

Property Offenders

Landon, M. S. (2016). *Of jobs and jail: Outcomes for Washington state property offenders*. Olympia: Washington State Statistical Analysis Center.

Property offenders sent to prison are mostly male (68%), White (80%), Non-Hispanic (91%) and between 18 and 22 years of age (37%). Most were first time offenders (66%).

“The fact that 65.8 percent of offenders spent the entirety of their sentence in community supervision contrasts sharply with CSG’s finding that only 10 percent of offenders in Washington are given this option. This implies that the definition of property offenses created by SB 5755 may be targeting a group that can already benefit from less restrictive sentencing options. It may also be possible that property offenders have significant overlaps with other groups such as drug offenders, who are eligible for Drug Offending Sentencing Alternatives.” (pg 9)

“The main trend in significant correlations is between the percentage of time confined and any of the outcomes. Spending a lower percentage of time in confinement is associated with lower convictions and lower returns to DOC, longer periods of time until recidivism and higher rates of employment and wages upon release.” (pg 12)

Of property offenders who were convicted but not confined in prison:

- 57% had a reconviction of any kind
- 29% had a reconviction to DOC
- 62% were employed post-release

Of property offenders who were confined in prison for the first time:

- 63% had a reconviction of any kind
- 44% had a reconviction to DOC
- 54% were employed post-release

Of property offenders who were confined in prison but NOT for the first time:

- 68% had a reconviction of any kind
- 40% had a reconviction to DOC
- 51% were employed post-release

(Figure 3, pg 16)

“The main significant results appear for sex, with males more likely to serve more time in confinement, have longer sentences overall and be less likely to have been confined previously.” (pg 23)

Prins, C., Officer, K., Eddy, J. M., and Bellatty, P. (2014). *Randomized controlled trial of Measure 57 intensive drug court for medium to high risk property offenders: Preliminary outcome evaluation*. Salem: Oregon State Criminal Justice Commission.

This study is based on a multi-site randomized controlled trial compare the effectiveness of the Measure 57 Drug Courts to traditional probation. It analyzes one year charge rates and considers any new misdemeanor or felony charge a recidivating event.

“This preliminary evaluation analyzes one year charge rates for all participants in the study, as well as the mean number of new charges within one year. Participants in the drug court group show a 20.6% drop in the one year new charge rate as compared to the traditional probation or control group. New charges for drug crimes show a 36.6% drop in the drug court group as compared to the control group. While these differences are slightly outside the statistical significance range, these one year new charge rates are promising and a follow up evaluation with a longer time frame to analyze recidivism is planned.” (pg 2)

Benedict, R. W, and Huff-Corzine, L. (1997). Return to the scene of the punishment: Recidivism of male property offenders on felony probation, 1986-1989. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 34(2), pp237-252.

Challenges prior research of the day that relied on small number of counties or from a single state. This study “employs the ‘nation’s largest follow-up survey of felons on probation using 12,369 of the total 306,000 felons sentenced to probation in 1986” (Langan and Cuniff 1992)”. (pg 240)

“The success rate for this study was 67.7 percent...More importantly, prior drug use was a good indicator of rearrest. Male felony offenders on probation for a property offense were more likely to be rearrested than offenders who did not have a prior history of drug abuse.” (pg248)

“Thus, we conclude that felony probation for property offenders in the United States is a viable alternative to incarceration and that lawmakers and criminal justice personnel should not be too quick to dispel its effectiveness.” (pg 249).