

**The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:**

**Document Title:**           **Assessing the Impact of Post-Release  
Community Supervision on Post-Release  
Recidivism and Employment**

**Author(s):**               **Catie Clark, William D. Bales, Samuel Scaggs,  
David Ensley, Philip Coltharp, Thomas G.  
Blomberg**

**Document No.:**       **249844**

**Date Received:**       **April 2016**

**Award Number:**       **2011-MU-BX-0006**

**This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this federally funded grant report available electronically.**

<p><b>Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.</b></p>
---

# Assessing the Impact of Post-Release Community Supervision on Post-Release Recidivism and Employment

---

Report Submitted to the  
National Institute of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
U.S. Department of Justice

Submitted by  
The Florida Department of Corrections and  
Florida State University College of Criminology and Criminal Justice

## Authors:

Catie Clark, Florida State University  
William D. Bales, Florida State University (Co-PI)  
Samuel Scaggs, Florida State University  
David Ensley, Florida Department of Corrections (Co-PI)  
Philip Coltharp, Florida Department of Corrections  
Thomas G. Blomberg, Florida State University

December 1, 2015

This project was supported by Award No. 2011-MU-BX-0006, awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication/program/exhibition are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>POST-RELEASE SUPERVISION IN FLORIDA</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>PRIOR LITERATURE</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>The Status of Analogous Research</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<i>Parole</i> .....	<i>15</i>
<i>Shock Probation</i> .....	<i>16</i>
<b>THE PRESENT STUDY</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Research Questions</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Data</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Building the FDC and FSU Researcher-Practitioner Partnership Recidivism Dataset</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<i>Corrections Data</i> .....	<i>21</i>
<i>Pre- and Post-Prison Arrest Data</i> .....	<i>23</i>
<i>Employment Data</i> .....	<i>24</i>
<b>Variables</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<i>Independent Variables</i> .....	<i>24</i>
<i>Control Variables</i> .....	<i>26</i>
<i>Dependent Variables</i> .....	<i>28</i>
<b>Analytical Techniques</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<i>Survival and Logistic Regression Modeling</i> .....	<i>29</i>
<i>Precision (Exact) Matching</i> .....	<i>30</i>
<i>Propensity Score Matching</i> .....	<i>30</i>
<b>RESULTS</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>DISCUSSION</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Limitations</b> .....	<b>42</b>
<b>Policy Implications</b> .....	<b>43</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>46</b>

## TABLES

Table 1. Control Variables Included in the Analyses .....	51
Table 2. Recidivism Measures: Arrests .....	52
Table 2a. Recidivism Measures: Conviction and Return to Prison, and Employment.....	53
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics – Recidivism and Post-Prison Employment Outcome Variables for Inmates with Post-Prison Supervision and Inmates Released with No Supervision to Follow .....	54
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics – Control Variables for Analyses of Inmates with Post-Prison Supervision and Inmates Released with No Supervision to Follow .....	55
Table 5. Effect of Post-Prison Supervision on Recidivism: Cox Proportional Hazard Regression Models.....	56
Table 6. Effect of Length of Time on Post-Prison Supervision on Recidivism: Cox Proportional Hazard Regression Models .....	57
Table 7. Effect of Any Post-Prison Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Logistic Regression Models (Control Covariates Not Presented) .....	58
Table 8. Effect of Post-Prison Release Split Probation/Community Control Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Logistic Regression Models (Control Covariates Not Presented).....	59
Table 9. Effect of Post-Prison Release Conditional Release Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Logistic Regression Models (Control Covariates Not Presented) .....	60
Table 10. Effect of Length of Time (in years) on Post-Prison Release Split Probation/Community Control Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Logistic Regression Models (Control Covariates Not Presented) .....	61
Table 11. Effect of Length of Time (in months) on Post-Prison Release Conditional Release Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Logistic Regression Models (Control Covariates Not Presented).....	62
Table 12. Effect of Any Post-Prison Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Precision Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented).....	63
Table 13. Effect of Post-Prison Split Probation/Community Control Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Precision Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented) .....	64
Table 14. Effect of Post-Prison Conditional Release Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Precision Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented) .....	65
Table 15. Effect of Any Post-Prison Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Propensity Score Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented).....	66
Table 16. Effect of Post-Prison Split Probation/Community Control Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Propensity Score Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented).....	67
Table 17. Effect of Post-Prison Conditional Release Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Propensity Score Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented) .....	68

## ABSTRACT

The shift from indeterminate to determinate sentencing policies over the past three decades and the ensuing decline in the use of parole for monitoring inmates' transition back into their communities, led to the development of alternate strategies of post-prison release supervision. The use of parole varies considerably across the United States, with some states (i.e., Oregon) requiring that all inmates released from prison be subject to supervision after release from incarceration. In contrast others, such as Florida, mandate the post-release supervision of those offenders who meet a statutorily defined list of criteria, while still allowing for the post-incarceration supervision of offenders who may have been sentenced to an additional sanction of community supervision (e.g. split supervision) to immediately follow their prison sentence. To date, the empirical literature that has examined forms of post-prison release supervision have focused almost exclusively on the use of parole. There is extensive literature relating to various forms of community supervision among offenders diverted from imprisonment, however, there remains a lack of understanding regarding the various effects of split supervision on prisoner reentry employment outcomes for released inmates.

This paper adds to the literature on post-prison release community supervision by examining the effect of two separate forms of post-prison supervision on offender recidivism and employment outcomes: split supervision and conditional release supervision. Using data from the Florida Department of Corrections (FDC), this study examines the effects of split supervision and conditional release supervision in comparison to release from prison with no form of supervision for a cohort of 201,447 inmates released from Florida prisons between January 2004 and December 2011. Survival analysis, logistic regression, precision matching, and propensity score matching (PSM methods are used to examine multiple recidivism outcomes at one, two,

and three years after release from incarceration, as well as to predict the likelihood of obtaining employment after release from prison. Findings indicate that post-prison supervision is a significant predictor of reduced recidivism outcomes (rearrest and conviction) among Florida inmates, as well as increasing the odds of offenders obtaining employment after release from prison, compared with those inmates who are released with no supervision after incarceration. These findings, however, are mitigated by the significantly increased likelihoods of returning to prison and rearrest for a felony for inmates placed on post-prison release supervision. Research findings and conclusions for future research, as well as policy implications of the study findings are discussed.















































routinely. These files can be linked using the offender identification number and are routinely used by the FDC and external researchers to build cohorts of offenders released from prison and community supervision.

#### *Pre- and Post-Prison Arrest Data*

Guidance on the measures of post-prison recidivism comes from a series of multi-state recidivism reports generated by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (e.g., Durose, Cooper & Snyder, 2014) which include arrest, conviction and return to prison as recidivism outcomes. The source of both pre- and post-prison arrest data for this study was the FDLE, which created the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) data system several decades ago. This data system contains detailed information on all arrests in Florida in which the suspect was fingerprinted at a local jail facility. The Florida Statistical Analysis Center (FSAC) at the FDLE maintains a SAS data warehouse of all of the CCH data (Burton, et al., 2004). The BRDA and FSAC have shared data for several years, and in doing so have developed an accurate method of ensuring that the resulting matching of arrest and corrections data is based on the same individuals who are in their respective databases.

The accuracy of the matching process is facilitated by the fact that the two data systems are populated with the unique individual identifiers used by each agency to track multiple entries into the state correctional system, including both prisons or community corrections offices, and arrests at the local level. For the creation of the data set that was used in the analyses included in this study, the BRDA provided FSAC with all of the relevant individual identifying variables, such as last name, first name, gender, race, FDLE number, FDC number, FBI number, date of birth, and Social Security number for each record in their 2004 to 2011 inmate recidivism file. The FSAC then matched the data to their CCH repository and provided the resulting dataset to

FDC. Prior to sharing this file with their research partners at FSU, BRDA staff encrypted the FDC offender unique identification numbers and eliminated all personal identifying information, such as last name, first name, and Social Security number, in order to ensure the anonymity of each individual in the dataset.

### *Employment Data*

The source of pre- and post-prison release employment data is the Florida Department of Revenue (FDR). This agency collects State of Florida employment data which contains each year and quarter in which individuals are employed, wages earned, and public assistance status. The individual identifier contained in the FDR data warehouse is the social security number, which is also contained in the FDC's OBIS. Using this identifier, inmates in the 2004 to 2011 reentry cohort were able to be matched to the FDR data, and from this measures of pre-incarceration employment and post-prison release employment were created.

### **Variables**

#### *Independent Variables*

This study will use multiple measures of post-prison release supervision. In order to address the first question a measure of any post-prison release supervision was used to account for the effect of inmates who are released from incarceration under any number of supervision strategies (including split probation, split community control, conditional release, and to a limited extent, parole, among others). This dichotomous measure of post-prison release supervision allows for the analysis of whether supervision after release from prison in any form has significant effects on recidivism and employment for released inmates.

In order to address the second research question two additional measures were created. While there are a number of types of post-prison release supervision to which offenders in

Florida may be released, the majority of inmates are either released to conditional release supervision or are sentenced to serve a term of split supervision following their incarceration. To that end, the first measure that addresses the various types of post-release supervision that an inmate may serve is for split probation/community control. This variable includes all inmates who were sentenced to a term of split supervision, including split felony probation, split drug offender probation, split sex offender probation, and split community control. The second measure is for conditional release supervision. This variable includes all inmates who were released from prison to a period of conditional release.

In order to address the third research question the final two measures were created. First, the length of supervision, in years, is considered for inmates sentenced to a term of split probation or community control. Second, the length of supervision, in months, is considered for inmates released to a term of conditional release supervision. The variables incorporate different measures of time on supervision (years versus months) because of the differences in average time on supervision for each form of post-release supervision. Specifically, because inmates who are placed on conditional release supervision are only serving a maximum of 15% of their original sentence in the community (accounting for the 85% mandatory minimum time that must be served incarcerated, in accordance with Florida's determinate sentencing laws, as previously discussed), the average period of conditional release supervision is generally short, averaging less than 12 months. Split supervision, on the other hand, is an additive sanction imposed by a judge at the time of sentencing. Terms of split supervision are typically much longer than conditional release and average approximately three years. Because of the varied nature of each type of supervision, the use of different measurements of sentence length is most appropriate in order to allow for greater variation in the populations.

### *Control Variables*

There are numerous factors that have been shown to be empirically linked to differences in the likelihood that released prisoners will recidivate, which are listed in Table 1 and described in more detail below. We control for the demographic characteristics of gender, race, and age, which have consistently been shown to be strong predictors of recidivism (Bales & Mears, 2008; Beck & Shipley, 1987; Langan & Levin, 2002). These include sex (male=1, female=0), three dichotomous variables capturing race and ethnicity of white (1=white/non-Hispanic, 0=non-white), black (1=black/non-Hispanic, 0=white), Hispanic (1=Hispanic, 0=black/non-Hispanic or white/non-Hispanic), and age at prison release as a continuous variable in years. Education level is measured through the results of the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). Inmates may take this test, which determines the equivalent grade level the inmate has achieved based on their reading, writing, and math proficiencies at that time, multiple times during their incarceration. For the purposes of this study, the score from the TABE exam which was administered most recently prior to the inmates' release date was used.

Whether inmates have substance abuse dependency problems is determined through the Drug Simple Screening Instrument (DSSI) and is operationalized as having a physical or psychological dependency (=1) or not (=0). There have been several studies which have examined the link between mental illness and recidivism and have found mixed results (Baillargeon, Binswanger, Williams, & Murray, 2009; Bonta & Hanson, 1998; Grann & Fazel, 2008). The variable psychiatric diagnosis at prison release (0=no, 1=yes) is based on if the inmate's latest mental health evaluation resulted in a psychiatric diagnosis which required some type of medication. If the inmate was assessed by the FDC to be a suspected or confirmed gang member (0=no, 1=yes) was an important control variable based on findings from prior research

that has found a positive influence of this affiliation with recidivism (Huebner, Varano, & Bynum, 2007; Dooley, Seals, & Skarbek, 2014). Whether the inmate was employed during first full quarter prior to their admission to prison (0=no, 1=yes) is included as a control variable along with the number of tattoos an inmate has (Bales, Blomberg, & Waters, 2013).

The most serious type of crime which resulted in offenders being imprisoned and their prior criminal record has been associated with reentry outcomes (Bales & Mears, 2008; Langan, Schmitt, & Durose, 2003; Putnins, 2005). Therefore, the most serious crime which resulted in a conviction and sentence to prison is measured through dummy variables (0=no, 1=yes) based on nine different crime types of murder/manslaughter, sex offenses, robbery, other violent offenses, burglary, property, drugs, weapons, and other miscellaneous offenses. While a host of prior criminal record measures were available to use in the models, due to multicollinearity problems when including all of them in the analysis, we selected four measures that had the greatest influence on recidivism and were not collinear. These include the number burglary convictions in the five years preceding prison admission, the number of theft convictions in the five years preceding admission, total number of prior arrests, and the number prior Florida prison admissions.

The effect of the length of stay in prison on recidivism explored in prior studies have found from mixed results (Beck & Shipley, 1987; Langan, et al., 2003), positive effects (Visher, Lattimore, & Linster, 1991), and negative relationships (Bales & Mears, 2008; Beck & Shipley, 1997). Therefore, time served in prison in months is included in the analysis. Custody level at release was measured through dummy variables (0=no, 1=yes) for inmates released with a community custody level, medium/minimum custody level, or close (representing the most severe restrictions on movement and privileges) custody level. Institutional adjustment as

indicated by violations of institutional rules and resulting infractions has been found to influence post-prison offending behavior (Chen & Shapiro, 2007; Kohl, Hoover, McDonald, & Solomon, 2008; Mears & Bales, 2009). Measures of institutional adjustment included whether inmates had one or more disciplinary infraction within 365 days of their prison release (0=no, 1=yes) and the total number of infractions per month served in prison (Bales & Mears, 2008). Provided that research has demonstrated that inmates who are visited in prison and those who are visited more often have significantly lower recidivism rates (Bales & Mears, 2008) we include a measure of the number of visits inmate received per month served.

Finally, for two reasons, we include dummy variables reflecting the year inmates were released from prison during our cohort period of 2004 to 2011. First, this eight year span of all prison releases provides a unique opportunity to control for changes in policies and practices related to prisoner reentry that are not directly measurable. Second, the “Great Recession” in the U.S. began in December 2007 and ended in June 2009 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). The Recession occurred in the middle of our cohort period and the dire economic conditions and in particular high unemployment rates, especially among minorities and young males, may have some influence on post-prison employment and recidivism.

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

### *Dependent Variables*

Tables 2 and 2a describe the dependent variables used in the analyses. The recidivism measures related to arrest events were derived from the FDLE arrest data. These data include the date of each arrest event and the type of charge(s). These data were used to determine whether an individual was arrested for any crime (felony or misdemeanor, excluding technical violations of supervision) after release from incarceration, and if they were arrested solely for a felony



offense (excluding technical violations of supervision). Multiple measures of arrest were used to distinguish between those who were arrested for any reason, and those who were arrested for more serious offenses (felonies). Additionally, these variables were created as close approximations of the arrest measures used in the Bureau of Justice Statistics' most current recidivism report "Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010" (Cooper, Durose & Snyder, 2014). The recidivism measure capturing a conviction for a felony crime was obtained from the FDC's "component" dataset which contains detailed data on every convicted charge for a felony in Florida which results in a sentence to state prison or some form of community supervision. The recidivism measure which indicates a return to Florida's prison system for any reason was obtained from the FDC's "prison movement" dataset which contains a record for every movement resulting in an entry into or an exit from a Florida prison. These records contain the movement date and the reason for the movement, such as whether it was a new sentence or a technical violation of supervision.

[INSERT TABLES 2 AND 2a HERE]

## **Analytical Techniques**

### *Survival and Logistic Regression Modeling*

First, Cox Regression Proportional Hazards Models, i.e., "survival analysis" is used to examine the effect of our independent variables of any post-prison supervision, split probation/community control, and conditional release supervision compared to those inmates released with no supervision to follow incarceration (see, Allison, 1995). This method measures the probability of recidivism (rearrest, reconviction, and reimprisonment) and the time to failure across the two groups. Second, logistic regression models, which is an appropriate multivariate modeling technique when the outcome variables is dichotomous, such as whether recidivism

occurred (0=no,1=yes), are created to estimate the impact of treatment, i.e., post-prison release supervision, on employment, rearrest, reconviction, and reimprisonment within one, two, and three years after prison release (see, Allison, 1999).

### *Precision (Exact) Matching*

Precision (or exact) matching is one method available for researchers who are trying to improve causal inference, but who cannot randomly assign people to receive a sanction due to ethical and practical constraints. Also known as “variable-by-variable” matching (Nagin, Cullen, & Jonson, 2009), this method selects cases within the treatment and control group where the values of each matching variable are identical. Those cases that do not match precisely are pruned from the analysis. Cases that remain and match across the treatment and control groups are made equivalent in their attributes. The only measured difference between these groups is the treatment, sanction, or condition of interest. While this method is characterized as a “foolproof way of controlling for potentially confounding variables” (Nagin, et al., 2009: 145), there are some issues associated with using it (Selltitz, Jahoda, Deutsch, & Cook, 1959). First, there needs to be an adequate initial case size so that enough variables can be incorporated in the matching process. The more variables that are used to match on, the greater the reduction in the number of cases available for analysis. A second problem occurs when the addition of more variables to match on leads to diminishing returns (Selltitz, et al., 1959). As variables are added, fewer matches can be identified. Because matching is only as beneficial as the variables included in the matching procedure, the third issue is that many data sources do not have an adequate number of relevant factors to incorporate in the matching procedure, thereby making the treatment and control groups less comparable.

### *Propensity Score Matching*

Propensity Score Matching (PSM) is another common technique used to infer causality in an observational study. This technique was originally developed by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) and is now commonly used in many different fields including health, economics, as well as in psychological and sociological applications. The propensity score is the conditional probability of selection into the treatment or control group given a set of covariates, and is used either to construct matches or as a weight in contrasting the treatment and control conditions. The application of PSM to sanction-based research has become prominent in the criminal justice and correctional literature, and can be applied to the likelihood of receiving post-prison release supervision (Apel & Sweeten, 2010; Nagin, et al., 2009). The specific type of propensity score matching that was used in these analyses include nearest neighbor matching using a 0.05 caliper.

## **RESULTS**

Tables 3 and 4 show the descriptive statistics for inmates released with any type of post-prison supervision to follow incarceration (n=64,223), those released with only split probation (including felony probation, drug offender probation, and sex offender probation) or community control (n=51,929), those released on conditional release supervision (n=7,454), and those inmates who were released from prison with no supervision to follow their incarceration (n=137,224). Inmates released to any type of post-prison supervision and those released on split probation/community control supervision had significantly lower rates of arrest for any misdemeanor or felony offense, arrest for a felony, and conviction for a felony offense. However, they also had significantly higher mean rates of returning to prison compared to inmates released with no supervision to follow incarceration<sup>11</sup>. Inmates released to conditional

---

<sup>11</sup> Mean differences for inmates released to any post-prison supervision were higher than those released with no supervision, and only reached a significance level of  $p < 0.10$  for arrest for a felony at one year. Those released to split probation/community control did not have statistically significant mean rates of arrest for a felony at one year compared to inmates released with no supervision to follow. All other results were significant at the  $p < 0.001$  level.

release supervision had somewhat different results; those offenders with conditional release supervision to follow incarceration had significantly higher rates of arrest for any misdemeanor or felony offense, arrest for a felony, but significantly lower rates of conviction for a felony offense<sup>12</sup>. Table 3 also shows that inmates placed on any type of post-prison supervision and those on split probation/community control supervision have significantly higher rates of employment after prison release, while those on conditional release supervision have significantly lower rates of employment after release compared to inmates released with no supervision to follow incarceration.

Table 4 shows the means and mean differences of the control variables included in the analyses for each of the primary independent variables. First, it should be noted that there are statistically significant differences between the means of each of the independent variables (any post-prison supervision, split probation/community control, and conditional release supervision) and the control group of inmates released from prison with no supervision to follow on virtually every control variable (see Table 4 for full findings). Results indicate that those released with a term of post-prison supervision are significantly more likely to be male, white,<sup>13</sup> older, and to be sentenced for a more serious offense (e.g., murder/manslaughter, sex offenses, robbery, other violent offenses), and to be serving a significantly longer term of incarceration than those with no supervision to follow prison.

Inmates with a term of post-prison supervision show significantly better institutional adjustment with lower number of disciplinary reports (DRs), both overall and within the 365

---

<sup>12</sup> Mean differences for inmates released to conditional release supervision only reached a significance level of  $p < 0.05$  for arrest for a felony at anytime (survival analysis “censored” variable). All other results were significant at the  $p < 0.001$  level.

<sup>13</sup> Except conditional release supervision, which has a significantly smaller mean rate of white offenders (36.8%) compared to those with no supervision to follow (42.8%).

days prior to release, and are visited significantly more often than those with no supervision to follow<sup>14</sup>. Finally, measures of prior history and inmate characteristics indicate that those released to post-prison supervision have significantly more prior convictions for burglary and theft<sup>15</sup>, are significantly more likely to be a suspected or confirmed gang member, have significantly higher mean psychiatric diagnoses at release<sup>16</sup>, have significantly greater substance abuse need<sup>17</sup>, as measured by their DSSI score, and are employed significantly less prior to prison admission than those with no supervision to follow incarceration.

[INSERT TABLES 3 AND 4 HERE]

We first assess the effects of receiving post-prison supervision on recidivism (arrest for any crime, arrest for a felony, conviction, and return to prison) using Cox proportional hazard regression (survival) modeling. Table 5<sup>18</sup> shows several important findings. First, the results for those released to any type of post-prison supervision and those released to a split probation/community control term of supervision are similar both in direction and magnitude of effect size across all four recidivism measures. Second, inmates released to conditional release supervision generally have significantly higher hazards of recidivism, with the exception of conviction, at anytime. Third, the positive effects of post-prison supervision on arrest for any crime are reversed when considering only arrests for felony offenses. For example, those with split probation/community control are 13.2% less likely to be arrested for a misdemeanor or

---

<sup>14</sup> Except conditional release supervision, which has a significantly smaller mean rate of visitation (1.6%) compared to those with no supervision to follow (29.1%).

<sup>15</sup> Except conditional release supervision, which shows a significantly smaller mean number of prior theft offenses (0.240) compared to those with no supervision to follow (0.925).

<sup>16</sup> Except split probation/community control, which is not statistically significantly different from those with no supervision to follow.

<sup>17</sup> Except conditional release, which is not statistically significantly different from those with no supervision to follow.

<sup>18</sup> Tables 5 through 17 report only the primary interactions with no control variables shown. Full results are available upon request.

felony, while they are 7.9% *more* likely to be arrested for a felony. These seemingly conflicting findings may be due to offenders on supervision being more likely to be arrested for a more serious offense (felony versus misdemeanor) as a result of their supervision; in other words, the act of being on supervision may cause an arresting officer to be more likely to charge someone with a felony over a misdemeanor due to supervision being seen an indicator of serious offending. Fourth, the finding that offenders on post-prison supervision are more likely to be returned to prison for any reason is consistent with prior research (Spivak & Damphousse, 2006).

[INSERT TABLE 5 HERE]

Table 6 shows the results of the length of time on both split probation/community control (in years) and conditional release supervision (in months) on each of the four recidivism outcomes, using survival analysis. For both split supervision and conditional release, longer sentences result in a significant reduction in the hazard of arrest for any crime, arrest for a felony<sup>19</sup>, and conviction. However, similar to findings in Table 5, the odds of returning to prison are increased. Importantly, these effect sizes are substantially smaller (0.9% for split supervision and 2.6% for conditional release) compared to those reported in Table 5 (69.4% and 82.1%, respectively), indicating that sentence length partially mitigates the likelihood of returning to prison for these offenders.

[INSERT TABLE 6 HERE]

The next step of the analysis was to consider the effects of any post-prison supervision, split probation/community control, and conditional release on post-prison employment and each of the recidivism outcome measures at one, two, and three years after release using logistic regression modeling. Tables 7, 8, and 9 report these findings. Similar to the findings in Table 5,

---

<sup>19</sup> Not statistically significant for conditional release supervision.

several conclusions can be drawn from these tables. First, consistent with survival analysis, the results and effect sizes for any post-prison supervision and split probation/community control are similar. Both groups show significantly reduced odds of arrest for any crime and conviction at one, two, and three years and significantly increased odds of arrest for a felony and return to prison at one, two, and three years. Additionally, both groups show significantly greater odds of being employed after release from prison (12.7% and 11%, respectively) compared to inmates released with no supervision to follow.

Inmates released to conditional released supervision have significantly greater odds of arrest (for any crime and for a felony) and of returning to prison at one, two, and three years after release from prison. However, the odds of conviction are significantly lower at one (30.3%), two (37.8%), and three years (43%) compared to those with no supervision to follow. Additionally, inmates on conditional release supervision have an 18% greater odds of being employed within the first quarter after release.

[INSERT TABLES 7, 8 AND 9 HERE]

Tables 10 and 11 report the findings for length of time on both split probation/community control (in years) and conditional release supervision (in months) on post-prison employment and each of the four recidivism outcomes at one, two, and three years after release from prison, using logistic regression modeling. The findings are again, consistent across both methodologies in terms of direction and effect size. For example, longer periods of both split supervision and conditional release result in significantly reduced odds of being arrested for any crime at one, two, and three years after release from incarceration.

There are some notable differences, however. Table 10 shows that, while length of time on split supervision does reduce the odds of conviction, the findings are not statistically

significant until three years after release. For each additional year of split supervision the odds of returning to prison are 2.1% lower at one year after release. Additionally, while post-prison employment does reach statistical significance for offenders on longer terms of split supervision, the effect size is not substantial (1.9% greater odds of being employed in the first quarter after release for each additional year of supervision). Table 11 shows that while the direction of the effect of length of time on conditional release has not changed for both conviction and return to prison, the significance of the effect sizes has changed when using logistic regression modeling. Conviction is only significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level at two and three years after release from prison, while the odds of returning to prison are significant at the  $p < 0.001$  level at two and three years after release. Finally, Table 11 shows that for each additional month of conditional release, offenders are more 3.5% more likely to be employed after release from prison.

[INSERT TABLES 10 AND 11 HERE]

In order to assess the reliability of the multivariate findings matching procedures were used next in analyzing the effects of post-prison supervision on recidivism and employment. Tables 12, 13, and 14 report the effects of any post-prison supervision, split probation/community control, and conditional release on post-prison employment and each of the four recidivism outcome measures at one, two, and three years after release using precision (or exact) matching. In these analyses the cases are matched on the treatment variable (any post-prison supervision, split probation/community control, and conditional release) using a host of covariates<sup>20</sup> in order to approximate randomization of cases into the treatment and control (e.g., no supervision to follow incarceration) groups.

---

<sup>20</sup> Matched covariates are not presented in the tables. Full results are available upon request.



Results show that findings, particularly for inmates released to any form of post-prison supervision and those on split probation/community control supervision, are consistent across multiple methodologies. For example, in Table 12 the odds of being arrested for any crime at one year are reduced by 17.1%, by 18.1% at two years, and by 19.6% at three years for inmates released to any type of post-prison supervision. Findings are similar for inmates released to split probation/community control (Table 13), however, unlike survival and logistic regression, the matched models for inmates released to conditional release supervision (Table 14) do not reach a level of statistical significance for arrest for any crime at one, two, or three years. This may be due to the fact that the number of cases which were able to be matched dropped substantially (e.g., from 144,678 to 3,426 at one year).

[INSERT TABLES 12, 13 AND 14 HERE]

The final set of analyses examine the effects of receiving any post-prison supervision, split probation/community control, and conditional release on post-prison employment and each of the four recidivism outcome measures at one, two, and three years after release using Propensity Score Matching (PSM). In these analyses the cases are matched on their propensity to receive treatment (any post-prison supervision, split probation/community control, and conditional release) using a host of covariates<sup>21</sup> in order to approximate randomization of cases into the treatment and control (e.g., no supervision to follow incarceration) groups.

Consistent with previous results, Tables 15, 16, and 17 report similar findings to analyses using other methodologies (survival, logistic regression, and precision matching). Inmates released to any post-prison supervision (Table 15) and those released to split probation/community control (Table 16) are significantly less likely to be arrested for any crime

---

<sup>21</sup> Matched covariates are not presented in the tables. Full results are available upon request.

and less likely to be convicted at one, two, and three years after release, while they are also more likely to be arrested for a felony offense, and be returned to prison during the same follow up periods. Additionally, these inmates are more likely to be employed within the first full quarter after release from incarceration. Inmates released to conditional release supervision (Table 17), however, are significantly more likely to be arrested for a new crime at three years<sup>22</sup>, be arrested for a felony at one, two, and three years after release, and be returned to prison at one, two, and three years after release. They are also significantly less likely to be convicted during the same follow up period. Post-prison employment is no longer statistically significant (Table 17).

[INSERT TABLES 15, 16, AND 17 HERE]

## **DISCUSSION**

The purpose of this study was to assess the various impacts that post-prison supervision has on recidivism and employment outcomes for inmates released from Florida prisons. Additionally, we aimed to determine if the type of post-release supervision and/or the length of time spent on post-release supervision created differential impacts among offenders.

The first research question guiding this work examined whether post-release supervision impacted recidivism and post-prison employment outcomes for a cohort of released inmates. Findings indicate that inmates released to any form of post-prison supervision are approximately 11-20% less likely to be arrested for any crime (felony or misdemeanor, excluding technical violations of supervision) and 30-44% less likely to be convicted for a felony offense after release from incarceration. Inmates placed on any type of post-prison supervision are also more likely to be employed within the first quarter after release from incarceration, compared to those released with no supervision to follow. However, these positive findings are mitigated by the

---

<sup>22</sup> Results at one and two years post-prison release are not statistically significant.

negative effects of supervision on arrest for a felony and return to prison. Those with any term of post-prison supervision are 7-20% more likely to be arrested for a felony and 67-360% more likely to be returned to prison after release from incarceration than those with no supervision to follow. The significant increase in likelihood of reimprisonment is likely due, at least in part, to the nature of supervision: those who are supervised can be returned to prison for technical violations in addition to being returned as a result of a new sentence. Our measure of reimprisonment includes all movements into the Florida prison system, and thus does not isolate those offenders who are returning to prison as a result of a violation of supervision. This is an important limitation in our study, and will be discussed below.

The second research question guiding this work examined whether the type of post-prison supervision (split probation/community control or conditional release) impacted recidivism and employment outcomes in different ways. Examining different types of post-prison supervision was important to this study as split supervision and conditional release supervision represent different release decisions. Inmates are placed on split supervision as a result of a judicial sentencing decision while those released to conditional release supervision have met certain statutory requirements and are automatically released by the FDC to supervision for the remainder of their prison term. As a result, it was expected that these two forms of post-prison supervision would result in different post-prison reentry experiences (as measured through recidivism and employment outcomes).

Findings indicate that there are important differences between inmates released to split supervision and those placed on conditional release supervision in terms of their employment and recidivism outcomes. First, inmates placed on split probation/community control are significantly less likely to be arrested for any crime while those on conditional release

supervision are more likely to be arrested. Second, while inmates released to both split supervision and conditional release have lower likelihoods of conviction and increased likelihoods of arrest for a felony and reimprisonment, the effects are slightly worse for those on conditional release supervision.

For instance, Table 8 shows that inmates placed on split probation/community control are 365.2% more likely to return to prison at one year, 173.9% more likely at two years, and 124.9% more likely at three years, compared to those with no supervision after incarceration. However, Table 9 shows that inmates released on conditional release supervision are 404.3% more likely to return to prison at one year, 174.5% more likely at two years, and 127.3% more likely at three years, compared to those with no supervision after incarceration. While substantively these results are the same, being placed on post-prison supervision significantly increases the likelihood of returning to prison, at each point in time the likelihood of reimprisonment is greater for those on conditional release supervision than it is for those on split probation/community control.

Third, variations exist between inmates placed on split supervision and those on conditional release supervision in terms of their likelihood of obtaining employment within the first quarter after release from incarceration. Those released to split supervision show an increased likelihood of employment after incarceration, which is consistent across multiple methods (logistic regression, precision matching, and PSM). The consistency of findings imparts confidence that these results reflect a true effect of split supervision on post-prison employment. However, the same is not true for those placed on conditional release supervision. Table 9 shows an 18% greater odds of being employed after release, but when more stringent statistical methods are used (precision matching and PSM) the findings are reversed and are no

longer significant. Overall, the findings would indicate a positive effect of post-prison supervision on employment for released inmates, but only for those on split supervision.

The third research question examined the effect of length of supervision on employment and recidivism for offenders on post-release supervision. To answer this question we compared the length of supervision (in years) for offenders on split supervision, as well as the length of supervision (in months) for offenders on conditional release. Results show that for each additional year of split supervision, the odds of arrest for a new crime, arrest for a felony, and conviction are all significantly reduced. While the odds of returning to prison are still significantly greater for those with split supervision, shorter terms of supervision appear to mitigate the likelihood of failure. In other words, while the likelihood of returning to prison at anytime for those on split supervision is nearly 70%, it only increases by 0.9% for each additional year of supervision. Therefore, the odds of returning to prison are greatest for those with very long terms of supervision.

Finally, this study employed multiple statistical methods for two primary reasons. First, the nature of the outcome measures dictated that more than one statistical method must be used to conduct the analyses. While recidivism measures (arrest for any crime, arrest for a felony, conviction, and return to prison) were available as continuous measures with clear event dates (i.e., the date of arrest from the FDLE data file, as described previously), the same was not true for the employment outcome. Our measure of post-prison employment could only be captured as a dichotomous variable, and thus was most appropriately analyzed using logistic regression. However, because more information was available for the recidivism measures it was appropriate to use both survival analysis and logistic regression to consider not only whether an offender recidivated, but whether the treatment (post-prison supervision) delayed the recidivism

event compared to the control group of offenders who did not have supervision to follow. Second, because our cohort included a large number of cases it was possible to conduct additional analyses using precision and Propensity Score matching techniques. These statistical methods are intended to approximate randomization in quasi-experimental design studies, such as the one outlined here. These additional methods were used to strengthen confidence in the findings: if results were consistent across multiple methods then it can be concluded that results are likely representative of a true effect of the treatment (post-prison supervision) on the outcomes (recidivism and employment).

### **Limitations**

There are several important limitations of the current study that must be weighed against the strength of the findings. Results from the current study are limited in their ability to be generalizable to other populations of released inmates, as is common in criminological and criminal justice research. This study examined a cohort of inmates released from Florida prisons from 2004 through 2011, excluding those inmates who were originally sentenced outside of Florida and those who were released to locations outside of Florida. Due in part to the unique characteristics of Florida's inmate and supervised populations, as well as the unique post-prison sentencing strategies employed, findings from this study are less likely to apply to correctional populations in other states or internationally. This limitation does not, however, minimize the importance of the findings presented here. Florida maintains one of the largest correctional populations in the U.S., and as such, continues to be a leader in finding responsible ways to help incarcerated populations successfully transition back into communities.

A second limitation of this study results from the measurement of return to prison. By including technical violations as one of the ways in which inmates are able to return to prison,

we were unable to draw clear distinctions between the effects of post-release supervision on the likelihood of returning to prison for new offending behavior versus returning to prison for a technical violation of supervision. It is not unsurprising that inmates who are released to post-prison supervision are at a greater risk for returning to prison for any reason because they have greater (and arguably easier) means of returning to prison via technical violations of supervision. Future research will need to parcel out this relationship by separately identifying returns to prison for technical violations of supervision from returns to prison for other (new criminal offending) reasons.

### **Policy Implications**

Across the U.S., thousands of inmates are released from incarceration back into communities every day. How these individuals successfully transition back into their community from the correctional system has been studied by criminological research in a myriad of ways. While research focusing on the use of community corrections as a tool for offender reentry has largely focused on parole supervision, there remains a gap in the understanding of alternative post-prison release supervision strategies. Taken as a whole, this study finds generally positive effects of post-release supervision on reducing recidivism and increasing employment after release from prison, particularly for offenders placed on a term of split probation or split community control supervision. The findings from this study drive two broad policy recommendations for researchers, practitioners, and policy makers.

First, findings indicate support for the use of post-prison supervision, specifically split probation and split community control supervision, as viable tools to reduce reoffending and increase employment for inmates returning to communities. Findings indicate strong, positive support for this association which is consistent across multiple statistical methods, further

increasing the reliability of the results. The results showing an increased likelihood of offenders returning to prison is likely due to a conflation of returning to prison for technical violations with returning to prison for other reasons. We argue the increased likelihood of returning to prison for supervised offenders is not necessarily indicative of a failure of supervision. Instead, if offenders are instead being “pulled back” into the prison system via technical violations of supervision before they reoffend for more serious reasons (i.e., committing new felony offenses), then, in fact, supervision should be considered a success. By properly identifying and monitoring offenders who are at a greater risk for reoffending and enacting a swift and certain punishment (via return to prison) for less serious offenses, community corrections is able to reduce the likelihood that these offenders will return to serious criminal behaviors after release from incarceration.

Future emphasis should be placed on correctly identifying offenders that would be best suited for post-prison release supervision, and identifying the supervision strategies that are most effective for this particular population of offenders. Additionally, future research should attempt to parcel out the differential effects of post-prison supervision on arrest for any crime versus arrest for a felony offense. The seemingly conflicting findings may be, in part, due to arrest decisions made by law enforcement officers. For policy makers, the use of split supervision as a reentry tool seems to have great potential. However, we would caution policy makers from expanding the use of split supervision until further research has been conducted to better understand the full scope of positive and negative effects of this supervision strategy on the reentry outcomes of released inmates.

Second, findings show consistently positive effects of post-release supervision on employment. The ability to find and maintain stable employment after release from prison is a



critical component for successful reentry. It is likely that offenders released to post-prison supervision have a greater likelihood of obtaining employment within the first few months after release from incarceration *because* of their supervised status. In Florida, one of the standard conditions of supervision (which applies to everyone under active supervision, regardless of the type of supervision to which they are assigned) requires that an offender maintain employment while on supervision or else enroll in classes at an educational institution. Individuals who are released from prison with no supervision may return to communities with few or no employment opportunities or resources. Those on post-release supervision not only have the motivation to become and stay employed (i.e., avoid being technically violated), but they also have resources for finding employment through their supervising officer.

Inmates without supervision to follow incarceration are less likely to obtain employment within the first full quarter after their release. A clear recommendation for policy makers would be to emphasize employment assistance and job placement among these unsupervised inmates. With scarce resources it is important for policy makers and correctional administrators to devote available programming, officer time, and funding towards those with the greatest need. Based on the findings in this study it is clear that policy makers should focus reentry and transitional services towards inmates who will be released into communities directly from the prison system. Taken with the previous conclusion regarding the positive effects on post-release supervision and reduced likelihood of reoffending, our general conclusion is that post-release supervision is beneficial as a tool to assist inmates in their transition back into communities.

## REFERENCES

- Allison, P. D. (1999). *Logistic Regression Using the SAS® System: Theory and Application*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.
- Allison, P. D. (1995). *Survival Analysis Using SAS®: A Practical Guide*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.
- Anderson, D. C. (1995). *Crime and the politics of hysteria: How the Willie Horton story changed American justice*. New York: Random House.
- Apel, R. J., & Sweeten, G. (2010). Propensity score matching in criminology and criminal justice. In A. R. Piquero, & D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Handbook of Quantitative Criminology* (pp. 543-562). New York: Springer.
- Arkowitz, S., Shale, J., & Carabello, K. (2008). Conditional release programs for civilly committed sex offenders. *The Journal of Psychiatry & Law*, 36(3), 485-511.
- Bales, W. D., Blomberg, T. G., & Waters, K. (2013). Inmate tattoos and in-prison and post-prison violent behavior. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 2: 20-31.
- Bales, W. D., Gaes, G. G., Blomberg, T. G., & Pate, K. N. (2010). An assessment of the development and outcomes of determinate sentencing in Florida. *Justice Research and Policy*, 21(4), 41-71.
- Bales, W. D., & Mears, D. P. (2008). Inmate social ties and the transition to society: Does visitation reduce recidivism? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 45(3), 287-321.
- Baillargeon, J., Binswanger, P. J., Williams, B., & Murray, O. (2009). Psychiatric disorders and repeat incarcerations: The revolving prison door. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 166(1), 103-109.
- Beck, A. J. & Shipley, B. E. (1987). *Recidivism of young parolees*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Bonta, J., Law, M., & Hanson, K. (1998). The prediction of criminal and violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 123(2), 123-142.
- Bottomly, K. A. (1990). Parole in transition: A comparative study of origins, developments, and prospects for the 1990s. In M. Tonry, & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research* (pp. 319-374). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2011). *National Corrections Reporting Program: Sentence length of state prisoners, by offense, admission type, sex, and race*. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2056>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (n.d.). *Build a multi-state fact sheet report*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncrp.info/SitePages/BuildMultiStateFactSheetReport>
- Burton, S. E., Finn, M., Livingston, D., Scully, K., Bales, W. D., & Padgett, K. (2004). Applying a crime seriousness scale to measure changes in the severity of offenses by individuals arrested in Florida. *Justice Research and Policy*, 6(1), 1-18.
- Carson, E. A., & Golinelli, D. (2013). *Prisoners in 2012: Trends in admissions and releases, 1991–2012*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Cheliotis, L. K. (2009). Before the next storm: Some evidence-based reminders about temporary release. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53(4), 420-432.
- Chen, M. K. & Shapiro, J. M. (2007). Do harsher prison conditions reduce recidivism? A discontinuity-based approach. *American Law and Economics Review*, 9(1), 1-29.
- Clear, T., & Cole, G. (1997). *American corrections*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Cooper, A. D., Durose, M. R., & Snyder, H. N. (2014). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=4986>.
- Ditton, P., & Wilson, D. J. (1999). *Truth in sentencing in state prisons*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Dooley, S., Seal, A., & Skarbek, D. (2014). The effect of prison gang membership on recidivism. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(3), 267-275.
- Durose, M. R., Cooper, A. D., & Snyder, H. N. (2014). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: patterns from 2005 to 2010*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Florida Department of Corrections. (2013a). *2012 Florida prison recidivism study - Releases from 2004 to 2011*. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Research and Data Analysis.
- Florida Department of Corrections. (2013b). *Annual report: Fiscal Year 2012-2013*. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Research and Data Analysis.
- Florida Department of Corrections. (2014a). *2013 Florida prison recidivism study - Releases from 2005 to 2012*. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Research and Data Analysis.

- Florida Department of Corrections. (2014b). 2013-2014 Agency statistics. *Inmate Releases and Time Served*. Retrieved from [http://www.dc.state.fl.us/pub/annual/1314/stats/im\\_release.html](http://www.dc.state.fl.us/pub/annual/1314/stats/im_release.html)
- Florida Department of Corrections. (n.d.). *Frequently asked questions regarding parole*. Retrieved from <http://www.dc.state.fl.us/oth/inmates/parole.html>
- Gelb, A., Dhungana, K., Adams, B., McCann, E., & Zafft, K. (2014). *Max out: The rise in prison inmates released without supervision*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Grann, D. M., & S. Fazel. (2008). The association between psychiatric diagnosis and violent re-offending in adult offenders in the community. *BMC Psychiatry*, 8(1), 92-98.
- Grattet, R., Petersilia, J., & Lin, J. (2008). *Parole violations and revocations in California*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Herbermann, E. J., & Bonczar, T. P. (2014). *Probation and parole in the United States, 2013*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Hipp, J. R., Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (2010). Parolee recidivism in California: The effect of neighborhood context and social service agency characteristics. *Criminology*, 48(4), 947-979.
- Hipp, J. R., & Yates, D. K. (2009). Do returning parolees affect neighborhood crime? A case study of Sacramento. *Criminology*, 47(3), 619–656.
- Huebner, B. M., Varano, S. P., & Bynum, T.S. (2007). Gangs, guns and drugs: Recidivism among serious young offenders. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 6(2):187-221.
- Jackson, P. C. (1983). Some effects of parole supervision on recidivism. *British Journal of Criminology*, 23(1), 17-34.
- Kohl, R., Hoover, H. M., McDonald, S. M., & Solomon, A. L. (2008). *Massachusetts recidivism study: A closer look at releases and returns to prison*. Washington DC: Urban Institute-Justice Policy Center.
- Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. J. (2002). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Langan, P. A., Schmitt, E. L., & Durose, M. R. (2003). *Recidivism of sex offenders released from prison in 1994*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Lin, J., Grattet, R., & Petersilia, J. (2010). “Back-end sentencing” and reimprisonment: Individual, organizational, and community predictors of parole sanctioning decisions. *Criminology*, 48(3), 759–795.

- Mears, D. P. & Bales, W. D. (2009). Supermax incarceration and recidivism. *Criminology*, 47(4), 1131-1166.
- Morris, N., & Tonry, M. (1990). *Between prison and probation: Intermediate punishments in a rational sentencing system*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nagin, D. S., Cullen, F. T., & Jonson, C. L. (2009). Imprisonment and reoffending. *Crime and Justice*, 38(1), 115-200.
- National Research Council. (2008). *Parole, desistance from crime, and community integration*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Ostermann, M. (n.d.). *The impact of post-release supervision upon recidivism in New Jersey*. Unpublished report, Rutgers University School of Criminal Justice.
- Petersilia, J. (1999). Parole and prisoner reentry in the United States. *Crime and Justice*, 26: 479-529.
- Petersilia, J. (2000a). Parole and prisoner reentry in the United States. *Perspectives*, 24(3), 32-46.
- Petersilia, J. (2000b). Parole and prisoner reentry in the United States, Part II. *Perspectives*, 24(4), 40-47.
- Piehl, A. M., & LoBuglio, S. F. (2005). Does supervision matter? In J. Travis, & C. Visser (Eds.), *Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America* (pp. 105-138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Putnins, A. (2005). Assessing recidivism risk among young offenders. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 38(3), 324-339.
- Rosenbaum, P. R., & Rubin, D. B. (1983). The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika*, 70(1), 41-55.
- Selltiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., & Cook, S. W. (1959). *Research methods in social relations*. New York: Holt.
- Solomon, A. L., Kachnowski, V., & Bhati, A. (2005). *Does parole work? Analyzing the impact of postprison supervision on rearrest outcomes*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- SPEC Associates. (2002). *Final evaluation report: Michigan department of correction's GPS pilot phase II*. Detroit, Michigan: Michigan Department of Corrections.
- Spivak, A. L., & Damphousse, K. R. (2006). Who returns to prison? A survival analysis of recidivism among adult offenders released in Oklahoma, 1985-2004. *Justice Research and Policy*, 8(2), 57-88.

- Steiner, B. (2004). Treatment retention: A theory of post-release supervision for the substance abusing offender. *Federal Probation*, 68(3), 24-29.
- Stemen, D. (2007). *Reconsidering incarceration: New directions for reducing crime*. Vera Institute of Justice, Center on Sentencing and Corrections. Retrieved from [http://vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/veraincarc\\_vFW2.pdf](http://vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/veraincarc_vFW2.pdf)
- Stemen, D., & Rengifo, A. F. (2012). Charting the evolution of structure and determinacy in state sentencing and corrections policies 1970–2010. *Justice Research and Policy*, 14(2), 1-31.
- Stemen, D., Rengifo, A., & Wilson, J. (2005). *Of fragmentation and ferment: The impact of state sentencing policies on incarceration rates, 1975-2002*. Final report to the National Institute of Justice.
- Talarico, S. M., & Myers, M. A. (1987). Split sentencing in Georgia: A test of two empirical assumptions. *Justice Quarterly*, 4(4), 611-630.
- The National Conference of State Legislatures. (2011). *Principles of effective state sentencing and corrections policy*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/civil-and-criminal-justice/principles-of-sentencing-and-corrections-policy.aspx>
- The PEW Charitable Trusts. (2013). *Issue brief: The impact of parole in New Jersey*. Retrieved from The PEW Charitable Trusts Research and Analysis: [http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/legacy/uploadedfiles/pes\\_assets/2013/PSPPNJParoleBrief.pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/legacy/uploadedfiles/pes_assets/2013/PSPPNJParoleBrief.pdf)
- Tonry, M., & Lynch, M. (1996). Intermediate sanctions. *Crime and Justice*, 20: 99-144.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2012). *The recession of 2007-2009*. Retrieved from [http://www.bls.gov/spotlight/2012/recession/pdf/recession\\_bls\\_spotlight.pdf](http://www.bls.gov/spotlight/2012/recession/pdf/recession_bls_spotlight.pdf)
- Visher, C. A., Lattimore, P. K., & Linster, R. L. (1991). Predicting the recidivism of serious youthful offenders using survival models. *Criminology*, 29(3), 329-366.

**Table 1. Control Variables Included in the Analyses**

Variable Name	Values
Sex	1 = Male, 0 = Female
<i>Race/Ethnicity:</i>	
White	1 = White/Non-Hispanic, 0 = Non-White
Black	1 = Black/non-Hispanic, 0 = White
Hispanic	1 = Hispanic, 0 = Black/non-Hispanic/White Non-Hispanic
Age at Prison Release	Continuous in Years
Education Tested Grade Level (TABE)	Continuous in Years
Substance Abuse Dependence	DSSI-Physical/Psychological Dependence = 1, None = 0
Psychiatric Diagnosis at Prison Release	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Employment Prior to Prison Admission	0 = Not employed first quarter prior to prison, 1 = employed
Number of Tattoos	Continuous number
Suspected or Confirmed Gang Member	0 = No, 1 = Yes
<i>Primary Offense at Prison Admission</i>	
Murder/Manslaughter	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Sex Offenses	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Robbery	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Other Violent Offenses	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Burglary	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Property Offenses	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Drug Offenses	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Weapons Offenses	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Other Offenses	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Number of Prior Burglary Offenses	Continuous number
Number of Prior Theft Offense	Continuous number
Number of Prior Arrests	Continuous number
Number of Prior Florida Prison Commitments	0 = None, 1 = One, 2 = Two, 3 = Three or More
Time Served in Prison	Months From Prison Admission to Release
<i>Custody at Release</i>	
Community	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Medium/Minimum	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Close	0 = No, 1 = Yes
One or More Disciplinary Infractions Within 365 Days of Release	0 = No, 1 = Yes
Total Number of Disciplinary Infractions Per Month	Continuous number
Number of Visits Per Month	Continuous number
<i>Year of Release from Prison</i>	
2004	0 = No, 1 = Yes
2005	0 = No, 1 = Yes
2006	0 = No, 1 = Yes
2007	0 = No, 1 = Yes
2008	0 = No, 1 = Yes
2009	0 = No, 1 = Yes
2010	0 = No, 1 = Yes
2011	0 = No, 1 = Yes

**Table 2. Recidivism Measures: Arrests**

Variable Name	Values
<i>Recidivism</i>	
Survival Variable – Arrest for any crime excluding violations - if censored	0 = Not arrested for any crime, excluding violations, prior to the last follow-up date; 1 = Number of months to first arrest for any crime excluding violations prior to the last follow-up date
Survival Variable – Number of months to first arrest for any crime excluding violations for uncensored cases or number of months to the last follow-up date for censored cases	Number of months to last follow-up date for cases not arrested for any crime excluding violations (censored) or number of months to first arrest for any crime excluding violations (uncensored)
If arrested for any crime excluding violations within one year post-prison release	0 = Not arrested for any crime, excluding violations, within one year post-prison release; 1 = Arrested for any crime, excluding violations, within one year post-prison release; Missing = less than one year from prison release to last follow-up date
If arrested for any crime excluding violations within two years post-prison release	0 = Not arrested for any crime, excluding violations, within two years post-prison release; 1 = Arrested for any crime, excluding violations, within two years post-prison release; Missing = less than two years from prison release to last follow-up date
If arrested for any crime excluding violations within three years post-prison release	0 = Not arrested for any crime, excluding violations, within three years post-prison release; 1 = Arrested for any crime, excluding violations, within three years post-prison release; Missing = less than three years from prison release to last follow-up date
Survival Variable – Arrest for a felony crime - if censored	0 = Not arrested for a felony crime prior to the last follow-up date; 1 = Number of months to first arrest for a felony crime prior to the last follow-up date
Survival Variable – Number of months to first arrest for a felony crime for uncensored cases or number of months to the last follow-up date for censored cases	Number of months to last follow-up date for cases not arrested for a felony crime (censored) or number of months to first arrest for a felony crime (uncensored)
If arrested for a felony crime within one year post-prison release	0 = Not arrested for a felony crime within one year post-prison release; 1 = Arrested for a felony crime within one year post-prison release; Missing = less than one year from prison release to last follow-up date
If arrested for a felony crime within two years post-prison release	0 = Not arrested for a felony crime within two years post-prison release; 1 = Arrested for a felony crime within two years post-prison release; Missing = less than two years from prison release to last follow-up date
If arrested for a felony crime within three years post-prison release	0 = Not arrested for a felony crime within three years post-prison release; 1 = Arrested for a felony crime within three years post-prison release; Missing = less than three years from prison release to last follow-up date



**Table 2a. Recidivism Measures: Conviction and Return to Prison, and Employment**

Variable Name	Values
<i>Recidivism</i>	
Survival Variable – Conviction for a felony crime - if censored	0 = Not convicted for a felony crime prior to the last follow-up date; 1 = Number of months to first conviction for a felony crime prior to the last follow-up date
Survival Variable – Number of months to first conviction for a felony crime for uncensored cases or number of months to the last follow-up date for censored cases	Number of months to last follow-up date for cases not convicted for a felony crime (censored) or number of months to first convicted for a felony crime (uncensored)
If convicted for a felony crime within one year post-prison release	0 = Not convicted for a felony crime within one year post-prison release; 1 = Convicted for a felony crime within one year post-prison release; Missing = less than one year from prison release to last follow-up date
If convicted for a felony crime within two years post-prison release	0 = Not convicted for a felony crime within two years post-prison release; 1 = Convicted for a felony crime within two years post-prison release; Missing = less than two years from prison release to last follow-up date
If convicted for a felony crime within three years post-prison release	0 = Not convicted for a felony crime within three years post-prison release; 1 = Convicted for a felony crime within three years post-prison release; Missing = less than three years from prison release to last follow-up date
Survival Variable – Return to Prison for Any Reason - if censored	0 = Not arrested for a felony crime prior to the last follow-up date; 1 = Number of months to first arrest for a felony crime prior to the last follow-up date
Survival Variable – Number of months to first return to prison for any reason for uncensored cases or number of months to the last follow-up date for censored cases	Number of months to last follow-up date for cases that did not return to prison for any reason (censored) or number of months to first return to prison for any reason (uncensored)
If returned to prison for any reason within one year post-prison release	0 = Returned to prison for any reason within one year post-prison release; 1 = Not returned to prison for any reason within one year post-prison release; Missing = less than one year from prison release to last follow-up date
If returned to prison for any reason within two years post-prison release	0 = Returned to prison for any reason within two years post-prison release; 1 = Not returned to prison for any reason within two years post-prison release; Missing = less than two years from prison release to last follow-up date
If returned to prison for any reason within three years post-prison release	0 = Returned to prison for any reason within three years post-prison release; 1 = Not returned to prison for any reason within three years post-prison release; Missing = less than three years from prison release to last follow-up date
<i>Employment</i>	
Post-Prison Employment	0 = No employment during first full quarter after prison release; 1 = Employed during first full quarter after prison release

**Table 3. Descriptive Statistics – Recidivism and Post-Prison Employment Outcome Variables for Inmates with Post-Prison Supervision and Inmates Released with No Supervision to Follow**

	Any Post-Prison Supervision n=64,223		Split Probation/ Community Control n=51,929		Conditional Release n=7,454		No Supervision n=137,224
	Mean	Mean Difference	Mean	Mean Difference	Mean	Mean Difference	Mean
<b>Dependent Variables (1= Yes, 0= No)</b>							
<i>Arrest for any felony or misdemeanor (excluding technical violations)</i>							
Anytime	0.621	0.080***	0.613	0.088***	0.678	0.022***	0.725
One year	0.325	0.078***	0.310	0.094***	0.437	-0.034***	0.437
Two years	0.493	0.093***	0.475	0.111***	0.632	-0.046***	0.608
Three years	0.611	0.088***	0.594	0.105***	0.755	-0.056***	0.693
<i>Arrest for any felony (excluding technical violations)</i>							
Anytime	0.596	0.019***	0.594	0.020***	0.627	-0.012*	0.607
One year	0.317	-0.004 <sup>†</sup>	0.312	0.002	0.379	-0.066***	0.316
Two years	0.461	0.012***	0.454	0.019***	0.545	-0.073***	0.473
Three years	0.546	0.017***	0.541	0.022***	0.622	-0.059***	0.561
<i>Conviction</i>							
Anytime	0.267	0.162***	0.265	0.163***	0.285	0.144***	0.437
One year	0.126	0.066***	0.122	0.070***	0.156	0.036***	0.195
Two years	0.193	0.113***	0.189	0.117***	0.237	0.069***	0.312
Three years	0.240	0.145***	0.237	0.148***	0.288	0.097***	0.392
<i>Return to Prison</i>							
Anytime	0.490	-0.139***	0.484	-0.132***	0.529	-0.108***	0.336
One year	0.129	-0.098***	0.121	-0.090***	0.182	-0.151***	0.065
Two years	0.237	-0.130***	0.227	-0.120***	0.303	-0.196***	0.177
Three years	0.310	-0.133***	0.302	-0.124***	0.381	-0.204***	0.273
<i>Post-prison Employment</i>							
Within first quarter	0.353	-0.021***	0.365	-0.033***	0.272	0.060***	0.332

<sup>†</sup>p<.10, \*p<.05, \*\*\*p<.001

Mean differences are calculated for each post-prison supervision release group compared to those who had no supervision to follow release from prison.

**Table 4. Descriptive Statistics – Control Variables for Analyses of Inmates with Post-Prison Supervision and Inmates Released with No Supervision to Follow**

	Any Post-Prison Supervision n=64,223		Split Probation/ Community Control n=52,028		Conditional Release n=7,454		No Supervision n=137,224
	Mean	Mean Diff.	Mean	Mean Diff.	Mean	Mean Diff.	Mean
Sex (1=Male, 0=Female)	0.891	-0.025***	0.880	-0.014***	0.956	-0.089***	0.866
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>							
White (1=White/non-Hispanic, 0=Non-White)	0.474	-0.046***	0.491	-0.063***	0.368	0.060***	0.428
Black (1=Black/non-Hispanic, 0=White)	0.453	0.057***	0.433	0.077***	0.566	-0.057***	0.510
Hispanic (1=Hispanic, 0=Black/non-Hispanic or White/non-Hispanic)	0.073	-0.011***	0.076	-0.014***	0.065	-0.003	0.062
Age at prison release (in years)	35.437	-1.228***	34.477	-0.267***	38.391	-4.181***	34.210
Education Tested Grade Level	7.541	-0.380***	7.708	-0.547***	6.698	0.463***	7.161
Substance Abuse Dependence (1= Physical or psychological dependence, 0= None)	0.517	-0.013***	0.511	-0.007**	0.503	0.001	0.504
Psychiatric Diagnosis at prison release (1=Yes, 0=No)	0.113	-0.005**	0.110	-0.001	0.137	-0.028***	0.109
Employment prior to prison admission	0.252	0.062***	0.250	0.063***	0.285	0.028***	0.314
Number of tattoos	2.740	0.286***	2.283	0.743***	6.123	-3.098***	3.025
Suspected or Confirmed Gang Member	0.062	-0.012***	0.063	-0.013***	0.069	-0.019***	0.050
<i>Primary Offense</i>							
Murder/Manslaughter	0.027	-0.018***	0.027	-0.018***	0.019	-0.010***	0.009
Sex offenses	0.078	-0.058***	0.082	-0.061***	0.082	-0.061***	0.020
Robbery	0.103	-0.058***	0.099	-0.055***	0.121	-0.077***	0.045
Other violent offenses	0.184	-0.077***	0.168	-0.061***	0.336	-0.229***	0.107
Burglary	0.159	-0.028***	0.164	-0.033***	0.121	0.011**	0.131
Property offenses	0.125	0.048***	0.133	0.039***	0.078	0.095***	0.172
Drugs	0.203	0.160***	0.211	0.152***	0.146	0.217***	0.363
Weapons offenses	0.024	0.015***	0.023	0.016***	0.034	0.005*	0.039
Other	0.097	0.016***	0.093	0.021***	0.065	0.049***	0.114
Number of prior burglary offenses	0.559	-0.183***	0.578	-0.202***	0.412	-0.036**	0.376
Number of prior theft offenses	1.054	-0.129***	1.119	-0.195***	0.685	0.240***	0.925
Number of prior arrests	12.525	1.565***	11.703	2.387***	16.797	-2.707***	14.090
Number of prior prison commitments <sup>1</sup>	0.581	0.012**	0.442	0.151***	1.419	-0.825***	0.593
Time served in prison (in months)	35.805	-14.973***	34.257	-13.424***	30.089	-9.257***	20.832
<i>Custody Level at Release</i>							
Community	0.197	0.039***	0.217	0.019***	0.070	0.166***	0.236
Medium/Minimum	0.652	-0.001	0.643	0.008**	0.714	-0.063***	0.651
Close	0.151	-0.038***	0.140	-0.027***	0.216	-0.103***	0.114
One or more DRs within 365 days of release (1=Yes, 0=No)	0.355	0.032***	0.363	0.024***	0.347	0.040***	0.387
Total number of DRs per month	0.086	0.014***	0.091	0.009***	0.071	0.029***	0.100
Number of visits per month	0.313	-0.022***	0.327	-0.036***	0.275	0.016	0.291
<i>Year of Release from Prison</i>							
2004	0.118	-0.014***	0.126	-0.022***	0.041	0.064***	0.105
2005	0.115	-0.002	0.123	-0.010***	0.049	0.064***	0.113
2006	0.120	0.003 <sup>†</sup>	0.127	-0.004*	0.069	0.054***	0.123
2007	0.124	0.008***	0.128	0.004*	0.095	0.037***	0.132
2008	0.129	0.006***	0.128	0.007***	0.137	-0.001	0.135
2009	0.133	0.002	0.130	0.005**	0.164	-0.029***	0.135
2010	0.131	0.001	0.122	0.009***	0.206	-0.075***	0.131
2011	0.130	-0.004*	0.116	0.010***	0.239	-0.113***	0.126

<sup>†</sup>p<.10, \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> Truncated where 3= 4 or more prior commitments.

Mean differences are calculated for each post-prison supervision release group compared to those who had no supervision to follow release from prison.

**Table 5. Effect of Post-Prison Supervision on Recidivism: Cox Proportional Hazard Regression Models**

	$\beta$	Standard Error	Hazard Ratio	N
<i>Any Type of Post-Prison Supervision</i>				
Arrest for any crime – Anytime	-0.118***	0.006	0.889	136,006
Arrest for a felony – Anytime	0.076***	0.007	1.078	122,664
Conviction – Anytime	-0.500***	0.009	0.606	75,953
Return to prison – Anytime	0.517***	0.008	1.678	79,680
<i>Split Probation/Community Control</i>				
Arrest for any crime – Anytime	-0.142***	0.007	0.868	127,976
Arrest for a felony – Anytime	0.076***	0.007	1.079	115,277
Conviction – Anytime	-0.514***	0.010	0.598	72,627
Return to prison – Anytime	0.527***	0.008	1.694	73,363
<i>Conditional Release Supervision</i>				
Arrest for any crime – Anytime	0.037*	0.015	1.038	101,194
Arrest for a felony – Anytime	0.125***	0.016	1.132	89,036
Conviction – Anytime	-0.465***	0.023	0.628	60,963
Return to prison – Anytime	0.600***	0.018	1.821	52,157

\*p&lt;.05, \*\*\*p&lt;.001

Total Observations = Any post-prison supervision: 201,447; Split Probation/CC: 189,252; Conditional Release: 144,678

**Table 6. Effect of Length of Time on Post-Prison Supervision on Recidivism: Cox Proportional Hazard Regression Models**

	$\beta$	Standard Error	Hazard Ratio	N
<i>Split Probation/Community Control</i>				
Arrest for any crime – Anytime	-0.039***	0.004	0.962	31,380
Arrest for a felony – Anytime	-0.022***	0.004	0.978	30,478
Conviction – Anytime	-0.027***	0.006	0.973	13,604
Return to prison – Anytime	0.009*	0.004	1.009	24,789
<i>Conditional Release Supervision</i>				
Arrest for any crime – Anytime	-0.029***	0.004	0.971	5,048
Arrest for a felony – Anytime	-0.007	0.004	0.993	4,663
Conviction – Anytime	-0.023***	0.007	0.978	2,121
Return to prison – Anytime	0.025***	0.005	1.026	3,939

\*p<.05, \*\*\*p<.001

Total Observations = Split Probation/CC: 51,388; Conditional Release: 7,444

**Table 7. Effect of Any Post-Prison Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Logistic Regression Models (Control Covariates Not Presented)**

<b>Recidivism Measure</b>	$\beta$	O.R.	$\chi^2$	R <sup>2</sup>	N
<i>Arrest for any crime (excluding technical violations)</i>					
One Year	-0.184***	0.832	32,243.696***	0.201	201,447
Two Years	-0.207***	0.813	37,159.584***	0.238	190,160
Three Years	-0.204***	0.816	35,669.1105***	0.183	176,893
<i>Arrest for a felony (excluding technical violations)</i>					
One Year	0.181***	1.199	24,274.216***	0.159	201,447
Two Years	0.128***	1.136	28,096.403***	0.189	184,548
Three Years	0.115***	1.122	25,239.351***	0.197	158,254
<i>Conviction</i>					
One Year	-0.399***	0.671	16,335.188***	0.130	201,420
Two Years	-0.515***	0.598	21,422.102***	0.156	188,850
Three Years	-0.586***	0.557	21,490.562***	0.171	162,729
<i>Return to Prison</i>					
One Year	1.526***	4.601	9,264.523***	0.121	201,447
Two Years	0.984***	2.675	13,310.541***	0.113	201,447
Three Years	0.787***	2.197	13,669.084***	0.115	175,965
<b>Post-Prison Employment</b>					
Employed within the first quarter	0.120***	1.127	56,630.296***	0.339	201,447

\*\*\*p<.001

O.R. = Odds Ratio

**Table 8. Effect of Post-Prison Release Split Probation/Community Control Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Logistic Regression Models (Control Covariates Not Presented)**

<b>Recidivism Measure</b>	$\beta$	O.R.	$\chi^2$	R <sup>2</sup>	N
<i>Arrest for any crime (excluding technical violations)</i>					
One Year	-0.229***	0.796	30,625.768***	0.203	189,252
Two Years	-0.253***	0.777	35,070.118***	0.238	178,950
Three Years	-0.225***	0.798	28,695.409***	0.239	149,725
<i>Arrest for a felony (excluding technical violations)</i>					
One Year	0.186***	1.204	23,135.682***	0.162	189,252
Two Years	0.124***	1.132	28,514.574***	0.197	178,084
Three Years	0.112***	1.118	24,017.379***	0.199	149,725
<i>Conviction</i>					
One Year	-0.408***	0.665	15,647.124***	0.132	189,229
Two Years	-0.526***	0.591	20,540.472***	0.158	177,860
Three Years	-0.590***	0.554	20,540.849***	0.173	153,874
<i>Return to Prison</i>					
One Year	1.537***	4.652	7,671.434***	0.114	189,252
Two Years	1.008***	2.739	11,713.668***	0.108	189,252
Three Years	0.810***	2.249	12,549.687***	0.113	166,053
<b>Post-Prison Employment</b>					
Employed within the first quarter	0.104***	1.110	54,421.711***	0.346	189,252

\*\*\*p<.001

O.R. = Odds Ratio

**Table 9. Effect of Post-Prison Release Conditional Release Supervision on Recidivism and Employment:  
Logistic Regression Models (Control Covariates Not Presented)**

<b>Recidivism Measure</b>	$\beta$	O.R.	$\chi^2$	R <sup>2</sup>	N
<i>Arrest for any crime (excluding technical violations)</i>					
One Year	0.102***	1.107	22,602.956***	0.195	144,678
Two Years	0.115***	1.122	25,187.277***	0.227	136,588
Three Years	0.110**	1.116	27,517.213***	0.276	127,435
<i>Arrest for a felony (excluding technical violations)</i>					
One Year	0.243***	1.275	17,847.932***	0.163	144,678
Two Years	0.255***	1.290	20,430.003***	0.191	132,040
Three Years	0.237***	1.267	18,092.868***	0.199	112,576
<i>Conviction</i>					
One Year	-0.361***	0.697	11,699.335***	0.125	144,654
Two Years	-0.475***	0.622	14,857.670***	0.147	135,253
Three Years	-0.563***	0.570	14,574.267***	0.161	115,879
<i>Return to Prison</i>					
One Year	1.618***	5.043	3,886.516***	0.095	144,678
Two Years	1.010***	2.745	7,057.013***	0.093	144,678
Three Years	0.821***	2.273	8,077.489***	0.101	125,716
<b>Post-Prison Employment</b>					
Employed within the first quarter	0.165***	1.180	41,146.227***	0.345	144,678

\*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

O.R. = Odds Ratio



**Table 10. Effect of Length of Time (in years) on Post-Prison Release Split Probation/Community Control Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Logistic Regression Models (Control Covariates Not Presented)**

<b>Recidivism Measure</b>	$\beta$	O.R.	$\chi^2$	R <sup>2</sup>	N
<i>Arrest for any crime (excluding technical violations)</i>					
One Year	-0.049***	0.952	7,698.440***	0.196	51,388
Two Years	-0.050***	0.951	9,490.949***	0.237	48,453
Three Years	-0.056***	0.945	8,650.568***	0.254	41,212
<i>Arrest for a felony (excluding technical violations)</i>					
One Year	-0.035***	0.966	6,132.959***	0.158	51,388
Two Years	-0.034***	0.967	7,508.309***	0.191	48,555
Three Years	-0.033***	0.967	6,655.209***	0.199	41,212
<i>Conviction</i>					
One Year	-0.015	0.985	3,071.881***	0.111	51,385
Two Years	-0.016 <sup>†</sup>	0.985	3,720.341***	0.119	48,496
Three Years	-0.029***	0.972	3,548.632***	0.121	42,301
<i>Return to Prison</i>					
One Year	-0.021*	0.979	1,278.009***	0.047	51,388
Two Years	-0.005	0.995	2,635.949***	0.076	51,388
Three Years	0.008	1.008	3,046.739***	0.092	45,422
<b>Post-Prison Employment</b>					
Employed within the first quarter	0.019*	1.019	14,894.264***	0.344	51,388

<sup>†</sup>p<.10, \*p<.05, \*\*\*p<.001

O.R. = Odds Ratio

**Table 11. Effect of Length of Time (in months) on Post-Prison Release Conditional Release Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Logistic Regression Models (Control Covariates Not Presented)**

<b>Recidivism Measure</b>	$\beta$	O.R.	$\chi^2$	R <sup>2</sup>	N
<i>Arrest for any crime (excluding technical violations)</i>					
One Year	-0.052***	0.950	1,163.337***	0.194	7,444
Two Years	-0.051***	0.951	1,376.931***	0.254	6,705
Three Years	-0.038***	0.962	1,672.900***	0.360	6,039
<i>Arrest for a felony (excluding technical violations)</i>					
One Year	-0.008	0.992	726.710***	0.127	7,444
Two Years	-0.011	0.989	801.849***	0.162	6,199
Three Years	-0.000	1.000	723.912***	0.198	4,612
<i>Conviction</i>					
One Year	-0.019 <sup>†</sup>	0.981	457.897***	0.103	7,440
Two Years	-0.022*	0.978	516.492***	0.115	6,501
Three Years	-0.020*	0.980	481.321***	0.135	4,865
<i>Return to Prison</i>					
One Year	0.015 <sup>†</sup>	1.015	166.968***	0.036	7,444
Two Years	0.041***	1.042	308.627***	0.058	7,444
Three Years	0.042***	1.043	262.245***	0.061	5,674
<b>Post-Prison Employment</b>					
Employed within the first quarter	0.034***	1.035	1,371.609***	0.244	7,444

<sup>†</sup>p<.10, \*p<.05, \*\*\*p<.001

O.R. = Odds Ratio

**Table 12. Effect of Any Post-Prison Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Precision Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented)**

	$\beta$	Odds Ratio	N
<b>Recidivism Measure</b>			
<i>Arrest for any crime (excluding technical violations)</i>			
One Year	-0.188***	0.829	26,739
Two Years	-0.199***	0.819	25,314
Three Years	-0.217***	0.804	23,650
<i>Arrest for a felony (excluding technical violations)</i>			
One Year	0.134***	1.144	26,739
Two Years	0.073**	1.076	24,605
Three Years	0.031	1.032	21,238
<i>Conviction</i>			
One Year	-0.366***	0.693	26,732
Two Years	-0.490***	0.613	25,167
Three Years	-0.587***	0.556	21,814
<i>Return to Prison</i>			
One Year	1.457***	4.295	26,739
Two Years	0.908***	2.480	26,739
Three Years	0.706***	2.026	23,494
<b>Post-Prison Employment</b>			
Employed within the first quarter	0.173***	1.189	26,739

\*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

**Table 13. Effect of Post-Prison Split Probation/Community Control Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Precision Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented)**

	$\beta$	Odds Ratio	N
<b>Recidivism Measure</b>			
<i>Arrest for any crime (excluding technical violations)</i>			
One Year	-0.221***	0.802	23,234
Two Years	-0.230***	0.795	22,047
Three Years	-0.224***	0.800	18,619
<i>Arrest for a felony (excluding technical violations)</i>			
One Year	0.140***	1.150	23,234
Two Years	0.080**	1.084	21,968
Three Years	0.053 <sup>†</sup>	1.055	18,619
<i>Conviction</i>			
One Year	-0.362***	0.697	23,231
Two Years	-0.476***	0.621	21,974
Three Years	-0.551***	0.576	19,114
<i>Return to Prison</i>			
One Year	1.494***	4.453	23,234
Two Years	0.944***	2.570	23,234
Three Years	0.737***	2.091	20,549
<b>Post-Prison Employment</b>			
Employed within the first quarter	0.189***	1.207	23,234

<sup>†</sup>p<.10, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

**Table 14. Effect of Post-Prison Conditional Release Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Precision Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented)**

	$\beta$	Odds Ratio	N
<b>Recidivism Measure</b>			
<i>Arrest for any crime (excluding technical violations)</i>			
One Year	0.061	1.063	3,426
Two Years	0.136	1.146	3,197
Three Years	0.063	1.065	2,998
<i>Arrest for a felony (excluding technical violations)</i>			
One Year	0.127	1.135	3,426
Two Years	0.197*	1.219	3,027
Three Years	0.108	1.114	2,486
<i>Conviction</i>			
One Year	-0.403***	0.668	3,420
Two Years	-0.534***	0.586	3,123
Three Years	-0.688***	0.503	2,579
<i>Return to Prison</i>			
One Year	1.364***	3.911	3,426
Two Years	0.740***	2.096	3,426
Three Years	0.626***	1.870	2,855
<b>Post-Prison Employment</b>			
Employed within the first quarter	-0.086	0.917	3,426

\*p<.05, \*\*\*p<.001

**Table 15. Effect of Any Post-Prison Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Propensity Score Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented)**

	Unmatched Sample				Matched Sample				
	Supervised	No Supervision	t-value	n	Supervised	No Supervision	Difference	t-value	n
<b>Recidivism Measure</b>									
<i>Arrest for any crime (excluding technical violations)</i>									
One Year	0.325	0.404	-33.90	201,447	0.338	0.368	-0.029***	-10.33	195,068
Two Years	0.493	0.586	-38.11	190,160	0.510	0.545	-0.035***	-11.62	184,275
Three Years	0.611	0.699	-36.72	176,893	0.629	0.665	-0.036***	-11.97	171,319
<i>Arrest for a felony (excluding technical violations)</i>									
One Year	0.317	0.314	1.66	201,447	0.328	0.286	0.041***	15.31	195,068
Two Years	0.461	0.473	-4.60	184,548	0.473	0.440	0.033***	10.94	178,672
Three Years	0.546	0.563	-6.32	158,254	0.558	0.527	0.031***	9.22	152,834
<i>Conviction</i>									
One Year	0.126	0.192	-36.95	201,420	0.131	0.174	-0.043***	-20.51	195,043
Two Years	0.193	0.306	-51.86	188,850	0.202	0.283	-0.080***	-30.97	182,867
Three Years	0.240	0.385	-58.14	162,729	0.251	0.357	-0.106***	-35.43	157,285
<i>Return to Prison</i>									
One Year	0.129	0.031	86.02	201,447	0.128	0.031	0.096***	61.82	195,068
Two Years	0.237	0.107	77.37	201,447	0.236	0.103	0.132***	61.18	195,068
Three Years	0.310	0.177	63.30	175,965	0.308	0.170	0.137***	51.88	170,277
<b>Post-Prison Employment</b>									
Employed within the first quarter	0.353	0.332	9.15	201,447	0.353	0.333	0.020***	7.09	201,447

\*\*\*p<.001

**Table 16. Effect of Post-Prison Split Probation/Community Control Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Propensity Score Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented)**

	Unmatched Sample				Matched Sample				
	Supervised	No Supervision	t-value	n	Supervised	No Supervision	Difference	t-value	n
<b>Recidivism Measure</b>									
<i>Arrest for any crime (excluding technical violations)</i>									
One Year	0.309	0.404	-37.83	189,252	0.318	0.351	-0.033***	-10.89	186,092
Two Years	0.474	0.586	-42.62	178,950	0.486	0.532	-0.046***	-14.04	175,997
Three Years	0.560	0.314	-36.85	149,725	0.571	0.614	-0.042***	-11.98	146,813
<i>Arrest for a felony (excluding technical violations)</i>									
One Year	0.312	0.314	-0.92	189,252	0.318	0.275	0.043***	14.81	186,092
Two Years	0.465	0.485	-7.63	178,084	0.474	0.439	0.035***	10.59	175,060
Three Years	0.540	0.563	-7.91	149,725	0.549	0.519	0.029***	8.21	146,813
<i>Conviction</i>									
One Year	0.122	0.192	-36.06	189,229	0.125	0.170	-0.044***	-19.52	186,067
Two Years	0.188	0.306	-50.12	177,860	0.194	0.273	-0.079***	-28.41	174,827
Three Years	0.236	0.385	-55.49	153,874	0.244	0.347	-0.103***	-32.19	150,958
<i>Return to Prison</i>									
One Year	0.121	0.031	77.27	189,252	0.122	0.028	0.092***	56.52	186,092
Two Years	0.227	0.107	68.09	189,252	0.228	0.096	0.132***	56.75	186,092
Three Years	0.301	0.177	55.94	166,053	0.301	0.162	0.139***	48.84	163,067
<b>Post-Prison Employment</b>									
Employed within the first quarter	0.365	0.332	13.55	189,252	0.365	0.339	0.026***	8.50	186,092

\*\*\*p<.001

**Table 17. Effect of Post-Prison Conditional Release Supervision on Recidivism and Employment: Propensity Score Matching Models (Matched Covariates Not Presented)**

	Unmatched Sample				Matched Sample				
	Supervised	No Supervision	t-value	n	Supervised	No Supervision	Difference	t-value	n
<b>Recidivism Measure</b>									
<i>Arrest for any crime (excluding technical violations)</i>									
One Year	0.437	0.404	5.82	144,678	0.435	0.437	-0.003	-0.30	144,304
Two Years	0.632	0.586	7.43	136,588	0.628	0.616	0.012	1.42	136,283
Three Years	0.755	0.699	9.33	127,435	0.751	0.732	0.020***	2.40	127,155
<i>Arrest for a felony (excluding technical violations)</i>									
One Year	0.379	0.314	11.84	144,678	0.375	0.353	0.021***	2.71	144,304
Two Years	0.545	0.473	11.19	132,040	0.540	0.507	0.033***	3.60	131,773
Three Years	0.622	0.563	7.87	112,576	0.617	0.591	0.025***	2.45	112,410
<i>Conviction</i>									
One Year	0.156	0.192	-7.71	144,654	0.154	0.229	-0.074***	-11.30	144,281
Two Years	0.189	0.306	-49.94	177,767	0.194	0.277	-0.083***	-29.76	174,796
Three Years	0.288	0.385	-13.60	115,879	0.288	0.424	-0.136***	-13.93	115,701
<i>Return to Prison</i>									
One Year	0.121	0.031	77.20	189,153	0.122	0.029	0.093***	55.84	186,055
Two Years	0.303	0.107	51.67	144,678	0.300	0.141	0.158***	23.25	144,304
Three Years	0.381	0.177	38.73	125,716	0.376	0.221	0.155***	17.94	125,503
<b>Post-Prison Employment</b>									
Employed within the first quarter	0.272	0.332	-10.80	144,678	0.275	0.281	-0.006	-0.84	144,304

\*\*\*p<.001