



ICPSR 3584

Evaluation of Adult Community Supervision Strategies in Multnomah County, Oregon, 1995, 1998, and 2000 Cohorts

Kelly Dedel Johnson

James Austin

Garth Davies

*George Washington University, The Institute
on Crime, Justice and Corrections*

User Guide

First ICPSR Version
September 2003



National Institute of Justice
Data Resources Program



Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Terms of Use

Bibliographic Citation: Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Dedel Johnson, Kelly, James Austin, and Garth Davies.
EVALUATION OF ADULT COMMUNITY SUPERVISION
STRATEGIES IN MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON, 1995,
1998, AND 2000 COHORTS [Computer file]. ICPSR version.
Washington, DC: George Washington University, Institute on
Crime, Justice and Corrections [producer], 2002. Ann Arbor,
MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social
Research [distributor], 2003.

Request for Information on Use of ICPSR Resources: To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Visit the ICPSR Web site for more information on submitting citations.

Data Disclaimer: The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.

Responsible Use Statement: In preparing data for public release, ICPSR performs a number of procedures to ensure that the identity of research subjects cannot be disclosed. Any intentional identification or disclosure of a person or establishment violates the assurances of confidentiality given to the providers of the information. Therefore, users of data obtained from the ICPSR archive and/or any of its special topic archives agree:

- To use these datasets solely for statistical analysis and reporting of aggregated information, and not for investigation of specific individuals or organizations, except when identification is authorized in writing by ICPSR
- To make no use of the identity of any person or establishment discovered inadvertently, and to advise ICPSR of any such discovery
- To produce no links among ICPSR datasets or among ICPSR data and other datasets that could identify individuals or organizations

Redistribution: ICPSR data may not be redistributed or sold to other individuals, institutions, or organizations without the written agreement of ICPSR.

Table of Contents

	Page
Summary.....	1
General Study Overview.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Methods.....	3
Study Design.....	3
Sources of Information.....	5
Sample.....	5
Response Rates.....	5
Date(s) of Data Collection.....	5
Summary of Contents.....	5
Description of Variables.....	5
Presence of Common Scales.....	6
Unit of Observation.....	6
Geographic Unit.....	6
Extent of Processing.....	6
Extent of Collection.....	6
Data Collection Notes.....	6
Restrictions.....	6
File Specifications.....	6
Publications.....	7
Related Publications.....	7
Final Reports and Other Publications.....	7
NIJ Data Resources Program.....	7
About the DRP.....	7
Data Completeness Report(s).....	9

Summary

This study was undertaken to determine whether a new form of community supervision in Multnomah County, Oregon, had been properly implemented and to determine its impact on public safety, as well as to assess recidivism rates in light of the revised supervision. A quasi-experimental design was employed using non-randomized comparison groups consisting of offenders admitted to community supervision in Multnomah County, Oregon, in 1995, 1998, and 2000. Administrative records data were collected from the Oregon Department of Corrections, Multnomah County Department of Community Justice, Portland Police Departments, Multnomah County Sheriff, the District Attorney's office, and court records.

General Study Overview

- Title:** Evaluation of Adult Community Supervision Strategies in Multnomah County, Oregon, 1995, 1998, and 2000 Cohorts
- Principal Investigator(s):** Kelly Dedel Johnson, James Austin, Garth Davies
- Investigator(s) Affiliation:** George Washington University, The Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections
- Grant Number:** 00-IJ-CX-0029
- Purpose of the Study:** Community justice departments across the nation are continually pressured to implement higher-intensity modes of supervision for serious offenders without the benefit of expanded resources. This study sought to examine one county's response to these pressures. In 1997, the Multnomah County Department of Community Justice in Oregon launched an ambitious effort to change the way in which adult community supervision services were provided by launching a new mode of supervision. The overall goal of the redesign was to refocus time and resources on high-risk offenders, while providing less restrictive modes of supervision to lower-risk offenders, without jeopardizing public safety. Specifically, the redesign required increased transfers of limited and low-risk probationers and parolees to a casebank caseload. Casebank provides minimal face-to-face supervision and compliance reviews, thereby conserving departmental resources for offenders who demonstrate a higher risk to re-offend. The redesign also provided differing service levels responding to the offenders' risks and needs, as well as a mechanism for the efficient transfer of offenders between caseloads, in response to their behavior. This study was undertaken to determine whether the new form of supervision had been properly implemented and to determine its impact on public safety, as well as to assess recidivism rates in light of the revised supervision.

Methods

- Study Design:** A quasi-experimental design was employed using non-randomized comparison groups consisting of offenders admitted to community supervision in 1995, 1998, and 2000. The 1995 cohort represents offenders processed through the traditional system of community supervision. The next two cohorts were exposed to a new form of supervision that relied on strategic decisions about supervision intensity and access to treatment resources, based on objective risk assessments. The 1998 cohort reflects offenders exposed to the first version of the new system of community supervision, while the 2000 cohort reflects the system of supervision as it had developed over time to become fully institutionalized within the department. At the outset of this research, the plan was to draw a sample of offenders from each

admission cohort and to combine both automated data and manual data collection efforts to obtain the full scope of information needed for the study. However, researchers found that sufficient automated data were available to permit the inclusion of entire admission cohorts, which increased the external validity of the findings and eliminated sampling bias. First, a list of offenders admitted to community supervision during each of the target years (1995, 1998, or 2000) was requested from the Oregon Department of Corrections, which is the state's repository for all community supervision data. An admission was defined as an offender admitted to supervision (a) for a new crime for which he or she was given a sentence to probation, (b) after serving a prison sentence with additional time to serve on parole or post-prison supervision, (c) upon returning to active supervision after previously absconding, or (d) upon moving into Multnomah County from active supervision in another county or state. These conditions, in combination, captured the population of offenders "newly exposed" to community supervision during a given year. It excluded those who might have received supervision during a given year as the result of an admission from a previous year. Once the cohorts were identified, a variety of data were obtained from several criminal justice agencies. Data on demographics, current offense, legal status, and caseload assignments (Part 1 and 2) were obtained directly from the Multnomah County Department of Community Justice (DCJ). Part 2 also includes risk/supervision-level data collected from the Oregon Department of Corrections. Data in Part 3 were collected on a targeted sample from four sources: (1) The Oregon Department of Corrections sent the DCJ a monthly snapshot which included information on every offender on community supervision that month. Monthly snapshots were obtained from January 1995 through June 2001. Offenders who were not part of the cohort were deleted from the files. These data were used both to describe the different cohorts and to examine differences across caseload types and supervision levels on various outcome measures. (2) Information on arrests and convictions was obtained from the data warehouse, Decision Support System-Justice (DSS-Justice), which contained integrated, individual-level data from law enforcement (Portland Police Departments and the Multnomah County Sheriff), the District Attorney, and the Courts. DSS-Justice provided arrest and conviction data for each offender in the sample. For the 1995 and 1998 cohorts, data covered two years subsequent to the admission date (follow-up data) and two years prior to the admission date (prior history data). For the 2000 cohort, the follow-up period was limited to one year in order to complete the research during the grant period. These data were used to describe the offenders' criminal justice histories and also included data for the key outcome measure--re-arrest. (3) Data describing the intensity of supervision of offenders in the sample were obtained from the Oregon Department of Corrections, which is the repository of the County's community supervision data. To this end, for each offender, chronological records of all supervision contacts were provided, including the type of contact (e.g., person-to-person, telephone, mail, etc.) and the person contacted (e.g., offender,

employer, etc.), for the entire period of supervision. These data permitted an assessment of whether the type and intensity of supervision varied across caseload types. (4) Finally, data on the use of sanctions were extracted for the DCJ's Sanctions Tracking Data Base. This database, created in 1997, contained information on the non-complaint behavior triggering the sanction (i.e., the conditions violated) and the specific type and duration of the sanction imposed. These data were obtained for the 1998 and 2000 cohorts, covering the entire period of supervision for each offender. Data of this kind were not available to assess the use of sanctions for the 1995 cohort. For Part 1, DCJ data were collected for the full study cohort (10,094 in 1995, 12,565 in 1998, and 13,632 in 2000). In order to complete the study during the required time frame, the 2000 cohort used in Parts 2 and 3 was limited to offenders admitted between January 1 and June 30, 2000 (N = 9,604).

Sources of Information: Administrative records data were collected from the Oregon Department of Corrections, Multnomah County Department of Community Justice, Portland Police Departments, Multnomah County Sheriff, District Attorney's office, and court records.

Sample: Any offender in Multnomah County, Oregon, admitted to community supervision during 1995 (N = 10,094), 1998 (N = 12,565), and 2000 (N = 13,632) was targeted for inclusion in the study. In order to complete the study during the required time frame, the 2000 cohort was limited to offenders admitted between January 1 and June 30, 2000 (N = 9,604). For Parts 2 and 3, certain groups of offenders were excluded from the research because they were not actually subjected to community supervision. The final targeted sample of cohorts used in Part 3 included 8,506 offenders from the 1995 cohort, 10,794 from 1998, and 8,353 from the 2000 cohort.

Date of Collection: 2001

Summary of Contents

Description of Variables: Data for Part 1 include date offender entered their first and second caseload, caseload type, caseload category, conviction charge description, category, subcategory, level and class, offense severity score, and admittance date. Demographic variables included are race, sex, and age. Variables for Part 2 include actual and calculated supervision levels for prior history and follow-up periods of observation. Data unique to Part 3 include the most serious prior arrest and conviction, number of contacts with offender, administration, legal, or supervisory treatment, most serious rearrest and reconviction, dates of rearrest and reconviction, recommended sanction, imposed sanction, and sanction supervision type.

- Presence of Common Scales: None.
- Unit of Observation: Individuals.
- Geographic Unit: None.
- Extent of Processing: Missing data codes were standardized ICPSR. ICPSR checked for undocumented codes, produced a codebook, generated SAS and SPSS data definition statements, converted the hardcopy documentation to a PDF file, and reformatted the data and documentation.
- Extent of Collection: This data collection contains three data files with a PDF user guide and a codebook in a separate PDF file, and SAS and SPSS data definition statements.
- Data Collection Notes: The user guide and codebook are provided by ICPSR as Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat Reader is provided on the ICPSR Web site.
- Restrictions: The data are restricted from general dissemination. Users interested in obtaining these data must complete a Data Transfer Agreement Form and specify the reasons for the request. A copy of the Data Transfer Agreement Form can be requested by calling 800-999-0960 or 734-647-5000. The Data Transfer Agreement Form is also available as a Portable Document Format (PDF) file from the NACJD Web site at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/Private/private.pdf>. Completed forms should be returned to: Director, National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Institute for Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248, or by fax: 734-647-8200.

File Specifications

<i>Part No.</i>	<i>Part Name</i>	<i>File Structure</i>	<i>Case Count</i>	<i>Variable Count</i>	<i>LRECL</i>	<i>Records Per Case</i>
1	Caseload and Offense Data for 1995, 1998, and 2000 Cohorts (Full Calendar Years)	rectangular	36,291	46	340	1
2	Caseload, Offense, and Supervision Data for 1995 and 1998 Cohorts (Full Calendar Years), and 2000 Cohort (Half Calendar Year)	rectangular	32,263	118	438	1
3	Targeted Sample Data	rectangular	27,653	303	1,128	1

Publications

Related Publications: Dedel Johnson, Kelly, James Austin, and Garth Davies. "Banking Low-Risk Offenders: Is It a Good Investment?" NCJ 201304. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, June 2002.

Final Reports and Other Publications: The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) was established in 1972 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), of the U.S. Department of Justice, to provide research findings to criminal justice professionals and researchers. NCJRS operates specialized clearinghouses that are staffed by information specialists who supply a range of reference, referral, and distribution services. Final reports and other publications describing research conducted on a variety of criminal justice topics are available. Publications can be obtained from NCJRS at NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD, 20849-6000, 800-851-3420 or 301-519-5500. TTY Service for the Hearing Impaired is 877-712-9279 (toll-free) or 301-947-8374 (local). The URL for the NCJRS Web site is:

<http://www.ncjrs.org/>

NIJ Data Resources Program

About the DRP: The National Institute of Justice Data Resources Program (DRP) makes datasets from NIJ-funded research and evaluation projects available to the research community and sponsors research and training activities devoted to secondary data analysis. Datasets are archived by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

The NACJD maintains a World Wide Web site with instructions for transferring files and sending messages. Criminal justice data funded by the Department of Justice are available via the Internet at this site at no charge to the user. NACJD may be contacted at NACJD/ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, 800-999-0960 or 734-647-5000. The URL for the NACJD Web site is:

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/>

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3584.P1

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```
=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
(Total cases=36291)                                  Missing Values
-----
```

41.3% (19 of 46 variables) have 0% Missing Values

13.0% (6 of 46 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

39.1% (18 of 46 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 46 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

2.2% (1 of 46 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

O_LEVEL OFFENSE LEVEL 8.1%

0.0% (0 of 46 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

4.3% (2 of 46 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

CASENO2 CASELOAD - SECOND 26.9%

CASETWO CASELOAD TYPE - SECOND 27.4%

```
=====
*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
in the data as coded.
```


DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3584.P2

Table 2: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                               Percent of Cases with
(Total cases=32263)                                  Missing Values
=====
  
```

15.3% (18 of 118 variables) have 0% Missing Values

3.4% (4 of 118 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

12.7% (15 of 118 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

3.4% (4 of 118 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

5.9% (7 of 118 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

CLC2	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 2	5.7%
CLC3	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 3	7.5%
CALSLVLF	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - TIME 1	7.7%
ACTSLVLF	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - TIME 1	7.7%
CALSLVLL	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL-TIME 12/24	7.7%
ACTSLVLL	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - TIME 12/24	7.7%
CLC4	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 4	9.3%

14.4% (17 of 118 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

CLC5	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 5	11.1%
CLC6	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 6	12.7%
CLC7	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 7	14.7%
ACTSL4	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 4	15.9%
CALSL4	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 4	15.9%
ACTSL3	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 3	16.5%
CALSL3	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 3	16.5%
CLC8	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 8	16.8%
ACTSL5	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 5	16.9%
CALSL5	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 5	16.9%
ACTSL2	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	17.4%
CALSL2	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	17.4%
ACTSL6	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 6	18.1%
CALSL6	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 6	18.1%

=====

Table 2 (continued)

Variable Name and Label		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
CLC9	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 9	18.8%
ACTSL7	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 7	19.7%
CALSL7	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 7	19.7%
16.9% (20 of 118 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values		
ACTSL8	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 8	21.2%
CALSL8	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 8	21.2%
CLC10	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 10	21.3%
ACTSL1	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	22.5%
CALSL1	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	22.5%
ACTSL9	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 9	22.8%
CALSL9	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 9	22.8%
CLC11	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 11	24.1%
ACTSL10	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 10	25.0%
CALSL10	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	25.0%
CASENO2	CASELOAD - SECOND	26.2%
CASETWO	CASELOAD TYPE - SECOND	26.6%
CLC12	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 12	27.2%
ACTSL11	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 11	27.3%
CALSL11	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	27.3%
ACTSL12	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 12	30.3%
CALSL12	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	30.3%
CLC13	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 13	31.5%
ACTSL13	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 13	34.4%
CALSL13	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	34.4%
28.0% (33 of 118 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values		
CLC14	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 14	49.6%
CLC15	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 15	51.6%
ACTSL14	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 14	52.1%
CALSL14	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	52.1%
CLC16	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 16	53.4%
ACTSL15	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 15	53.9%
CALSL15	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	53.9%
CLC17	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 17	54.9%
ACTSL16	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 16	55.5%
CALSL16	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	55.5%
CLC18	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 18	56.7%
ACTSL17	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 17	57.0%
CALSL17	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	57.0%

Table 2 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
ACTSL18 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 18	58.7%
CALSL18 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	58.7%
CLC19 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 19	59.0%
ACTSL19 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 19	60.8%
CALSL19 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	60.8%
CLC20 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 20	61.6%
ACTSL20 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 20	63.3%
CALSL20 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	63.3%
CLC21 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 21	64.2%
ACTSL21 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 21	65.8%
CALSL21 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	65.8%
CLC22 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 22	66.6%
ACTSL22 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 22	68.0%
CALSL22 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	68.0%
CLC23 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 23	69.1%
ACTSL23 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 23	70.4%
CALSL23 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	70.4%
CLC24 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 24	72.0%
ACTSL24 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 24	73.2%
CALSL24 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	73.2%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
 Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
 in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3584.P3

Table 3: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
(Total cases=27653)                                  Missing Values
-----
21.5% (65 of 303 variables) have 0% Missing Values

4.0% (12 of 303 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

2.6% (8 of 303 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

1.7% (5 of 303 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

1.0% (3 of 303 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

O_LEVEL  OFFENSE LEVEL                                5.3%
CLC4     CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 4                      6.5%
CLC5     CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 5                      8.5%

7.3% (22 of 303 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

CLC6     CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 6                      10.2%
CLC7     CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 7                      12.5%
ACTSL4   ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 4          12.7%
CALSL4   CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 4      12.7%
ACTSL3   ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 3          13.3%
CALSL3   CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 3      13.3%
ACTSL5   ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 5          13.8%
CALSL5   CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 5      13.8%
CLC1_RC1 CASELOAD-INIT-GEN/SPEC/CSBK/NO SHOW ONL      14.1%
ACTSL2   ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2          14.3%
CALSL2   CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2      14.3%
CLC8     CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 8                      14.7%
ACTSL6   ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 6          15.1%
CALSL6   CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 6      15.1%
ACTSL7   ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 7          16.8%
CALSL7   CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 7      16.8%
CLC9     CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 9                      16.9%
ACTSL8   ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 8          18.5%
=====

```

Table 3 (continued)

Variable Name and Label		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
CALSL8	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 8	18.5%
ACTSL1	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	19.4%
CALSL1	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	19.4%
CLC10	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 10	19.6%

25.4% (77 of 303 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

ACTSL9	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 9	20.2%
CALSL9	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 9	20.2%
CONTS_1	MONTH 1 - TOTAL # OF CONTACTS	22.5%
ACTSL10	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 10	22.5%
CALSL10	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	22.5%
CLC11	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 11	22.6%
CONTTYP1	CONTACT TYPE-SUPV/TRT-PERSON TO PERSON	23.0%
CONTWHO2	CONTACT WHO - COLLATERAL	23.3%
CASENO2	CASELOAD - SECOND	24.3%
CASETWO	CASELOAD TYPE - SECOND	24.6%
CONTTYP2	CONTACT TYPE-SUPV/TRT-ADMINISTRATIVE	25.0%
ACTSL11	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 11	25.1%
CALSL11	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	25.1%
CLC12	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 12	26.0%
CONTWHO1	CONTACT WHO - OFFENDER	26.1%
ACTSL12	ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 12	28.3%
CALSL12	CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	28.3%
CLC13	CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 13	30.8%
GRPGPAR1	CONDITION GRP-GEN PROB/PAROLE 1-SUPVY	30.8%
GRPGPAR2	CONDITION GRP-GEN PROB/PAROLE 2-PENALTY	30.8%
GRPGPAR3	COND GRP-GEN PROB/PAROLE 3-RESTRICTIONS	30.8%
GRPGPAR4	CONDITION GRP-GEN PROB/PAROLE 4-TRT	30.8%
GRPSPAR1	COND GRP-SPECIAL PAROLE 1-SUPERVISORY	30.8%
GRPSPAR2	CONDITION GROUP-SPECIAL PAROLE 2-PENALT	30.8%
GRPSPAR3	COND GRP-SPECIAL PAROLE 3-RESTRICTIONS	30.8%
GRPSPAR4	CONDITION GROUP-SPECIAL PAROLE 4-TRT	30.8%
GRPSPRB1	COND GRP-SPECIAL PROBATION 1-SUPERVISOR	30.8%
GRPSPRB2	COND GRP-SPECIAL PROBATION 2-PENALTY	30.8%
GRPSPRB3	COND GRP-SPECIAL PROB 3-RESTRICTIONS	30.8%
GRPSPRB4	COND GRP-SPECIAL PROBATION 4-TRT	30.8%
RECSANC1	RECOMMENDED SANCTION 1 - JAIL	30.8%
RECSANC2	RECOMMENDED SANCTION 2 - JAIL + PROGRAM	30.8%
RECSANC3	RECOM SANCTION 3-CUSTODY UNITS ONLY PRO	30.8%
RECSANC4	RECOM SANCTION 4-NON CUSTODY UNITS PROG	30.8%
RECSANC5	RECOMMENDED SANCTION 5 - REVOKE	30.8%

Table 3 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
SANCPRG1 IMPOSED SANCTION 1 - JAIL	30.8%
SANCPRG2 IMPOSED SANCTION 2 - JAIL + PROGRAM	30.8%
SANCPRG3 IMPOSED SANC 3-CUSTODY UNITS ONLY PROG	30.8%
SANCPRG4 IMPOSED SANC 4-NON CUSTODY UNITS PROG	30.8%
SANCPRG5 IMPOSED SANCTION 5 - REVOKE	30.8%
SAN_CSLD CASELOAD - AT FIRST SANCTION EVENT	30.8%
SANCSLD1 SANCTION CASELOAD 1 - CASEBANK	30.8%
SANCSLD2 SANCTION CASELOAD 2 - GENERIC	30.8%
SANCSLD3 SANCTION CASELOAD 3 - ICM (NONE)	30.8%
SANCSLD4 SANCTION CASELOAD 4 - SPECIALIZED	30.8%
SANCSLD5 SANCTION CASELOAD 5 - LOCAL CONTROL	30.8%
SANCSLD6 SANCTION CASELOAD 6 - NO SHOW (OLD)	30.8%
SANCSLD7 SANCTION CASELOAD 7 - EXCLUDED	30.8%
SANCSLD8 SANCTION CASELOAD 8 - ABSCOND	30.8%
SANCSLVL SUPERVISION LEVEL-AT 1ST SANCTION EVENT	30.8%
SANSLVL1 SANCTION SUPERVISION LEVEL 1 - LIMITED	30.8%
SANSLVL2 SANCTION SUPERVISION LEVEL 2 - LOW	30.8%
SANSLVL3 SANCTION SUPERVISION LEVEL 3 - MEDIUM	30.8%
SANSLVL4 SANCTION SUPERVISION LEVEL 4 - HIGH	30.8%
SANSPVTP SUPV TYPE(LEGAL STATUS)-1ST SANC EVENT	30.8%
SANSPVT1 SANCTION SUPERVISION TYPE 1 - PAROLE	30.8%
SANSPVT2 SANCTION SUPERVISION TYPE 2-POST-PRISON	30.8%
SANSPVT3 SANCTION SUPERVISION TYPE 3-PROBATION	30.8%
ACTSRV_Y NUMBER OF SANCTIONS ACTUALLY SERVED	30.8%
SANCTNS TOTAL NUMBER OF SANCTIONS	30.8%
SAN_EVTS NUMBER OF SANCTION EVENTS	30.8%
MS_GRP GP MOST SER VIOLATION-GEN PROB/PAROLE GRP	30.8%
MS_GRP SP MOST SER VIOLATION-SPECIAL PAROLE GRP	30.8%
MS_GRP SB MOST SER VIOLATION-SPEC PROBATION GRP	30.8%
MSVIOL MOST SERIOUS VIOLATION	30.8%
MS_RCSAN MOST SERIOUS RECOMMENDED SANCTION GROUP	30.8%
MS_SANC MOST SERIOUS IMPOSED SANCTION GROUP	30.8%
MS_ACTSV MOST SERIOUS SANCTION - ACTUALLY SERVED	30.8%
VIOLTNS TOTAL NUMBER OF VIOLATIONS	30.8%
VIOLS_RC VIOLATIONS - RECODE	30.8%
SANEV_RC SANCTION EVENTS - RECODE	30.8%
SANC_DY SANCTION DUMMY	30.8%
CTYP1_1 MONTH 1-# CONTACTS-TYPE-SUPV/TRT-PER-PE	31.3%
ACTSL13 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 13	32.9%
CALSL13 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	32.9%
CLC1_RC2 CASELOAD-INITIAL-CASEBANK VS GENERIC	35.0%
CWH01_1 MONTH 1-# CONTACTS-WHO-OFFENDER	39.2%

Table 3 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
36.6% (111 of 303 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values	
CWHO2_1 MONTH 1-# CONTACTS-WHO-COLLATERAL	40.1%
CLC1_RC3 CASELOAD-INITIAL-GENERIC VS SPECIALIZED	42.2%
CTYP2_1 MONTH 1-# CONTACTS-TYPE-SUPV/TRT-ADMIN	46.0%
CONTS_6 MONTH 6 - TOTAL # OF CONTACTS	47.8%
CLC14 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 14	48.9%
ACTSL14 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 14	50.7%
CALSL14 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	50.7%
CLC15 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 15	51.0%
ACTSL15 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 15	52.7%
CALSL15 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	52.7%
CLC16 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 16	52.9%
ACTSL16 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 16	54.5%
CALSL16 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	54.5%
CLC17 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 17	54.7%
ACTSL17 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 17	56.1%
CALSL17 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	56.1%
CLC18 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 18	56.6%
CONTS_12 MONTH 12 - TOTAL # OF CONTACTS	57.1%
ACTSL18 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 18	57.9%
CALSL18 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	57.9%
CTYP1_6 MONTH 6-# CONTACTS-TYPE-SUPV/TRT-PER-PE	58.7%
REARRDT DATE OF FIRST REARREST (YYYYMMDD)	59.0%
REARR_YR REARREST - YEAR	59.0%
REARR_MN REARREST - MONTH	59.0%
REARR_DY REARREST - DAY	59.0%
DAYSTRAR DAYS TO REARREST	59.0%
MONSTRAR MONTHS TO REARREST	59.0%
CLC19 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 19	59.0%
MSREARR MOST SERIOUS REARREST ORSNO	59.2%
ACTSL19 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 19	60.3%
CALSL19 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 1	60.3%
CONTWHO3 CONTACT WHO - LEGAL	60.7%
CWHO1_6 MONTH 6-# CONTACTS-WHO-OFFENDER	61.6%
CLC20 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 20	61.9%
MSP_ARR MOST SERIOUS PRIOR ARREST ORSNO	62.7%
ACTSL20 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 20	63.0%
CALSL20 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	63.0%
CONTWHO5 CONTACT WHO - ADMINISTRATION	63.4%
ORN_RARR OUTCOUNT REASON - RECODE	64.2%

Table 3 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
CLC_RARR CASELOAD CATEGORY AT REARREST	64.2%
CTYP2_6 MONTH 6-# CONTACTS-TYPE-SUPV/TRT-ADMIN	64.2%
CLC21 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 21	64.8%
CWHO2_6 MONTH 6-# CONTACTS-WHO-COLLATERAL	64.9%
PA_LEVEL MOST SERIOUS PRIOR ARREST LEVEL	65.5%
ACTSL21 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 21	65.7%
CALSL21 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	65.7%
CTYP1_12 MOS 12-# CONTACTS-TYPE-SUPV/TRT-PER-PER	66.4%
ASL_RARR ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL AT REARREST	67.1%
CSL_RARR CSL-MISSINGS REPLACED W/ ACTUAL SCORES	67.1%
CLC22 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 22	67.3%
ACTSL22 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 22	68.1%
CALSL22 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	68.1%
CWHO1_12 MONTH 12-# CONTACTS-WHO-OFFENDER	69.5%
CLC23 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 23	70.0%
ACTSL23 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 23	70.7%
CALSL23 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	70.7%
CWHO2_12 MONTH 12-# CONTACTS-WHO-COLLATERAL	71.4%
CTYP2_12 MONTH 12-# CONTACTS-TYPE-SUPV/TRT-ADMIN	71.5%
CLC24 CASELOAD TYPE - PERIOD 24	73.0%
RECNVDT DATE OF FIRST RECONVICTION (YYYYMMDD)	73.1%
RECNV_YR RECONVICTION - YEAR	73.1%
RECNV_MN RECONVICTION - MONTH	73.1%
RECNV_DY RECONVICTION - DAY	73.1%
DAYSTCNV DAYS TO CONVICTION	73.1%
MONSTCNV MONTHS TO CONVICTION	73.1%
MSRECNV MOST SERIOUS RECONVICTION ORSNO	73.6%
ACTSL24 ACTUAL SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 24	73.6%
CALSL24 CALCULATED SUPERVISION LEVEL - PERIOD 2	73.6%
CONTS_18 MONTH 18 - TOTAL # OF CONTACTS	75.0%
PRIOR_A1 PRIOR ARRESTS - ONE YEAR CUTOFF	76.4%
CONTS_24 MONTH 24 - TOTAL # OF CONTACTS	80.2%
CTYP1_18 MOS 18-# CONTACTS-TYPE-SUPV/TRT-PER-PER	80.4%
TTSANC TIME TO FIRST SANCTION EVENT (DAYS)	83.2%
TTSAN_RC TIME TO 1ST VIOLATION/SANCTION-RECODE	83.2%
CWHO1_18 MONTH 18-# CONTACTS-WHO-OFFENDER	83.3%
CWHO2_18 MONTH 18-# CONTACTS-WHO-COLLATERAL	83.3%
CTYP1_24 MOS 24-# CONTACTS-TYPE-SUPV/TRT-PER-PER	83.9%
CONTWHO4 CONTACT WHO - INSTITUTION	84.0%
CTYP2_18 MONTH 18-# CONTACTS-TYPE-SUPV/TRT-ADMIN	84.0%
MSP_CNV MOST SERIOUS PRIOR CONVICTIONS ORSNO	84.3%
PC_LEVEL MOST SERIOUS PRIOR CONVICTION LEVEL	84.9%

Table 3 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
REC_CU RECOMMENDED CUSTODY UNITS	86.0%
CUSUNITS IMPOSED CUSTODY UNITS	86.2%
CWHO2_24 MONTH 24-# CONTACTS-WHO-COLLATERAL	86.2%
CWHO1_24 MONTH 24-# CONTACTS-WHO-OFFENDER	87.5%
CONTTYP3 CONTACT TYPE - INSTITUTION	87.8%
CTYP2_24 MONTH 24-# CONTACTS-TYPE-SUPV/TRT-ADMIN	88.1%
RECU_PAR RECOM CUSTODY UNITS-PAROLE/POST-PRISON	89.3%
CU_PAR IMPOSED CUSTODY UNITS-PAROLE/POST-PRISO	89.4%
CWHO5_1 MONTH 1-# CONTACTS-WHO-ADMINISTRATION	90.2%
CWHO3_1 MONTH 1-# CONTACTS-WHO-LEGAL	93.2%
CWHO5_6 MONTH 6-# CONTACTS-WHO-ADMINISTRATION	94.4%
CWHO3_6 MONTH 6-# CONTACTS-WHO-LEGAL	94.7%
CWHO3_12 MONTH 12-# CONTACTS-WHO-LEGAL	95.3%
CWHO5_12 MONTH 12-# CONTACTS-WHO-ADMINISTRATION	95.5%
RECU_PRB RECOMMENDED CUSTODY UNITS - PROBATION	96.1%
CU_PRB IMPOSED CUSTODY UNITS - PROBATION	96.2%
CWHO3_18 MONTH 18-# CONTACTS-WHO-LEGAL	97.3%
CWHO3_24 MONTH 24-# CONTACTS-WHO-LEGAL	97.5%
CWHO5_18 MONTH 18-# CONTACTS-WHO-ADMINISTRATION	97.5%
CWHO5_24 MONTH 24-# CONTACTS-WHO-ADMINISTRATION	98.0%
CWHO4_12 MONTH 12-# CONTACTS-WHO-INSTITUTION	98.1%
CWHO4_6 MONTH 6-# CONTACTS-WHO-INSTITUTION	98.3%
CWHO4_1 MONTH 1-# CONTACTS-WHO-INSTITUTION	98.4%
CWHO4_18 MONTH 18-# CONTACTS-WHO-INSTITUTION	98.5%
CWHO4_24 MONTH 24-# CONTACTS-WHO-INSTITUTION	98.6%
CTYP3_12 MONTH 12-# CONTACTS-TYPE-INSTITUTION	98.6%
CTYP3_18 MONTH 18-# CONTACTS-TYPE-INSTITUTION	98.8%
CTYP3_1 MONTH 1-#CONTACTS-TYPE-INSTITUTION	98.9%
CTYP3_24 MONTH 24-# CONTACTS-TYPE-INSTITUTION	99.0%
CTYP3_6 MONTH 6-# CONTACTS-TYPE-INSTITUTION	99.1%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
in the data as coded.