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Background

The Maine and Massachusetts Statistical Analysis Centers (SACs) are working on a joint project to study the recidivism rates of sex offenders who were released from supervision in 2009 or later.
Approach

- Both SACs are making use of criminal history records in their respective states to track any type of subsequent arrest and/or conviction for any member of this cohort.

- Criminal history records from each state will be shared with the other to identify cohort members who recidivate in the neighboring state.
Methods

Analyses will focus on whether cohort members, categorized by offender type (rapist, child molester, other), were arrested and/or convicted of a subsequent sex offense, violent offense, or any other type of offense.
To accomplish this study, the Maine and Massachusetts SACs will obtain cohort data from their respective Departments of Corrections (DOC); including those going to probation/parole in 2009 through 2018. Records will be obtained for all offenders convicted of a sex offense and released from MA or ME prison including those going to probation/parole in 2009.
## Data Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maine</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Obtain sex offender cohort from the Maine Department of Corrections</td>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Obtain sex offender cohort from the Massachusetts Department of Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Ascertain how many cohort members were arrested for subsequent offense by type: felony (including another sex offense) and misdemeanor from the ME Department of Public Safety’s Criminal Records Repository</td>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Determine how many cohort members were arraigned for subsequent offense by type: felony (including another sex offense) and misdemeanor from criminal offender record information (iCORI) entered and maintained by the MA Office of Commissioner of Probation on the MA Department of Criminal Justice Information Services network (DCJIS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Determine if any Massachusetts cohort members were arrested in ME by offense type. Source: ME Department of Public Safety’s Criminal Records Repository</td>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Determine if any Maine cohort members were arrest in MA by offense type. Source: iCORI data accessed through DCJIS. Data is not fingerprint supported and match will be conducted by name/dob algorithm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These records will include the following variables:

- **ID**: state identification # (SID), FBI #, probation central file # (PCF)
- **Demographics**: date of birth, sex, race, ethnicity
- **Offense information**: offense date (for Maine), arrest date (or arraignment date in MA), arrest offense description(s) (arraignment offense description for MA), arrest offense class (arraignment offense class for MA), conviction date, conviction offense description, conviction offense class,
- **Subsequent offense, arrest & conviction**: all subsequent arrests & offenses (arraignments & offenses for MA), all arrest classes and descriptions (arraignments for MA), all subsequent convictions & offenses
Part of this project will involve translating the transactional system records into a dimensional format and storing the results in a relational database. The involvement of the Search Institute’s Open Justice Broker Consortium (OJBC) will facilitate this process.

This process will bring consistency to the data formats while making it easier for the SAC analysts to analyze the data.
Challenges

- Unusual requests for both states
- Turnover in key position in Maine DOC
- Other emerging priorities in Maine, relegating SOR request to lower on the list
- Massachusetts data is not available for county sex offender releases and we are hoping to capture some estimates from sex offender registry data
Challenges (cont.)

- In MA, the query is being processed quickly, but we were originally waiting to request the MA data until the ME DOC data was received, then we changed due to delay with ME DOC.
- Query results have been inconsistent.
- Data for earlier years 2004 - 2008 more difficult to capture for Massachusetts cohort.
Next Steps

- Change to "Maine data request is pending; Massachusetts file will be available shortly.

- Search is ready to take output and mesh it with criminal history records to check for subsequent arrests

- Search has strong ties to both states’ criminal history records staff and familiarity with both systems.
Long-Term Recidivism of Washington Sex Offenders

Presented by Matt Landon
Background

• 2018 BJS study of long-term recidivism trends found that 83% of the nearly 68,000 federal prisoners examined were re-arrested within nine years post-release

• The Washington SAC proposed a project in response focusing on the long-term recidivism rates of sex offenders

• This study was completed and posted to the Washington SAC website at the beginning of 2020
Data

• Washington State Patrol’s Criminal History data, which links individuals to arrest records and charges
• Connected to Washington’s Sex Offender Registry, indicating the initial registration dates of offenders returning to the community
• Excluding those who moved out of state during the study period, the sample consisted of 7,683 sex offenders registering between 2000-2003
Measures

• Recidivism defined as a recorded re-arrest during the study period; this is the broadest definition, and intended to keep consistency with the 2018 BJS study

• Failure to register was removed as an offense measure, as it is a status-based crime

• Average risk of arrest for non-cohort members calculated using census estimates and statewide arrest rates
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-27</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>33.32%</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>33.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-40</td>
<td>2,539</td>
<td>33.05%</td>
<td>5,099</td>
<td>66.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>2,584</td>
<td>33.63%</td>
<td>7,683</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>4,081</td>
<td>53.12%</td>
<td>4,081</td>
<td>53.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>14.02%</td>
<td>5,158</td>
<td>67.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>7.86%</td>
<td>5,762</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Other</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>7,683</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re-arrest Crime Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At Least One Sex Crime</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>12.65%</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>12.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Sex Crimes</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>48.29%</td>
<td>4,682</td>
<td>60.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Rearrests</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>39.06%</td>
<td>7,683</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Re-Arrest Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Since Registration</th>
<th>Cumulative First Re-arrest</th>
<th>Percent Re-arrested</th>
<th>Total Re-arrested Per Year</th>
<th>Total Offenses Per Year</th>
<th>Risk of First Re-arrest</th>
<th>Risk Compared to Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>27.45%</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>3,562</td>
<td>27.45%</td>
<td>+24.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,939</td>
<td>38.25%</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>14.89%</td>
<td>+12.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
<td>+6.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,693</td>
<td>48.07%</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
<td>+4.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,879</td>
<td>50.49%</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td><strong>4.66%</strong></td>
<td>+1.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>52.69%</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
<td>+1.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,192</td>
<td>54.56%</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>+1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,298</td>
<td>55.94%</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
<td>+0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,369</td>
<td>56.87%</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td><strong>-0.59%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,446</td>
<td>57.87%</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>-0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,523</td>
<td>58.87%</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>-0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,575</td>
<td>59.55%</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>-1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4,622</td>
<td>60.16%</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>-1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4,651</td>
<td>60.54%</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>-1.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,682</td>
<td>60.94%</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>-1.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 80-20 Rule

- The statistical truism that 20% of a population often accounts for 80% of the activity appears to hold true for sex offender re-arrests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re-Arrests</th>
<th>Total Offenders</th>
<th>Percent of Offenders</th>
<th>Total Offenses</th>
<th>Percent of Offenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>39.06%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>14.11%</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
<td>2,762</td>
<td>9.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>8.53%</td>
<td>2,894</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td><strong>23.35%</strong></td>
<td>23,798</td>
<td><strong>77.93%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When is Risk “Normal”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Since Registration</th>
<th>Risk of First Rearrest</th>
<th>Average Risk of Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.45%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.89%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does Risk Level = Actual Risk?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Since Registration</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Average Risk of Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.20%</td>
<td>27.30%</td>
<td>38.41%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.72%</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>22.04%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.19%</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
<td>4.15%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
<td>8.17%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
<td>8.38%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Offense Specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Arrest Category</th>
<th>Number of Offenders Arrested</th>
<th>Total Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Sex Crime</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>1428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arrest Category</td>
<td>3710</td>
<td>29110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total Arrests: 29110
- 95.32% for New Sex Crime
- 79.24% for Other Arrest Category
- 4.68% for Other Arrest Category
Limitations

• Reliance on official data sources means this only accounts for instances of police reports that end in an arrest; sex offenses are known to be a vastly underreported crime

• Arrests do not necessarily lead to convictions, and repeat arrestees may also be those who are released without convictions

• Those who died during the study period might not have been excluded, thus inflating the cohort
Discussion

• The majority of sex offender re-arrests occur in the first several years following initial registration
• Sex offenses are a relatively small number of re-arrests, but a fifth of those re-arrested had at least one new sex offense
• Risk levels appear to predict re-arrest in the first years following registration, and lose their predictivity over time
• The low increase in re-arrest totals during later years challenges the efficacy of long-term supervision
Web Link

Want to see more? For this report and other works from the Washington SAC, click the link below.

https://sac.ofm.wa.gov/statistical-analysis-center-publications
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Presented to the Panel of State Statistical Analysis Centers at the “American Society of Criminology” annual meeting
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RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Long-term recidivism follow-up of individuals convicted of sexual offenses and released in Michigan

Examine how likelihood of reoffending varies by definition of recidivism
  A registerable sex offense only? Technical violations?

Examine variation in recidivism by covariates
  Prior incarceration
  Type of sexual offense
DATA OVERVIEW AND CONSTRUCTION

Files Received

Identifying Sexual Offenses

Identify Release Dates

Identify Recidivism
DATA OVERVIEW AND CONSTRUCTION

Files Received

**Sentencing History**
- 448,525 rows of data
- 80,458 unique offenders
- Variables included:
  - Offense code
  - Offense description
  - Arrest date
  - Conviction date

**Transit File**
- 676,245 rows of data
- 64,784 unique offenders
- Variables included:
  - Movement date
  - Movement source location and destination
  - Movement reason

Flowchart:
- Identifying Sexual Offenses
- Identify Release Dates
- Identify Recidivism
DATA OVERVIEW AND CONSTRUCTION

Files Received

Identifying Sex Offenses

- Prior conviction for an offense listed in the Michigan Sex Offenders Registration Act
  - These were identified using the offense code
- Identified using the conviction most proximate, but prior to, their release from prison
- \( N \approx 18,500 \) individuals previously convicted of a sex offense and subsequently released

Identify Release Dates

Identify Recidivism
Data Overview and Construction

Sentencing File
- 448,525 rows of data
- 80,458 unique offenders
- Variables included:
  - Offense code
  - Offense description
  - Arrest date
  - Conviction date

Transit File
- 676,245 rows of data
- 64,784 unique offenders
- Variables included:
  - Movement date
  - Movement source location and destination
  - Movement reason

Identifying Sexual Offenses

Identifying Release from Prison

Identify “viable starts” – when they are released to community
- Each individual’s transits were chronologically ranked
- Movement that indicated release extracted from their first 12 transits

Files Received

Identify Recidivism
DATA OVERVIEW AND CONSTRUCTION

Files Received

Identifying Sexual Offenses

Identifying Release from Prison

The first instance of one of the following movements was used to indicate a viable start date:

- Discharged from probation
- Paroled in custody
- Discharged Sentenced to Fine, Cost or Restitution Only
- Discharged by Court – Nolle Prosequi
- First Parole

Start dates then merged with sentencing history

Identify Recidivism
DATA OVERVIEW AND CONSTRUCTION

Identifying Release from Prison

The first instance of one of the following movements was used to indicate a viable start date

- Discharged from probation
- Paroled in custody
- Discharged Sentenced to Fine, Cost or Restitution Only
- Discharged by Court – Noelle Prosequi
- First Parole

Movements Conditional on Location
- Conviction Reversed by Court
- Sentence Reduced to Misdemeanor
- Terminated, Continued on Additional Prefix
- Court Resentenced to Probation
- Transferred Out... Institutional or Caseload
- Discharged on the Maximum without Parole
- Discharged on Maximum after Parole and Return
- Released from SAI – Complete
- Discharge From Prison Under HYTA Without Probation
- Released from SAI – Incomplete
- Discharge from Prison Under HYTA & Continued on Probation
DATA OVERVIEW AND CONSTRUCTION

Recidivism event – new CONVICTION identified by arrest date most proximal to release movement date
Recidivism hierarchy constructed according to type of offense committed post-release
- Tier 1 – Offenses that qualify for sex offender registration
- Tier 2 – Offenses indicative of non-compliance with sex offender legislation requirements (failure to register, residency violations)
- Tier 3 – Offenses of a sexual nature that do not invoke registration requirements (assault w/ intent to rape, human trafficking, sexually delinquent)

Files Received

Identifying Sexual Offenses

Identify Release Dates

Identifying Recidivism

Files Received

Identifying Sexual Offenses

Identify Release Dates

Identifying Recidivism

Recidivism event – new CONVICTION identified by arrest date most proximal to release movement date
Recidivism hierarchy constructed according to type of offense committed post-release
- Tier 1 – Offenses that qualify for sex offender registration
- Tier 2 – Offenses indicative of non-compliance with sex offender legislation requirements (failure to register, residency violations)
- Tier 3 – Offenses of a sexual nature that do not invoke registration requirements (assault w/ intent to rape, human trafficking, sexually delinquent)
DATA OVERVIEW AND CONSTRUCTION

Identifying Recidivism

Recidivism event – new CONVICTION identified by arrest date most proximal to release movement date
Recidivism hierarchy constructed according to type of offense committed post-release

Tier 1 - Offenses that qualify for sex offender registration
General Recidivism – any new offense
RECIDIVISM HIERARCHY

Tier 1: Registerable offenses only
Tier 2: Registerable sex offenses and failure to comply offenses
Tier 3: Registerable sex offenses, failure to comply offenses, and non-registerable offenses of a sexual nature
General recidivism – any new offense
METHODS OF ANALYSIS

Censoring: Subjects are censored when they do not experience the event of interest (i.e. arrest)

Those without a subsequent arrest date were censored at the end of the observation period

Subjects were also censored according to the type of offense committed

Tier I Recidivism – new arrest for registerable sex offense is event of interest, all other offenses censored

Process repeated for each tier
METHODS OF ANALYSIS

Hazard Function
  Describes the risk of recidivism event at each time, given survival to that point

Survivor Function
  Describes the probability that a person will “survive” past that time point

Discrete Time Survival Models
  Regression analysis of hazard curve based on offender subgroups
RESULTS: GENERAL RECIDIVISM

Hazard and survival curves for general recidivism – any new offense

Conditional Failure Distribution for Reconviction

Conditional Survival Distribution for Reconviction

Years After Release

Hazard Function $h(t)$

Survivor Function $S(t)$
RESULTS: GENERAL RECIDIVISM

Hazard curves for general recidivism by prior incarceration and original sex offense

Conditional Failure Distribution for Reconviction by Prior Incarceration

Conditional Failure Distribution for Reconviction by Original Offense
RESULTS: GENERAL RECIDIVISM

Predicted Hazard (95% CI) - General Recidivism by Prior Incarceration
Based on Quadratic Discrete Time Logit Regression

Predicted Hazard (95% CI) - General Recidivism by CSC Level
Based on Quadratic Discrete Time Logit Regression
RESULTS: SEXUAL RECIDIVISM

Hazard and survival curves for Tier 1 recidivism – new conviction for a registerable sex offense only
RESULTS: SEXUAL RECIDIVISM

Hazard curves for sexual recidivism by prior incarceration and original sex offense

Conditional Failure Distribution for Reconviction by Prior Incarceration

Conditional Failure Distribution for Reconviction by Original Offense
RESULTS: SEXUAL RECIDIVISM

Predicted Hazard (95% CI) - Sexual Recidivism by Prior Incarceration
Based on Linear Discrete Time Logit Regression

Predicted Hazard (95% CI) - Sexual Recidivism by CSC Level
Based on Linear Discrete Time Logit Regression
## RESULTS: RECIDIVISM RATES BY YEARS FROM RELEASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Classifications</th>
<th>% convicted within</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Recidivism</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Recidivism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Multiple “Spell” Survival Analysis
  Does recidivism beget recidivism? Is there a pattern of escalation?

Incarceration Dose-Response
  Does length of incarceration accelerate or decelerate future recidivism events?
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