CJA **NEW YORK CITY CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCY, INC.**

Jerome E. McElroy
Executive Director

POST-SENTENCING RE-ARREST AMONG NEW YORK CITY RELEASED OFFENDERS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE FOURTH QUARTER OF 2003 DATASET

Qudsia Siddiqi, Ph.D.
Project Director

Final Report

June 2008
(Revised September 2010)

52 Duane Street, New York, NY 10007 (646) 213-2500

POST-SENTENCING RE-ARREST AMONG NEW YORK CITY RELEASED OFFENDERS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE FOURTH QUARTER OF 2003 DATASET

Qudsia Siddiqi, Ph.D.
Project Director

Research Assistance:

Elyse J. Revere
Research Analyst

Steve Mardenfeld
Senior Research Assistant

Systems Programming:

Barbara Geller Diaz
Associate Director, Information Systems

Aida Tejaratchi
Senior Analyst

Administrative Support:

Annie Su
Administrative Associate

June 2008
(Revised September 2010)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank Jerome E. McElroy, Executive Director of CJA, for his editorial suggestions, and Dr. Richard R. Peterson, Director of Research at CJA, for his timely review, advice and comments on the final draft of the manuscript.

The author thanks Barbara Diaz, Associate Director of Information Systems, for her support and input in extracting the re-arrest data. The author would also like to thank Aida Tejaratchi, Senior Programmer, who did the programming to extract re-arrest data from the CJA database.

The author extends special thanks to Elyse J. Revere, Research Analyst, for supervising the extraction and cleaning of the re-arrest data, and providing invaluable input to the research. The author is thankful to Steve Mardenfeld, Senior Research Assistant, for his assistance with statistical analysis and checking the final draft of the manuscript. The author also thanks Annie Su, Administrative Associate, for preparing numerous drafts of the tables, and for her administrative support. Special thanks to Raymond Caligiure, Graphics and Production Specialist, for his assistance with editing and refining some of the tables.

Finally, the author would like to thank the New York City Department of Correction for providing the detention and release data.

The methodology, findings, and conclusions of the study, as well as any errors and omissions are the responsibility of the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents Continues to Next Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

LIST OF TABLES

List of Tables Continues to Next Page

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

List of Tables Continues to Next Page

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

POST-SENTENCING RE-ARREST AMONG NEW YORK CITY RELEASED OFFENDERS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE FOURTH QUARTER OF 2003 DATASET

I. Introduction

This report was prepared in response to a request from the Office of the Criminal Justice Coordinator (OCJS) of the City of New York. The OCJS was interested in information on the likelihood of re-arrest after release from jail/prison among convicted offenders who received a sentence involving incarceration of six months or more. The findings will be used by the City to assist Alternative-to-Incarceration Programs (ATIs) in targeting cases for intervention in court.

The analysis was conducted in two phases. In Phase I, we examined the likelihood of post-sentencing re-arrests among Criminal Court convicted offenders. In Phase II, we focused on Supreme Court convicted offenders. The findings are described below.

II. Methodology

A. Data and Sampling

Data for the analysis presented in this report were drawn from a cohort of arrests made October 1, 2003 through December 31, 2003. The re-arrest data had a cutoff date of September 30, 2007. The Fourth Quarter of 2003 dataset contained 72,170 docketed arrests. As identified previously by the New York City Criminal Justice Agency (CJA), 609 cases in Criminal Court were sentenced to six to twelve months, whereas 2,224 cases received a Supreme Court sentence of six months or greater. After reviewing the date and length of the sentence, we decided to limit our analysis to offenders who were incarcerated for six to eighteen months. The eighteen month cutoff point would allow all the incarcerated offenders in our sample to have a minimum of one year risk time prior to extracting the re-arrest data.

After applying the 18 month cut point, our file contained 1,739 cases. This number included both Criminal Court and Supreme Court cases. The file comprising 1,739 cases was an arrest-based file. In that file, 4% of the convicted offenders had more than one arrest in the sampling period. The re-arrest data were based on NYSID numbers. For offenders having multiple re-arrests, this would result in extracting the same defendant data for each arrest linking

to the same NYSID number. To avoid this over-counting of re-arrests, the arrest-based file was converted into an offender-based file where only an offender's first arrest in the sampling period was included in the study sample. The offender-based file contained 1,670 offenders. While cleaning the data, we found that 59 offenders had no time-at-risk because they were either still in custody, deported, or were released after our cutoff date. Those offenders were dropped from the sample. Also excluded from the sample were two offenders who were given desk appearance tickets (DATs), 23 offenders who were under sixteen years of age (JOs), and 11 offenders who had a CD sentence. For some of the 11 cases, the imprisonment sentence was the alternative for failure to complete the CD. After these exclusions, our sample contained 1,575 convicted offenders who were sentenced to six to eighteen months and released at least a year on or prior to extracting the re-arrest information. Our analysis focused on the likelihood of re-arrest after a convicted offender was released from jail/prison. The offenders in our sample were tracked from the date on which they finished the incarcerative portion of their sentence to September 30, 2007. DOC data and DCJS rap sheets were used to determine the date of release from incarceration.

In New York, there are three types of incarcerative sentences: definite, which includes a single length of time no longer than one year; indeterminate, which includes a range of minimum and maximum; and determinate, which is a singe length of time greater than one year. All Criminal Court sentences are definite, but Supreme Court sentences can be of any type. Based on the length and type of sentence, the offenders were grouped into following categories: 1) Criminal Court definite sentence of six to twelve months; 2) Supreme Court sentence of six months jail plus probation (split sentence); 3) Supreme Court definite sentence of six to twelve months; and 4) Supreme Court sentence of over 12 months which would include determinate sentences of one and

a half years, and indeterminate sentences with a minimum sentence of between one year and one and a half years (Table 2-1). In our sample, only one sentence was determinate.

As shown by Table 2-1, 36% (N=561) of the offenders in our sample were sentenced to six to twelve months in Criminal Court. Regarding offenders convicted in Supreme Court, 10% (N=156) received a Supreme Court split sentence of six months, 33% (N=529) received a

Table 2-1

Distribution of Convicted Offenders by Type of Sentence

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

Sentence Type	N	%
Criminal Court Sentence of 6-12 Months	561	36
Supreme Court Split Sentence of 6 Months	156	10
Supreme Court Definite Sentence of 6 to 12 Months	529	33
Supreme Court Sentence of 12-18 Months	329	21
Total	1,575	100

Supreme Court definite sentence of six to twelve months, and 21% (N=329) received a Supreme Court sentence of 12 to 18 months.

B. Re-Arrest Data

We extracted the information on first re-arrest that occurred during the at-risk period (date of release to September 30, 2007). The information was also extracted on first violent felony re-arrest. The re-arrest information included offender's demographics, criminal history, re-arrest charges, and count of re-arrests, which occurred after release from jail/prison and on or prior to September 30, 2007.

C. Research Plan

We looked at offender characteristics for our sample's initial arrest for each sentence type. They included demographic attributes, case-processing characteristics, community-ties indicators, criminal-history measures, and charge-related information. Charges were recoded into Penal Law Articles, which also included attempts. Information pertaining to first re-arrest after release from jail/prison and first violent felony re-arrest was examined. The violent felony offenders (VFO) were defined in the same manner as for previous CCSS/ATIIS studies. The list of charges used to identify a VFO for those studies included charges defined as a VFO by the New York State Penal Law, as well as the felony charges of murder, arson, and kidnapping. Finally, for each sentence type, we performed multivariate analysis to distinguish offenders who were re-arrested from those who were not re-arrested. Due to relatively fewer cases, Staten Island was excluded from our multivariate analysis. For the same reason, community-ties items were recoded into affirmative and negative responses, regardless of verification.

Offenders categorized as "unresolved conflict" on community items were also added to offenders with "negative" responses (see Appendix A-1 for coding of variables).

Since the outcome variable in our analysis was dichotomous (post-sentencing re-arrest or no post-sentencing re-arrest), logistic regression analysis was used to develop multivariate models (see Appendix A-2 for a detailed discussion of logistic regression analysis).

For each sentence type, we used findings from the logistic regression analysis to develop subgroups of offenders. To determine whether those subgroups presented a lower risk of re-arrest and re-arrest for a VFO, comparisons were made with the at-risk sample.

III. Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Among Offenders with a Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

This section presents findings from the analysis of Criminal Court offenders who were sentenced to six to twelve months and released after serving the incarcerated portion of their sentence. Section A describes offenders' characteristics. Section B presents post-sentencing re-arrest information. Section C describes findings from the multivariate analysis of first post-sentencing re-arrest. Section D presents information on low-risk offenders.

As mentioned previously, in the Fourth Quarter of 2003 dataset, 561 convicted offenders received a Criminal Court sentence of six to twelve months and were at-risk for post-sentencing re-arrest. Their characteristics are described below.

A. Offender Characteristics at Sample's Initial Arrest

Demographic and Case-Processing Characteristics

Table 3-1 displays demographic and case-processing characteristics for convicted offenders who were released after serving their jail term. As shown by the table, 90% of the offenders were male. Slightly more than one half of the offenders were Black, one-third were Hispanic, slightly less than one-tenth were White, and the remainder were "other" ethnicity. The median age was 37 years old.

In the Criminal Court sample, the highest proportion of the offenders was initially arrested in Manhattan (33%), followed by Queens (28%), Bronx (20%), Brooklyn (17%) and Staten Island (2%). The median time at-risk from release to our cutoff date was 1,236 days. The median time-at-risk from release to first re-arrest for those who were re-arrested was 137 days.

Community Ties

Table 3-2 presents community-ties variables for offenders at-risk for post-sentencing re-arrest. As shown by the table, an overwhelming majority of the offenders in the Fourth Quarter

Table 3-1

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Demographic and Case-Processing Characteristics

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=561)

Offender Characteristics	N	%
DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES		
Sex		
Male	505	90
Female	56	10
Total	561	100
Ethnicity		
Black	305	55
Hispanic	192	34
White	52	9
Other	9	2
Total	558	100
Age at Arrest		
18 and younger	16	3
19-20 years	17	3
21-24 years	60	11
25-29 years	67	12
30-34 years	69	12
35- 39 years	110	20
40 and older	222	40
Total	561	101
Median Age (Years)	37	
CASE-PROCESSING CHARACTERISTICS		
Borough of Arrest		
Brooklyn	93	17
Manhattan	186	33
Queens	158	28
Staten Island	14	2
Bronx	110	20
Total	561	100
Median Time-at-Risk	1,236 days	
Median Time-at-Risk from Release to First Re-Arrest for Re-Arrested Offenders	137 days	

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

Table 3-2

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Community Ties and CJA Recommendation at Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=561)

	N	%
COMMUNITY-TIES ITEMS		
Verified NYC Area Address		
Yes Unverified	359	71
Yes Verified	69	14
No Unverified	69	14
No Verified	1	0
Unresolved Conflict	5	1
Total	503	100
Verified Length of Residence of at Least 18 months		
Yes Unverified	247	49
Yes Verified	54	11
No Unverified	179	36
No Verified	16	3
Unresolved Conflict	8	2
Total	504	101
Verified Family Ties Within Residence		
Yes Unverified	178	35
Yes Verified	52	10
No Unverified	248	49
No Verified	21	4
Unresolved Conflict	5	1
Total	504	100
Expects Someone at Arraignment		
Yes	104	21
No/Don't Know	396	79
Total	500	100
Verified Telephone		
Yes Unverified	204	41
Yes Verified	65	13
No Unverified	213	43
No Verified	5	1
Unresolved Conflict	12	2
Total	499	100
Verified Full Time Employment/ School/ Training		
Yes Unverified	97	19
Yes Verified	16	3
No Unverified	335	67
No Verified	49	10
Unresolved Conflict	6	1
Total	503	100
CJA Recommendation		
Recommended	25	5
Moderate Risk	37	7
Not Recommended	431	79
No Recommendation	50	9
Total	543	100

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

of 2003 sample reported living in the New York City area. Slightly more than half of the offenders reported having a telephone in their residence or having a cellular phone. Three-fifths reported living at their current address for 18 months or longer. Offenders reportedly living with someone at the time of initial arrest comprised less than half of the sample. Slightly more than one-fifth of the offenders reported being employed, in school, or in a training program full time. One-fifth expected a relative or friend at Criminal Court arraignment.

An examination of CJA's recommendation showed (Table 3-2) that only 5% of the offenders were recommended for ROR at the time of their initial arrest and 7% were considered moderate risk for pretrial failure-to-appear (FTA). The remaining 88% were either not recommended or received no recommendation.

Criminal History

Table 3-3 provides criminal-history information for offenders at-risk for post-sentencing re-arrest. The table shows that almost all of the offenders (99%) had been arrested previously. An overwhelming majority (85%) had been convicted previously on misdemeanor charges, and three-fourths had at least one prior felony conviction. Forty-three percent had at least one case pending at the time of the sample initial arrest and 13% had a bench warrant attached to their rap sheet. Slightly more than four-fifths had a history of warrants at initial arrest.

Charge-Related Information

Table 3-4 provides charge-related information for offenders with a Criminal Court sentence of six to twelve months. Although the table presents information on arrest, affidavit, and disposition charges, only affidavit and disposition (conviction) charges are described here.

As shown by Table 3-4, more than one-fourth (28%) of the offenders were charged with offenses involving controlled substances (drugs).[1] The other common charges included larceny (21%), assault (10%), and burglary (10%).

Regarding the top disposition charge, more than one-fourth were convicted on larceny (28%), followed by drugs (21%), assault and related offenses (11%), and criminal facilitation

[1] Penal Law Article 220 for controlled substances does not include offenses involving marijuana.

Table 3-3

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Criminal History

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=561)

	N	%
CRIMINAL HISTORY		
First Arrest		
Yes	7	1
No	534	99
Total	541	100
Prior Felony Convictions		
Yes	415	76
No	128	24
Total	543	100
Prior Misdemeanor Convictions		
Yes	463	85
No	80	15
Total	543	100
Open Cases		
Yes	234	43
No	309	57
Total	543	100
Type of Warrant Attached to Rap Sheet		
Bench Warrant	67	13
Other Warrants	53	10
No Warrants	412	77
Total	532	100
Prior Warrants		
Yes	447	83
No	89	17
Total	536	100

Table 3-4

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Charge-Related Information for Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=561)

	N	%
Top Arrest Charge Severity		
A Felony	1	0
B Felony	119	21
C Felony	37	7
D Felony	114	20
E Felony	98	18
A Misdemeanor	184	33
B Misdemeanor or Lower	6	1
Total	559	100
Top Arrest Charge (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	62	11
Burglary	46	8
Criminal Mischief	32	6
Larceny	109	19
Robbery	29	5
Other Theft Related Offenses	39	7
Forgery	18	3
Offenses Against Judicial and Other Proceedings	22	4
Controlled Substances	154	28
Other	50	9
Total	561	100
Top Affidavit Charge Severity		
A Felony	1	0
B Felony	106	19
C Felony	37	7
D Felony	108	19
E Felony	65	12
A Misdemeanor	237	42
B Misdemeanor or Lower	4	1
Total	558	100

Table 3-4

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Charge-Related Information for Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=561)

	N	%
Top Affidavit Charge (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	56	10
Burglary	55	10
Larceny	118	21
Other Theft Related Offenses	38	7
Robbery	28	5
Controlled Substances	158	28
Other	108	19
Total	561	100
Top Disposition Charge Severity		
A Misdemeanor	548	98
B Misdemeanor or Lower	13	2
Total	561	100
Disposition Charge (Penal Law Article)		
Criminal Facilitation	38	7
Assault	61	11
Criminal Mischief	20	4
Larceny	156	28
Other Theft Related Offenses	53	9
Offenses Against Judicial and Other Proceedings	27	5
Controlled Substances	118	21
Other	88	16
Total	561	101

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

(7%). The remaining offenders were convicted on "other" charges, as well as criminal mischief, theft, and offenses against judicial and other proceedings.

With regard to the Penal Law severity, 57% of the offenders at arraignment were charged with felonies. As expected, at disposition all felony-level charges were reduced to misdemeanor-level charges.

B. Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Table 3-5 presents the re-arrest information for our at-risk sample of Criminal Court offenders. As shown by the table, the re-arrest rate in our sample was quite high--82% were re-arrested at least once after release from jail. Sixty-nine percent had two or more re-arrests in the at-risk period.

Regarding the borough of first post-sentencing re-arrest, Manhattan was the borough with the highest proportion of offenders re-arrested (35%), followed by Brooklyn (23%), the Bronx (21%), Queens (19%), and Staten Island (2%). Felony charges comprised almost one-third of first re-arrests. The remaining re-arrests were for A misdemeanor or lower charges. Regarding the Penal Law charges at first re-arrest, 29% of the offenders were re-arrested for offenses related to controlled substances. Slightly less than one-fifth of the released offenders were re-arrested for offenses related to larceny. Burglary accounted for another 10% of the re-arrests. Nine percent of the offenders were re-arrested for theft related offenses.

VFO Information

As shown by Table 3-5, 21% of the offenders in the at-risk period were re-arrested for VFO charges. Four percent of the offenders at first re-arrest had VFO charges.

C. Logistic Regression Analysis of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Using the Fourth Quarter 2003 sample of at-risk offenders with a Criminal Court sentence of six to twelve months, we developed logistic regression models to identify statistically significant predictors of post-sentencing re-arrest. Based on prior research on recidivism, we selected a number of independent variables. Before developing logistic regression models, we

Table 3-5

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Information

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=561)

	N	%
Post Sentence Re-Arrest		
Yes	458	82
No	103	18
Total	561	100
Count of Re-Arrests		
None	103	18
One	69	12
Two or More	389	69
Total	561	99
VFO Re-Arrest Count		
No Re-Arrest	103	18
No VFO Re-Arrest	341	61
One VFO Re-Arrest	89	16
Two or More VFO Re-Arrests	28	5
Total	561	100
VFO Charge at First Re-Arrest		
No Re-Arrest	103	18
VFO Charge at First Re-Arrest	23	4
No VFO Charge at First Re-Arrest	423	75
Missing Information	12	2
Total	561	99
Type of First Re-Arrest		
Summary	453	99
Desk Appearance Ticket	5	1
Total	458	100
Borough of First Re-Arrest		
Brooklyn	105	23
Manhattan	161	35
Queens	86	19
Staten Island	10	2
Bronx	96	21
Total	458	100

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

Table 3-5

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Information

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=561)

	N	%
Severity of First Re-Arrest Charge		
A Felony	2	0
B Felony	52	12
C Felony	9	2
D Felony	40	9
E Felony	42	9
A Misdemeanor	232	52
B Misdemeanor or Lower	60	14
Other	7	2
Total	444	100
Top Charge at First Re-Arrest (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	24	6
Burglary	44	10
Larceny	81	18
Robbery	13	3
Other Theft Related Offenses	41	9
Controlled Substances (Article 220)	134	29
Marijuana (Article 221)	27	6
Other	113	25
Total	451	100

examined their correlations with the outcome variable (data not shown) (also see bivariate relationship in Appendix B-1).

The variables that showed significant correlations with post-sentencing re-arrest included time-at-risk, sex, ethnicity, borough where the initial arrest occurred, full-time activity at initial arrest, prior misdemeanor convictions, pending cases at the time of initial arrest, and top charge at disposition. These variables were used to develop a logistic regression model (Appendix C-1). Since offenders who were released early had more time to commit crimes, time-at-risk was added as a control variable. Our final model controlled for all the statistically significant variables from that model.

Table 3-6 presents findings from the final model of post-sentencing re-arrest. To control for its effect, the variable reflecting time-at-risk was added first to the model. It was significantly related to post-sentencing re-arrest. As expected, the likelihood of re-arrest increased with an increase in time-at-risk. After controlling for the effect of time-at-risk, an offender's sex, prior misdemeanor convictions, and top disposition charge proved to be useful in predicting post-sentencing re-arrest. Beginning with the disposition charge, when compared with offenders with the average effect of the charge variable, offenders convicted on offenses involving criminal facilitation (Penal Law Article 115) were less likely to be re-arrested, whereas offenders convicted on larceny (Penal Law Article 155) were more likely to be re-arrested after release from jail. An examination of beta coefficients for predictor variables indicated that the offenders convicted on criminal facilitation had the strongest negative influence on the likelihood of re-arrest (beta coefficient=-1.026). For offenders with the top disposition charge of criminal facilitation, the odds that an offender would not be re-arrested were 2.79 times (1/.358) greater than that for offenders with the average effect of the charge variable. The odds that an offender convicted on offenses involving larceny would be re-arrested were 1.78 times greater than the odds for offenders with the mean effect of the charge variable. An offender's sex was the next strongest predictor of re-arrest (beta coefficient=.835). The odds of post-sentencing re-arrest were 2.3 times greater for male offenders than that for female offenders. The table further shows

Table 3-6

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Logistic Regression Model Predicting Likelihood of
Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=533)

Independent Variables	Beta Coefficient	Significance Level	Odds Ratio
TIME-AT-RISK	0.003	0.012	1.003
PRIOR MISDEMEANOR CONVICTIONS	0.619	0.036	1.856
CHARGE AT DISPOSITION (PENAL LAW ARTICLE)			
Excluded Category: Other			
Criminal Facilitation	-1.026	0.001	0.358
Assault	-0.009	0.978	0.991
Larceny	0.580	0.026	1.787
Other Theft Related Offenses	0.527	0.181	1.693
Offenses Against Judicial and Other Proceedings	-0.034	0.939	0.966
Controlled Substance	0.071	0.770	1.074
SEX (Male)	0.835	0.014	2.304

Nagelkerke R Square=.094

that offenders previously convicted on prior misdemeanor charges were more likely to be re-arrested than offenders with no prior misdemeanor convictions. The odds of post-sentencing re-arrest were 1.85 times greater for offenders with prior misdemeanor convictions than the odds for offenders with no such convictions.

Table 3-6 shows that the total variance explained by our model was 9% (Nagelkerke R square=.094).

Summary and Discussion of Findings

The proportion of variance explained by statistically significant predictors in our model was relatively low (9%). It should be noted that this is fairly typical in research on recidivism and is mostly attributed to difficulties involved in predicting recidivism.

In our model, top charge at disposition was significantly related with post-sentencing re-arrest. When compared with offenders with the mean effect of the charge variable, offenders convicted on offenses involving criminal facilitation were less likely to be re-arrested, whereas offenders convicted on offenses involving larceny were more likely to be re-arrested. The size of the beta co-efficient indicated that after controlling for time-at-risk, offenders with a disposition charge of criminal facilitation had the strongest negative influence on the likelihood of post-sentencing re-arrest. Prior research also identifies charge as a significant predictor of recidivism. However, findings regarding specific charges are inconsistent (see Siddiqi 2006 for a review of prior research on recidivism).

In our multivariate model, as determined by the beta coefficient, sex was the next strongest predictor of post-sentencing re-arrest--male offenders were more likely to be re-arrested than female offenders. This was also consistent with prior studies of recidivism.

We found that having prior misdemeanor convictions at initial arrest had a significant effect on the likelihood of post-sentencing re-arrest--the odds of post-sentencing re-arrest were higher among offenders who had been convicted previously on misdemeanor charges than among offenders with no such convictions. This finding is consistent with prior research on recidivism, which suggests that offenders with prior criminal justice involvement are more likely

to recidivate than offenders with no prior criminal justice involvement. In our at-risk sample, 85% of the offenders had been convicted previously on misdemeanor charges, and based on our finding they would be at- risk for post-sentencing re-arrest.

In our final model, time-at-risk was a statistically significant, but weak predictor of post-sentencing re-arrest (as determined by the beta coefficient).

We would also like to describe variables that were significantly correlated to post-sentencing re-arrest, but did not attain statistical significance in our full model (Appendix C-1). They included full-time activity at initial arrest, ethnicity, borough of initial arrest, and pending cases at the time of initial arrest. This was not surprising as all of these variables were weakly correlated with post-sentencing re-arrest. The correlations between re-arrest and full time activity, ethnicity (Black), borough of initial arrest (Queens), and pending cases were .075, .074, -.072, and .085, respectively (data not shown). Therefore, when controlled simultaneously with other variables in the model, they did not attain statistical significance.

Finally, we would like to mention that several criminal-history measures that have been identified by previous studies as significant predictors of recidivism were not significantly correlated to post-sentencing recidivism in our at-risk sample. We were not surprised by this finding as there was little variation in our sample with respect to the criminal-history indicators. For example, in our at-risk sample, 99% of the released offenders had been arrested previously, 76% had prior felony convictions, and 83% had a history of warrants. Therefore, these attributes did not significantly differentiate released offenders on the likelihood of re-arrest.

D. Identifying Low-Risk Offenders

We used findings from our logistic regression analysis to identify offenders who would be at low risk for post-sentencing re-arrest. Our model for Criminal Court offenders with six to twelve months of jail time suggested that the likelihood of re-arrest was lower among offenders who had no prior misdemeanor convictions. Based on this finding, we examined re-arrest information for offenders (Group 3-1) who did not have prior misdemeanor convictions. Our

logistic regression model also suggested a lower probability of re-arrest among female offenders and offenders who were convicted on offenses involving criminal facilitation. Due to a relatively small N, (female=56, criminal facilitation=38), these offenders were not further examined.

Table 3-7 presents the re-arrest information for Group 3-1 (offenders with no prior misdemeanor convictions) as well as for the at-risk sample. As shown by the table, Group 3-1 was comprised of 80 offenders. Of this number, 72% were re-arrested after release from jail. Fifty-nine percent had two or more re-arrests in the at-risk period. One-fifth of the offenders were re-arrested for VFO charges. Eight percent had a VFO charge on the first re-arrest.

To determine whether offenders in Group 3-1 represented a lower risk of post-sentencing re-arrest than offenders in our at-risk sample, we compared the above findings with the findings derived from the at-risk sample. The comparison showed that the re-arrest rate for Group 3-1 was considerably lower than the average re-arrest rate for our at-risk sample (72% versus 82%). The proportion of offenders with two or more re-arrests in the at-risk period was also lower for Group 3-1 than for the at-risk sample (59% versus 69%). In contrast to these findings, the proportion of offenders with a VFO charge on first re-arrest was higher for Group 3-1 (8% for Group 3-1, 4% for the at-risk sample). The two samples did not differ with respect to the proportion of offenders with VFO re-arrests in the at-risk period.

In sum, our findings suggest that although offenders in Group 3-1 had lower re-arrest rates than offenders in the at-risk sample, they still represented a high risk for post-sentencing re-arrest. Our findings further suggest that the risk of re-arrest for VFO charges was just as high for our subgroup of offenders as for the at-risk sample.

Table 3-7

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Low-Risk Offenders: Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Information

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Group 3-1 (No Prior Misd. Convictions)		At-Risk Sample	
	(N=80)		(N=561)	
Re-Arrest Information	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest				
No	22	28	103	18
Yes	58	72	458	82
Total	80	100	561	100
Re-Arrest Count				
None	22	28	103	18
One	11	14	69	12
Two or More	47	59	389	69
Total	80	101	561	99
VFO Re-Arrest				
No Re-Arrest	22	28	103	18
No VFO Re-Arrest	42	52	341	61
One or More VFO Re-Arrests	16	20	117	21
Total	80	100	561	100
VFO Charge at First Re-Arrest				
No Re-Arrest	22	28	103	18
No VFO at First Re-Arrest	52	65	423	75
VFO at First Re-Arrest	6	8	23	4
Missing Information	0	0	12	2
Total	80	101	561	99

IV. Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Among Offenders with a Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

This section describes findings from the analysis of offenders who received a Supreme Court split sentence of six months and were released and at-risk for post-sentencing re-arrests.

As mentioned in the Methodology Section, in the Fourth Quarter of 2003 sample of released offenders, 156 offenders received a Supreme Court split sentence of six months. Their characteristics as well as findings from the multivariate analysis of post-sentencing re-arrest are presented below.

A. Offender Characteristics at Sample's Initial Arrest

Demographic and Case-Processing Characteristics

Table 4-1 displays demographic and case-processing characteristics for offenders receiving split sentences in Supreme Court. Ninety percent of these convicted offenders were male. Forty-six percent were Black, 38% were Hispanic, and the remaining offenders were White or "other" ethnicity. The median age was 22 years old.

Table 4-1 further shows that 46% of the released offenders were initially arrested in Manhattan. Queens arrestees comprised slightly more than one-fifth of the sample, and 15% were arrested in the Bronx. One-tenth were initially arrested in Brooklyn. Staten Island had the lowest number of arrests (6%). The median time-at-risk from release to our cutoff date was 1,257 days. The median time-at-risk from release to first re-arrest for those who were re-arrested was 208 days.

Community Ties

Table 4-2 presents community-ties variables for offenders receiving six month split sentences in Supreme Court. As shown by the table, 91% of the offenders reported living in the New York City area. Slightly less than two-thirds reported having a telephone in their residence, or having a cellular phone, and living at their current address for 18 months or longer. Offenders reportedly living with someone at the time of initial arrest comprised three-fifths of the sample. Forty-five percent reported being employed, in school, or in a training program full time and slightly less than two-fifths expected a relative or friend at Criminal Court arraignment.

Table 4-1

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Demographic and Case-Processing Characteristics

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=156)

Offender Characteristics	N	%
DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES		
Sex		
Male	140	90
Female	16	10
Total	156	100
Ethnicity		
Black	71	46
Hispanic	58	38
White	18	12
Other	7	4
Total	154	100
Age at Arrest		
18 and younger	45	29
19-20 years	24	15
21-24 years	26	17
25-29 years	19	12
30-34 years	12	8
35-39 years	10	6
40 and older	20	13
Total	156	100
Median Age (Years)	22	
CASE-PROCESSING CHARACTERISTICS		
Borough of Arrest		
Brooklyn	17	11
Manhattan	72	46
Queens	34	22
Staten Island	9	6
Bronx	24	15
Total	156	100
Median Time-at-Risk	1,257 days	
Median Time-at-Risk from Release to First Re-Arrest for Re-Arrested Offenders	208 days	

Table 4-2

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Community Ties and CJA Recommendation at Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=156)

	N	%
COMMUNITY-TIES ITEMS		
Verified NYC Area Address		
Yes Unverified	103	72
Yes Verified	27	19
No Unverified	13	9
Total	143	100
Verified Length of Residence of at Least 18 Months		
Yes Unverified	73	51
Yes Verified	19	13
No Unverified	43	30
No Verified	7	5
Unresolved Conflict	1	1
Total	143	100
Verified Family Ties Within Residence		
Yes Unverified	65	46
Yes Verified	20	14
No Unverified	51	36
No Verified	7	5
Total	143	101
Expects Someone at Arraignment		
Yes	54	38
No/Don't Know	88	62
Total	142	100
Verified Telephone		
Yes Unverified	64	45
Yes Verified	27	19
No Unverified	51	36
Total	142	100
Verified Full Time Employment/ School/ Training		
Yes Unverified	51	36
Yes Verified	13	9
No Unverified	67	47
No Verified	12	8
Total	143	100
CJA Recommendation		
Recommended	45	30
Moderate Risk	29	20
Not Recommended	67	45
No Recommendation	8	5
Total	149	100

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

With regard to the CJA recommendation, 30% were recommended for ROR, whereas 20% were considered moderate risk for pretrial FTA.

Criminal History

Table 4-3 provides criminal-history information for offenders who received a split sentence of six months in Supreme Court. The table shows that almost three-fourths of the offenders had been arrested previously. More than one-fourth had been convicted previously on misdemeanor charges. One-tenth had at least one prior felony conviction. Offenders with one or more cases pending at the time of initial arrest comprised one-third of the sample, and 12% had a bench warrant attached to their rap sheet. Slightly more than one-third had a history of prior warrants.

Charge-Related Information

Table 4-4 provides charge characteristics for convicted offenders with a Supreme Court split sentence of six months. Beginning with the arraignment charge in Penal Law format, one-third of the offenders were charged with drugs. Almost one-fourth were charged with robbery. One-tenth of the offenders were charged with burglary. Similar distributions were observed at disposition.

Table 4-4 further shows that 36% of the offenders in our at-risk sample were arraigned on D felony charges. The proportion of offenders with a D felony increased to 53% at conviction.

B. Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Table 4-5 provides re-arrest information for offenders with a Supreme Court split sentence of six months. As shown by the table, in our at-risk sample of convicted offenders, 65% were re-arrested in the at-risk period. Forty-six percent of the offenders were re-arrested more than once during the at-risk period. Regarding the first re-arrest, more than two-fifths of the re-arrests were made for felony charges. The most common charge at first re-arrest was drugs (23%). Assault was the second most common charge (13%), followed by offenses involving marijuana (12%), and burglary (12%).

Table 4-3

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Criminal History

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=156)

	N	%
CRIMINAL HISTORY		
First Arrest		
Yes	40	27
No	108	73
Total	148	100
Prior Felony Convictions		
Yes	15	10
No	134	90
Total	149	100
Prior Misdemeanor Convictions		
Yes	42	28
No	107	72
Total	149	100
Open Cases		
Yes	51	34
No	98	66
Total	149	100
Type of Warrant Attached to Rap Sheet		
Bench Warrant	17	12
Other Warrants	11	7
No Warrants	119	81
Total	147	100
Prior Warrants		
Yes	51	36
No	90	64
Total	141	100

Table 4-4

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Charge-Related Information for Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=156)

	N	%
Top Arrest Charge Severity		
A Felony	8	5
B Felony	70	45
C Felony	24	15
D Felony	40	26
E Felony	10	6
A Misdemeanor	3	2
B Misdemeanor	1	1
Total	156	100
Top Arrest Charge (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	17	11
Burglary	15	10
Robbery	35	22
Controlled Substances	52	33
Other	37	24
Total	156	100
SUPREME COURT CHARGES		
Top Arraignment Charge		
A Felony	1	1
B Felony	48	31
C Felony	28	18
D Felony	57	36
E Felony	22	14
Total	156	100

Table 4-4

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Charge-Related Information for Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=156)

	N	%
Top Arraignment Charge (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	12	8
Burglary	15	10
Robbery	38	24
Controlled Substances	51	33
Other	40	26
Total	156	101
Top Disposition Charge Severity		
B Felony	4	3
C Felony	45	29
D Felony	82	53
E Felony	24	15
Total	155	100
Disposition Charge (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	11	7
Burglary	15	10
Robbery	36	23
Controlled Substances	52	33
Other	41	26
Total	155	99
Disposition Charge Severity		
B Felony	4	3
C Felony	45	29
D Felony	82	53
E Felony	24	15
Total	155	100

Table 4-5

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Information

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=156)

	N	%
Post Sentence Re-Arrest		
Yes	102	65
No	54	35
Total	156	100
Count of Re-Arrests		
None	54	35
One	31	20
Two or More	71	46
Total	156	101
VFO Re-Arrest Count		
No Re-Arrest	54	35
No VFO Re-Arrest	71	46
One VFO Re-Arrest	25	16
Two or More VFO Re-Arrests	6	4
Total	156	101
VFO Charge at First Re-Arrest		
No Re-Arrest	54	35
VFO at First Re-Arrest	12	8
No VFO at First Re-Arrest	90	58
Total	156	101
Type of First Re-Arrest		
Summary	102	100
Desk Appearance Ticket	0	0
Total	102	100
Borough of First Re-Arrest		
Brooklyn	13	13
Manhattan	32	31
Queens	21	21
Staten Island	6	6
Bronx	30	29
Total	102	100

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

Table 4-5

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Information

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=156)

	N	%
Severity of First Re-Arrest Charge		
A Felony	2	2
B Felony	17	17
C Felony	5	5
D Felony	13	13
E Felony	8	8
A Misdemeanor	32	31
B Misdemeanor or Lower	25	25
Total	102	101
Top Charge on First Re-Arrest (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	13	13
Burglary	12	12
Controlled Substances (Article 220)	23	23
Marijuana (Article 221)	12	12
Other	41	40
Total	101	100

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

With respect to the borough of the first post-sentencing re-arrest, 31% of the offenders were re-arrested in Manhattan, 29% in the Bronx, 21% in Queens, 13% in Brooklyn, and 6% in Staten Island.

VFO Information

Table 4-5 further shows that 20% of the re-arrests in the at-risk period were for violent felony offenses. Eight percent had a VFO charge on first re-arrest.

C. Logistic Regression Analysis of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

We developed multivariate models to identify significant predictors of post-sentencing re-arrest among offenders with a Supreme Court split sentence of six months. To select variables for our models, we examined correlations between a number of independent variables and the outcome variable (also see bivariate relationship in Appendix B-2). Our analysis showed that prior arrests, prior bench warrants, borough where the initial arrest occurred, age at initial arrest, sex, and time-at-risk were significantly correlated with re-arrest. All of these variables were used to develop a logistic regression model, with the exception of sex. Due to relatively fewer female offenders, sex was not included in the model. To control for time an offender was at-risk to be re-arrested, the time-at-risk variable was added first to the model (Appendix C-2). The variables that were significantly related to re-arrest in that model were used to develop the final model.

In our at-risk sample of offenders with a Supreme Court split sentence of six months, prior warrants and prior arrests were moderately correlated (correlation=.438, level of significance=.000, data not shown). Therefore, when both variables were simultaneously controlled for in a model, only prior warrants attained statistical significance (Appendix C-2). To address the issue of multi-collinearity, we developed two separate models, each controlling for one of these variables. The findings from both models are presented as follows.

Table 4-6 presents Model A which was comprised of three variables. They included time-at-risk, prior warrants, and age at initial arrest. Time-at-risk was not a significant predictor of re-arrest for Supreme Court offenders with a split sentence of six months. After controlling for time-at-risk, prior warrants and age were significantly related to post-sentencing re-arrest.

Table 4-6

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Model A: Logistic Regression Model Predicting Likelihood of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=138)

Independent Variables	Beta Coefficient	Significance Level	Odds Ratio
TIME-AT-RISK	0.002	0.268	1.002
PRIOR WARRANTS	1.301	0.002	3.674
AGE AT INITIAL ARREST			
Reference Category=18 and younger			
19-24 years	-0.899	0.083	0.407
25 and older	-1.286	0.012	0.276

Nagelkerke R Square = .156

The beta coefficients indicated that both variables had a strong influence on the likelihood of re-arrest. The odds of post-sentencing re-arrest were 3.6 times greater for offenders with prior warrants than that for offenders with no prior warrants. With respect to the age variable, offenders aged 25 or older were less likely to be re-arrested than offenders aged 18 or under. The odds that an offender aged 25 or older would not be re-arrested were 3.6 times greater (1/.276) than that for offenders aged 18 or under. Table 4-5 shows that the total variance explained by Model A was 16% (Nagelkerke R Square=.156).

Model B, presented by Table 4-7 controlled for prior arrests, age, and time-at-risk. After controlling for time-at-risk, prior arrest had a statistically significant influence on the likelihood of post-sentencing re-arrest. The odds that an offender with prior arrests would be re-arrested were 2.79 times greater than that for an offender with no prior arrests. As in Model A, age was a significant predictor of re-arrest. The variance explained by Model B was 12% (Nagelkerke R Square=.122).

Summary and Discussion of Findings

We found three variables that were significantly related to post-sentencing re-arrest for offenders with a Supreme Court split sentence of six months. Specifically, we found that after controlling for time-at-risk, the odds of post-sentencing re-arrest were higher among younger offenders and offenders who had a history of warrants or offenders who had been arrested previously at initial arrest. A comparison of beta coefficients for prior warrants and prior arrests indicated the former was a stronger predictor of re-arrest than the latter.

The findings regarding the effect of prior warrants, prior arrests, and age on post-sentencing re-arrest did not surprise us as they were similar to findings from research on recidivism. However, we were somewhat surprised by the strong explanatory power of our predictor variables in Model A. To be specific, the total variance explained by model A which controlled for time-at-risk, prior warrants, and age was 16%, 13% of which was explained by prior warrants and age (data not shown). In general, predictive models of recidivism with so few variables have only weak explanatory power.

In our analysis of Supreme Court offenders receiving a six month split sentence, the top disposition charge was not found to be significantly correlated with post-sentencing re-arrest.

Table 4-7

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Model B: Logistic Regression Model Predicting Likelihood of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=138)

Independent Variables	Beta Coefficient	Significance Level	Odds Ratio
TIME-AT-RISK	0.002	0.163	1.002
PRIOR ARRESTS	1.027	0.014	2.793
AGE AT INITIAL ARREST			
Reference Category=18 and younger			
19-24 years	-0.684	0.185	0.505
25 and older	-1.073	0.032	0.342

Nagelkerke R Square = .122

This may be attributed to the small sample size we were working with (N=156). The number of offenders in each charge category was too small to have a meaningful effect on the outcome variable.

D. Identifying Low-Risk Offenders

Our logistic regression models showed that offenders with no prior arrests/no prior warrants and offenders aged 25 or older were less likely to be re-arrested. Based on these findings we created three groups of offenders. The first group (Group 4-1) contained offenders who were not arrested previously or had no prior warrants.[2] The second group (Group 4-2) was comprised of offenders who were 25 or older. Group 4-3 contained offenders who had not been arrested previously or had no prior warrants and were aged 25 or older. The re-arrest information about these groups is presented in Table 4-8.

As shown by the table, Group 4-1 (no prior arrests or no prior warrants) was comprised of 96 offenders (62% of the at-risk sample). The re-arrest rate for these offenders was 57%. Thirty-six percent had two or more re-arrests in the at-risk period. Eighteen percent had VFO re-arrests and 7% had a VFO charge on the first re-arrest.

Group 4-2 contained 61 offenders who were 25 or older at sample's initial arrest. As shown by Table 4-8, 54% of these offenders were re-arrested after their release. About one-third had two or more re-arrests in the at-risk period. Less than one-tenth (8%) were re-arrested for VFO charges and 3% had VFO charges on the first post-sentencing re-arrest.

Group 4-3 took into account all the attributes that were significantly related to post-sentencing re-arrest among Supreme Court offenders with a split sentence of six months (no prior arrests or no prior warrants and 25 or older). This group only contained 33 offenders. Forty-eight percent of these offenders were re-arrested after release from jail. Slightly more than one-quarter had two or more re-arrests and 6% had VFO re-arrests. None of the offenders had a VFO charge at first re-arrest.

[2] To increase the number of low-risk offenders, our selection criteria included offenders who had no prior arrests or warrants, rather than no prior arrests and no prior warrants.

Table 4-8

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Low-Risk Offenders: Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Information

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Group 4-1 No prior arrest/ No prior warrant (N=96)		Group 4-2 25 or older (N=61)		Group 4-3 No prior arrest/ No prior warrant and 25 and older (N=33)		At-Risk Sample (N=156)	
Re-Arrest Information	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest								
No	41	43	28	46	17	52	54	35
Yes	55	57	33	54	16	48	102	65
Total	96	100	61	100	33	100	156	100
Re-Arrest Count								
None	41	43	28	46	17	52	54	35
One	20	21	12	20	7	21	31	20
Two or More	35	36	21	34	9	27	71	46
Total	96	100	61	100	33	100	156	101
VFO Re-Arrest								
No Re-Arrest	41	43	28	46	17	52	54	35
No VFO Re-Arrest	38	40	28	46	14	42	71	46
One or More VFO Re-Arrests	17	18	5	8	2	6	31	20
Total	96	101	61	100	33	100	156	101
VFO Charge at First Re-Arrest								
No Re-Arrest	41	43	28	46	17	52	54	35
No VFO at First Re-Arrest	48	50	31	51	16	48	90	58
VFO at First Re-Arrest	7	7	2	3	0	0	12	8
Total	96	100	61	100	33	100	156	101

When compared with offenders in the at-risk sample, Offenders in Group 4-3 had lower rates of re-arrest in general (65% for the former, 48% for the latter) and re-arrests for VFO charges (20% for the former, 6% for the latter). The proportion of offenders with two or more re-arrests was also lower for offenders in Group 4-3 (27%) than for offenders in the at-risk sample (46%).

A comparison of our subgroups with the at-risk sample indicated that all of the three groups had lower re-arrest rates than the at-risk sample. Furthermore, relatively few offenders in each group were re-arrested more than once in the at-risk period. Group 4-3, which was based on all the significant variables from the logistic regression model, had the lowest re-arrest rate. This was also true for re-arrests made for VFO charges. It should be noted that Group 4-3 contained relatively fewer offenders and as such the percentages for some of the categories did not carry much weight.

In sum, our subgroups had lower re-arrest rates than the at-risk sample. However, despite their lower re-arrest rates, all of the three groups presented a considerable risk of post-sentencing re-arrest. Specifically, more than one-half of the offenders in Group 4-1 and Group 4-2, and almost one-half of the offenders in Group 4-3 were re-arrested after their release from jail.

V. Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Among Offenders with a Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

As mentioned previously, in the Fourth Quarter of 2003 Dataset, 529 convicted offenders received a Supreme Court definite sentence of six to twelve months. Multivariate models were developed to identify significant predictors of post-sentencing re-arrest for these offenders. Before describing the findings from that analysis, offender characteristics and re-arrest information are presented.

A. Offender Characteristics at Sample's Initial Arrest

Demographic and Case-Processing Characteristics

Table 5-1 displays demographic and case-processing attributes for offenders with six to twelve months of definite sentence. As shown by the table, male offenders comprised 93% of

Table 5-1

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Demographic and Case-Processing Characteristics

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=529)

Offender Characteristics	N	%
DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES		
Sex		
Male	491	93
Female	38	7
Total	529	100
Ethnicity		
Black	295	56
Hispanic	183	35
White	37	7
Other	8	2
Total	523	100
Age at Arrest		
18 and younger	98	18
19-20 years	93	18
21-24 years	96	18
25-29 years	63	12
30-34 years	30	6
35- 39 years	50	10
40 and older	99	19
Total	529	101
Median Age (Years)	23	
CASE-PROCESSING CHARACTERISTICS		
Borough of Arrest		
Brooklyn	107	20
Manhattan	229	43
Queens	92	17
Staten Island	14	3
Bronx	87	16
Total	529	99
Median Time-at-Risk	1,144 days	
Median Time-at-Risk from Release to First Re-Arrest for Re-Arrested Offenders	197 days	

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

the at-risk sample. Fifty-six percent were Black, 35% were Hispanic and 7% were White. The remaining 2% were of "other" ethnicity. The median age was 23 years old.

As shown by Table 5-1, 43% of the offenders were initially arrested in Manhattan. This was followed by Brooklyn (20%), Queens (17%), the Bronx (16%), and Staten Island (3%).

The median time-at-risk for released offenders with a Supreme Court definite sentence of six to twelve months was 1,144 days. The median risk time from release to first post-sentencing re-arrest was 197 days.

Community Ties

Examining the community-ties items (Table 5-2), an overwhelming majority (91%) of the offenders in our at-risk sample reported living at a New York City area address. Slightly less than three-fifths reported living with someone at the time of their initial arrest. Seventy percent reported living at their current address for 18 months or longer. Almost two-thirds of the offenders reported having a telephone in the residence or having a cellular phone. One-third of the offenders in our at-risk sample reported being employed, in school, or in a training program full time at the time of initial arrest.

Almost two-fifths expected someone at Criminal Court arraignment at the time of their initial arrest. With respect to the CJA recommendation, 22% were recommended for ROR and 16% received a moderate rating at initial arrest.

Criminal History

Table 5-3 presents the criminal history of the convicted offenders at the time of initial arrest. As shown by the table, 86% of the convicted offenders receiving a Supreme Court definite sentence of six to twelve months had been arrested previously. Almost one-half had been convicted previously on misdemeanor charges. The same percentage applied to offenders with prior warrants. One-fourth had at least one prior felony conviction. Slightly more than one-third had pending cases and 13% had an open bench warrant at sample's initial arrest.

Charge-Related Information

Table 5-4 provides the information related to charges at initial arrest for offenders with a Supreme Court definite sentence of six to twelve months. The table shows that both at arraignment and conviction, slightly less than one-half of the offenders were charged with drug

Table 5-2

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Community Ties and CJA Recommendation at Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=529)

	N	%
COMMUNITY-TIES ITEMS		
Verified NYC Area Address		
Yes Unverified	356	73
Yes Verified	87	18
No Unverified	35	7
No Verified	1	0
Unresolved Conflict	10	2
Total	489	100
Verified Length of Residence of at Least 18 Months		
Yes Unverified	270	55
Yes Verified	73	15
No Unverified	119	24
No Verified	14	3
Unresolved Conflict	13	3
Total	489	100
Verified Family Ties Within Residence		
Yes Unverified	213	44
Yes Verified	71	14
No, Unverified	178	36
No Verified	19	4
Unresolved Conflict	9	2
Total	490	100
Expects Someone at Arraignment		
Yes	187	39
No/Don't Know	298	61
Total	485	100
Verified Telephone		
Yes Unverified	235	48
Yes Verified	81	16
No Unverified	147	30
No Verified	7	1
Unresolved Conflict	20	4
Total	490	99
Verified Full Time Employment/ School/ Training		
Yes Unverified	126	26
Yes Verified	41	8
No Unverified	272	56
No Verified	45	9
Unresolved Conflict	5	1
Total	489	100
CJA Recommendation		
Recommended	112	22
Moderate Risk	81	16
Not Recommended	291	57
No Recommendation	24	5
Total	508	100

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

Table 5-3

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Criminal History

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=529)

	N	%
CRIMINAL HISTORY		
First Arrest		
Yes	70	14
No	434	86
Total	504	100
Prior Felony Convictions		
Yes	133	26
No	371	74
Total	504	100
Prior Misdemeanor Convictions		
Yes	241	48
No	263	52
Total	504	100
Open Cases		
Yes	182	36
No	322	64
Total	504	100
Type of Warrant Attached to Rap Sheet		
Bench Warrant	64	13
Other Warrants	40	8
No Warrants	396	79
Total	500	100
Prior Warrants		
Yes	248	50
No	249	50
Total	497	100

Table 5-4

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Charge-Related Information for Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=529)

	N	%
Top Arrest Charge Severity		
A Felony	13	2
B Felony	263	50
C Felony	71	13
D Felony	117	22
E Felony	49	9
A Misdemeanor	12	2
B Misdemeanor	4	1
Total	529	99
Top Arrest Charge (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	34	6
Burglary	23	4
Larceny	19	4
Robbery	69	13
Other Theft-Related Offenses	25	5
Controlled Substances	253	48
Weapon	60	11
Other	46	9
Total	529	100
SUPREME COURT CHARGES		
Top Arraignment Charge Severity		
A Felony	3	1
B Felony	148	28
C Felony	102	19
D Felony	189	36
E Felony	70	13
A Misdemeanor	11	3
B Misdemeanor or lower	4	1
Total	527	101

Table 5-4

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Charge-Related Information for Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=529)

	N	%
Top Arraignment Charge (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	24	4
Burglary	24	4
Larceny	24	4
Robbery	54	11
Controlled substances	251	48
Other Theft-Related Offenses	26	5
Weapon	68	13
Other	56	11
Total	527	100
Top Disposition Charge Severity		
B Felony	19	4
C Felony	147	28
D Felony	217	41
E Felony	65	12
A Misdemeanor	76	14
B Misdemeanor or lower	5	1
Total	529	100
Disposition Charge (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	29	6
Burglary	21	4
Larceny	39	7
Robbery	46	9
Other Theft-Related Offenses	23	4
Controlled Substances	247	47
Weapon	73	14
Other	51	10
Total	529	101

Perentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

offenses. Two-fifths of the offenders were convicted on D felonies, followed by C felonies (28%), E felonies (12%), and B felonies (4%). The remaining 15% of offenders were convicted on misdemeanor charges.

B. Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Table 5-5 displays information about re-arrests for the at-risk sample. As can be seen, in the at-risk sample of Supreme Court offenders with six to twelve months of definite sentences, 69% were re-arrested after release from jail. More than one-half of the offenders were re-arrested more than once in the at-risk period.

With respect to the information on first re-arrest, Manhattan had the largest proportion re-arrested after release from jail (35%). Two-fifths of the first re-arrests were for felony charges. Twenty-nine percent of the offenders at their first re-arrest were charged with offenses involving drugs.

Information Regarding VFO Re-Arrests

One-fifth of the at-risk offenders were re-arrested on VFO charges. Eight percent of the first post-sentencing re-arrests were for VFO charges.

C. Logistic Regression Analysis of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

In order to identify significant predictors of post-sentencing re-arrest among offenders who received a Supreme Court definite sentence of six to twelve months, we developed several logistic regression models. The variables were selected based on their correlation with the outcome variable (data not shown) (also see bivariate relationship in Appendix B-3). They included prior arrests, prior misdemeanor convictions, prior felony convictions, prior bench warrants, top disposition charge, length of time at current address, living with someone at the time of initial arrest, and time-at-risk. Using these variables, we developed our first logistic regression model, where the effect of each variable was examined while controlling for the effects of the other variables in the model. As in our previous models, time-at-risk was added first to the model as a control variable. The findings are presented in Appendix C-3. The variables that proved to be statistically significant predictors of post-sentencing re-arrest among

Table 5-5

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Information

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=529)

	N	%
Post Sentence Re-Arrest		
Yes	366	69
No	163	31
Total	529	100
Count of Re-Arrests		
None	163	31
One	75	14
Two or More	291	55
Total	529	100
VFO Re-Arrest Count		
No Re-Arrest	163	31
No VFO Re-Arrest	253	48
One VFO Re-Arrest	85	16
Two or More VFO Re-Arrests	28	5
Total	529	100
VFO Charge at First Re-Arrest		
No Re-Arrest	163	31
VFO at First Re-Arrest	45	8
No VFO at First Re-Arrest	315	60
Total	523	99
Type of First Re-Arrest		
Summary	360	98
Desk Appearance Ticket	6	2
Total	366	100
Borough of First Re-Arrest		
Brooklyn	94	26
Manhattan	127	35
Queens	59	16
Staten Island	14	4
Bronx	72	20
Total	366	101

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

Table 5-5

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Information

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=529)

	N	%
Severity of First Re-Arrest Charge		
A Felony	2	1
B Felony	71	19
C Felony	20	6
D Felony	34	9
E Felony	21	6
A Misdemeanor	127	35
B Misdemeanor or Lower	80	22
Severity Unknown	4	1
Total	359	99
Top Charge at First Re-Arrest (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	37	10
Burglary	31	9
Larceny	15	4
Robbery	16	4
Other Theft Related Offenses	28	8
Controlled Substances (Article 220)	103	29
Marijuana (Article 221)	50	14
Weapon	16	4
Other	66	18
Total	362	100

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

offenders with Supreme Court definite sentence of six to twelve months were used to develop final models. Before presenting those models, we would like to mention that prior warrants and prior arrests were moderately correlated with each other (correlation=.402, significance level=.000) (data not shown). In our model, when these two variables were simultaneously controlled for, only prior arrests proved to be a statistically significant predictor of post-sentencing re-arrest (Appendix C-3). Since this could be the result of multi-collinearity between these two variables, the influence of each variable on post-sentencing re-arrest was examined separately. Specifically, our Model A controlled for prior arrests and all the other significant variables from Appendix C-3. In Model B, prior arrest was replaced by prior warrants. The findings from both models are presented below.

Logistic Regression Model Controlling for Prior Arrests and Other Significant Variables

Our Model A (Table 5-6) controlled for time-at-risk, prior arrests, top disposition charge, and reported length of time at residence on initial arrest. Time-at-risk had no influence on the likelihood of re-arrest. Table 5-6 shows that after controlling for the effect of time-at-risk, all else being equal, top disposition charge, prior arrests, length of time at current address, and borough of initial arrest proved to be statistically significant predictors of re-arrest. When predicting post-sentencing re-arrest, two categories of disposition charge type proved to be useful—offenses involving burglary (Penal Law Article 140), and offenses involving firearms and other dangerous weapons (Penal Law Article 265). As indicated by the size of the beta coefficient (B=1.571), burglary was the strongest predictor of re-arrest in our model. The odds of post-sentencing re-arrest were about five times greater for offenders convicted on burglary charges than that for offenders with the mean effect of the charge variable. Continuing with the disposition charge, offenders convicted on weapon charges were less likely to be re-arrested than offenders with the average effect of the charge variable. The variable reflecting prior arrests (beta coefficient=1.149) was the second strongest predictor of re-arrest. Offenders who had been arrested previously were more likely to be re-arrested after release from jail than offenders who were not arrested previously. The odds of post-sentencing re-arrest for offenders having a history of arrest were about three times greater than that for offenders with no prior arrests.

Table 5-6

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Model A: Logistic Regression Model Predicting Likelihood of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=513)

	Beta Coefficient	Significance Level	Odds Ratio
TIME-AT-RISK	0.001	0.333	1.001
PRIOR ARRESTS	1.149	0.000	3.156
DISPOSITION CHARGE			
Excluded Category: Other			
Assault	-0.218	0.592	0.804
Burglary	1.571	0.022	4.811
Larceny	0.052	0.892	1.053
Robbery	-0.110	0.762	0.896
Other Theft Related Offenses	-0.413	0.328	0.662
Controlled Substance	0.096	0.646	1.100
Weapon Charges	-0.676	0.016	0.509
VERIFIED LENGTH OF RESIDENCE OF AT LEAST 18 MONTHS	-0.852	0.000	0.427
BOROUGH OF INITIAL ARREST			
Excluded Category: Brooklyn			
Manhattan	-0.252	0.140	0.777
Queens	-0.275	0.184	0.787
Bronx	0.564	0.020	1.757

Nagelkerke R Square = .153

The table further shows that all else being equal, offenders with affirmative responses to living at current address for 18 months or longer were more likely to be re-arrested than offenders with negative responses or responses that were in conflict with that of a verifier. Finally, the odds of re-arrests were higher among offenders initially arrested in the Bronx. As shown by Nagelkerke R square, the proportion of variance explained by the model was 15%.

Logistic Regression Model Controlling for Prior Warrants and Other Significant Variables

Our second model controlled for prior warrants, top disposition charge, borough of initial arrest, length of time at current address (at initial arrest), and time-at-risk (Table 5-7). As expected, after controlling for time-at-risk, all the variables that were significant in the previous model remained significant and could be interpreted in the same manner. The variable reflecting prior warrants also had a significant influence on the likelihood of post-sentencing re-arrest--offenders with prior warrants at the sample's initial arrest were more likely to be re-arrested after release from jail than those with no prior warrants.

We compared the beta coefficients for prior arrests and prior warrants to determine which variable was a stronger predictor of post-sentencing re-arrest. The comparison revealed that after controlling for the other variables in the model, the variable reflecting prior warrants (beta coefficient=.772) was a weaker predictor of re-arrest than the variable reflecting prior arrests (beta coefficient=1.149). As a result, the proportion of variance explained by the model controlling for prior warrants was slightly lower than that for the model controlling for prior arrests (14% versus 15%).

Summary and Discussion of Findings

After controlling for time-at-risk, our analysis identified five variables that were significantly related to post-sentencing re-arrest. They included top charge at disposition, prior arrests, prior warrants, length of time at residence, and borough of initial arrest. In our models, two categories of charge type were found to be statistically significant predictors of re-arrests—burglary and weapons. Specifically, the likelihood of re-arrest was higher among offenders convicted on burglary and related offenses, and lower among offenders convicted on weapon charges. Prior research on recidivism suggests that the type of charge influences the likelihood of recidivism. However, findings regarding specific types of charges are not consistent.

Table 5-7

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Model B: Logistic Regression Model Predicting Likelihood of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=513)

Independent Variables	Beta Coefficient	Significance Level	Odds Ratio
TIME-AT-RISK	0.001	0.269	1.001
PRIOR WARRANTS	0.772	0.001	2.164
DISPOSITION CHARGE			
Excluded Category: Other			
Assault	-0.214	0.595	0.807
Burglary	1.548	0.023	4.701
Larceny	0.027	0.945	1.027
Robbery	-0.040	0.912	0.961
Other Theft Related Offenses	-0.511	0.225	0.600
Controlled Substances	0.163	0.435	1.177
Weapon	-0.616	0.027	0.540
VERIFIED LENGTH OF RESIDENCE OF AT LEAST 18 MONTHS	-0.849	0.027	0.428
BOROUGH OF INITIAL ARREST			
Excluded Category: Brooklyn			
Manhattan	-0.271	0.110	0.763
Queens	-0.239	0.244	0.787
Bronx	0.610	0.012	1.840

Nagelkerke R Square = .139

In our analysis, due to the moderate correlation between prior arrests and prior warrants, the effects of these variables were examined separately. When examined individually, each variable was found to be a significant predictor of re-arrest. The likelihood of post-sentencing re-arrest was higher among offenders with prior arrests.

Likewise, the probability of re-arrest was higher among offenders with prior warrants. These findings were consistent with findings from other studies of recidivism, which suggest that offenders with criminal history are more likely to recidivate than those without such history. Continuing with criminal-history measures, as determined by the size of the beta coefficient, the variable reflecting prior arrests was a stronger predictor of re-arrest than the variable reflecting prior warrants.

In our models, reported length of time at residence significantly predicted post sentencing re-arrest. We were somewhat surprised by this finding as this variable did not attain significance in our previous research on pretrial re-arrest among the general population of defendants (Siddiqi 1998). The direction of the relationship, which suggested lower re-arrest rates for offenders who had lived at their residence for less than 18 months, surprised us as well. Prior CJA research on domestic violence defendants shows higher pretrial re-arrest rates for defendants who lived at their address for one year or less (Peterson 2006). The effect of this variable on post-conviction re-arrests among the general population of offenders needs to be further examined.

The finding regarding the borough of initial arrest indicated that all else being equal, the likelihood of re-arrest was higher among offenders initially arrested in the Bronx. We do not know why Bronx offenders were more likely to be re-arrested than the offenders with the average effect of the variable. Since the borough of arrest variable is unique to our sample, we can not compare this finding to prior research on recidivism either.

The explanatory power of our final models (as shown by Nagelkerke R Square) was relatively weak (15% for Model A and 14% for Model B). This is typical of the research predicting recidivism and is generally attributed to difficulties involved in predicting recidivism.

Our research also identified prior felony convictions, ethnicity, and living with someone at initial arrest as the significant correlates of post-sentencing re-arrest. However, they did not

attain statistical significance in our first logistic regression model (Appendix C-3), and therefore were not included in final models.

D. Identifying Low-Risk Offenders

Our logistic regression models indicated lower re-arrest rates for offenders who had no prior arrests or warrants, and were convicted on offenses involving weapon charges. To determine whether offenders with these characteristics would have lower re-arrest rates than offenders in the at-risk sample, we developed two subgroups (Table 5-8). The model also suggested a lower likelihood of re-arrest among offenders who had lived at their address for less than 18 months. Unless this finding is verified by further research, this variable will not be used in our identification of low-risk groups.

Our first subgroup (Group 5-1) included 260 offenders who were not arrested previously or had no prior warrants (Table 5-8). [3] Three-fifths of them were re-arrested after their release from jail. Forty-six percent had two or more re-arrests in the at-risk period. One-fifth of the re-arrests in the at-risk period were for VFO charges. Eight percent had a VFO charge on their first post-sentencing re-arrest.

Group 5-2 was comprised of 73 offenders who were convicted on weapon charges. Their re-arrest rate was 55%. Two-fifths of the offenders in Group 5-2 had two or more re-arrests. Almost one-fifth (19%) of the re-arrests in the sampling period were made for VFO charges. One-tenth had a VFO charge on the first re-arrest.

A comparison of our subgroups with the at-risk sample showed that they had lower re-arrest rates than the at-risk sample (Table 5-8). Furthermore, both subgroups had a considerably lower proportion of offenders with two or more re-arrests in the at-risk period. The two subgroups did not differ from the at-risk sample with respect to having VFO re-arrests in the at-risk period. Group 5-2, however, had a slightly higher proportion of offenders with a VFO charge on the first post-sentencing re-arrest.

[3] To increase the number of low-risk offenders, our selection criteria included offenders who had no prior arrests or warrants, rather than no prior arrests and no prior warrants.

Table 5-8

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Low-Risk Offenders: Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Information

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Group 5-1		Group 5-2		At-Risk Sample	
	No Prior Arrest/ No Prior Warrant (N=260)		Weapon Charges (N=73)		(N=529)	
Re-Arrest Information	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest						
No	101	39	33	45	163	31
Yes	159	61	40	55	366	69
Total	260	100	73	100	529	100
Re-Arrest Count						
None	101	39	33	45	163	31
One	39	15	11	15	75	14
Two or More	120	46	29	40	291	55
Total	260	100	73	100	529	100
VFO Re-Arrest						
No Re-Arrest	101	39	33	45	163	31
No VFO Re-Arrest	104	40	26	36	253	48
VFO Re-Arrest	55	21	14	19	113	21
Total	260	100	73	100	529	100
VFO at First Re-Arrest						
No Re-Arrest	101	39	33	45	163	31
No VFO at First Re-Arrest	137	53	32	44	315	60
VFO at First Re-Arrest	22	8	8	11	45	8
Total	260	100	73	100	523	99

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

Based on findings from the logistic regression models, we developed one more group (data not shown). This group included offenders who had no prior arrests/no prior warrants, and were convicted on weapon charges. Less than 10% of the offenders had these characteristics (N=47). Their re-arrest rate was 45%. Because of their small N, they were not investigated further.

To summarize, our findings suggest that our subgroups (Group 5-1 and Group 5-2) had lower re-arrest rates than offenders in the at-risk sample. Those re-arrest rates, nevertheless, were still considerably high. The offenders in both subgroups did not differ from the offenders in the at-risk sample with respect to VFO re-arrests in the at-risk period.

VI. Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Among Offenders with a Supreme Court Sentence of 12-18 Months

In our sample, 329 offenders received a sentence of incarceration ranging from 12 to 18 months. These convicted offenders were released after serving their sentence and were at-risk for re-arrest. The section that follows describes their characteristics, as well as the re-arrest information. The section concludes with findings derived from multiple logistic regression models.

A. Offender Characteristics at Sample's Initial Arrest

Demographic and Case-Processing Characteristics

Table 6-1 presents the demographic and case-processing characteristics for convicted offenders whose sentence involved an incarceration of over 12 months. As shown by the table, 94% of the incarcerated offenders in that sample were male. More than one-half were Black, one-third were Hispanic, and the remainder were White or "other" ethnicity. The median age at initial arrest in the sampling period was 29 years old.

As shown by Table 6-1, slightly more than two-fifths of the convicted offenders were initially arrested in Manhattan (44%), followed by Queens (20%), the Bronx (18%), Brooklyn (15%), and Staten Island (4%). The median time-at-risk from release to our cutoff date was 892

Table 6-1

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Demographic and Case-Processing Characteristics

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=329)

Offender Characteristics	N	%
DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES		
Sex		
Male	310	94
Female	19	6
Total	329	100
Ethnicity		
Black	180	55
Hispanic	110	34
White	28	8
Other	10	3
Total	328	100
Age at Arrest		
18 and younger	53	16
19-20 years	27	8
21-24 years	47	14
25-29 years	43	13
30-34 years	43	13
35-39 years	51	16
40 and older	65	20
Total	329	100
Median Age (Years)	29	
CASE-PROCESSING CHARACTERISTICS		
Borough of Arrest		
Brooklyn	50	15
Manhattan	144	44
Queens	64	20
Staten Island	12	4
Bronx	59	18
Total	329	101
Median Time-at-Risk	892 days	
Median Time-at-Risk from Release to First Re-Arrest for Re-Arrested Offenders	173 days	

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

days. For those who were re-arrested, the median time at-risk from release to their first re-arrest was 173 days.

Community Ties

Table 6-2 presents the community-ties variables for offenders who were sentenced for over 12 months in Supreme Court. As shown by the table, an overwhelming majority of the convicted offenders reported living at a New York City area address. One-half of the offenders reported living with someone at the time of initial arrest. Additionally, three-fifths of the offenders reported having a working telephone in their residence, or a cellular phone, and living at their current address for 18 months or longer. Slightly less than two-fifths reported being employed, in school, or in a training program full time. Less than one-third expected a relative or friend at Criminal Court arraignment of the initial arrest. Fifteen percent of the convicted offenders were recommended for ROR at initial arrest. The same percentage applied to offenders who were considered moderate risk for pretrial FTA.

Criminal History

Table 6-3 provides an offender's criminal history recorded at the time of the sample's initial arrest. As can be seen, the offenders in our at-risk sample had extensive criminal histories. To be specific, 89% percent had been arrested prior to the sample's initial arrest. Fifty-eight percent had been convicted previously on felony charges. The same proportion applied to prior misdemeanor convictions. Those with a history of warrants comprised three-fifths of re-arrests. Forty-five percent had at least one open case at the time of the sample's initial arrest. Eight percent had a bench warrant attached to their rap sheet.

Charge-Related Information

Table 6-4 presents the charge-related information for the sample's initial arrest. As shown by the table, for two-fifths of the offenders, the top charge both at arraignment involved drugs. As shown by Table 6-4, three-fifths of the offenders were convicted on E felonies.

Table 6-2

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Community Ties and CJA Recommendation at Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=329)

	N	%
COMMUNITY-TIES ITEMS		
Verified NYC Area Address		
Yes Unverified	221	75
Yes Verified	40	14
No Unverified	25	8
No Verified	2	1
Unresolved Conflict	6	2
Total	294	100
Verified Length of Residence of at Least 18 Months		
Yes Unverified	150	51
Yes Verified	33	11
No Unverified	96	33
No Verified	7	2
Unresolved Conflict	7	2
Total	293	99
Verified Family Ties Within Residence		
Yes Unverified	117	40
Yes Verified	34	12
No Unverified	126	43
No Verified	10	3
Unresolved Conflict	6	2
Total	293	100
Expects Someone at Arraignment		
Yes	89	30
No/Don't Know	204	70
Total	293	100
Verified Telephone		
Yes Unverified	136	46
Yes Verified	40	14
No Unverified	105	36
No Verified	2	1
Unresolved Conflict	10	3
Total	293	100
Verified Full Time Employment/ School/ Training		
Yes Unverified	87	30
Yes Verified	22	8
No Unverified	161	55
No Verified	18	6
Unresolved Conflict	4	1
Total	292	100
CJA Recommendation		
Recommended	48	15
Moderate Risk	47	15
Not Recommended	199	64
No Recommendation	19	6
Total	313	100

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

Table 6-3

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Criminal History

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=329)

	N	%
CRIMINAL HISTORY		
First Arrest		
Yes	34	11
No	277	89
Total	311	100
Prior Felony Convictions		
Yes	180	58
No	131	42
Total	311	100
Prior Misdemeanor Convictions		
Yes	179	58
No	132	42
Total	311	100
Open Cases		
Yes	140	45
No	171	55
Total	311	100
Type of Warrant Attached to Rap Sheet		
Bench Warrant	25	8
Other Warrants	28	9
No Warrants	254	83
Total	307	100
Prior Warrants		
Yes	183	60
No	124	40
Total	307	100

Table 6-4

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Charge-Related Information for Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=329)

	N	%
Top Arrest Charge Severity		
A Felony	15	5
B Felony	129	39
C Felony	44	13
D Felony	76	23
E Felony	50	15
A Misdemeanor	13	4
B Misdemeanor	2	1
Total	329	100
Top Arrest Charge (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	22	7
Burglary	38	12
Larceny	23	7
Robbery	35	11
Other Theft Related Offenses	30	9
Controlled Substances	132	40
Other	49	15
Total	329	101
SUPREME COURT CHARGES		
Top Arraignment Charge Severity		
A Felony	6	2
B Felony	95	29
C Felony	26	8
D Felony	94	29
E Felony	105	32
A Misdemeanor	1	0
B Misdemeanor	1	0
Total	328	100

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

Table 6-4

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Charge-Related Information for Initial Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	N	%
Top Charge at Arraignment (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	21	6
Burglary	45	14
Larceny	20	6
Robbery	32	10
Other Theft Related Offenses	29	9
Controlled Substances	133	40
Weapon	12	4
Other	36	11
Total	328	100
Disposition Charge (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	19	6
Burglary	44	13
Larceny	27	8
Robbery	34	10
Other Theft Related Offenses	25	8
Controlled Substances	133	40
Other	47	14
Total	329	99
Disposition Charge Severity		
A Felony	1	0
B Felony	71	22
C Felony	22	7
D Felony	38	12
E Felony	197	60
Total	329	101

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

B. Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

The re-arrest information for our at-risk sample is displayed by Table 6-5. As shown by the table, in the Supreme Court at-risk sample of offenders with a 12 to 18 months sentence of incarceration, 57% were re-arrested after release from prison. Thirty-eight percent had two or more re-arrests in the at-risk period.

Table 6-5 also presents information on first re-arrest during the at-risk period. As shown by the table, for 44% of the re-arrested offenders, Manhattan was the borough of first post-sentencing re-arrest. Thirty-six percent of the offenders at their first arrest were charged with a felony. For 29% of the re-arrested offenders, the top Penal Law charge was drugs.

VFO Information

Eleven percent of the offenders in our at-risk sample were re-arrested for VFO charges (Table 6-5). Five percent had a VFO charge at their first re-arrest.

C. Logistic Regression Analysis of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

In order to identify significant predictors of post-sentencing re-arrest among offenders with a Supreme Court sentence of 12 to 18 months, we developed a multiple logistic regression model. The model included all the variables that were significantly correlated with a post-sentencing re-arrest (data not shown) (see bivariate relationship in Appendix B-4). They included prior arrests, prior misdemeanor convictions, prior warrants, top charge at Supreme Court disposition, full time activity, telephone in the residence/cellular phone, sex, borough of initial arrest, and time-at-risk (Appendix C-4). Because of relatively fewer females in our sample, sex was not included in the model. The statistically significant predictors of re-arrest from that model were used to develop the final model, which is presented by Table 6-6.

In the final model predicting post-sentencing re-arrest for offenders with Supreme Court sentences ranging from 12 to 18 months, time-at-risk was added first as a control variable. It was found to be a significant predictor of post-sentencing re-arrest. As expected, offenders with a longer time-at-risk were more likely to be re-arrested. After controlling for its effect, the top charge at Supreme Court disposition and borough of arrest were significantly related to post-sentencing re-arrest. Beginning with the top charge, all else being equal, offenders convicted on

Table 6-5

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Information

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=329)

	N	%
Post Sentence Re-Arrest		
Yes	187	57
No	142	43
Total	329	100
Count of Re-Arrest		
None	142	43
One	63	19
Two or More	124	38
Total	329	100
VFO Re-Arrest Count		
No Re-Arrest	142	43
No VFO Re-Arrest	150	46
One or More VFO Re-Arrests	37	11
Total	329	100
VFO Charge at First Re-Arrest		
No Re-Arrest	142	43
VFO at First Re-Arrest	18	5
No VFO at First Re-Arrest	168	51
Total	328	99
Type of First Re-Arrest		
Summary	183	98
Desk Appearance Ticket	4	2
Total	187	100
Borough of First Re-Arrest		
Brooklyn	43	23
Manhattan	82	44
Queens	21	11
Staten Island	5	3
Bronx	36	19
Total	187	100

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

Table 6-5

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest Information

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=329)

	N	%
Severity of First Re-Arrest Charge		
A Felony	2	1
B Felony	23	12
C Felony	13	7
D Felony	17	9
E Felony	13	7
A Misdemeanor	81	43
B Misdemeanor or Lower	31	17
Unknown	5	3
Total	185	99
Top Charge on First Re-Arrest (Penal Law Article)		
Assault	18	10
Burglary	16	9
Larceny	18	10
Robbery	9	5
Other Theft Related Offenses	20	11
Controlled Substances (Article 220)	53	29
Marijuana (Article 221)	15	8
Other	33	18
Total	182	100

Percentages may not total 100% because of rounding.

Table 6-6

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Logistic Regression Model Predicting Likelihood of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=317)

Independent Variables	Beta Coefficient	Significance Level	Odds Ratio
TIME AT RISK	0.002	0.000	1.002
DISPOSITION CHARGE			
Excluded Category: Other			
Assault	-1.220	0.012	0.295
Burglary	1.696	0.000	5.450
Larceny	-0.583	0.126	0.558
Robbery	-0.225	0.539	0.798
Other Theft-Related Offenses	0.617	0.137	1.853
Controlled Substances	0.087	0.696	0.917
BOROUGH OF INITIAL ARREST			
Excluded Category: Brooklyn			
Manhattan	0.244	0.215	0.128
Queens	-0.614	0.010	0.541
Bronx	0.149	0.537	1.160

Nagelkerke R Square=.189

burglary and related charges (Penal Law Article 140) were significantly more likely to be re-arrested than offenders with the average effect of that variable. The odds of post-sentencing re-arrest for these offenders were about five times greater than that for offenders with the average effect of that variable. Offenders convicted on assault charges (Penal Law Article 120) were less likely to be re-arrested after release from prison.

Regarding borough where the initial arrest occurred, when compared with offenders with the mean effect, offenders initially arrested in Queens were less likely to be re-arrested. As shown by Nagelkerke R square, the variance explained by the model was 19%. Of this, 12% of the variance was explained by the top disposition charge alone (data not shown).

Summary and Discussion of Findings

Our logistic regression analysis identified only two variables as the statistically significant predictors of post-sentencing re-arrest—top disposition charge and borough where the initial arrest occurred. The finding regarding the significant relationship between charge type and re-arrest is consistent with prior studies on recidivism. In our final model, two categories of disposition charge type attained statistical significance. They included offenses involving assault and offenses involving burglary. Offenders convicted on burglary had the strongest effect (as determined by beta coefficient) on the likelihood of re-arrest, followed by offenders convicted on assault charges. It should be noted, however, that relatively few offenders were convicted on assault charges. We recommend more research to verify this finding.

Our model also showed that offenders initially arrested in Queens were less likely to be re-arrested than offenders with the mean effect of the borough of arrest variable. Since the borough of arrest variable is unique to our sample, we can not compare this finding with previous research on recidivism. Also, we do not have an explanation for why the likelihood of re-arrest was lower among offenders initially arrested in Queens.

As shown by Nagelkerke R Square, the total amount of variance explained by the model was 19%, which, considering the fewer variables in the model, was somewhat surprising. Of that 19%, 12% of the variance was explained by the top disposition charge alone, suggesting that the variable had great explanatory power.

We would also like to describe the variables which were identified by our research as the significant correlates of post-sentencing re-arrest. However, when controlled simultaneously in a logistic regression model, they did not prove to be statistically significant predictors of re-arrest. They included prior arrests, prior misdemeanor convictions, full time activity, and a telephone in the residence/cellular phone. Regarding the criminal-history measures, both prior arrests and prior misdemeanor convictions had no significant influence on the prediction of re-arrest, which was somewhat surprising. The finding regarding prior arrests may be attributed to little variance—only 11% of the offenders were not arrested previously (N=34). With respect to the community-ties variables, in our model, being engaged in a full-time activity and having a telephone in the residence or having a cellular phone did not attain statistical significance. This was not unexpected as prior research on recidivism suggests similar findings—when predicting recidivism, community-ties items have been found to have either no influence or a weak influence.

D. Identifying Low-Risk Offenders

Our logistic regression model suggested that offenders convicted on assault charges were less likely to be re-arrested than offenders with the average effect of the charge variable. In our sample, only 19 offenders were convicted on assault charges; one-third of them were re-arrested after release from prison (Appendix B-4). Because of the small N, these offenders were not investigated further.

VII. Summary

This section summarizes our research on the likelihood of post-sentencing re-arrest among offenders who were sentenced to six to eighteen months of incarceration. First, the findings for Criminal Court offenders with six to twelve months of jail time are described, followed by that for Supreme Court offenders.

A. Criminal Court Offenders with Six to Twelve Months of Jail Time

In our sample of Criminal Court released offenders, the majority was male with a median age of 37 years old. Slightly more than half of the offenders were Black. One-third of the convicted offenders were initially arrested in Manhattan. For slightly more than one-fourth of the offenders, the most severe charge at conviction was larceny. Drugs were the second most common charge at initial arrest (21%).

Our analysis showed that the offenders in the at-risk sample had extensive criminal histories--almost all of them had been arrested previously, with a majority having prior convictions on misdemeanor or felony charges. More than two-fifths had pending case(s) at initial arrest. More than three-fourths had warrants prior to the sample case.

Our research showed that in our sample, the re-arrest rate among released offenders was quite high—82% had been re-arrested at least once after release from jail. One-fifth of the released offenders were re-arrested for VFO charges. Drugs were the most common charge (29%) at the first post-sentencing re-arrest, followed by larceny (18%).

In our multiple logistic regression model, when controlled for the effect of time-at-risk, three variables proved to be statistically significant predictors of post-sentencing re-arrest—top disposition charge, prior misdemeanor convictions and sex. When compared with the average effect of the charge variable, offenders convicted on offenses involving criminal facilitation were less likely to be re-arrested, whereas offenders convicted on larceny were more likely to be rearrested after release from jail. The size of the beta coefficient indicated that the top disposition charge of criminal facilitation was the strongest predictor of re-arrest, followed by sex. Male offenders were more likely to be re-arrested than female offenders. Offenders with prior misdemeanor convictions had a greater probability of re-arrest.

In order to identify offenders who would present a relatively lower risk of post-sentencing re-arrest, we examined re-arrest rates for offenders who had no prior misdemeanor convictions. There were 80 such offenders in our sample. In comparison to the average re-arrest rate of 82%, their re-arrest rate was 72%. This finding suggested that offenders with no prior

misdemeanor convictions were also at high risk for post-sentencing re-arrest. Our inability to identify low-risk offenders was mainly due to a very high re-arrest rate among offenders in our at-risk sample.

B. Offenders with Supreme Court Sentences

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

In our at-risk sample of offenders with a Supreme Court split sentence of six months, an overwhelming majority was male, with a median age of 22 years old.

Approximately three-fourths of the at-risk offenders in our sample had been arrested previously. One-tenth had been convicted previously on felony charges and more than one-fourth had prior misdemeanor convictions. One-third had a history of warrants at initial arrest. Slightly more than one-tenth had a bench warrant attached to the rap sheet. One-third had at least one case pending at initial arrest. Slightly more than one-half were convicted on D felony charges. Almost two-thirds had been re-arrested after release from jail. About one-fifth had at least one VFO re-arrest in the at-risk period.

Our multivariate analysis identified three variables as significant predictors of re-arrest—prior arrests, prior warrants, and age at initial arrest. It should be noted that prior arrests and prior warrants were moderately correlated with each other. As a result, when controlled simultaneously in a model, only prior warrants attained statistical significance. When examined individually with other variables, each proved to be useful in predicting post-sentencing re-arrest. In our models, offenders aged 18 and younger, and offenders with prior misdemeanor convictions/prior warrants were more likely to be re-arrested. Prior warrants and age were found to be strong predictors of post-sentencing re-arrest. The variable reflecting prior arrests also had a strong effect on the likelihood of re-arrest. However, in comparison to prior warrants, its effect was slightly weaker.

We used findings from our logistic regression models to identify low-risk offenders for post-sentencing re-arrest. We created three subgroups. All of the three groups had lower re-arrest rates than the re-arrest rate for the at-risk sample. It should be noted that despite their lower re-arrest rates, all of the three groups presented a considerably high risk of post-sentencing

re-arrest. Specifically, more than one-half of the offenders in Group 4-1 and Group 4-2, and almost one-half of the offenders in Group 4-3 were re-arrested after release from jail. Group 4-1 contained more offenders than the other two groups.

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

In our at-risk sample of offenders with a Supreme Court sentence of six to twelve months, an overwhelming majority was male. More than half of the offenders were Black and slightly more than one-third were Hispanic. The median age was 23 years old.

An overwhelming majority of the convicted offenders receiving a Supreme Court definite sentence of six to twelve months had been arrested previously. About one-half had been convicted previously on misdemeanor charges. One-fourth had at least one prior felony conviction. Almost one-half had a history of prior warrants. Slightly more than one-third had pending cases and slightly more than one-tenth had an open bench warrant at the sample's initial arrest.

The released offenders in our sample had a very high re-arrest rate—69% were re-arrested after release from jail. More than one-half of the convicted offenders in our sample were re-arrested more than once during the at-risk period. One-fifth had at least one VFO re-arrest in the at-risk period. Eight percent of the first post-sentencing re-arrests were made for VFO charges. Manhattan was the borough where the highest proportion of initial and first post-sentencing re-arrests occurred.

After controlling for time-at-risk, we found five variables that had a significant influence on the likelihood of re-arrest. They included top charge at disposition, prior arrests, prior warrants, reported length of time at residence on initial arrest, and borough of initial arrest. In our models, when prior arrests and prior warrants were simultaneously controlled for, only prior arrests proved to be a statistically significant predictor of post-sentencing re-arrest. Since this could be the result of multi-collinearity between these two variables, the influence of each variable on post-sentencing re-arrest was examined separately.

In our models, two types of disposition charges were found to be statistically significant predictors of re-arrest—burglary and weapons. The odds of post-sentencing re-arrest were higher among offenders convicted on burglary and related offenses, and lower among offenders convicted on offenses involving weapons. Offenders with prior arrests and prior warrants had

higher re-arrest rates. The finding regarding the length of time at residence variable suggested that offenders living at their address for 18 months or longer were more likely to be re-arrested than offenders with less time at their address. Our models also show that offenders who were initially arrested in the Bronx were more likely to be re-arrested than the offenders with the mean effect of the borough of initial arrest.

We used findings from our logistic regression models to create subgroups of offenders who, relative to the average re-arrest rate for the at-risk sample, would have a considerably lower re-arrest rate. We developed two groups of offenders. The first group (5-1) included offenders who were not arrested previously, or had no prior warrants. The second group (5-2) contained offenders who were convicted on weapon offenses. When compared with the at-risk sample, offenders in Group 5-1 and Group 5-2 had lower re-arrest rates than offenders in the at-risk sample. Furthermore, both groups contained fewer offenders who were re-arrested more than once. The two subgroups did not differ from the at-risk sample with respect to the proportion of offenders re-arrested for VFO charges. Group 5-1 was quite similar to the at-risk sample with respect to having VFO charges on the first post-sentencing re-arrest. In comparison, a slightly higher proportion of offenders in Group 5-2 had a VFO charge on the first re-arrest.

Supreme Court Sentence of 12 to 18 Months

An overwhelming majority of the convicted offenders with a Supreme Court sentence of 12 to 18 months was male. Slightly more than one-half of the offenders were Black, one-third were Hispanic, and the remainder were White or "other" ethnicity. The median age at initial arrest in the sampling period was 29 years old. Two-fifths of the offenders were convicted on offenses involving drugs.

Slightly more than two-fifths of the convicted offenders were initially arrested in Manhattan. Manhattan also had the highest proportion of offenders re-arrested after release from prison.

As shown by the criminal-history indicators, the convicted offenders in our at-risk sample had extensive criminal justice involvement at the sample's initial arrest. For example, 89% of the offenders had been arrested prior to the sample's initial arrest. Almost three-fifths had been

convicted previously on misdemeanor or felony charges, and had prior warrants. Those with a pending case at the time of initial arrest comprised more than two-fifths of the sample. Eight percent had a bench warrant attached to their rap sheet.

In our at-risk sample of Supreme Court offenders with a sentence of 12 to 18 months, the re-arrest rate was quite high—57% were re-arrested after release from prison. Eleven percent of the re-arrests in the at-risk period were for VFO charges. Five percent had a VFO charge on the first post-sentencing re-arrest.

We conducted logistic regression analysis to identify variables that had a statistically significant effect on the likelihood of re-arrest among released offenders with a Supreme Court sentence of 12 to 18 months. In our analysis, only two variables proved to be useful in predicting post-sentencing re-arrest—top disposition charge and borough where the initial arrest occurred. Regarding the top charge at disposition, offenders convicted on burglary had the strongest influence on the likelihood of re-arrest. They were more likely to be re-arrested than offenders with the average effect of the charge variable. Offenders convicted on assault charges were less likely to be re-arrested after release from prison. With respect to the borough of arrest, offenders who were initially arrested in Queens were less likely to be re-arrested than offenders with the mean effect of the variable. We do not have any explanation for lower re-arrest rates among Queens offenders. Finally, due to the small N, offenders convicted on weapon charges were not examined with respect to their re-arrest rates.

We compared three groups of Supreme Court at-risk offenders on major findings of the study. The highlights of that comparison are presented as follows:

1. For all three groups of Supreme Court offenders, drugs were the most common charge at conviction as well as first re-arrest.

2. Offenders with a Supreme Court sentence of 12 to 18 months had the most extensive criminal history (prior arrests 89%, prior misdemeanor convictions 58%, prior felony convictions 58%, prior warrants 60%, pending cases 45%), followed by offenders with a definite sentence of six to twelve months (prior arrests 86%, prior misdemeanor convictions 48%, prior felony convictions 26%, open cases 36%), and offenders with a split sentence of six months (prior

arrests 73%, prior misdemeanor convictions 28%, prior felony convictions 10%, prior warrants 36%, open cases 34%).

3. Offenders with a Supreme Court definite sentence of six to twelve months had the highest re-arrest rate, (69%), followed by offenders with a split sentence of six months (65%), and offenders with a sentence of 12 to 18 months (57%). The lower re-arrest rate for offenders sentenced to 12 to 18 months of incarceration could be attributed to the relatively lower time-at-risk they had.

4. Offenders with a definite sentence of six to twelve months had the highest, and offenders with 12 to 18 months of incarceration had the lowest, proportion re-arrested more than once (55% versus 38%). Offenders with a split sentence of six months had 46% re-arrested more than once.

5. One-fifth of the offenders with a split sentence of six months or definite sentences of six to twelve months were re-arrested for VFO charges (20% for the former, 21% for the latter). The VFO re-arrest rate for offenders with a sentence of 12 to 18 months was 11%.

6. In our models, top charge at conviction was found to be a statistically significant predictor of post-sentencing re-arrest for all Supreme Court at-risk offenders, with the exception of those with a split sentence of six months. The insignificance may be attributed to the relatively small sample size of Supreme Court offenders with a split sentence of six months.

7. Prior warrants and prior arrests significantly predicted re-arrest for offenders with a split sentence of six months. This was also true for offenders with a definite sentence of six to twelve months.

8. For each sentence type, the subgroups of offenders which were based on statistically significant predictors of re-arrest had lower re-arrest rates than the sample's average re-arrest rate. Those re-arrest rates, nevertheless, were still quite high, ranging from 48%, 54%, and 57% for the three subgroups with a Supreme Court split sentence of six months (Group 4-3, Group 4-2, and Group 4-1), to 55% and 61% for the subgroups with a Supreme Court definite sentence of six to twelve months (Group 5-2 and Group 5-1). Regarding the VFO re-arrests, the subgroups did not differ substantially from their sample, with the exception of Group 4-2 and Group 4-3 of Supreme Court offenders with a split sentence of six months. The proportion of offenders with

VFO re-arrests was considerably lower for Group 4-2 and Group 4-3 than for the at-risk sample. However, due to the relatively small size of these groups, these findings should be interpreted with caution.

To summarize, all of the Criminal Court and Supreme Court offenders in our at-risk sample had extensive criminal justice involvement at the time of the sample's initial arrest. The significantly high re-arrest rates for the at-risk samples as well as for the subgroups, suggest that their criminal behavior did not stop after release from jail/prison. Alternatively, serving jail/prison time did not deter them from committing more crimes. In fact, about one-fifth of the re-arrests for Criminal Court offenders as well as for Supreme Court offenders with a split sentence of six months or definite sentences of six to twelve months were made for VFO charges, suggesting that some of these offenders after their release presented a serious threat to the safety of the community.

VIII. Conclusion

Although our research identified several subgroups of offenders with lower re-arrest rates than the average re-arrest rate, all of those subgroups presented a considerable risk of post-sentencing re-arrest—about half of the offenders in each subgroup were re-arrested after their release from jail. Our inability to identify low-risk offenders was mainly due to very high re-arrest rates among offenders in the at-risk sample. Therefore, although the re-arrest rates for the subgroups were considerably lower than the average re-arrest rate, they were still too high to categorize an offender as a "relatively lower" risk of post-sentencing re-arrest. Despite these limitations, we would like to make the following recommendations.

Our research on Criminal Court and Supreme Court at-risk offenders identified a few variables as significant predictors of re-arrest. Of the statistically significant variables, top charge at conviction, prior arrests, and prior warrants proved to be quite strong predictors of post-sentencing re-arrest. When predicting post-sentencing re-arrests for Criminal Court offenders, the variable reflecting prior misdemeanor convictions also proved to be useful. Based on these findings, we suggest that an offender's criminal history as measured by prior arrests and prior

warrants, as well as disposition charges, should be taken into account when considering eligibility for options other than incarceration. Furthermore, a considerably large proportion of offenders in our sample had prior warrants, which suggests that these offenders may also present a risk for non-appearance. This finding may aid in determining which option would be an appropriate alternative-to-incarceration.

References

Siddiqi, Qudsia. 1998. *The Likelihood of Pretrial Re-Arrest in New York City.* Unpublished Report. New York: NYC Criminal Justice Agency.

Siddiqi, Qudsia. 2006. *Predicting the Likelihood of Pretrial Re-Arrest for Violent Felony Offenses and Examining the Risk of Pretrial Failure among New York City Defendants: An Analysis of the 2001 Dataset*. New York: NYC Criminal Justice Agency.

Peterson, Richard R. 2006. *Pretrial Failure to Appear and Pretrial Re-Arrest among Domestic Violence Defendants in New York City*. New York: NYC Criminal Justice Agency.

Appendix A-1

Coding of Variables for Regression Models

Variable	Codes	Variable	Codes
POST-SENTENCING RE-ARREST		EMPL/SCHOOL/TRAINING	
No	0	Yes, Yes Verified	1
Yes	1	No, No Verified, Unresolved Conflict	2
SEX		LENGTH OF TIME AT CURRENT	
Female	0	ADDRESS	
Male	1	Yes, Yes Verified	1
		No, No Verified, Unresolved Conflict	2
ETHNICITY			
Black	1	LIVING WITH SOMEONE	
White or Other	2	Yes, Yes Verified	1
Hispanic	3	No, No Verified, Unresolved Conflict	2
AGE (CONTINUOUS)	Years	PRIOR ARREST	
		No	0
AGE (CATEGORICAL)		Yes	1
18 and younger	1		
19 to 24 years	2	PRIOR MISDEMEANOR	
25 and older	3	CONVICTIONS	
		No	0
BOROUGH OF ARREST		Yes	1
Brooklyn	1		
Manhattan	2	PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS	
Queens	3	No	0
Staten Island	4	Yes	1
Bronx	5		
		PRIOR WARRANTS	
TIME-AT-RISK (CONTINUOUS)	Days	No	0
		Yes	1
TELEPHONE/CELLULAR PHONE			
Yes, Yes Verified	1	OPEN CASES	
No, No Verified, Unresolved Conflict	2	No	0
		Yes	1

Appendix A-1 (continued)

Coding of Variables for Regression Models

Variable	Codes	Variable	Codes
CHARGE AT CONVICTION		Supreme Court Definite Sentence	
Criminal Court Sentence of 6-12 Months		of 6-12 Months	
Criminal Facilitation	1	Assault	1
Assault	2	Burglary	2
Larceny	3	Larceny	3
Other Theft Related Offenses	4	Robbery	4
Offenses Against Judicial and		Other Theft Related Offenses	5
Other Proceedings	5	Controlled Substance	6
Controlled Substance	6	Weapon Charges	7
Other	7	Other	8
Supreme Court Split Sentence		Supreme Court Sentence	
of 6 Months		of 12 to 18 Months	
Burglary	1	Assault	1
Robbery	2	Burglary	2
Controlled Substances	3	Larceny	3
Other	4	Robbery	4
		Other Theft Related Offenses	5
		Controlled Substance	6
		Other	7

Appendix A-2

Multiple Logistic Regression Analysis

Multiple logistic regression analysis is a statistical technique that is used to test the individual effect of a number of independent variables on a dichotomous dependent variable, while controlling for the other variables in the model. A logistic regression procedure predicts the log-odds (the logit coefficients) of an observation being in one category of the dependent variable versus another. When reporting the results from a logistic regression model, one may also wish to transform the log-odds into odds ratios. This is accomplished by taking the antilog of the logit coefficient. The result is then interpreted as how much the odds of an outcome change, given a specific category of an independent variable. An odds ratio greater than one indicates an increase in the likelihood of an event occurring, and an odds ratio of less than one indicates a decrease in the likelihood of an event occurring. An odds ratio of one indicates the odds remain unchanged (no association between the independent and dependent variable). If the independent variable is continuous, such as age, the odds ratio measures the change in the odds of an outcome given one unit change in the independent variable. For dichotomous independent variables, such as gender, the odds ratio tells us how much the odds of an outcome change when cases are in one category versus another category. If a categorical independent variable has more than two categories, such as borough of initial arrest, the odds ratio measures the effect of being in each category of the independent variable versus a specified reference category. In the present analysis, with the exception of the analysis predicting re-arrest for offenders with a Supreme Court split sentence of six months, the effect for each category was compared to the overall effect of that variable (deviation contrast technique). When predicting re-arrest for offenders with a split sentence of six months, the results for the categorical variables were interpreted with reference to a specified excluded category (simple contrast technique).

As an example, assume that a dichotomized independent variable is coded "1" if a defendant has a history of warrants, and "0" otherwise (no prior warrants). Also assume that the dependent variable, indicating post-sentencing re-arrest, is coded "1" if a released offender is re-

arrested and "0" if a released offender is not re-arrested. We assume that estimating a univariate logistic regression model with prior warrants as the only independent variable produces a logit coefficient (log-odds) of .344. This suggests that when the variable of prior warrants changes from 0 to 1, there is an associated increase of .344 in the log-odds of re-arrest. Taking the antilog of the logit coefficient gives an odds ratio of 1.410. This indicates the odds of post-sentencing re-arrest for offenders with prior warrants are about 1.4 times greater than that for offenders who do not have a history of warrants.

In the present analysis, a .05 level (or less) was used to ascertain whether an observation had a statistically significant effect on the dependent variable. A .05 level of significance indicates that the observation could have occurred by chance alone five times in 100. The overall ability of all the independent variables in a logistic regression model to predict the outcome variable was measured by examining Nagelkerke R Square. This statistic indicates what proportion of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by all the independent variables in the model. Its values range from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating no variation in the dependent variable and 1 suggesting that all the variation in the dependent variable was explained by the independent variables in the model.

Appendix B-1

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Offender Characteristics by Post Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES						
Sex						
Male	418	83	87	17	505	100
Female	40	71	16	29	56	100
Total	458		103		561	
Ethnicity						
Black	257	84	48	16	305	100
Hispanic	148	77	44	23	192	100
White/Other	51	84	10	16	61	100
Total	456		102		558	
Age at Initial Arrest						
18 and younger	14	88	2	13	16	100
19-20 years	15	88	2	12	17	100
21-24 years	49	82	11	18	60	100
25-29 years	50	75	17	25	67	100
30-34 years	54	78	15	22	69	100
35-39 years	94	85	16	15	110	100
40 and older	182	82	40	18	222	100
Total	458		103		561	
CASE-PROCESSING CHARACTERISTICS						
Borough of Initial Arrest						
Brooklyn	78	84	15	16	93	100
Manhattan	151	81	35	19	186	100
Queens	122	77	36	23	158	100
Staten Island	13	93	1	7	14	100
Bronx	94	85	16	15	110	100
Total	458		103		561	

Appendix B-1 (continued)

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Offender Characteristics by Post Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
COMMUNITY-TIES ITEMS						
Verified Telephone						
Yes, Yes Verified	218	81	51	19	269	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	189	82	41	18	230	100
Total	407		92		499	
Verified Full Time Employment/ School/ Training						
Yes, Yes Verified	86	76	27	24	113	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	324	83	66	17	390	100
Total	410		93		503	
Verified Length of Residence of at Least 18 Months						
Yes, Yes Verified	252	84	49	16	301	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	159	78	44	22	203	100
Total	411		93		504	
Expects Someone at Arraignment						
Yes	85	82	19	18	104	100
No/Don't Know	322	81	74	19	396	100
Total	407		93		500	
Verified NYC Area Address						
Yes, Yes Verified	353	82	75	18	428	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	57	76	18	24	75	100
Total	410		93		503	
Verified Family Ties within Residence						
Yes, Yes Verified	191	83	39	17	230	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	220	80	54	20	274	100
Total	411		93		504	
CJA Recommendation						
Recommended	17	68	8	32	25	100
Mod. Risk	28	76	9	24	37	100
Not Recommended	358	83	73	17	431	100
No Recommendation	44	88	6	12	*50*	100
Total	447		96		543	

Appendix B-1 (continued)

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
CRIMINAL HISTORY						
First Arrest						
Yes	5	71	2	29	7	100
No	439	82	95	18	534	100
Total	444		97		541	
Prior Misdemeanor Convictions						
None	58	73	22	28	80	100
1	35	67	17	33	52	100
2 or More	353	86	58	14	411	100
Total	446		97		543	
Prior Felony Convictions						
Yes	336	81	79	19	415	100
No	110	86	18	14	128	100
Total	446		97		543	
Open Cases						
Yes	201	86	33	14	234	100
No	245	79	64	21	309	100
Total	446		97		543	
Prior Warrant						
Yes	372	83	75	17	447	100
No	67	75	22	25	89	100
Total	439		97		536	
Bench Warrant Attached to Rap Sheet						
No	340	83	72	17	412	100
Yes	58	87	9	13	67	100
Other	40	61	13	25	53	100
Total	438	75	94		532	

Appendix B-1 (continued)

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Disposition Charge Severity						
A Misdemeanor	446	81	102	19	548	100
B Misdemeanor or Lower	12	92	1	8	13	100
Total	458		103		561	
Disposition Charge (Penal Law Article)						
Criminal Facilitation	24	63	14	37	38	100
Assault	48	79	13	21	61	100
Larceny	138	88	18	12	156	100
Other Theft Related Offenses	46	87	7	13	53	100
Offenses Against Judicial and Other Proceedings	22	81	5	19	27	100
Controlled Substances	95	81	23	19	118	100
Other	85	79	23	21	108	100
Total	458		103		561	

Appendix B-2

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES						
Sex						
Male	96	69	44	31	140	100
Female	6	38	10	63	16	100
Total	102		54		156	
Ethnicity						
Black	51	72	20	28	71	100
Hispanic	35	60	23	40	58	100
White/Other	14	56	11	44	25	100
Total	100		54		154	
Age at Initial Arrest						
18 and younger	37	82	8	18	45	100
19-20 years	15	63	9	38	24	100
21-24 years	17	65	9	35	26	100
25-29 years	11	58	8	42	19	100
30-34 years	7	58	5	42	12	100
35-39 years	5	50	5	50	10	100
40 and older	10	50	10	50	20	100
Total	102		54		156	
CASE-PROCESSING CHARACTERISTICS						
Borough of Initial Arrest						
Brooklyn	10	59	7	41	17	100
Manhattan	46	64	26	36	72	100
Queens	20	59	14	41	34	100
Staten Island	6	67	3	33	9	100
Bronx	20	83	4	17	24	100
Total	102		54		156	

Appendix B-2 (continued)

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post Sentencing-Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
COMMUNITY-TIES ITEMS						
Verified Telephone						
Yes, Yes Verified	56	62	35	38	91	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	36	71	15	29	51	100
Total	92		50		142	
Verified Full Time Employment/ School/ Training						
Yes, Yes Verified	40	63	24	38	64	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	53	67	26	33	79	100
Total	93		50		143	
Verified Length of Residence of at Least 18 Months						
Yes, Yes Verified	60	65	32	35	92	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	33	65	18	35	51	100
Total	93		50		143	
Expects Someone at Arraignment						
Yes	35	65	19	35	54	100
No	58	66	30	34	88	100
Total	93		49		142	
Verified NYC Area Address						
Yes, Yes Verified	84	65	46	35	130	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	9	69	4	31	13	100
Total	93		50		143	
Verified Family Ties within Residence						
Yes, Yes Verified	55	65	30	35	85	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	38	66	20	34	58	100
Total	93		50		143	
CJA Recommendation						
Recommended	24	53	21	47	45	100
Moderate Risk	21	72	8	28	29	100
Not Recommended	48	72	19	28	67	100
No Recommendation	5	62	3	38	8	100
Total	98		51		149	

Appendix B-2 (continued)

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
CRIMINAL HISTORY						
First Arrest						
Yes	21	53	19	48	40	100
No	76	70	32	30	108	100
Total	97		51		148	
Prior Misdemeanor Convictions						
None	70	65	37	35	107	100
1	8	44	10	56	18	100
2 or More	20	83	4	17	24	100
Total	98		51		149	
Prior Felony Convictions						
Yes	11	73	4	27	15	100
No	87	65	47	35	134	100
Total	98		51		149	
Open Cases						
Yes	34	67	17	33	51	100
No	64	65	34	35	98	100
Total	98		51		149	
Prior Warrant						
Yes	41	80	10	20	51	100
No	52	58	38	42	90	100
Total	93		48		141	
Bench Warrant Attached to Rap Sheet						
No	71	60	48	40	119	100
Yes	15	88	2	12	17	100
Other	10	91	1	9	11	100
Total	96		51		147	

Appendix B-2 (continued)

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Offender Characteristics by Post Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Top Disposition Charge Severity						
B Felony	4	100	0	0	4	100
C Felony	31	69	14	31	45	100
D Felony	50	61	32	39	82	100
E Felony	16	67	8	33	24	100
Total	101		54		155	
Top Disposition Charge (Penal Law Article)						
Burglary	10	67	5	33	15	100
Robbery	27	75	9	25	36	100
Controlled Substances	34	65	18	35	52	100
Other	30	58	22	42	52	100
Total	101		54		155	

Appendix B-3

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES						
Sex						
Male	346	70	145	30	491	100
Female	20	53	18	47	38	100
Total	366		163		529	
Ethnicity						
Black	222	75	73	25	295	100
Hispanic	117	64	66	36	183	100
White/Other	25	56	20	44	45	100
Total	364		159		523	
Age at Initial Arrest						
18 and younger	76	78	22	22	98	100
19-20 years	65	70	28	30	93	100
21-24 years	69	72	27	28	96	100
25-29 years	38	60	25	40	63	100
30-34 years	20	67	10	33	30	100
35-39 years	33	66	17	34	50	100
40 and older	65	66	34	34	99	100
Total	366		163		529	
CASE-PROCESSING CHARACTERISTICS						
Borough of Initial Arrest						
Brooklyn	70	65	37	35	107	100
Manhattan	156	68	73	32	229	100
Queens	58	63	34	37	92	100
Staten Island	10	71	4	29	14	100
Bronx	72	83	15	17	87	100
Total	366		163		529	

Appendix B-3 (continued)

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
COMMUNITY-TIES ITEMS						
Verified Telephone						
Yes, Yes Verified	221	70	95	30	316	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	117	67	57	33	174	100
Total	338		152		490	
Verified Full Time Employment/ School/ Training						
Yes, Yes Verified	110	66	57	34	167	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	227	70	95	30	322	100
Total	337		152		489	
Verified Length of Residence of at Least 18 Months						
Yes, Yes Verified	251	73	92	27	343	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	86	59	60	41	146	100
Total	337		152		489	
Expects Someone at Arraignment						
Yes	136	73	51	27	187	100
No	198	66	100	34	298	100
Total	334		151		485	
Verified NYC Area Address						
Yes, Yes Verified	309	70	134	30	443	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	29	63	17	37	46	100
Total	338		151		489	
Verified Family Ties Within Residence						
Yes, Yes Verified	206	73	78	27	284	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	132	64	74	36	206	100
Total	338		152		490	
CJA Recommendation						
Recommended	75	67	37	33	112	100
Moderate Risk	46	57	35	43	81	100
Not Recommended	214	74	77	26	291	100
No Recommendation	17	71	7	29	24	100
Total	352		156		508	

Appendix B-3 (continued)

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
CRIMINAL HISTORY						
First Arrest						
Yes	29	41	41	59	70	100
No	320	74	114	26	434	100
Total	349		155		504	
Prior Misdemeanor Convictions						
None	167	63	96	37	263	100
1	39	63	23	37	62	100
2 or More	143	80	36	20	179	100
Total	349		155		504	
Prior Felony Convictions						
Yes	102	77	31	23	133	100
No	247	67	124	33	371	100
Total	349		155		504	
Open Cases						
Yes	124	68	58	32	182	100
No	225	70	97	30	322	100
Total	349		155		504	
Prior Warrant						
Yes	193	78	55	22	248	100
No	152	61	97	39	249	100
Total	345		152		497	
Bench Warrant Attached to Rap Sheet						
No	270	68	126	32	396	100
Yes	48	75	16	25	64	100
Other	28	70	12	30	40	100
Total	346		154		500	

Appendix B-3 (continued)

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Top Disposition Charge Severity						
B Felony	11	58	8	42	19	100
C Felony	107	73	40	27	147	100
D Felony	148	68	69	32	217	100
E Felony	43	66	22	34	65	100
A Misdemeanor	53	70	23	30	76	100
B Misdemeanor or Lower	4	80	1	20	5	100
Total	366		163		529	
Top Disposition Charge (Penal Law Article)						
Assault	20	69	9	31	29	100
Larceny	29	74	10	26	39	100
Robbery	31	67	15	33	46	100
Other Theft Related Offenses	14	61	9	39	23	100
Burglary	19	90	2	10	21	100
Controlled Substances	180	73	67	27	247	100
Weapon	40	55	33	45	73	100
Other	33	65	18	35	51	100
	366		163		529	

Appendix B-4

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post-sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES						
Sex						
Male	181	58	129	42	310	100
Female	6	32	13	68	19	100
Total	187		142		329	
Ethnicity						
Black	101	56	79	44	180	100
Hispanic	63	57	47	43	110	100
White/Other	22	58	16	42	38	100
Total	186		142		328	
Age at Initial Arrest						
18 and younger	31	58	22	42	53	100
19-20 years	17	63	10	37	27	100
21-24 years	29	62	18	38	47	100
25-29 years	23	53	20	47	43	100
30-34 years	25	58	18	42	43	100
35-39 years	29	57	22	43	51	100
40 and older	33	51	32	49	65	100
Total	187		142		329	
CASE-PROCESSING CHARACTERISTICS						
Borough of Initial Arrest						
Brooklyn	31	62	19	38	50	100
Manhattan	87	60	57	40	144	100
Queens	27	42	37	58	64	100
Staten Island	8	67	4	33	12	100
Bronx	34	58	25	42	59	100
Total	187		142		329	

Appendix B-4 (continued)

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
COMMUNITY-TIES ITEMS						
Verified Telephone						
Yes, Yes Verified	87	49	89	51	176	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	73	62	44	38	117	100
Total	160		133		293	
Verified Full Time Employment/ School/ Training						
Yes, Yes Verified	48	44	61	56	109	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	113	62	70	38	183	100
Total	161		131		292	
Verified Length of time at Residence						
Yes, Yes Verified	94	51	89	49	183	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	66	60	44	40	110	100
Total	160		133		293	
Expects Someone at Arraignment						
Yes	55	62	34	38	89	100
No	106	52	98	48	204	100
Total	161		132		293	
Verified NYC Area Address						
Yes, Yes Verified	143	55	118	45	261	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	18	55	15	45	33	100
Total	161		133		294	
Verified Family Ties within Residence						
Yes, Yes Verified	80	53	71	47	151	100
No, No Verified, Unresolved Confl.	80	56	62	44	142	100
Total	160		133		293	
CJA Recommendation						
Recommended	25	52	23	48	48	100
Moderate Risk	23	49	24	51	47	100
Not Recommended	116	58	83	42	199	100
No Recommendation	12	63	7	37	19	100
Total	176		137		313	

Appendix B-4 (continued)

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
CRIMINAL HISTORY						
First Arrest						
Yes	14	41	20	59	34	100
No	161	58	116	42	277	100
Total	175		136		311	
Prior Misdemeanor Convictions						
None	66	50	66	50	132	100
1	23	55	19	45	42	100
2 or More	86	63	51	37	137	100
Total	175		136		311	
Prior Felony Convictions						
Yes	106	59	74	41	180	100
No	69	53	62	47	131	100
Total	175		136		311	
Open Cases						
Yes	85	61	55	39	140	100
No	90	53	81	47	171	100
Total	175		136		311	
Prior Warrant						
Yes	106	58	77	42	183	100
No	67	54	57	46	124	100
Total	173		134		307	
Bench Warrant Attached to Rap Sheet						
No	139	55	115	45	254	100
Yes	16	64	9	36	25	100
Other	17	61	11	39	28	100
Total	172		135		307	

Appendix B-4 (continued)

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Offender Characteristics by Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample

	Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest				Total	
	Yes		No			
Offender Characteristics	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
Top Disposition Charge Severity						
A Felony	0	0	1	100	1	100
B Felony	37	52	34	48	71	100
C Felony	9	41	13	59	22	100
D Felony	22	58	16	42	38	100
E Felony	119	60	78	40	197	100
Total	187		142		329	
Top Disposition Charge (Penal Law Article)						
Assault	6	32	13	68	19	100
Burglary	38	86	6	14	44	100
Larceny	11	41	16	59	27	100
Robbery	18	53	16	47	34	100
Other Theft Related Offenses	17	68	8	32	25	100
Controlled Substances	75	56	58	44	133	100
Other	22	47	25	53	47	100
Total	187		142		329	

Appendix C-1

Criminal Court Sentence of Six to Twelve Months
Logistic Regression Model Predicting Likelihood of
Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=491)

Independent Variables	Beta Coefficient	Significance Level	Odds Ratio
TIME-AT-RISK	0.003	0.027	1.003
SEX	0.725	0.053	2.064
ETHNICITY			
Excluded Category: White, Other			
Black	0.228	0.232	1.257
Hispanic	-0.198	0.317	0.821
VERIFIED FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT/ SCHOOL/TRAINING	0.373	0.183	1.452
OPEN CASES	0.279	0.278	1.321
PRIOR MISDEMEANORS CONVICTIONS	0.629	0.041	1.876
CHARGE AT DISPOSITION (PENAL LAW ARTICLE)			
Excluded Category: Other			
Criminal Facilitation	-0.963	0.005	0.382
Assault	-0.036	0.912	0.965
Larceny	0.592	0.030	1.807
Other Theft Related Offenses	0.450	0.267	1.568
Offenses Against Judicial and Other Proceedings	-0.081	0.858	0.922
Controlled Substances	0.095	0.711	1.099
BOROUGH OF INITIAL ARREST			
Excluded Category: Brooklyn			
Manhattan	-0.150	0.467	0.861
Queens	-0.272	0.168	0.762
Bronx	0.358	0.160	1.431

Negelkirke R Square = .120

Appendix C-2

Supreme Court Split Sentence of Six Months

Logistic Regression Model Predicting Likelihood of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=138)

Independent Variables	Beta Coefficient	Significance Level	Odds Ratio
TIME-AT-RISK	0.002	0.275	1.002
PRIOR WARRANTS	1.099	0.023	3.022
PRIOR ARRESTS	0.393	0.407	1.482
BOROUGH OF INITIAL ARREST			
Excluded Category: Brooklyn			
Manhattan	0.446	0.460	1.562
Queens	0.174	0.797	1.191
Bronx	1.074	0.169	2.928
AGE AT INITIAL ARREST			
Reference Category=18 and younger			
19-24 Years	-0.817	0.129	0.442
25 and older	-1.245	0.020	0.288

Nagelkerke R Square=.188

Appendix C-3

Supreme Court Definite Sentence of Six to Twelve Months

Logistic Regression Model Predicting Likelihood of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=471)

Independent Variables	Beta Coefficient	Significance Level	Odds Ratio
TIME AT RISK	0.001	0.546	1.001
PRIOR ARRESTS	0.754	0.023	2.125
PRIOR MISDEMEANORS	0.228	0.399	1.256
PRIOR FELONY CONVICTIONS	0.197	0.499	1.218
PRIOR WARRANTS	0.401	0.133	1.493
DISPOSITION CHARGE			
Excluded Category: Other			
Assault	-0.159	0.713	0.853
Burglary	1.628	0.019	5.092
Larceny	0.071	0.862	1.073
Robbery	-0.014	0.971	0.986
Other Theft-Related Offenses	-0.690	0.113	0.501
Controlled Substances	0.222	0.318	1.249
Weapon	-0.669	0.023	0.512
VERIFIED LENGTH OF RESIDENCE OF AT LEAST 18 MONTHS	-0.688	0.008	0.503
FAMILY TIES	-0.429	0.091	0.651
BOROUGH			
Excluded Category: Brooklyn			
Manhattan	-0.286	0.115	0.751
Queens	-0.206	0.340	0.813
Bronx	0.642	0.012	1.900
ETHNICITY			
Excluded Category: White, Other			
Black	0.240	0.188	1.271
Hispanic	-0.272	0.158	0.762

Nagelkerke R Square=.193

Appendix C-4

Supreme Court Sentence of Twelve to Eighteen Months

Logistic Regression Model Predicting Likelihood of Post-Sentencing Re-Arrest

Fourth Quarter of 2003 At-Risk Sample
(N=283)

Independent variables	Beta Coefficient	Significance Level	Odds Ratio
TIME-AT-RISK	0.002	0.000	1.002
PRIOR ARRESTS	0.167	0.714	1.182
PRIOR MISDEMEANOR CONVICTIONS	0.409	0.184	1.505
DISPOSITION CHARGE			
Excluded Category: Other			
Assault	-1.157	0.033	0.315
Burglary	1.541	0.000	4.668
Larceny	-0.454	0.287	0.635
Robbery	-0.205	0.614	0.815
Other Theft Related Offenses	0.526	0.282	1.693
Controlled Substances	-0.211	0.395	0.810
VERIFIED FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT/ SCHOOL/TRAINING	0.397	0.190	1.487
VERIFIED TELEPHONE	0.327	0.255	1.386
BOROUGH OF INITIAL ARREST			
Excluded Category: Brooklyn			
Manhattan	0.159	0.458	1.173
Queens	-0.555	0.030	0.574
Bronx	0.232	0.371	1.262

Nagelkerke R Square = .229