DJJ RECIDIVISM REPORT 202106, FINAL VERSION 3.5





2020 RECIDIVISM REPORT

WITH FY 2013-2016 RECIDIVISM RATES

Tyrone Oliver, Commissioner

2020 GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE JUSTICE RECIDIVISM REPORT

Tyrone Oliver, Commissioner

Contributing Authors Sean Hamilton, Assistant Commissioner Shawanda Reynolds-Cobb, Deputy Commissioner Lisa Mantz, Assistant Deputy Commissioner Eugene Gaultney, Assistant Director of Information Technology Bill Webb, Statistical Research Analyst Andrew (Weigang) Chang, Programmer Analyst









RECIDIVISM QUICK FACTS

2016 RISK ANALYSIS BY AGE GROUP



GEORGIA'S JUVENILE DELINQUENT POPULATION

Felony offenders made up 46% of the release population (2016), 47% of juvenile re-offenses, with a 35.9% (3-yr) recidivism rate

Misdemeanor re-offenders generated a recidivism rate of 34.3% (3-yr)

OFFENSE CATEGORIES

	Releases (Percentage Share)				
FY	Felony Misdemeanor				
2013	39.6%	60.4%			
2014	41.1% 58.9%				
2015	43.3%	56.7%			
2016	46.5%	53.5%			

This report does <u>not</u> include release or recidivistic data from any of Georgia's Independent courts since these counties do not report recidivating events to DJJ. Georgia's seventeen counties with Independent courts are Chatham, Clayton, Cobb, Columbia, Crawford, DeKalb, Dougherty, Floyd, Fulton, Glynn, Gordon, Gwinnett, Hall, Peach, Spalding, Troup, and Whitfield counties.

Adult recidivistic data is provided from the Department of Corrections.

PREDISPOSITION RISK ASSESSMENT SCORING

PDRA utilization participation rates increased to 88% in 2016, surpassing the previous year's rate (85%). Low and medium risk youth captured 68% of the releases.



2020 RECIDIVISM REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	Page
KEY FINDINGS	2
GA DJJ RECIDIVISM METHODOLOGY	3
RECIDIVISM TRENDS	4
FY 2016 COHORT DEMOGRAPHICS	5
PREDICTING RECIDIVISM	9
OFFENSE ANALYSIS	11
YEAR 1 ANALYSIS	12
SURVIVAL ANALYSIS	13
SUMMARY	14
EPILOGUE	15
KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY'S LETTER TO THE COMMISSIONER	16
ANNEX A: DEFINITIONS	17

FIGURES AND TABLES

Table 1. One, two, and three-year recidivism rates for the FY 2016 Release Cohort1Figure 1. Four-year comparison of release and recidivism values2Figure 2. Spatial representation of release and recidivism monitoring3Figure 3. Georgia 15-17 year-old population versus recidivist count4Figure 4. Release populations by race5Figure 5. Release population percentage share by gender6Figure 7. FY 2016 Release population age distribution, and 1-year recidivism rate7Table 2. FY 2016 Release and Recidivists Population by Age7Figure 8. FY 2016 Age distribution by Most Serious Offense8Table 3. PDRA risk level distribution by Percentage share for the FY2016 release cohort9Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate10Figure 9. Release by Legal Category11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14		
Figure 2. Spatial representation of release and recidivism monitoring3Figure 3. Georgia 15-17 year-old population versus recidivist count4Figure 4. Release populations by race5Figure 5. Release populations by gender6Figure 6. Release population percentage share by gender6Figure 7. FY 2016 Release population age distribution, and 1-year recidivism rate7Table 2. FY 2016 Release and Recidivists Population by Age7Figure 8. FY 2016 Age distribution by Most Serious Offense8Table 3. PDRA risk level distribution by percentage share for the FY2016 release cohort9Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate10Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14	Table 1. One, two, and three-year recidivism rates for the FY 2016 Release Cohort	1
Figure 3. Georgia 15-17 year-old population versus recidivist count4Figure 4. Release populations by race5Figure 5. Release populations by gender6Figure 6. Release population percentage share by gender6Figure 7. FY 2016 Release population age distribution, and 1-year recidivism rate7Table 2. FY 2016 Release and Recidivists Population by Age7Figure 8. FY 2016 Age distribution by Most Serious Offense8Table 3. PDRA risk level distribution by percentage share for the FY2016 release cohort9Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate10Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14	Figure 1. Four-year comparison of release and recidivism values	2
Figure 4. Release populations by race5Figure 5. Release populations by gender6Figure 6. Release population percentage share by gender6Figure 7. FY 2016 Release population age distribution, and 1-year recidivism rate7Table 2. FY 2016 Release and Recidivists Population by Age7Figure 8. FY 2016 Age distribution by Most Serious Offense8Table 3. PDRA risk level distribution by percentage share for the FY2016 release cohort9Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate10Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14	Figure 2. Spatial representation of release and recidivism monitoring	3
Figure 4. Release populations by race6Figure 5. Release populations by gender6Figure 6. Release population percentage share by gender6Figure 7. FY 2016 Release population age distribution, and 1-year recidivism rate7Table 2. FY 2016 Release and Recidivists Population by Age7Figure 8. FY 2016 Age distribution by Most Serious Offense8Table 3. PDRA risk level distribution by percentage share for the FY2016 release cohort9Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate10Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14	Figure 3. Georgia 15-17 year-old population versus recidivist count	4
Figure 6. Release population percentage share by gender6Figure 7. FY 2016 Release population age distribution, and 1-year recidivism rate7Table 2. FY 2016 Release and Recidivists Population by Age7Figure 8. FY 2016 Age distribution by Most Serious Offense8Table 3. PDRA risk level distribution by percentage share for the FY2016 release cohort9Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate10Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14	Figure 4. Release populations by race	5
Figure 7. FY 2016 Release population age distribution, and 1-year recidivism rate7Table 2. FY 2016 Release and Recidivists Population by Age7Figure 8. FY 2016 Age distribution by Most Serious Offense8Table 3. PDRA risk level distribution by percentage share for the FY2016 release cohort9Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate10Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14	Figure 5. Release populations by gender	6
Table 2. FY 2016 Release and Recidivists Population by Age7Figure 8. FY 2016 Age distribution by Most Serious Offense8Table 3. PDRA risk level distribution by percentage share for the FY2016 release cohort9Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate10Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14	Figure 6. Release population percentage share by gender	6
Figure 8. FY 2016 Age distribution by Most Serious Offense8Table 3. PDRA risk level distribution by percentage share for the FY2016 release cohort9Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate10Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14	Figure 7. FY 2016 Release population age distribution, and 1-year recidivism rate	7
Table 3. PDRA risk level distribution by percentage share for the FY2016 release cohort9Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate10Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14	Table 2. FY 2016 Release and Recidivists Population by Age	7
Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate10Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14	Figure 8. FY 2016 Age distribution by Most Serious Offense	8
Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type11Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14Table 7. Deviction Date of the Event Marcol (2010-2010)14	Table 3. PDRA risk level distribution by percentage share for the FY2016 release cohort	9
Table 5. Releases by Legal Category12Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis13Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)14Table 7. Deviction Date of the Event State of the St	Table 4. PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate	10
Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis 13 Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016) 14	Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type	11
Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016) 14	Table 5. Releases by Legal Category	12
	Figure 10. Time-to-failure Analysis	13
Table 7. Recidivism Rates by Fiscal Year (2013-2016) 14	Table 6. Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)	14
	Table 7. Recidivism Rates by Fiscal Year (2013-2016)	14





The Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice (GDJJ) 2020 Recidivism Report highlights the second full year of complete data reflecting the impact of the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2013 (HB 242). Since the implementation of these reforms, the combination of removing status offenders and certain misdemeanants from secure detention population, along with the use of the Pre-Disposition Risk Assessment (PDRA) instrument (which will help the agency determine the best level of intervention for at risk youth) has helped to increase the level of service to youth in need.

While the results seen in this year's recidivism report are encouraging, there is much more work to be done to limit juveniles from re-offending. The PDRA risk assessment instrument has gained acceptance throughout the agency and continues to produce tangible results with a reliable and equitable assessment of risks. By accurately classifying young offenders by risk level across jurisdictions, agency resources can be directed towards those higher-risk youth who are more likely to re-offend.

In addition, DJJ has partnered with Kennesaw State University's (KSU) Center of Statistics and Analytical Research (CSAR) to validate and assist with the preparation of this year's report. KSU reviewed the methodology and calculations as well as provided guidance with the report presentation. Through these partnerships and procedures, it is hoped that the positive trends in the reduction of juvenile reoffending continue in Georgia in future years.



OVERVIEW

The report contains a snapshot, analysis, and view of the changing dynamics of the juvenile population. Continuing to use the updated 2017 recidivism methodology, the 2020 Recidivism Report provides standard criteria to generate consistent recidivism calculations. The consistency of this reporting provides transparency to measure and monitor, and compare recidivism rate movements using a consistent standard.

The number of juvenile releases continues to contract in Georgia's juvenile justice system. Juveniles between the ages of 15 and 16 made up over half 56% (2,268) of the FY2016 release total (4,026). On the lower end of the release spectrum, juveniles between 17 and 18 comprised only 9% of the population released. Overall, releases declined by 6.6% during the report year.

Despite this contraction, the number of juvenile recidivists has declined in Georgia, albeit slower than the number of juvenile releases. In 2016, the recidivist population in DJJ facilities declined to 1,412 juveniles, 85 fewer re-offenders than the previous year.

Recidivism rates have remained between 34%-37% for the entire four-year reporting range. Reductions in the 2016 release population 6.6% (288) edged out the recidivists' population (5.6%) in the current report, by 1 percent. The decline in the release population along with the increase in delinquencies placed additional pressure on the 2016 recidivism rate, contributed to the slight increase. The 3-year recidivism rate for the 2016 cohort increased to 35.07%, approximately 4/10ths of a percent higher than the previous report.

This report does <u>not</u> include release or recidivistic data from any of Georgia's independent courts since these counties do not report recidivating events to DJJ. Georgia's seventeen counties with Independent courts are Chatham, Clayton, Cobb, Columbia, Crawford, DeKalb, Dougherty, Floyd, Fulton, Glynn, Gordon, Gwinnett, Hall, Peach, Spalding, Troup, and Whitfield counties.

		Rate (Change
FY 2016	Recidivism % Rate	Year 2	Year 3
Year 1	26.35%		
Year 2	32.81%	6.46%	
Year 3	35.07%	-	2.26%

Table 1. One, two, and three-year recidivism rates for the FY 2016 Release Cohort (rounded to two decimal places).

Georgia's recidivism definition: A new charge within three years of the initial post-adjudication community placement which results in a juvenile court delinquency adjudication or adult criminal conviction.



2020 Georgia DJJ

Recidivism Update

KEY FINDINGS



Figure 1. Comparison of three year recidivism rates across FY 2013 to FY 2016 Cohorts

Releases and Recidivists

The FY2016 release cohort continued a positive downward trend, marking the third consecutive year of post-reform declines since 2014. There were 4,026 juveniles released in 2016, 288 fewer than released in 2015. During the 3-year follow-up period, 1,412 juvenile re-offenders were identified, 85 less than the year before; a mere 18 juveniles away from matching the previous year's calculated recidivism rate of 34.07%.

Both the number of releases and recidivists declined this reporting period. However, releases (6.6%) edged out the decline in the number of recidivists (5.6%) by one percentage point, placing slight upward pressure on the 3-year rate. We expect the number of releases to level out in the coming years and have less of an impact as a numerator in the rate calculation.

Technical offenses, status offenses (CHINS) or SB 440 offenses are not included in this report's juvenile release population.



GEORGIA RECIDIVISM METHODOLOGY

This report analyzes juvenile release cohorts by fiscal year. Each release begins with the first day a youth becomes available for reoffending in the community and ends after three years or the day a new qualifying re-adjudication occurs. One and two-year monitoring is conducted as well as a final count when the cohort reaches its three-year maturity.



Once a juvenile is released into the community, the recidivism monitoring period begins. This point may be at the start of a new probation or community commitment or when a juvenile is released from secure confinement. Measurement begins at the point of release into the community when youth has the opportunity to commit a new offense and impact public safety. Most offenders are still under DJJ supervision when they are released to the community on probation, in aftercare, or in residential placements.

Recidivating Events

Georgia's recidivism measurement methodology counts multiple recidivating events for the same juvenile as a single recidivism count. Recidivism is measured for a period of at least one year from time of release into the community out to three years. The majority of recidivism, as observed by Georgia DJJ and other states, occurs within the first year, marking an essential window for analysis. The extended follow-up period of three years describes long-term outcomes.

Linking to Adult Corrections

A juvenile may legally be an adult during the at-risk follow-up period after release into the community. Juvenile records are linked with adult conviction data so that adult recidivating events are captured in our analysis.

The data provided by the Georgia Department of Corrections provides the offense date for youngadult offenders who were previously adjudicated by a Juvenile Court. For this population, DJJ juvenile recidivism calculation uses the date of the offense in our analysis for those young adults sentenced to an adult prison and any combination of adult offenses constitutes a singular recidivism count.



RECIDIVISM TRENDS



Figure 3. Georgia 15-17 year old population versus release cohort, and recidivists count. The estimates are based on the 2010 Census and reflect changes to the April 1, 2010 population (ACS Age and Sex survey, Table: S0101) due to the Count Question Resolution program and geographic program revisions.

In accordance with the Census Bureau's American Community Survey projections, Georgia's juvenile population (age 15-17) increased by an additional 23,000 youth in 4-years (2013-2016), an increase of 5.7%.

DJJ's release cohort population declined 25% during the 4-year reporting time frame, moving from 5,407 (FY2013) to 4,026 (FY2016). Juveniles (15 to 17 years-old) made up 65% (2,597) of the 2016 releases.

A total of 1,061 juveniles re-offended (in one-year) after being released from the latest reporting cohort, a 23% decline from the juvenile recidivists (1,391) recorded in 2013. Juveniles, between the age of 15 to 17 years-old, made up 59% (631) of the youth that received a new adjudication released in 2016.

SB 440 youth cases that are processed through adult criminal justice systems were omitted from Georgia's recidivist population. (see page #17 for the definition of SB 440)



FY 2016 COHORT DEMOGRAPHICS



Figure 4. Release populations by race from FY 2013 to FY 2016

An ongoing decline in the juvenile release population continued into the 2016 fiscal year. While the juvenile population declined, the concentration percentage share of African-American youth increased.

The African-American release population declined (4.5%) to 2,374 youth in 2016. However, the percentage share of youth with African heritage inched closer to 60% of the releases in 2016. Youth of color made up a larger concentration (58.9%) of the juveniles released to the community during the last reporting year.

The Caucasian youth population remained in the mid-thirty percentile with 34.1% of the release population, a slight decline from the previous year (34.5%). Caucasians represented 25.4% (359) of the (3-year) juvenile recidivists released from the 2016 cohort.

Hispanic youth had the largest year-over-year percentage decline (19.3%, 41), making up 4.25% (171) of the FY2016 releases and 3.0% (43) of the 3-year juvenile recidivists population.

The youth of Asian, American Indian, and Pacific Islander descent were placed into the "Other" category and made up 2.6% of the release population with 106 juveniles in 2016.



RELEASE AND RECIDIVISTS POPULATION BY GENDER



Figure 5. Release population percentage share by gender from FY 2013 to FY 2016.



Figure 6. Recidivist population percentage share by gender from FY 2013 to FY 2016.

The total number of releases decreased from 5,407 in 2013 to 4,026 in FY 2016. Of the juveniles released in FY 2016, 1 out of every five was female. There is a slow and steady upward tick throughout the last four years in the percentage of males released, from 75% in 2013 to almost 80% in 2016. Conversely, the downward trend in female releases shifted from 24% in 2013 to 20% in 2016.

Males account for 85% (1,201) of the 3-year recidivists listed in the 2016 release cohort, with the percentage share of female re-offenders reaching a 4-year low of 15% (211).





Figure 7. FY 2016, Release population age distribution, and 1-year recidivism rate.

On average, 1 out of every four juveniles in the 2016 cohort re-offended within a year of release. Although adolescents age sixteen have the highest count of releases—31% of all releases—those age fifteen had the second-highest recidivism rate of 33.5%. Of those aged 13-15, approximately 1 in 3 juveniles re-offended with in one-year. A single juvenile contributed toward the anomaly of having the highest recidivism rate of 50% (table 2), one of the two juveniles that were age nine at the time of release.

	Rel	eases	1-Year Recidivists	
FY	Age	Count	Count	Rate
	9	2	1	50.00%
	10	8	-	-
	11	51	16	31.37%
	12	175	40	22.86%
	13	405	135	33.33%
2016	14	714	228	31.93%
20	15	1,018	341	33.50%
F	16	1,250	268	21.44%
	17	329	22	6.69%
	18	36	3	8.33%
	19	20	3	15.00%
	20	6	1	16.67%
	21	12	3	25.00%
FY	2016 Total	4,026	1,060	26.33%

Juvenile releases in 2016 have been on a steep upward trend for youth ages nine to sixteen and a steep downward trend for youth ages seventeen to twenty-one. The recidivism rate in 2016 has steadily increased for youth ages eleven to sixteen and declined for youth sixteen years and older.

Table 2. FY 2016 Release and Recidivists Population by Age.

Juvenile Release population:

A defined group of youth placed in a juvenile cohort that have been released to the community and tracked for reporting purposes.





Figure 8. FY 2016 Age (10-18 year-olds) distribution by Most Serious Offense (MSO) * excludes 9, 19, 20 & 21 year-olds.

Juvenile offense data is one of the few compiled juvenile justice information that remains consistent (percentage share wise) year in and year out. The delinquent activities of juveniles from the 2016 cohort illustrate the consistent offense patterns of released youth. Juveniles between the ages of 10 -18 years old (3,986) are a subset of the 2016 releases (4,026). The 15 and 16-year-old age groups combined made up the largest number of releases 56% (2,268), followed by the release of 13 and 14 year-old teenagers with 28% (1,119). Combined, the two age groups (13 - 14 and 15 - 16 years-old) made up 85% (3,387) of the juvenile release offenses.

Property offenses rank as the highest adjudicated offense for juveniles, with 1,588 (39%) juvenile property offenses in 2016. Of all of the property offenses, 33% (533) were committed by youth within 12 months after their 16th birthday. Violent offenses were the second-highest offense category capturing 22% (903) of the offenses, including the 243 (26%) offenses committed by 16 year-old youth.

The third-largest offense category involved public order and traffic offenses, with juvenile related adjudications making up 19% (770) of the offenses. Sixteen year-old youth committed the most public order and traffic violations, with 30% (231) of the offenses.



PREDICTING RECIDIVISM

Releases by PDRA Risk Level

The Pre-Disposition Risk Assessment (PDRA) became the new risk instrument for DJJ, midway through the 2015 fiscal year, coordinated with the introduction of Juvenile Justice Reform (JJR) and the new juvenile judicial legislative changes put in place. The PDRA was introduced as a more robust risk assessment instrument than its' predecessor, the Comprehensive Risk and Needs Assessment (CRN).

The new instrument (PDRA) had several advantages over the outgoing CRN risk assessment instrument (RAI), including a better distribution across risk levels (low, medium, and high) and a greater separation of outcomes. Also, the PDRA provided a correlated view of risk and recidivism rates, accurately classified juveniles by the risk of delinquency, and provided an enhanced risk level recidivism predictability.

The PDRA gained more acceptance as the DJJ staff statewide became more confident in the evidence-based risk instrument. Utilization moved closer to the 90% (88.4%) participation range in 2016, surpassing the 85.3% rate achieved in 2015.

As a result of extended PDRA testing, it was determined that the percentage share of low (34.6%) and medium (33.7%) risk youth was a higher number of youth in the DJJ system and that the actual number of high-risk youth (20%) declined. The share of juveniles that did not receive a PDRA test continued to shrink (3.1 percentage points), as the instrument gained popularity.

		Juvenile Releases % Share by PDRA Risk Level				
	FY	Low	Medium	High	NoPDRA	
	2013	0.18%	0.30%	0.37%	99.15%	
PDRA %	2014	19.74%	18.55%	11.88%	49.83%	
Share	2015	32.31%	32.08%	20.96%	14.65%	
	2016	34.60%	33.78%	20.09%	11.53%	

Table 3. Release cohort by PDRA risk distribution level and percentage share

The term risk is used to refer to the potential act for repeated involvement in delinquent behavior.



			Recidivists 1Yr			
FY	Legal Action	Low	Medium	High	NoPDRA	Rate
	Committed	8.64%	22.43%	49.30%	19.63%	25.93%
16	STP + Probation	12.04%	40.15%	38.32%	9.49%	48.54%
20	STP	11.90%	19.05%	42.86%	26.19%	26.19%
	Probation	40.16%	34.92%	14.47%	10.45%	24.56%
1 Y	r Recidivists Rate by Risk Level	15.36%	28.68%	41.04%	26.94%	

Table 4. Most current PDRA risk level versus commitment type (legal status) and one-year recidivism rate for the FY2016 release cohort.

The PDRA

The adopted Pre-Disposition Risk Assessment (PDRA) instrument completed a successful second full year of vital youth risk classifications. The instrument placed youth into segmented risk-appropriate groups, aiding DJJ in effectively identifying and targeting juvenile services to youth with a high likelihood of future delinquency.

Probation

Most youth who enter the juvenile court system are released on probation. In 2016, 88% (3,556) of the juveniles in the cohort were released on probation, with three out of every four youth (75%) receiving a low or medium PDRA risk level. The remaining one fourth of the releases consisted of high-risk juveniles 15% (515) and juveniles omitted from taking the PDRA 10% (372).

Committed Youth

Approximately 10% (428) of juveniles released were committed youth, including designated felons (DFs). The committed designation is used for juveniles that present a danger to public safety. Almost half of the committed designated youth 49% (211) were classified as hi-risk, requiring extensive programming and services to avoid future adjudications. In a separate non-committed category, a small number 1% (42) of youth were placed on a Short-Term Program (STP).



OFFENSE ANALYSIS



Figure 9. Release population by Event Legal Action Type

OFFENSE ANALYSIS

All 2016 juvenile release cohort cases have been closed out and categorized into four legal action categories: Probation, Committed, Committed Designated Felon (DF), or Short-Term Program (STP). Most juveniles 88% (3,556) receive probation after disposition and are assigned to a Probation Officer to provide guidance and oversight.

Probation continues to capture the largest portion of the juvenile release population, with 88% (3,556) of the juvenile releases receiving this legal action, slightly lower than the previous year 89% (3,877). Youth on probation spend most of their time in the community trying to maintain an everyday balanced life between family, school, local environment, and social duties. Of the youth that received probation 1,242 of them re-offended within three years, generating a recidivism rate of 34.9%.

The two most serious legal categories for youth are Committed 5.4% (218) and Committed Designated Felon 5.2% (210), which captured a smaller portion of the release population. Youth that falls into one of these two legal categories usually experience extended length of stays at a secure facility as the result of a serious offense conviction and receive specialized services before they're released back into the community. Committed youth experienced the highest 3-year recidivism rate of the four legal categories (42.2%), with 92 re-offenders. Youth with a Committed Designated Felon (DF) designation (62) recidivated at a 3-year rate of 29.5% during the follow-up period.

Short-Term Program (STP), where youth can be placed in a YDC by a judge to attend a short-term program, is a legal category that is rarely used. Only 42 juveniles were released into this legal category in 2016, less than 2% of the release cohort. Sixteen STP youth received a new charge after release, generating a recidivism rate of 38.1% over three years.

Probation releases to the community remains the most often used legal action.



2020 Georgia DJJ

Recidivism Update

		Juvenile Releases				
	Felony		Misdem	neanor		
FY	Releases	% Share	Releases	% Share		
2013	2,142	39.62%	3,265	60.38%		
2014	1,841	41.10%	2,638	58.90%		
2015	1,868	43.30%	2,446	56.70%		
2016	1,874	46.55%	2,152	53.45%		

Juvenile population releases continued to shift from misdemeanor to felony releases in 2016. Misdemeanor releases dropped near the 50% mark in 2016 with 2,152 releases, 12% (294) less than the previous year. The misdemeanor release population percentage share declined 3.2 percentage points to 53.4% of the release population, well below the 60% share it reached in 2013. Misdemeanor offenders re-offended at a 3 year rate of 34.3% (739) after release.

Felony offenses increased along with its' percentage share of the release population as the number of total releases declined. In 2016, this more serious offense type increased to 46.5% (1,894) of the release population, marking the third consecutive year of upward movement. The progressive increase of felony releases (3.2%) in 2016 exceeded the 2015 (2.2%), and 2014 (1.5%) annual percentage increases. Juveniles convicted of a felony offense received a slightly higher 3-year delinquency rate of 35.9% (673).

The juvenile release population continues to shift towards more serious offenders, as the post development of juvenile justice reform continues to mature. It is expected that felony offenses will have a continued concentration in the number and percentage share of releases as current population dynamics continue to develop.

The 2015 cohort exhibited an increase in the release percentages of felons and a decrease in the release percentage of misdemeanants.





Figure 10. FY 2016 Release Cohort, Time-to-failure curve

Time-to-failure is a critical component of tracking recidivism. It is used to indicate the most vulnerable time periods that juveniles are more likely to engage in recidivistic behavior after release. Male and female youth have different offense characteristics and delinquency tendencies; therefore, recidivism for each gender was tracked separately.

The Kaplan-Meier statistical model was used to generate a time-to-failure delinquency curve. The curve illustrates a cumulative pattern of juvenile delinquency over 36 months. However, most recidivism acts (75%) occurred within the first year after release. Therefore, the data within this time frame is particularly relevant.

The two lines in Figure 11 represent the path of the delinquency percentage movements by gender. During the first 30-days after release, male and female delinquency rates (4.9% and 3.6%, respectively) were reasonably consistent. The line separation progressively increases after the first 30 days, with the gap expanding throughout the remaining tracking period.

At the six-month (post-release) time interval, male youth-produced 760 new delinquent acts, elevating the recidivism rate to 20.4%. The female delinquency rate reached 12.8% during the same time period, with 107 new reoffenders. At the one-year time frame, 28.3% (905) of the male youth released had engaged in a new recidivistic act compared to 19.2% (159) for females.

The graph indicates that male and female youth tend to recidivate at a similar rate during the first 30 days of release, with the likelihood of males engaging in recidivistic acts increasing faster than females, gaining more separation towards the end of the 36 month tracking period.



SUMMARY

This report marks the second full fiscal year of post-reform recidivism data. The previous report established a bench mark for future reports with FY 2015 base year data. Future results from the ruminants of the 2014 Juvenile Justice Reform Act remains a key element which this report addresses. The agency examined and analyzed data from the FY 2016 release cohort from various analytical view points to gain insight in to the direction, trends, and impact of our evolving juvenile system and the laws that impact juvenile justice.

Declines in the juvenile population continued to impact reporting data. Youth in the juvenile justice system reached a new three year low with 4,026 releases, establishing a lower reporting cohort. Releases consisted mostly of males (79%) and minorities (59%). The two leading most serious offense (MSO) categories for youth were property offenses and violent acts. Juvenile commitments and designated felons combined exceeded 10% (10.6%) of the release population with 428 releases. The PDRA risk assessment instrument classified 2,753 (68%) low and medium-risk youth from the 2016 release cohort.

The recidivism rate for the 2016 cohort was slightly elevated for each of the three referenced years, increasing the final year's recidivism rate. The initial first-year rate reached 26.3% (1,061). In Year 2, the recidivism rate increased to 32.8%, with 1,321 recidivists. In Year 3 the final year, the recidivism rate increased slightly to 35.07%, a fraction of a percent (4/10 tenths) higher than the rate posted in the previous report. The recidivism rate calculation was influenced by the increase in the number of recidivists and decline in the release cohort, which placed additional pressure on the rate.

	Recidivists (Cumulative Count)		
Releases Year 1 Year 2 Year 3			
5,407	1,391	1,789	1,966
FY2014 4,479		1,532	1,630
4,314	1,118	1,401	1,497
4,026	1,061	1,321	1,412
	5,407 4,479 4,314	ReleasesYear 15,4071,3914,4791,2044,3141,118	ReleasesYear 1Year 25,4071,3911,7894,4791,2041,5324,3141,1181,401

Table 6. 4-Year Recidivism Events by Fiscal Year (FY 2013 to FY 2016).

	Recidivism Rate (Cumulative %)				
FY	Year 1 Year 2 Year 3				
2013	25.73%	33.09%	36.36%		
2014	26.88% 34.20% 36.39%				
2015	25.92% 32.48%		34.70%		
2016	26.35%	32.81%	35.07%		

Table 7. Recidivism Rates by Fiscal Year (FY 2013 to FY 2016).



2020 Georgia DJJ

Recidivism Update

EPILOGUE

The 2020 Recidivism Report provides a second full year of juvenile justice data (post-reform) which will be compared against the establish base year rates generated in the previous year. These ongoing reports help establish a pathway to improve the delivery of services, a guide marker for trends analysis, and program development research. With the increased acceptance of the second full year of PDRA assessments, there is optimism that recidivism efforts will continue to improve. There is an expectation of continued growth of the PDRA risk assessment tool along with better understanding and usage of said risk instrument. DJJ will continue to explore new ways to leverage the new instrument and various other resources to increase service effectiveness to Georgia's youth.

REPORT LIMITATIONS

Due to Georgia's unique court system, this report is limited to data obtained from shared and dependent courts and excludes data from independent courts. Also, juvenile releases are tracked for recidivistic events through the shared and dependent courts. We use data from the Georgia Department of Corrections (GDOC) to capture the recidivistic events of released juveniles that are 17 years-of-age and older. However, GDOC data only provides data on inmates who have been sentenced to adult incarceration. This method omits us from gathering offense data on juveniles that were released from DJJ's care (=>17 age) that were placed on probation.

END NOTES

1. In 2017, Georgia DJJ changed the definition and data attributes of recidivism values. This definition was approved by the Governor's Office and DJJ Staff.

2. Note: Information provided by the Georgia Department of Corrections (GDOC) data query. Generated by GDOC July 2020.

3. Source: US Census, Georgia population forecast. Retrieved from www.census.gov.

4. Note: 19 and 20 year-old-youth were excluded from this graph, both metrics were visually indiscernible and only represented 1 percent of the release population.

5. Pre-Disposition Risk Assessment (PDRA)

6. Data Includes: African-American, Hispanic, American Indian, Pacific Islander, and Other races

7. Property (MSO) offenses (1,588) / Total MSO offenses (3,986) = 39.8% Recidivism rate

Kaplan-Meir time-to-failure graph provided by KSU (page 13)

Release cohort data references the 2016 fiscal year release cohort, unless other wise noted.





February 5, 2021

Commissioner Tyrone Oliver Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice 3408 Covington Highway Decatur, Georgia 30032

Dear Commissioner Oliver,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the logic and provide input on the 2020 Recidivism Report. The report summarizes the recidivism rates between fiscal years 2013 and 2016. The relationship between the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) and KSU's Center for Statistics and Analytical Research (CSAR) was developed by Eugene Gaultney from the DJJ and Jennifer Lewis Priestley, Ph.D. from the School of Data Science and Analytics.

I have reviewed the logic and the associated SQL computer code that created the summaries presented in the Recidivism Report. The computer code was reviewed line by line, ensuring that the logic worked as expected. This review was shared with the DJJ and the code was revised when appropriate. A near final draft of the publication was also reviewed, looking for improvements in organization or presentation of the materials. I provided an outline of the suggested changes, many of which were adopted.

The Center for Statistics and Analytical Research at Kennesaw State University is proud to be part of the final product and welcomes future collaborations with the DJJ.

Jennifer Lewis Priestley, PhD Professor of Statistics and Data Science School of Data Science and Analytics

COLLEGE OF COMPUTING AND SOFTWARE ENGINEERING School of Data Science and Analytics

Town Point Building - Suite 2400 - MD 9104 - 3391 Town Point Drive - Kennesaw, GA 30144 Phone: 470-578-2865 - www.kennesaw.edu



ANNEX A: DEFINITIONS

<u>Adjudication</u> – The process for determining if allegations brought forth in the juvenile court petition are true. An adjudicatory hearing is held to determine the facts of the case and an appropriate course of action.

<u>**Commitment**</u> – A juvenile court disposition which places a youth in the custody of DJJ for supervision, treatment and rehabilitation. Under operation of law, the commitment order is valid for two years. DJJ makes the placement determination of whether the youth should be placed in a Youth Development Campus (YDC) or on an alternate placement. Most often, a youth is committed when probation and/or other services available to the court have failed to prevent a youth from returning to the court on either a new offense(s) or violation of probation.

Designated Felony (DF) Commitment – A juvenile court adjudication that a youth has committed certain felony acts and is a disposition in which a youth has met certain criteria, which indicates the youth requires restrictive custody. The juvenile court judge determines whether a youth requires restrictive custody as well as the length of time (from 12 to 60 months) a youth must be placed in a YDC. Commitments with restrictive custody have restrictions on terminations and reduce the intensive level of aftercare supervision. Under operation of law, the commitment orders with restrictive custody are valid for five years or until a youth is 21 years old.

<u>SB 440</u> – Refers to the School Safety and Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 1994 (SB 440). Among other things, this legislation modified the jurisdiction of juvenile courts to provide that superior courts have exclusive jurisdiction over children ages 13-17 who are alleged to have committed one of the following offenses (commonly referred to as the "Seven Deadly Sins"): aggravated child molestation, aggravated and sexual battery, aggravated sodomy, murder, rape, voluntary manslaughter, or armed robbery with a firearm. Prior to indictment, a district attorney may elect to send the case to juvenile court.

<u>Youth Development Campuses (YDCs)</u> – Residential institutions providing academic, recreational, vocational, medical, mental health, counseling and religious services for those youth committed to DJJ, or convicted of an offense under Senate Bill 440.

<u>Short Term Program (STP)</u> - Programs operated by DJJ for youth sentenced by juvenile court judges to serve up to a maximum of 30 days or for youth screened for the program as a result of an Administrative Revocation.

<u>**Pre-Disposition Risk Assessment (PDRA)**</u> - The PDRA is an assessment instrument that helps juvenile justice systems identify the system-involved youth on whom they should focus. The tool helps to classify those youth who are most likely to be involved in future adjudications, allowing agencies to know how intensively to intervene, or what, if any, intervention is necessary.

