

Description and Post-Arrest Outcomes of South Central Iowa Drug Task Force Arrestees

April, 2012

Prepared by
Iowa Department of Human Rights
Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning
Statistical Analysis Center



This evaluation has been supported by the COPS Methamphetamine Grant #2007CKWX0234 through the Marion County Sheriff's Office. Findings here do not necessarily represent the official policies of Marion County Sheriff's Office or the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION.....	2
STUDY COHORT.....	3
DATA METHODS & SOURCES	4
DESCRIPTION OF ARRESTEES	6
Demographics.....	6
Substance Abuse History.....	8
Prior Arrests	11
Arresting Offense	12
COURT OUTCOMES FOR ARRESTEES	13
DESCRIPTION OF CONVICTED OFFENDERS	13
SUPERVISION STATUSES FOR CONVICTED OFFENDERS	14
<i>Cases Resulting in Imprisonment</i>	15
Demographics.....	15
Arresting Offense	15
Prior Arrests	16
<i>Cases Resulting in Community Supervision</i>	17
Demographics.....	17
Arresting Offense	17
Prior Arrests	18
<i>Comparison of Cases Resulting in Imprisonment vs. Community Supervision</i>	19
LONG-TERM OUTCOMES	23
Employment	23
Substance Abuse Treatment.....	24
Recidivism	27
APPENDIX A.....	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Study Variables and Data Sources.....	5
Table 2: TF Arrestees by Gender.....	6
Table 3: TF Arrestees by Race/Ethnicity.....	6
Table 4: TF Arrestees by Age Group.....	6
Table 5: TF Arrestees by Educational Level.....	7
Table 6: TF Arrestees by Marital Status.....	7
Table 7: TF Arrestees by Biological Parental Status.....	7
Table 8: TF Arrestees by Number of Biological Children.....	7
Table 9: TF Arrestees by Parent of Biological Child(ren) under Age 18.....	8
Table 10: TF Arrestees by Age at First Use (Years).....	8
Table 11: TF Arrestees by Frequency of Use (30 Days Prior to Substance Abuse Treatment Entry).....	9
Table 12: TF Arrestees by Methamphetamine Method of Use.....	9
Table 13: TF Arrestees by Primary Substance of Choice.....	9
Table 14: TF Arrestees by Secondary Substance of Choice.....	10
Table 15: TF Arrestees by Tertiary Substance of Choice.....	10
Table 16: TF Arrestees by Type of Substance Used.....	10
Table 17: TF Arrestees by Number of Prior Substance Abuse Treatment Admissions.....	10
Table 18: Number of Prior Arrests by Number of Offenders.....	11
Table 19: Felony vs. Misdemeanor Prior Arrests.....	11
Table 20: Number of Arrests by Offense Type.....	11
Table 21: Most Serious Arrest Charge by Offense Type.....	12
Table 22: Most Serious Arrest Offense by Charge Level.....	12
Table 23: Court Outcomes.....	13
Table 24: Percentage Convicted as Charged by Offense Level.....	16
Table 25: Prison Time Actually Served (Months) by Offense Level.....	16
Table 26: Arresting Charge vs. Convicting Offense for Offenders Returned to the Community.....	18
Table 27: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Gender.....	19
Table 28: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Race/Ethnicity.....	19
Table 29: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Age.....	19
Table 30: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Educational Level.....	19
Table 31: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Marital Status.....	20
Table 32: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Biological Parental Status.....	20
Table 33: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Number of Biological Children.....	20
Table 34: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Parent of Biological Child(ren) under Age 18.....	21
Table 35: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Primary Substance of Choice.....	21
Table 36: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Arresting Charge Type.....	21
Table 37: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Arresting Charge Level.....	21
Table 38: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Convicting Offense Type.....	22
Table 39: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Convicting Offense Level.....	22
Table 40: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Prior Arrest Type.....	22
Table 41: TF Convicted Offenders by Highest Level of Employment in Tracking Period.....	23
Table 42: TF Convicted Offenders by Last (or only) Known Employment in Tracking Period.....	23
Table 43: TF Convicted Offenders by Ever Unemployed in Tracking Period.....	24
Table 44: TF Convicted Offenders by Number of Offenders in Treatment.....	24
Table 45: TF Convicted Offenders by Demographic Characteristics of Offenders in Treatment.....	25
Table 46: TF Convicted Offenders by Type of Care in First Treatment Episode.....	25
Table 47: TF Convicted Offenders by Treatment Outcomes.....	26
Table 48: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Number of Offenders in Treatment.....	27
Table 49: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Treatment Outcomes.....	27
Table 50: First Recidivist Offense Level by Recidivist Offense Type.....	28
Table 51: Number of Recidivist Acts of Offenders Convicted as a Result of a TF Arrest from TF Initial Arrest until March 31, 2010.....	28
Table 52: Most Serious Recidivist Arrest Offense Level by Recidivist Offense Type.....	28
Table 53: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Recidivism (New Arrests).....	29
Table 54: Relationship between Substance Abuse Treatment and Recidivism.....	30
Table 55: Characteristics of Study Groups.....	31

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study examined the characteristics and outcomes of cases resulting from arrests made by the South Central Iowa Drug Task Force between January 1, 2001 and June 30, 2007. The original cohort included 309 alleged offenders. Detailed analyses were performed on arrest cases that resulted in a conviction (n=245). Variables of interest for the group of convicted offenders were supervision statuses, demographic characteristics, and long-term outcomes such as employment, substance abuse treatment, and recidivism (defined as any new arrest).

The study suggests that the racial make-up of those arrested by the Task Force (TF) was similar to that of the population of the area covered by the TF, with a high percentage of Caucasian arrests. As expected, the predominant drug involved in the Task Force cases was methamphetamine, characteristic of the type of rural areas covered by the TF.

While nearly 80% of Task Force arrests resulted in conviction, many charges were reduced. For example, while Class B felonies were alleged in 44.3% of the TF arrests, only 6.9% of the convictions occurred at this level. Most convictions resulted in community placement, with about 23% resulting in imprisonment. The average time served in prison for those imprisoned was 19.9 months.

While few of those convicted (2%) were in drug treatment at the time of their arrest, a majority (63%) participated in treatment after arrest, showing that many offenders enter treatment due to their involvement in the justice system. Most of those participating in treatment (59%) were involved in extended outpatient treatment. Many, however, did not successfully complete treatment, as just over half (53%) successfully completed treatment. Those imprisoned were more likely than community-based placements to successfully complete treatment.

Recidivism results showed that about half (47%) of those who were convicted were later arrested for a new criminal offense. Nearly half of these first recidivist arrests (49%) were for drug offenses. That more than half the new arrest were for non-drug offenses suggests that many of those arrested were criminals who happened to do drugs, rather than addicts who got into crime to help support their habit.

The most serious recidivism offenses tended to be less serious than the offense resulting in inclusion in this study. While the largest group of offenders in the study (44%) was charged with Class B felonies, the largest percentage of new offenses (23%) was for Class D felonies. Put another way, 88% of those arrested by the Task Force were charged with felonies, while 56% of the recidivist arrests for those convicted were felonies.

Of note is that offenders who underwent drug treatment had recidivism rates similar to those who did not receive treatment. This finding, however, is compromised somewhat by the delay between arrest by the Task Force and the date of entering treatment (766 days for those imprisoned and 407 for those sent to community alternatives).

INTRODUCTION

According to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, a multi-jurisdictional task force (MJTF) “is a cooperative law enforcement effort involving two or more criminal justice agencies, with jurisdiction over two or more areas, sharing the common goal of addressing drug control or violent crime problems. MJTFs allow law enforcement agencies in different jurisdictions to work together as a single enforcement entity with the ability to improve communication, share intelligence, and coordinate activities. This allows for more efficient use of resources and targeting of offenders whose activities cross jurisdictional boundaries.”

Multi-jurisdictional drug task forces “target the illegal distribution of drugs at the local and regional levels.”¹ These units typically include: (a) full-time officers, (b) from a variety of different law enforcement agencies, (c) within a specific geographic region, (d) that conduct drug investigations and drug enforcement activities, (e) across a geographic region that spans individual departmental jurisdiction.²

Similar to other Iowa drug task forces, the South Central Iowa Drug Task Force (TF) is the first line of defense against drug-related activities in Iowa communities within its geographic area. The ten southern Iowa counties that TF serves include Appanoose, Clarke, Decatur, Lucas, Madison, Marion, Monroe, Ringgold, Union, and Wayne. The TF received a Community Oriented Policing (COPS) Methamphetamine grant, for which the Marion County Sheriff’s Office (MCSO) served as the lead agency. The TF also collaborates with other local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies in making the appropriate arrest.

As stated by the TF, the problem is that South Central Iowa is plagued with methamphetamine criminals. The area is largely rural and also one of the most economically deprived areas in the state, factors associated with methamphetamine production and abuse. The methamphetamine problem is compounded by the fact that a large number of children, through drug abusing parents and caregivers, are exposed to methamphetamine and its harmful ingredients. The project goals for this grant were to 1) improve public safety through a reduction in the availability and use of methamphetamine and 2) reduce the negative impact of methamphetamine use and abuse on the community.

In 2008, the TF asked the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP) to conduct a study of the offenders arrested by the TF. The purpose of the study was to gain a better understanding of who is arrested by the TF, what happens to them as a result of their arrests, and what happens once they return to the community in the years following their arrests.

¹ Hayeslip, D. W., & Russell-Einhorn, M. L. (2003). *Evaluation of multi-jurisdictional task forces project: Phase 1 final report*. Retrieved October 27, 2011, from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service Web site: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/200904.pdf>

² Olson, d. E., Albertson, S., Brees, J., Cobb, A., Feliciano, L., Juergens, R., Ramker, G. F., & Bauer, R. (2002). *New approaches and techniques for examining and evaluating multi-jurisdictional drug task forces in Illinois*. Retrieved October 27, 2011, from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority Web site: <http://www.icjia.state.il.us/public/pdf/ResearchReports/NewApproaches.pdf>

STUDY COHORT

The study cohort for this project is arrest cases by the TF that occurred between January 1, 2001 and June 30, 2007. Demographic characteristics, criminal histories, substance abuse histories, court outcomes, and other background characteristics of all arrest cases (n=309) were examined.

Further study focused only on arrest cases that resulted in a conviction (n=245). Variables of interest for the group of convicted offenders were supervision statuses, demographic characteristics, and long-term outcomes such as employment, substance abuse treatment, and recidivism (defined as any new arrest).

Appendix A contains a table providing a comparison of the characteristics of study groups (those arrested, convicted, imprisoned, and on community supervision).

Two analysts traveled to the TF office and, with the assistance of members of the TF, collected the initial list of arrest cases from TF files. Records were examined to ascertain the number and identity of those individuals arrested by the TF. That examination disclosed the names of 468 individuals, some of whom who had been arrested on more than one occasion by the TF during the study period. In those cases, each arrest was treated as a separate case, thus some individuals were counted more than once.

To validate the TF "arrest records", they were compared to the data contained in the on-line version of the Iowa Courts Information System (ICIS). This comparison resulted in 309, or 66%, of the cases matching. While this may appear to be a low number of matches, the involvement of federal authorities and other factors suggest that this is a reasonable percentage of matches. Some specific suggested causes are listed below:

- Deferred Judgments – As will be discussed later, this study population appeared to have received a large number of deferred judgments. If the deferred judgment's period of probation was successfully completed, all references to the arrest and court disposition will be removed from the Iowa criminal history system (CCH) and "hidden" in ICIS, thus making it appear as though there had never been an arrest. This appears to have happened to a number of the older cases where no record of the arrest could be found in the court's or CCH's data.
- Federal Involvement – The Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) played an integral part in TF operations and, in some instances, took control of the arrestees and evidence, and filed for prosecution in the federal courts. In these cases, there was no prosecution at the State level, thus no record was created in ICIS.
- DHS Referrals – It appears in some cases that no charges were formally filed against the arrestee but the individual was referred to DHS for services.
- Data Entry Errors – Some cases were entered into the database more than once.
- Informants – Law enforcement agencies regularly attempt to recruit confidential informants, and in many cases recruit from among the individuals whom the agency arrests. In some cases, no charges are filed against the individual in exchange for becoming an informant.
- Other Jurisdictions – The normal operational area for the TF was, as the name implies, South Central Iowa. This area includes some counties that border Missouri, and given the nature of the drug trade, the TF had some activities in Missouri. The appropriate

Missouri law enforcement agencies were informed of the TF activity, and assisted in several ways. In at least one instance, a drug transaction occurred in Missouri, and the offender was arrested by Missouri law enforcement personnel. Such cases would be tried in the Missouri courts, and thus were not included in the study because no court disposition data were electronically available.

DATA METHODS & SOURCES

In the present study, the unit of analysis is a case rather than an individual, so offenders who were arrested by the TF more than once were included in the cohort more than once. Nineteen individuals had multiple arrests in the study period.

Court outcomes were reviewed through March 31, 2010. In three arrest cases, the court dispositions were pending through the tracking period and eventually resulted in a guilty conviction at a later date. However, for the purposes of this study, these cases were counted as pending, since the conviction occurred outside the time parameter.

On long-term outcome measures, arrest cases that resulted in a conviction (n=245) were tracked from the date of arrest through March 31, 2010.

Due to incomplete record tracking in jails, the study was not able to include information on offenders who entered jail after being convicted. Instead, court data were reviewed to determine placements based on court sentences. Based on the sentencing orders, cases in which offenders were determined to have gone to jail were counted as a return to the community. This decision was made due to the nature of jail stays, which will be discussed later in the report.

Information on whether or not an arrest case was considered a Drug Endangered Children (DEC) case was collected from TF case files. Of the original 468 records collected from TF files, 59 were identified as a Drug Endangered Children (DEC) case (12.6%). Of the 309 arrest cases in the final cohort, only 20 were identified as DEC cases (6.5%) and 18 of those resulted in a conviction. Because of the small number of Drug Endangered Children (DEC) cases that resulted in a conviction, further exploration of child maltreatment and foster care were not possible in order to ensure the confidentiality of study participants.

Please note, some percentages may not add up to 100.0% because of rounding. In the tables, the "total" percentages are shown as 100%, as the numbers round up or down to 100%.

Table 1 provides a list of study variables and the data sources.

Table 1: Study Variables and Data Sources

Study Variables	Data Sources
Description & Demographics	
Name	TF files
Age	TF files
Gender	TF files
Highest level of Education	ICON, PSI reports, ISMART/SARS
Race/Ethnicity	CCH, ICON
Marital Status	ICON, PSI reports, ISMART/SARS
Parental Status	PSI reports
Number of Children	PSI reports
Children under Age 18	PSI reports
Drug Endangered Children (DEC)	TF files
Substance Abuse History	
Age of first use	ISMART/SARS
Frequency of use last month	ISMART/SARS
Primary, Secondary, Tertiary Substances of Choice	ISMART/SARS
Method of Methamphetamine use	ISMART/SARS
Type of substance used	ICON (LSI-R), ISMART/SARS
Number of SA admissions in last 10 years	ISMART/SARS
Offenses	
Prior Arrest	CCH, Courts on-Line
Arresting Offense	CCH, Courts on-Line
Supervision Statuses (based on sentences)	
Prison	CCH, Courts on-Line
Community Supervision	CCH, Courts on-Line
Outcomes	
Employment	ICON, ICON (LSI-R), ISMART/SARS
Substance Abuse Treatment	ISMART/SARS
Recidivism (New Arrest)	CCH, Courts on-Line

Notes: ICON refers to the Iowa Correctional Offender Network, the automated database used by the Department of Corrections; PSI refers to the Pre-Sentence Investigation, a report prepared by a probation/parole officer detailing an offender's background; ISMART/SARS refers to the Iowa Service Management and Reporting Tool/Substance Abuse Reporting System, the administrative database used by the Department of Public Health for substance abuse treatment tracking; CCH refers to the Iowa Computerized Criminal History files, maintained by the Division of Criminal Investigation, detailing an offender's past criminal activity; LSI-R refers to the Level of Service Inventory-Revised, a diagnostic tool used by the Department of Corrections to assess offenders risk and needs.

DESCRIPTION OF ARRESTEES

The typical person arrested by TF was male (72.8%), Caucasian (97.1%), less than 30 years old (57.3%), holding a high school diploma or GED (58.3%), single (39.8%), and a parent (43.6%) of children under age 18 (91.1%). Detailed demographic data are provided in Tables 2 through 9.

Data from the 2010 Census indicates that Caucasians comprised 97.3% of the population of the ten counties participating in the TF.

Demographics

Table 2: TF Arrestees by Gender

Gender	Number	Percentage
Male	225	72.8%
Female	84	27.2%
Total	309	100%

Table 3: TF Arrestees by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percentage
Caucasian	300	97.1%
Hispanic	6	1.9%
African American	2	0.6%
Native American	1	0.3%
Total	309	100%

Table 4: TF Arrests by Age Group

Age	Average	Min	Max
Age	30.7	18	56
Age Group	Number	Percentage	
<21	56	18.1%	
21 – 25	71	23.0%	
26 – 30	50	16.2%	
31 – 35	38	12.3%	
36 – 40	38	12.3%	
41 – 45	32	10.4%	
46 – 50	20	6.2%	
51 and Over	4	1.3%	
Total	309	100%	

Table 5: TF Arrestees by Educational Level

Educational Level	Number	Percentage
Less than High School Diploma	67	21.7%
High School Diploma/GED	180	58.3%
Technical Training/Some College	33	10.7%
College Degree (Associate/Bachelor)	7	2.3%
Unknown	22	7.1%
Total	309	100%

Data were primarily obtained from ICON correctional records and pre-sentence investigation reports. If ICON data were not available for offenders, data were obtained from SARS/ISMAART, using the substance abuse evaluation and treatment records nearest to the date of arrest. Efforts were taken to determine education level near the date of arrest.

Table 6: TF Arrestees by Marital Status

Marital Status	Number	Percentage
Single	123	39.8%
Divorced/Widowed	64	20.7%
Cohabiting/Common-Law	36	11.7%
Married	61	19.7%
Unknown	25	8.1%
Total	309	100%

Data were primarily obtained from ICON correctional records and pre-sentence investigation reports. If ICON data were not available for offenders, data were obtained from SARS/ISMAART, using the substance abuse evaluation and treatment records nearest to the date of arrest. Marital status may change over time and efforts were taken to determine the marital status near the date of arrest.

Table 7: TF Arrestees by Biological Parental Status

Biological Parental Status	Number	Percentage
Parent	133	43.0%
Non-Parent	92	29.8%
Pregnant	2	0.6%
Unknown	82	26.5%
Total	309	100%

Data were obtained from ICON's presentence investigation (PSI) reports for the arresting offense or the offense closest to the date of arrest. Some offenders did not have ICON correctional records, and for others, PSIs did not report parental information.

Table 8: TF Arrestees by Number of Biological Children

Number of Biological Children	Number	Percentage
One	53	39.3%
Two	37	27.4%
Three	22	16.3%
Four	14	10.4%
Five or More	5	3.7%
Unknown	4	3.0%
Total	135	100%

Data were obtained from ICON's presentence investigation (PSI) reports for the arresting offense or the offense closest to the date of arrest. Number of children at or near the time of arrest among offenders who were parents, including unborn children.

Table 9: TF Arrestees by Parent of Biological Child(ren) under Age 18

Child(ren) under Age 18	Number	Percentage
Yes	123	91.1%
No	12	8.9%
Total	135	100%

Data were obtained from ICON's presentence investigation (PSI) reports for the arresting offense or the offense closest to the date of arrest. Parent to at least one biological child under the age of 18, including unborn children.

Substance Abuse History

As shown in Tables 10 through 17, below, substance use and abuse started early in life and was a major aspect of life for many offenders. On average, the typical person arrested by TF first used drugs or alcohol around age 16 (alcohol and marijuana started during the teenage years; while the onset of methamphetamine was in the early 20s). The majority of arrestees (54.9%) who reported alcohol as a primary, secondary, or tertiary substance of choice reported no use of alcohol in the past month, 65.5% of marijuana abusers reported no use of the drug in the past month, and 63% of methamphetamine abuser reported no use of the drug in the past 30 days prior to substance abuse treatment entry. Only 7.5% of alcohol abusers, 10.8% of marijuana abusers, and 17% of methamphetamine abusers used their substance of choice daily. Thirty-four percent reported having previously been admitted to substance abuse treatment in the last ten years.

Arrestees were most likely to report methamphetamine as their primary substance of choice (33.7%). Two thirds (66.7%) reported currently using methamphetamine. Among methamphetamine users, nearly half (49.3%) smoked the drug. Meth users also were more likely than other offenders to report using the drug daily.

For each arrest case, the first substance abuse record that occurred after the date of arrest was used. Substance abuse information is self-reported by offenders. Data were unavailable for offenders who did not have an assessment or treatment.

Table 10: TF Arrestees by Age at First Use (Years)

Age at First Use (Years)	Number	Average	SD
Any Substance	224	15.8	5.2
Alcohol	133	14.5	3.4
Marijuana	148	15.5	4.0
Methamphetamine	146	22.0	8.2

Data were only reported for primary, secondary, and tertiary substance of choice, and offenders whose substance(s) of choice were something other than alcohol, marijuana, or methamphetamine were not reported.

Table 11: TF Arrestees by Frequency of Use (30 Days Prior to Substance Abuse Treatment Entry)

Frequency of Use	Number	Percentage
Alcohol	133	100%
No Use	73	54.9%
1-3 Times in Past Month	39	29.3%
1-2 Times/Week	9	6.8%
3-6 Times/Week	2	1.5%
Daily	10	7.5%
Marijuana	148	100%
No Use	97	65.5%
1-3 Times in Past Month	21	14.2%
1-2 Times/Week	12	8.1%
3-6 Times/Week	2	1.4%
Daily	16	10.8%
Methamphetamine	146	100%
No Use	92	63.0%
1-3 Times in Past Month	21	14.4%
1-2 Times/Week	3	2.1%
3-6 Times/Week	5	3.4%
Daily	25	17.1%

Data were only reported for primary, secondary, and tertiary substance of choice, and offenders whose substance(s) of choice were something other than alcohol, marijuana, or methamphetamine were not reported.

Table 12: TF Arrestees by Methamphetamine Method of Use

Methamphetamine Method of Use	Number	Percentage
Smoking	72	49.3%
Injection	49	33.6%
Inhalation	21	14.4%
Oral	4	2.7%
Total	146	100%

Table 13: TF Arrestees by Primary Substance of Choice

Primary Substance of Choice	Number	Percentage
Methamphetamine	104	33.7%
Marijuana	62	20.1%
Alcohol	54	17.5%
Other	5	1.6%
None	3	1.0%
Unknown	81	26.2%
Total	309	100%

Table 14: TF Arrestees by Secondary Substance of Choice

Secondary Substance of Choice	Number	Percentage
Marijuana	72	23.3%
Alcohol	47	15.2%
Methamphetamine	30	9.7%
Other	9	2.9%
None	70	22.7%
Unknown	81	26.2%
Total	309	100%

Table 15: TF Arrestees by Tertiary Substance of Choice

Tertiary Substance of Choice	Number	Percentage
Alcohol	32	10.4%
Marijuana	14	4.5%
Methamphetamine	14	4.5%
Other	12	3.9%
None	156	50.5%
Unknown	81	26.2%
Total	309	100%

Table 16: TF Arrestees by Type of Substance Used

Type of Substance Used (n=264)	Number	Percentage
Methamphetamine	176	66.7%
Marijuana	160	60.6%
Alcohol	134	50.8%
Crack/Cocaine	8	3.0%
Benzodiazepine (Xanax)	6	2.3%

For each arrest case, the first substance abuse record that occurred after the date of arrest was used. For offenders who did not have a SARS/ISMAART assessment or treatment, information on the type of drugs used was collected (when available) from the "current drug problem" indicated on the Level of Service Inventory Revised (LSI-R). The LSI-R assessment closest to the date of arrest (either before or after), was used. For each arrest case, offenders are counted once in each drug category that drug use was reported, and thus they may be counted more than once. Substance abuse information is self-reported by offenders. Offenders for whom information was unavailable are not included in the percentages.

Table 17: TF Arrestees by Number of Prior Substance Abuse Treatment Admissions

Number of Prior SA Treatment Admissions (in last 10 years)	Number	Percentage
Zero	122	39.5%
One	54	17.5%
Two	20	6.5%
Three	10	3.2%
Four	12	3.9%
Five or More	9	2.9%
Unknown	82	26.5%
Total	309	100%

Prior Arrests

Analyses of the data indicate that over one-third of the study population (33.7%; n=104) had no prior arrests according to the CCH data. For the remainder of the study population (n=205), the number of prior arrests ranged from one to 34. Table 18 below portrays the number of prior arrests for the study population.

Table 18: Number of Prior Arrests by Number of Offenders

Number of Prior Arrests	Number of Offenders	Percentage
0	104	33.7%
1	69	22.3%
2	26	8.4%
3	34	11.0%
4	20	6.5%
5	14	4.5%
6	7	2.3%
7	15	4.9%
8	9	2.9%
9	3	1.0%
10 or more	8	2.6%
Total	309	100%

It should be noted that those offenders with *10 or more* prior arrests (n=8) comprised only 2.6% of the study population, yet were responsible for 130, or 42.1%, of the pre-TF arrests.

It should also be noted that 749 arrests divided by the study population (309) equals an average of 2.4 pre-TF arrests per offender.

Table 19: Felony vs. Misdemeanor Prior Arrests

Prior Arrest Type	Number	Percentage
Felony	191	25.5%
Misdemeanor	558	74.5%
Total	749	100%

Table 20: Number of Arrests by Offense Type

Offense Type	Number	Percentage
Person	84	11.2%
Property	152	20.3%
Drug Related	200	26.6%
Public Order	313	41.8%
Total	749	100%

For purposes of the above table, public order offenses include all offenses that are not violent, against property, or drug related (e.g., traffic, OWI, weapons, etc). This is done to avoid a long table with a large number of categories with a very small sample sizes.

Arresting Offense

Table 21: Most Serious Arrest Charge by Offense Type

Offense Type	Number	Percentage
Drug Related	296	95.8%
Person	8	2.6%
Weapon	3	1.0%
Property	1	0.3%
Traffic	1	0.3%
Total	309	100%

As might be expected, Table 21 indicates that the most serious arrest charge was a drug related charge in over 95% of the cases. The violent (person) crimes were comprised of seven child endangerment charges and one sexual abuse case; the weapons offenses all involved a convicted felon possessing a firearm; the property-related case was a theft; and the traffic offense was driving while barred.

Table 22: Most Serious Arrest Offense by Charge Level

Offense Level	Number	Percentage
Class B Felony	137	44.3%
Class C Felony	56	18.1%
Class D Felony	78	25.3%
Aggravated Misdemeanor	5	1.6%
Serious Misdemeanor	32	10.4%
Simple Misdemeanor	1	0.3%
Total	309	100%

Table 22 clearly indicates the serious nature of the charges that were filed after the arrests in that almost 90% were felony charges. In Iowa, a Class B felony is punishable by up to 25 years in prison, a Class C felony up to 10 years, and a Class D felony up to 5 years. A Class B drug offense typically involves manufacture or sale. A Class C drug offense is typically possession with intent to sell. Class D drug offenses usually involve marijuana, while serious misdemeanors are usually simple possession of drugs.

COURT OUTCOMES FOR ARRESTEES

As a result of the TF arrests, there were 245 convictions for a public offense. This number includes 239 cases that were initially convicted and six cases that eventually resulted in a conviction after revocation of a deferred judgment.

Table 23: Court Outcomes

Outcome	Number	Percentage
Guilty	239	77.3%
Dismissed	41	13.3%
Deferred Judgment	29	9.4%
Total	309	100%

Table 23 indicates two points of note. First would be the conviction rate of 77%, indicating that almost eight out of every ten arrestees were convicted of some criminal offense as a result of the TF arrest. A review of the convicting offenses will be conducted later in this report. The second is the number of deferred judgments granted. The Iowa Court Information System (ICIS) data contained in the Iowa Justice Data Warehouse indicate that during the period of January 1, 2001 through December 31, 2006, the percentage of deferred judgment cases was 2.9%. This is the timeframe during which most of the arrests in the study were made. In the study population, the percentage of deferred judgments was 9.4%, or more than three times the percentage of all court dispositions. If the age of the arrestees from Table 4 is considered in conjunction with the DCI number of the arrestees (high numbers indicating few, if any, prior arrests for a serious offense), it could be concluded that a number of the arrestees were young people experiencing their first arrest for a serious offense. It might also be concluded that the courts afforded these individuals an opportunity to “turn their life around” and after so doing, have a “clean” criminal history. Reviewing the outcomes of the deferred judgment cases, 20 were eventually dismissed when the subject successfully completed the probation requirements set by the court, six were eventually convicted when their deferred judgments were revoked as a result of one or more violations of the terms and conditions of their probation, and three cases were still pending before the court. As previously mentioned, if the deferred judgment’s period of probation was successfully completely completed, all references to the arrest and court disposition would be removed from the Iowa criminal history system (CCH) and “hidden” in ICIS, thus making it appear as though there had never been an arrest. This appears to have happened to a number of the older cases where no record of the case can be found in the court’s or CCH’s data.

DESCRIPTION OF CONVICTED OFFENDERS

Of the 245 convictions, 78.4% were of a male (n=192) and 21.6% were of a female (n=53). Among the convicted offenders, nearly all (98.4%) were Caucasian (n=241). Two offenders were Hispanic, one was African-American, and one was Native American. The ages of the convicted offenders ranged from a low of 18 years of age to a high of 56 years of age, with an average age of 30.7.

In terms of educational attainment, most offenders convicted (59%) had attained a high school diploma or GED (n=145). Twenty-four percent had less than a high school diploma (n=59), 11% had some technical training or college (n=27), and less than 1% had a college degree (n=1). Educational status was unknown for 13 offenders (5.3%).

At the time of arrest, about 41% of convicted offenders were single (n=100), 21% were married (n=52), 20% were divorced or widowed (n=49), and only 11% were cohabitating or common-law (n=28). Marital status was unknown for the remaining 7% (n=16).

Approximately 45% (n=110) of convicted offenders were parents or expectant parents at the time of the arrest, while 32% did not have children (n=79). Parental status was unknown for the remaining 23% (n=56). Among those with children, a large majority had three or fewer children. Forty two percent had one child (n=46), 26% had two children (n=29), and 17% had three children (n=19). Also, most of the offenders who had children (91.8%) had at least one child that was under the age of 18 (n=101).

The primary substance of choice for convicted offenders was methamphetamine (indicated by offenders in 34.3% of cases; n=84). About 21% of offenders indicated that marijuana was their substance of choice (n=51), and 17% indicated alcohol (n=42). Slightly over 2% had no primary substance of choice or something other than methamphetamine, alcohol, or marijuana (n=6). The primary substance of choice was unknown for one-quarter (25.3%) of the offenders (n=62). The most serious convicting offense was for a drug crime in 93.9% of the cases (n=230). The remaining most serious offenses included a crime against a person in seven cases, operating while intoxicated in two cases, weapons violations in two cases, a public order offense in two cases, a property crime in one case, and a traffic offense in one case.

The most serious convicting offense in 6.9% of the cases was for a Class B Felony (25 years prison maximum) (n=17), 28.6% were for a Class C Felony (10 years prison maximum) (n=70), 35.9% were for a Class D Felony (five years prison maximum) (n=88), 6.9% were for an Aggravated Misdemeanor (two years prison maximum) (n=17), 19.2% were for a Serious Misdemeanor (one year jail maximum) (n=47), and 2.0% were for a Simple Misdemeanor (30 days jail maximum) (n=5). Only one conviction (0.4%) was for an "Other" Felony (15 years prison maximum).

SUPERVISION STATUSES FOR CONVICTED OFFENDERS

For further analysis, the study cases were divided in two groups; those where the offender was returned to the community and those where the offender was actually imprisoned. Those cases in which the offender was sentenced to jail were included in the cases where the offender was returned to the community for several reasons. First, the jails were normally located in the offender's county of residence (as opposed to a prison, which is most likely located outside the offender's county of residence). Second, jail sentences were usually short, days, when compared to prison sentences, maximum years to be served. Thus the offender was normally returned to the community in a relatively short period of time. Third, in a number of cases, the number of days to be served in jail equaled the number of days the offender had been in custody, thus the sentence was actually "time served" with no additional jail time to be served.

The 245 convictions for offenses resulted in 188 prison sentences; however, of those sentences, 117 had the entire prison sentence suspended. Therefore, 71 actually resulted in prison incarceration, including two cases where the offender was originally given a deferred judgment and probation which were later revoked, with a resulting prison sentence.

The convictions also resulted in 52 sentences to jail; however, of those, 36 had a portion, or all, of the number of jail days suspended.

In 152 cases, some period of probation was imposed. In all of these cases, a period of jail or prison incarceration was also imposed, although in some cases, some or all of the incarceration

was suspended. In addition to the probation, nine cases resulted in the offender be sentenced to a residential facility also, and in one case, a period of community service was also imposed.

Cases Resulting in Imprisonment

Demographics

As was previously indicated, there were 71 cases where the offender was actually incarcerated in prison. In those cases, 91.5% of offenders were males (n=65) and 8.5% were females (n=6).

Caucasians were incarcerated in 95.8% of cases (n=68). Only one case was of an African American, one of a Hispanic, and one of a Native American. The age of the offenders incarcerated in prison ranged from 19 through 51, with the average age being 33.3.

In slightly over three-quarters (76.1%) of cases resulting in incarceration, offenders had attained a high school diploma or GED (n=54). Fourteen percent had less than a high school diploma (n=10), 8.5% had some technical training or college (n=6), and 1.4% had a college degree (n=1).

At the time of arrest, thirty-seven percent of offenders who were incarcerated were single (n=26), 33.8% were divorced or widowed (n=24), 22.5% were married (n=16), and 7% were cohabitating or common-law (n=5).

Approximately 58% (n=41) of convicted offenders sentenced to prison were parents at the time of the arrest, while 34% did not have children (n=24). Parental status was unknown for the remaining 8.5% (n=6). Among those with children, a large majority had three or fewer children. Forty four percent had one child (n=18), 24% had two children (n=10), and 15% had three children (n=6). Also, nearly all of the offenders (97.6%) had at least one child that was under the age of 18 (n=40).

The primary substance of choice for almost half of incarcerated offenders was methamphetamine (indicated by offenders in 46.5% of cases; n=33). About 14% of offenders indicated that marijuana was their substance of choice (n=10), and 7% indicated alcohol (n=5). Only one case had something other than methamphetamine, alcohol, or marijuana. The primary substance of choice was unknown for 31% the offenders (n=22).

Arresting Offense

Of the 71 cases where the offender was incarcerated in prison, the most serious **arresting charge** was a drug charge in 97.2% of the cases (n=69). The remaining two cases were offenses against a person. The most serious arresting charge was a Class B Felony in 66.2% of the cases (n=47), a Class C Felony in 19.7% of the cases (n=14), a Class D Felony in 12.7% of the cases (n=9), and an Aggravated Misdemeanor in the one remaining case. The preponderance of Class B felonies suggests a strong relationship between the seriousness of the arresting offense and imprisonment.

The most serious **convicting offense** was a drug charge in 97.2% of the cases (n=69), a crime against person in one case, and a public order offense in the last case. In 16.9% of the cases (n=12), the most serious convicting charge was a Class B Felony; in 45.1% of the cases, a Class C Felony (n=32); in 35.2% of the cases, a Class D Felony (n=25). Only one case was an Other Class Felony, and one case was an Aggravated Misdemeanor.

Table 24: Percentage Convicted as Charged by Offense Level

Offense Level at Arrest	Percent Convicted	Percent Convicted at Arrest Offense Level	Percent Imprisoned
Class B Felony (n=137)	83.2% (n=114)	12.4% (n=17)	34.3% (n=47)
Class C Felony (n=56)	92.9% (n=52)	48.0% (n=25)	25.0% (n=14)
Class D Felony (n=78)	68.0% (n=53)	46.2% (n=36)	11.5% (n=9)
Misdemeanor (n=38)	68.4% (n=26)	63.2% (n=24)	5.3% (N=2)
Total (n=309)	79.3% (n=245)	33.0% (n=102)	23.3% (n=72)

Table 24 shows a strong relationship between the seriousness of the original charge and the likelihood of eventual conviction and imprisonment. Note that, while a high percentage of the Class B charges resulted in conviction, few resulted in conviction for Class B felonies. This contrasts with C felonies, which had an even higher overall conviction rate, with nearly half resulting in conviction for Class C felonies. Among the misdemeanants, there were lower rates of eventual conviction, but higher percentages being convicted as originally charged.

Imprisonment rates followed the expected pattern, with rates dropping as charge level decreased. With regard to the time actually served in prison, the minimum time served was 3.2 months, the maximum time served was 51.2 months, and the average length of prison incarceration was 19.9 months. Each of these is well below the possible maximum term due to the indeterminate nature of Iowa’s indeterminate sentencing system.

Table 25: Prison Time Actually Served (Months) by Offense Level

Average Time Served	19.9
Minimum Time Served	3.2
Maximum Time Served	51.2
Class B Felony Average Time Served	32.9
Class C Felony Average Time Served	18.4
Class D Felony Average Time Served	14.6
Aggravated Misdemeanor	10.9

Prior Arrests

Of the 71 cases resulting in prison incarceration, a total of 11 cases, or 15.5%, had no identifiable prior arrests. In 29.6% of cases, there were no felony arrests prior to the TF arrest (n=21). Further, in 36.6% of the cases, the offender had no prior misdemeanor arrests (n=26). The number of prior felony arrests ranged from zero to eight, with a total of 102 felony arrests within the imprisoned cohort. That resulted in an average of 1.4 prior felony arrests per case, or an average of 2.0 prior felony arrests for those cases in which there was a prior felony arrest. Similarly, the number of prior misdemeanor arrests ranged from zero to 13, with a total of 145 prior misdemeanor arrests. That resulted in an average of 2.0 prior misdemeanor arrests per case, or 3.2 prior misdemeanor arrests in those cases in which there was a prior misdemeanor arrest. Overall, the average number of prior arrests per case was 3.5, or 4.1 prior arrests for those cases where there was a prior arrest. With regard to the type of offenses for which the prior arrests were made, 89, or 36.0%, were for public order offenses, 86, or 34.8%, were for

drug offenses, 52, or 21.1%, were for property crimes, and 20, or 8.1%, were for crimes against a person.

There appears to be little, if any, correlation between the number of arrests prior to the TF arrest and the seriousness of the TF arrest. The “top five” offenders accrued a total of 79 arrests prior to the TF arrest. In three cases, the offender was charged with a Class D felony; in one case, the offender was charged with an aggravated misdemeanor; and in the one remaining case, the offender was charged with a serious misdemeanor. Given that 193 of the 309 arrests, or 62.5%, were Class B or C Felony arrests, the seriousness of the TF charges could be considered below average against the individuals who have most clearly demonstrated a propensity for criminal action.

Cases Resulting in Community Supervision

Demographics

There were 174 offenders who were convicted of a public offense as a result of the SCIDTF arrest and returned to the community as previously defined. Of the 174, 127, or 73.0% were male, and 47, or 27.0%, were female. All but one of these offenders, 173 or 99.4%, were Caucasian, with the one remaining offender being Hispanic. These offenders ranged in age from 18 years to 56 years, with the average age being 29.6 years.

In slightly over half (52.3%) of cases resulting in community supervision, offenders had attained a high school diploma or GED (n=91). Twenty-eight percent had less than a high school diploma (n=49), 12.1% had some technical training or college (n=21), and none had a college degree.

At the time of arrest, about forty-three percent of offenders on community supervision were single (n=74), 14.4% were divorced or widowed (n=25), 20.7% were married (n=36), and 13.2% were cohabitating or common-law (n=23).

Approximately 40% (n=69) of convicted offenders sentenced to community supervision were parents or expectant parents at the time of the arrest, while 31.6% did not have children (n=55). Parental status was unknown for the remaining 28.7% (n=50). Among those with children, a large majority had three or fewer children. Forty one percent had one child (n=28), 27.5% had two children (n=19), and 18.8% had three children (n=13). Also, the majority of these offenders (88.4%) had at least one child who was under the age of 18 (n=61).

The primary substance of choice for the highest percentage (29.3%) of offenders on community supervision was methamphetamine (indicated by offenders in 51 cases). About 24% of offenders indicated that marijuana was their substance of choice (n=41), and 21.3% indicated alcohol (n=37). Three cases had something other than methamphetamine, alcohol, or marijuana, and in two cases there was no substance of choice. The primary substance of choice was unknown for 23% the offenders (n=40).

Arresting Offense

Of the 174 cases in which the offender was returned to the community after conviction, the most serious ***arresting charge*** was a drug charge in 95.4% of the cases (n=166). There were four offenses against one or more persons (child endangerment), two weapons offenses where a convicted felon was found in possession of a firearm, one property offense involving a theft and one traffic case involving driving while barred. The most serious arresting charge was a Class B

Felony in 39.1% (n=68) of the cases, a Class C Felony in 21.8% (n=38) of the cases, a Class D Felony in 25.3% (n=44) of the cases, an Aggravated Misdemeanor in 2.9% (n=5), a Serious Misdemeanor in 10.3% (n=18) of the cases, and a Simple Misdemeanor in the remaining case.

The most serious **convicting offense** was a drug charge in 92.5% of the cases (n=161), a crime against person in 3.4% (n=6) of the cases, a weapons offense in 1.1% (n=2), an OWI in 1.1% (n=2), a public order offense in 0.6% (n=1), a traffic offense in 0.6% (n=1), and a property offense in 0.6% (n=1). In 2.9% of the cases (n=5), the most serious convicting offense was a Class B Felony; in 21.8% of the cases, a Class C Felony (n=38); in 36.2% of the cases, a Class D Felony (n=63); an Aggravated Misdemeanor in 9.2% of the cases (n=16); a Serious Misdemeanor in 27.0% of the cases (n=47), and a Simple Misdemeanor in 2.9% of the cases (n=5).

Table 26: Arresting Charge vs. Convicting Offense for Offenders Returned to the Community

	Arresting Charge (n=174)	Convicting Offense (n=174)
Type		
Drug Offense	95.4%	92.5%
Violent Offense	2.3%	3.4%
Property Offense	0.6%	0.6%
Public Order Offense	1.7%	3.5%
Level		
Class B Felony	39.1%	2.9%
Class C Felony	21.8%	21.8%
Class D Felony	25.3%	36.2%
Aggravated Misdemeanor	2.9%	9.2%
Serious Misdemeanor	10.3%	27.0%
Simple Misdemeanor	0.6%	2.9%

Prior Arrests

Of the 174 cases resulting in return to the community, a total of 61 cases, or 35.1%, had no identifiable prior arrests. Most (136, or 78.2%) had no felony arrests prior to the TF arrest that resulted in the conviction. Further, in 42.0% of the cases, the offender had no prior misdemeanor arrests (n=73). The number of prior felony arrests ranged from zero to eight, with a total of 64 felony arrests. That resulted in an average of 0.4 prior felony arrests per case, or an average of 1.7 prior felony arrests for those cases where there was a prior felony arrest. Similarly, the number of prior misdemeanor arrests ranged from zero to 34, with a total of 330 prior misdemeanor arrests. That resulted in an average of 2.3 prior misdemeanor arrests per case, or 3.3 prior misdemeanor arrests in those cases where there was a prior misdemeanor arrest. Overall, the average number of prior arrests per case was 2.3 or 3.5 prior arrests for those cases where there was a prior arrest.

Examining the types of offenses for which subjects were previously arrested, one finds a wide range. The largest group of prior offenses were public order offenses (178, or 45.2%), while smaller percentages were found for drug offenses (89, or 22.6%), property crimes, (79, or 20.1%), and crimes against persons (48, or 12.2%).

Comparison of Cases Resulting in Imprisonment vs. Community Supervision

Tables 27 through 40 present data comparing offenders sentenced to prison as a result of their arresting conviction to those sentenced to community supervision.

Compared to those who were sentenced to community supervision, offenders sentenced to prison were more likely to be male (91.5% vs. 73.0%), older (an average of 33.3 years of age vs. 29.6), holding a high school diploma or GED (76.1% vs. 52.3%), a divorcee or widower (33.8% vs. 14.4%), with child(ren) under the age of 18 (97.6 vs. 88.4%), and abusing meth as their primary substance of choice (46.5% vs. 29.3%). Not surprisingly, those sentenced to prison were also more likely to have been convicted of Class B (16.9% vs. 2.9%), Class C (45.1% vs. 21.9%), or Class D (35.2% vs. 36.8%) felonies as a result of their arresting offenses. In terms of their criminal histories, prisoners were also much more likely to have had a prior pre-TF *felony* arrest (70.4% vs. 21.8%) than offenders who entered community supervision.

Table 27: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Gender

Gender	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Male	65	91.5%	127	73.0%	192	78.4%
Female	6	8.5%	47	27.0%	53	21.6%
Total	71	100%	174	100%	245	100%

Table 28: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Caucasian	68	95.8%	173	99.4%	241	98.4%
Hispanic	1	1.4%	1	0.6%	2	0.8%
African American	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Native American	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Total	71	100%	174	100%	245	100%

Table 29: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Age

Age	Imprisoned			Community Supervision			Total		
	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max
Age	33.3	19	51	29.6	18	56	30.7	18	56

Table 30: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Educational Level

Education Level	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Less than High School Diploma	10	14.1%	49	28.2%	59	24.1%
High School Diploma/GED	54	76.1%	91	52.3%	145	59.2%
Technical Training/Some College	6	8.5%	21	12.1%	27	11.0%
College Degree (Associate/Bachelor)	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Unknown	0	0.0%	13	7.5%	13	5.3%
Total	71	100%	174	100%	245	100%

Data were primarily obtained from ICON correctional records and pre-sentence investigation reports. If ICON data were not available for offenders, data were obtained from SARS/ISMART, using the substance abuse evaluation and treatment records nearest to the date of arrest. Efforts were taken to determine education level near the date of arrest.

Table 31: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Marital Status

Marital Status	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Single	26	36.6%	74	42.5%	100	40.8%
Divorced/Widowed	24	33.8%	25	14.4%	49	20.0%
Cohabiting/Common-Law	5	7.0%	23	13.2%	28	11.4%
Married	16	22.5%	36	20.7%	52	21.2%
Unknown	0	0.0%	16	9.2%	16	6.5%
Total	71	100%	174	100%	245	100%

Data were primarily obtained from ICON correctional records and pre-sentence investigation reports. If ICON data were not available for offenders, data were obtained from SARS/ISMART, using the substance abuse evaluation and treatment records nearest to the date of arrest. Marital status may change over time and efforts were taken to determine the marital status near the date of arrest.

Table 32: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Biological Parental Status

Biological Parental Status	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Parent	41	57.7%	68	39.1%	109	44.5%
Non-Parent	24	33.8%	55	31.6%	79	32.2%
Pregnant	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	1	0.4%
Unknown	6	8.5%	50	28.7%	56	22.9%
Total	71	100%	174	100%	245	100%

Data were obtained from ICON's presentence investigation (PSI) reports for the arresting offense or the offense closest to the date of arrest. Some offenders did not have ICON correctional records, and for others, PSIs did not report parental information.

Table 33: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Number of Biological Children

Number of Biological Children	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
One	18	43.9%	28	40.6%	46	41.8%
Two	10	24.4%	19	27.5%	29	26.4%
Three	6	14.6%	13	18.8%	19	17.3%
Four	3	7.3%	6	8.7%	9	8.2%
Five or More	3	7.3%	2	2.9%	5	4.5%
Unknown	1	2.4%	1	1.4%	2	1.8%
Total	41	100%	69	100%	110	100%

Data were obtained from ICON's presentence investigation (PSI) reports for the arresting offense or the offense closest to the date of arrest. Number of children at or near the time of arrest among offenders who were parents, including unborn children.

Table 34: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Parent of Biological Child(ren) under Age 18

	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Child(ren) under Age 18						
Yes	40	97.6%	61	88.4%	101	91.8%
No	1	2.4%	8	11.6%	9	8.2%
Total	41	100%	69	100%	110	100%

Data were obtained from ICON's presentence investigation (PSI) reports for the arresting offense or the offense closest to the date of arrest. Parent to at least one biological child under the age of 18, including unborn children.

Table 35: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Primary Substance of Choice

	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Primary Substance of Choice						
Methamphetamine	33	46.5%	51	29.3%	84	34.3%
Marijuana	10	14.1%	41	23.6%	51	20.8%
Alcohol	5	7.0%	37	21.3%	42	17.1%
Other	1	1.4%	3	1.7%	4	1.6%
None	0	0.0%	2	1.1%	2	0.8%
Unknown	22	31.0%	40	23.0%	62	25.3%
Total	71	100%	174	100%	245	100%

For each arrest case, the first substance abuse record that occurred after the date of arrest was used. Substance abuse information is self-reported by offenders. Data were unavailable for offenders who did not have an assessment or treatment.

Table 36: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Arresting Charge Type

	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Arresting Charge Type						
Drug	69	97.2%	166	95.4%	235	95.9%
Person	2	2.8%	4	2.3%	6	2.4%
Property	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	1	0.4%
Traffic	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	1	0.4%
Weapon	0	0.0%	2	1.1%	2	0.8%
Total	71	100%	174	100%	245	100%

Table 37: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Arresting Charge Level

	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Arresting Charge Level						
Class B Felony	47	66.2%	68	39.1%	115	46.9%
Class C Felony	14	19.7%	38	21.8%	52	21.2%
Class D Felony	9	12.7%	44	25.3%	53	21.6%
Aggravated Misdemeanor	1	1.4%	5	2.9%	6	2.4%
Serious Misdemeanor	0	0.0%	18	10.3%	18	7.3%
Simple Misdemeanor	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	1	0.4%
Total	71	100%	174	100%	245	100%

Table 38: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Convicting Offense Type

Convicting Offense Type	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Drug	69	97.2%	161	92.5%	230	93.9%
Person	1	1.4%	6	3.4%	7	2.9%
Property	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	1	0.4%
Weapon	0	0.0%	2	1.1%	2	0.8%
OWI	0	0.0%	2	1.1%	2	0.8%
Public Order	1	1.4%	1	0.6%	2	0.8%
Traffic	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	1	0.4%
Total	71	100%	174	100%	245	100%

Table 39: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Convicting Offense Level

Convicting Offense Level	Imprisoned		Community Supervision		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Class B Felony	12	16.9%	5	2.9%	17	6.9%
Class C Felony	32	45.1%	38	21.8%	70	28.6%
Class D Felony	25	35.2%	63	36.2%	88	35.9%
Aggravated Misdemeanor	1	1.4%	16	9.2%	17	6.9%
Serious Misdemeanor	0	0.0%	47	27.0%	47	19.2%
Simple Misdemeanor	0	0.0%	5	2.9%	5	2.0%
Other Felony	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Total	71	100%	174	100%	245	100%

Table 40: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Prior Arrest Type

Prior Arrest Type	Imprisoned (n=71)		Community Supervision (n=174)		Total (n=245)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Prior Felony	50	70.4%	38	21.8%	88	35.9%
Prior Misdemeanor	45	63.4%	101	58.0%	146	59.6%

LONG-TERM OUTCOMES

This section explores what happened once offenders returned to the community, by examining the long-term outcomes from the date of arrest through March 31, 2010 for the group of offenders who were subsequently convicted for their arresting offense. Outcomes of interest included employment, substance abuse treatment, and recidivism.

Employment

For the employment information reported in the following section, the data sources use information that was self-reported by offenders. Also, information on employment was only available during the times when offenders had treatment/assessment or were under correctional supervision and therefore, the data obtained are only snapshots in time.

Table 41: TF Convicted Offenders by Highest Level of Employment in Tracking Period

Highest Level of Employment	Number	Percentage
Unemployed	23	9.4%
Other Unemployed (Student/Disabled/Retired)	11	4.5%
Employed Part Time or Sporadic Employment	10	4.1%
Employed Full Time	175	71.4%
Employed Status Not Specified	6	2.4%
Unknown	20	8.2%
Total	245	100%

Table 41 shows the highest level of employment convicted offenders achieved in the tracking period. Of the 245 cases that resulted in conviction, 71.4% (n=175) achieved full time employment status as the highest level of employment in the tracking period. Nearly 14% (n=34) were unemployed or unemployed due to other reasons, such as disability, retirement, or being a student. About 4% (n=10) held part time or sporadic employment, and 2.4% (n=6) were employed but their highest employment status (e.g., full-time, part-time, seasonal) was not specified. Employment status was unknown for the remaining 8.2% (n=20).

Table 42: TF Convicted Offenders by Last (or only) Known Employment in Tracking Period

Last (or only) Known Employment	Number	Percentage
Unemployed	84	34.3%
Other Unemployed (Student/Disabled/Retired)	19	7.8%
Employed Part Time or Sporadic Employment	19	7.8%
Employed Full Time	91	37.1%
Employed, Status Not Specified	12	4.9%
Unknown	20	8.2%
Total	245	100%

Owing to their criminal backgrounds, the criminal population may generally have difficulties in attaining employment, but this issue may have compounded during the national economic

recession that coincided with the final two years of tracking. Table 42 reports convicted offenders' last (or in some cases, only) record of employment during the tracking period. About 42% were last known to be either unemployed or unemployed due to disability, retirement, or being a student, 37.1% (n=91) were employed full time, 7.8% (n=19) were employed part time or sporadically, and 4.9% were employed but the employment status was not specified (n=12). Employment status was completely unknown for the remaining 8.2% (n=20).

Table 43: TF Convicted Offenders by Ever Unemployed in Tracking Period

Ever Unemployed	Number	Percentage
Yes	206	84.1%
No	19	7.8%
Unknown	20	8.2%
Total	245	100%

A noteworthy observation when collecting employment data was that many offenders did not hold stable employment and cycled in and out of job positions. Although, as previously stated, 71% of offenders achieved full time employment status, records also indicated that 84% of the convicted offenders were unemployed at some point in the tracking period (n=206). See Table 43 for information regarding unemployment.

Substance Abuse Treatment

Substance abuse treatment data, obtained from the Department of Public Health, were reviewed for cohort members through the tracking period. Some offenders did not enter treatment during the tracking time. Please note that the data tables below only report data for offenders who did enter treatment.

Table 44: TF Convicted Offenders by Number of Offenders in Treatment

In Treatment during Arrest	Number	Percentage	
Yes	5	2.0%	
No	240	98.0%	
Total	245	100%	
In Treatment after Arrest	Number	Percentage	
Yes	155	63.3%	
No	90	36.7%	
Total	245	100%	
		Average	SD
Total Number of Treatment Episodes for Offenders in Tracking Period After Arrest (n=155)		2.2	1.5
Time between Arrest and First TX Entrance (Days) (n=155)		495.3	644.6

Of the 245 arrests that eventually resulted in conviction, only 2% of offenders (n=5) were participating in substance abuse treatment at the time of their arrest. About 63% participated in treatment at some time after their arrest (n=155), while 37% did not participate in treatment (n=90) in the tracking period. It is evident from these figures that there is a relationship between

being arrested by the TF and entering drug treatment at a later time. This may be notable, given the very small number of individuals who were in treatment at the time of their arrests.

Among substance abuse treatment participants, the average time between arrest and the first entrance to treatment was 495 days, or about 1 year and 4 months. Treatment participants had an average of 2.2 treatment episodes total during the course of the tracking period. This information is reported in Table 44.

Table 45: TF Convicted Offenders by Demographic Characteristics of Offenders in Treatment

Selected Demographic Characteristics of TX Admits (n=155)	Number	Percentage
Male	125	80.6%
Caucasian	151	97.4%
High School Diploma/GED	96	61.9%
Married	32	20.6%
Parent or Pregnant	80	51.6%
	Average	SD
Age	29.7	9.5

Table 45 depicts the characteristics of the convicted offenders who entered treatment after arrest. The average age of those admitted into treatment was 29.7 years. About 81% of treatment admissions were male (n=125), 97.4% were Caucasian (n=151), 61.9% had obtained a high school diploma or GED, only 20.6% were married at the time or arrest (n=32), and 51.6% were parents or expectant parents (n=80).

Table 46: TF Convicted Offenders by Type of Care in First Treatment Episode

Level of Care	Number	Percentage
Continuing Care	8	5.2%
Extended Outpatient	92	59.4%
Intensive Outpatient	18	11.6%
Clinically Managed Low Intensity Residential	4	2.6%
Clinically Managed High Intensity Residential	31	20.0%
Medically Monitored Inpatient Detoxification	2	1.3%
Total	155	100%
	Average	SD
Days in Treatment (n=151)	98.5	110.4
	Average	SD
Number of Sessions in Outpatient Care (n=118)		
Individual	7.1	8.0
Group	4.3	10.0
Family	0.1	0.9

As shown in Table 46, the majority (59.4%) of convicted offenders who participated in treatment received extended outpatient treatment in the first treatment episode after arrest (n=92).

Twenty percent received clinically managed high intensity residential treatment (n=31), 11.6% entered intensive outpatient treatment (n=8). Only 5.2% entered continuing care (n=8), 2.6% entered clinically managed low intensity residential treatment (n=4), and 1.3% entered medically monitored inpatient detoxification (n=2). On average, participants spent 98.5 days, or about three months, in treatment during their first treatment episode after arrest. Offenders who entered outpatient care participated, on average, in 7.1 individual sessions, 4.3 group sessions, and 0.1 family sessions.

Table 47: TF Convicted Offenders by Treatment Outcomes

First Treatment Episode Outcome	Number	Percentage
Completed Treatment	82	52.9%
Client Left	35	22.6%
Program Decision	15	9.7%
Incarcerated	9	5.8%
Referred Outside	8	5.2%
Other	2	1.3%
No Discharge Information	4	2.6%
Total	155	100%

Over half (52.9%) of the convicted offenders completed treatment (n=82). Twenty-two percent left treatment (n=35), 9.7% were removed based on program decision (n=15), 5.8% were incarcerated (n=9), 5.2% were referred to another program (n=8), and 1.3% had other outcomes (n=2). No discharge information was available in four cases. This information is presented in Table 47.

Tables 48 and 49 present treatment admission and outcomes data for arrest cases that resulted in prison compared to those in community supervision. Compared to those who entered community supervision, arrestees who entered prison as a result of their arresting offense were less likely to be placed in treatment during the study tracking period (53.5% vs. 67.2%). On average, prisoners also had fewer treatment episodes in the tracking period (1.9 vs. 2.3) and waited longer to be admitted to treatment after their arrests (766 days vs. 407.4 days). Nevertheless, prisoners who entered treatment were slightly more likely than those under community supervision to successfully complete treatment (57.9% vs. 51.3%).

Table 48: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Number of Offenders in Treatment

In Treatment after Arrest	Prison		Community Supervision	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	38	53.5%	117	67.2%
No	33	46.5%	57	32.8%
Total	71	100%	174	100%
	Average	SD	Average	SD
Total Number of Treatment Episodes for Offenders in Tracking Period After Arrest (n=155)	1.9	1.1	2.3	1.6
Time between Arrest and First TX Entrance (Days) (n=155)	766.0	685.6	407.4	608.3

Table 49: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Treatment Outcomes

First Treatment Episode Outcome	Prison		Community Supervision	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Completed Treatment	22	57.9%	60	51.3%
Client Left	5	13.2%	30	25.6%
Program Decision	4	10.5%	11	9.4%
Incarcerated	6	15.8%	3	2.6%
Referred Outside	1	2.6%	7	6.0%
Other	0	0.0%	2	1.7%
No Discharge Information	0	0.0%	4	3.4%
Total	38	100%	117	100%

Recidivism

A recidivist act is defined for the purpose of this study as an arrest for a public offense (as recorded in the CCH and/or Courts On-Line records) that occurred subsequent to the TF arrest through March 31, 2010.

Of the 245 offenders in the study who were convicted as a result of a TF arrest, 130, or 53.1%, **did not** recidivate in the tracking period.

Of the 245 offenders in the study who were convicted as a result of the TF arrest, 115, or 46.9%, **did** recidivate in the tracking period. Nearly half these new arrests were for drug-related offenses. Note, too, that these recidivist offenses tended to be less serious than the offenses resulting in an offender's being included in this study (e.g., 44.3 of the original offenses were Class B felonies, while 13.9% of the recidivist events were Class B felonies).

Table 50: First Recidivist Offense Level by Recidivist Offense Type

	FELB	FELC	FELD	OFOF	AGMS	SRMS	SMMS	Total	%
Drug	14	8	12	0	0	20	2	56	48.7%
OWI	0	0	1	0	2	7	0	10	8.7%
Person	1	1	2	0	4	1	0	9	7.8%
Other	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.9%
Property	1	1	4	0	1	1	8	16	13.9%
Pub Order	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	13	11.3%
Traffic	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	7	6.1%
Weapon	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	2.6%
Total	16	10	22	1	12	32	22	115	100%
%	13.9%	8.7%	19.1%	0.9%	10.4%	27.8%	19.1%	100%	

The time between the TF arrest and the first recidivist arrest varied greatly. The shortest time between the two arrests was four days, the longest time was 2,758 days (7.6 years), and the average time was 623 days or 1.7 years.

Table 51: Number of Recidivist Acts of Offenders Convicted as a Result of a TF Arrest from TF Initial Arrest until March 31, 2010

Number of Recidivist Acts	Number of Offenders	Percentage
0	130	53.1%
1	51	20.8%
2	29	11.8%
3	11	4.5%
4	13	5.3%
5 or More	11	4.4%
Total	245	100%

Table 52: Most Serious Recidivist Arrest Offense Level by Recidivist Offense Type

	FELB	FELC	FELD	OFOF	AGMS	SRMS	SMMS	Total	%
Drug	16	16	12	0	1	13	2	60	52.2%
OWI	0	0	1	0	6	6	0	13	11.3%
Person	1	3	2	0	6	3	0	15	13.0%
Other	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.9%
Property	1	1	8	0	1	1	4	16	13.9%
Pub Order	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	3.5%
Traffic	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	2.6%
Weapon	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	2.6%
Total	18	20	26	1	18	24	8	115	100%
%	15.7%	17.4%	22.6%	0.9%	15.7%	20.9%	7.0%	100%	

Of the 174 offenders who returned to the community, 81, or 46.6%, recidivated by being arrested for a public offense. They were arrested 65 times in which the most serious arrest

charge was a felony (33.5%) and 129 times in which the most serious arrest charge was a misdemeanor (66.5%), for a total of 194 arrests, or an average of 2.4 arrests per recidivist offender. Of the 194 arrests, 75, or 38.7%, were for some form of drug charge, 67, or 34.5%, were for a public order offense, 33, or 17.0%, were arrested for an offense against property, and 19, or 9.8%, were arrested for an offense against one or more persons. Of the 194 recidivist arrests, 190 resulted in a conviction (97.9%). There were 55 convictions for a felony offense (28.9%), with the remaining 135 (71.1%) resulting in convictions for misdemeanor offenses. Not surprisingly, 75 or 39.5%, were for a drug related offense, 66, or 34.7%, were for a public order offense, 29, or 15.3% were for a property offense, and 20, or 10.5%, were for offenses against one or more persons.

The time between the TF arrest and the first recidivist arrest also varied greatly. The shortest time between the two arrests was 4 days, the longest time was 2,758 days (7.6years), and the average time was 569 days or 1.6 years.

Of the 71 offenders who were sentenced to prison, 34, or 47.9%, recidivated by being arrested for a public offense. They were arrested 31 times where the most serious arrest charge was a felony (43.7%), and 40 times where the most serious arrest charge was a misdemeanor (56.3%), for a total of 71 arrests, or an average of 2.1 arrests per offender who recidivated. Of the 71 arrests, 33, or 46.5%, were for some form of drug charge, 14, or 19.7%, were for a public order offense, 17, or 23.9%, were arrested for an offense against property, and seven, or 9.9%, were arrested for an offense against persons. As a result of these recidivist arrests, all but two resulted in a conviction for a public offense (97.2%).

The time between the TF arrest and the first recidivist arrest also varied greatly. The shortest time between the two arrests was 11 days, the longest time was 2,670 days (7.3 years) and the average time was 750 days or 2.1 years.

Table 53: TF Convicted Offender Placement by Recidivism (New Arrests)

Recidivism (New Arrest)	Prison			Community Supervision		
	Number	Percentage		Number	Percentage	
Offenders with New Arrest*	34	47.9%		81	46.6%	
All New Arrests**	71	-----		194	-----	
All New Drug Arrests	33	46.5%		75	38.7%	
All New Felony Arrests	31	43.7%		65	33.5%	
All Convictions on Arresting Offenses	69	97.2%		190	97.9%	
	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max
Number of New Arrests per Offender	2.1	1	6	2.4	1	12
Time to First New Arrest (Days)	750	11	2,670	569	4	2,758

*Data counts unique cases of offenders with TF arrests.

** Data counts all new arrests in the tracking period for offenders with new arrests.

Table 53 provides recidivism (new arrest) data that compares cases of offenders who were imprisoned and those who were placed under community supervision as a result of being convicted of the TF arresting offense. The groups had similar new arrest rates, new arresting offense conviction rates, and new arrests per offender. However, TF arrestees who were initially convicted and placed in prison were more likely to recidivate with new *drug* offenses than those placed under community supervision. Approximately 47% of all new arrests for prisoners were drug-related compared to only about 39% for those placed under community

supervision. Also, prisoners had more serious charges, as their new arrests were more likely to be for felony offenses (43.7% vs. 33.5%). On the other hand, those who were initially placed under community supervision were re-arrested an average of six months more quickly than imprisoned offenders.

The relationship between substance abuse treatment and recidivism was explored (See Table 54). Just under two-thirds (63.3%) of the TF cases that resulted in conviction entered substance abuse treatment. Of those that entered substance abuse treatment, the recidivism rate was 34.8% (54/155). Of those who did not enter treatment, the recidivism rate was 31.1% (28/90). There does not appear to be a relationship between entering substance abuse treatment and recidivism. However, as stated earlier, the average length of time between task force arrest and first substance abuse treatment entrance was 495 days (766 days for those imprisoned and 407 days for those sent to community alternatives), so the delay in entry to treatment may have reduced any effect it treatment might have had on recidivism.

Table 54. Relationship between Substance Abuse Treatment and Recidivism

Recidivism (New Arrest)	Substance Abuse Treatment			
	Yes		No	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Offenders with New Arrest	54	34.8%	28	31.1%

APPENDIX A

Table 55: Characteristics of Study Groups

		Total Cohort (n=309)	Convicted (n=245)	Imprisoned (n=71)	Community Supervision (n=174)
Sex	Male	72.8%	78.4%	91.5%	73.0%
	Female	27.2%	21.6%	8.5%	27.0%
Race/Ethnicity	Caucasian	97.1%	98.4%	95.8%	99.4%
	African American	0.6%	0.4%	1.4%	0.0%
	Hispanic	1.9%	0.8%	1.4%	0.6%
	Native American	0.3%	0.4%	1.4%	0.0%
Age	Average Age	30.7	30.7	33.3	29.6
Education	High School/GED	58.3%	59.2%	76.1%	52.3%
Marital Status	Married	19.7%	21.2%	22.5%	20.7%
	Single	39.8%	40.8%	36.6%	42.5%
	Divorced/Widowed	20.7%	20.0%	33.8%	14.4%
	Cohabiting/ Common-Law	11.7%	11.4%	7.0%	13.2%
Parent Status	Parent	43.6%	44.9%	57.7%	39.7%
	Non-Parent	29.8%	32.2%	33.8%	31.6%
Drug Use	Meth Primary	33.7%	34.3%	46.5%	29.3%
	Marijuana Primary	20.1%	20.8%	14.1%	23.6%
	Alcohol Primary	17.5%	17.1%	7.0%	21.3%
Prior Arrest	Yes	66.3%	70.6%	84.5%	64.9%
Prior Felony Arrest	Yes	34.3%	35.9%	70.4%	21.8%
Prior Misdemeanor Arrest	Yes	56.0%	59.6%	63.4%	58.0%
Convicting Offense Type	Drug		93.9%	97.2%	92.5%
	Violent		2.9%	1.4%	3.4%
	Property		0.4%	0.0%	0.6%
	Public Order		0.8%	1.4%	0.6%
	Weapons		0.8%	0.0%	1.1%
	Traffic		0.4%	0.0%	0.6%
	OWI		0.8%	0.0%	1.1%
Convicting Offense Level	Class B Felony		6.9%	16.9%	2.9%
	Class C Felony		28.6%	45.1%	21.8%
	Class D Felony		35.9%	35.2%	36.2%
	Misdemeanor		28.1%	1.4%	39.1%

"Other" and "Unknown" (cases for which data were not available) categories are not reported in this table.