	Secure Community Confinement	Day Reporting Centers	Other Facilities
Army						
Air Force	Non-Profit	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Navy	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
US Parole	Corr Autho	Other	Other	Corr Autho	n/a	
NPB Canada	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Corr Autho; Non-Profit
Ontario Canada	Non-Profit	n/a	n/a		n/a	
Bermuda	Corr Autho	n/a	n/a	n/a	Other	n/a
England/Wales						
New Zealand						
Puerto Rico	Corr Autho	Corr Autho	Corr Autho	Corr Autho	Corr Autho	Corr Autho

VIOLATIONS OF SUPERVISION CONDITIONS

Table 32. Available Responses for Conditions Violations

	Outpatient Treatment	Inpatient Treatment	Electronic Monitoring	House Arrest	Day Reporting Centers	Brief Stay in Jail	Halfway Back Centers
Army	x	x	x	x	x		x
Air Force	x	x		x	x		
Navy	x			x			
US Parole	x	x		x	x		x
NPB Canada							
Ontario Canada				x		x	
Bermuda	x		x				
England/Wales							
New Zealand							
Puerto Rico	x	x	x				x

Table 33. Authority to Impose Responses

	Outpatient Treatment	Inpatient Treatment	Electronic Monitoring	House Arrest
Army				
Air Force				
Navy	Supervising PO; Regional Manager; Case/Hearing Officer	Supervising PO; Regional Manager; Case/Hearing Officer	Supervising PO; Regional Manager; Case/Hearing Officer	Regional Manager; Case/Hearing Officer
US Parole	Supervising PO	Supervising PO		
NPB Canada				
Ontario Canada				
Bermuda	Case/Hearig Officer			
England/Wales				
New Zealand				
Puerto Rico	Supervising PO; Case/Hearing Officer	Supervising PO; Case/Hearing Officer		
	Day Reporting Centers	**Brief Stay in Jail**	**Halfway Back Centers**	**Other Facility**
Army				
Air Force				
Navy	Supervising PO; Regional Manager; Case/Hearing Officer	Supervising PO; Regional Manager; Case/Hearing Officer	Supervising PO; Regional Manager; Case/Hearing Officer	Supervising PO; Regional Manager; Case/Hearing Officer
US Parole			Regional Manager	
NPB Canada				Supervising PO
Ontario Canada				
Bermuda				
England/Wales				
New Zealand				
Puerto Rico	Supervising PO; Case/Hearing Officer		Supervising PO; Case/Hearing Officer	

Table 34. Decision Matrix and Approvals

	Use Matrix	How?	Must Approve Motion to Revoke		Can Issue Arrest Warrants		
			Unit Manager	RA	RA	Other Supervising Agency	Court
Army				yes	yes		
Air Force				yes	yes		
Navy				yes	yes		
US Parole			yes		yes		
NPB Canada				yes		yes	
Ontario Canada				yes	yes		
Bermuda	yes	Presumptive		yes	yes		
England/Wales				.			
New Zealand					yes		yes
Puerto Rico	yes	Mandatory		yes	yes		

REVOCATIONS

Table 35. Authority Over Revocations

				Power to Revoke Supervision
	Manage Violations	Sets Time to Serve	Use Time Setting Guidelines	Portion of Offenders Across Crime Categories
Army	yes			All
Air Force	yes	yes		All
Navy	yes			.
US Parole	yes	yes	yes	All
NPB Canada	yes			All
Ontario Canada	yes	yes		All
Bermuda	yes	yes		All
England/Wales		.		.
New Zealand				All
Puerto Rico	yes			All

Table 36. Decision Matrix for Revocations

	LSI-R		Salient Factor Score		In-House	
	Use	Validated	Use	Validated	Use	Validated
US Parole					yes	yes
NPB Canada						
Ontario Canada						
Bermuda	yes					
Puerto Rico	yes	yes	yes	yes		

Table 37. Options for Revocations

	Options				RA Duties*
	Revoke/ Send to Prison	Revoke/ Send to Prison Treatment	Don't Revoke/ Send to Intermediate Sanctions	Don't Revoke/ Send to Community Faciity	Makes Revocation Recommendations Across Crime Categories
Army	yes			yes	
Air Force	yes	yes		yes	yes
Navy					
US Parole	yes		yes		yes
NPB Canada	yes			yes	
Ontario Canada	yes				
Bermuda	yes			yes	
England/Wales					
New Zealand	yes				
Puerto Rico	yes		yes	yes	yes

*** Only Bermuda makes final decisions**

STATISTICS AND RECIDVISM

Table 38. Difficulty Producing Statistics

Statistic	Army		Air Force		US Parole	
	Level of Difficulty	Publish Regularly	Level of Difficulty	Publish Regularly	Level of Difficulty	Publish Regularly
Average sentence length for all offenders sentenced to prison during a calendar year	High		Impossible		None	yes
Average sentence length by offense category for all offenders sentenced to prison during a calendar year	High		Impossible		None	yes
Average time served for all offenders released from prison during a calendar year	High		Impossible		None	
Average time served by offenders released from prison by offense category during a calendar year	Impossible		Impossible		None	
Number of offenders paroled during a calendar year	Moderate		None		None	yes
Number of offenders leaving supervision during a calendar year who successfully completed parole	High		Moderate		High	
Number of offenders leaving supervision during a calendar year whose parole was revoked	Moderate	yes	None		High	
Average time under supervision for offenders leaving parole during a calendar year who successfully complete parole	High	yes	High		High	
Average time under supervision for offenders leaving parole during a calendar year who are revoked		yes	Impossible		High	
Statistic	**NPB Canada**		**Ontario Canada**		**Bermuda**	
	Level of Difficulty	**Publish Regularly**	**Level of Difficulty**	**Publish Regularly**	**Level of Difficulty**	**Publish Regularly**
Average sentence length for all offenders sentenced	None	yes	Moderate			

to prison during a calendar year						
Average sentence length by offense category for all offenders sentenced to prison during a calendar year	None		Moderate		Impossible	
Average time served for all offenders released from prison during a calendar year	None		Moderate		Impossible	
Average time served by offenders released from prison by offense category during a calendar year	None		Moderate		Impossible	
Number of offenders paroled during a calendar year	None	yes	Moderate	yes	None	yes
Number of offenders leaving supervision during a calendar year who successfully completed parole	None	yes	Moderate	yes	None	
Number of offenders leaving supervision during a calendar year whose parole was revoked	None	yes	Moderate	yes	Impossible	
Average time under supervision for offenders leaving parole during a calendar year who successfully complete parole	None	yes	High		Moderate	
Average time under supervision for offenders leaving parole during a calendar year who are revoked	None	yes	High		Impossible	
Statistic	**England/Wales**		**New Zealand**		**Puerto Rico**	
	Level of Difficulty	**Publish Regularly**	**Level of Difficulty**	**Publish Regularly**	**Level of Difficulty**	**Publish Regularly**
Average sentence length for all offenders sentenced to prison during a calendar year	High		Moderate		Impossible	
Average sentence length by offense category for all offenders sentenced to prison during a calendar year	High		Moderate		Impossible	
Average time served for all offenders released from prison during a calendar	High		Moderate		Impossible	

year						
Average time served by offenders released from prison by offense category during a calendar year	High		Moderate		Impossible	
Number of offenders paroled during a calendar year	None	yes	None	yes	Impossible	yes
Number of offenders leaving supervision during a calendar year who successfully completed parole	None	yes	Moderate		Impossible	yes
Number of offenders leaving supervision during a calendar year whose parole was revoked	None	yes	None	yes	None	
Average time under supervision for offenders leaving parole during a calendar year who successfully complete parole	High	yes	Moderate		Impossible	
Average time under supervision for offenders leaving parole during a calendar year who are revoked	High		None		Impossible	

* Navy provided no responses

Table 39. Recidivism Rates

	Ontario Canada	England/Wales	Puerto Rico
Rate (all calculated for one year):	**8.5%**	**5.70%**	**0.5%**
Offenders included in rate:			
All offenders released from prison to supervision			yes
All offenders released by the releasing authority from prison to supervision	yes	yes	
Events included:			
Prison - new conviction		yes	yes
Prison - revocation for new criminal activity	yes	yes	
Prison - technical violation	yes		yes
Return to jail			yes
Placement - outpatient treatment			yes
Placement - inpatient treatment			yes
Placement - day reporting center			yes
Placement - electronic monitoring			yes
Placement - curfew/house arrest			
Placement - halfway back residential			yes
Placement - intermediate (corrections)			
Placement - intermediate (parole)			
Date to Measure Recidivism:			
Date of revocation decision	yes	yes	yes

No Table 40. No Alternatives to Incarceration Reported

APPENDIX B

Survey Questionnaire