WASHINGTON STATE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CENTER

Criminal Justice Research & Statistics Center

Informing a data-driven justice system

Washington State's Sentencing Guidelines and Offender Score

Vasiliki Georgoulas-Sherry, Ph.D. & Hanna Hernandez, M.A.

Contents

Abstract 1

Background 1

Washington State's Sentencing Guidelines 1

Washington State's Sentencing Guideline Structure 1

Table 1. Washington State's sentencing grid (RCW 9.94A.510) 2

Current Report 3

Data Parameters and Methods 3

Limitations 4

Results 5

Demographics 5

Table 2. Demographics of the sample 6

Table 3. Counts of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell 6

Table 4. Count by offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by gender 7

Table 5. Count by offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing of sentencing. 8

Table 6. Count by offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community. 9

Recidivism 10

Table 7. Distribution of recidivators by age at time of sentencing, BIPOC community, and gender 11

Table 8. Distribution of recidivators by grid cell 11

Table 9. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by gender 12

Table 10. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by age at time of sentencing 12

Table 11. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by BIPOC community 13

Table 12. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by offender score 13

Community Supervision Point 14

Table 13. Distribution of community supervision point by age at time of sentencing, BIPOC community, and gender 14

Table 14. Distribution of community supervision point by grid cell 14

Table 15. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by community supervision point 16

Table 16. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by community supervision point and by gender 16

Table 17. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by community supervision point and by age at time of sentencing 17

Table 18. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by community supervision point and by BIPOC community 18

Table 19. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by community supervision point and by offender score 18

Multiplier 19

Table 20. Distribution of multiplier by age at time of sentencing, BIPOC community, and gender 19

Table 21. Distribution of multiplier, by grid cell 20
Table 22. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by a multiplier 21
Table 23. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by multiplier and by gender 22
Table 24. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by multiplier and by age at time of sentencing 22
Table 25. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by multiplier and by BIPOC community 23
Table 26. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by multiplier and by offender score 24
Predicting Recidivism 24
Table 27. AUCs for offender score, community supervision point, and multiplier 25
Disclaimer 26
References 26
Appendixes 27
Table A1. Average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community 27
Table A2. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell 29
Table A3. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by gender 30
Table A4. Offender score ratio for male and female offenders, by seriousness level 31
Table A5. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing 32
Table A6. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community 33
Table A7. Offender score ratio for BIPOC and Non-BIPOC community offenders, by seriousness level 34
Table A8. Average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community for recidivators 35
Table A9. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell for recidivators 36
Table A10. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by gender for recidivators 37
Table A11. Offender score ratio for male and female offender who recidivated, by seriousness level 38
Table A12. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing for recidivators 39
Table A13. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community for recidivators 40
Table A14. Offender score ratio for BIPOC and Non-BIPOC community offenders who recidivated, by seriousness level 41
Table A15. Average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community for offenders with a presence of a community supervision point 42
Table A16. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell for recidivators with a presence of a community supervision point 43
Table A17. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by gender for recidivators with a presence of a community supervision point 44

Table A18. Offender score ratio for male and female offender, who with a presence of a community supervision point, recidivated, by seriousness level 45

Table A19. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing for recidivators with a presence of a community supervision point 46

Table A20. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community for recidivators with a presence of a community supervision point 47

Table A21. Offender score ratio for BIPOC and Non-BIPOC community offenders, who with a presence of a community supervision point, recidivated, by seriousness level 48

Table A22. Average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community for offenders with a presence of a multiplier 49

Table A23. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell for recidivators with a presence of a multiplier 50

Table A24. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by gender for recidivators with a presence of a multiplier 51

Table A25. Offender score ratio for male and female offender, who with a presence of a multiplier, recidivated, by seriousness level 52

Table A26. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing for recidivators with a presence of a multiplier 53

Table A27. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community for recidivators with a presence of a multiplier 54

Table A28. Offender score ratio for BIPOC and Non-BIPOC community offenders, who with a presence of a multiplier, recidivated, by seriousness level 55

Table B1. Summary of Tables 2, 7, 13, 16, 20, 23, A4, A11, A18, and A25 56

Table B2. Summary of Tables 2, 7, 13, 16, 18, 25, A7, A14, A21, and A28 57

To accommodate people with disabilities, this document is available in alternate formats by calling the Office of Financial Management at 360-902-0555. TTY/TDD users should contact OFM through the Washington Relay Service at 711 or 1-800-833-6388.

Abstract

In 2019, Washington State passed legislation (Engrossed Substitute House Bill 1109) establishing the Washington State Criminal Sentencing Task Force to "review state sentencing laws … for the purpose of: (a) reducing sentencing implementation complexities and errors; (b) improving the effectiveness of the sentencing system; and (c) promoting and improving public safety" (401). To respond to the legislation, the Washington Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) housed in the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) applied for and received the 2018 State Justice Statistics (SJS) Grant from Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to review Washington State's offender score, and other situational calculations associated to the offender score, on rates of recidivism rates.

Background

Washington State's Sentencing Guidelines

In 1981, the Washington State Legislature enacted the Sentencing Reform Act (SRA), which established the Sentencing Guidelines Commission (SGC) and directed it to recommend to the Legislature a determinate sentencing system for adult felonies. The principal goal of the new sentencing guidelines system was to ensure that offenders who commit similar crimes and have similar criminal histories receive equivalent sentences; specifically, sentences were to be proportionate and determined by the offender's criminal record and the offense's seriousness level.

In 1982, the SGC completed the original adult felony sentencing "grid", and, in 1983, the Legislature adopted the SGC's recommendations into law. The SRA was enacted to help make the criminal justice system more accountable to the public by developing a sentencing system that structures or guides, but does not eliminate, the use of judicial discretion in sentencing adult felony offenders.

The SRA took effect for crimes committed on or after July 1, 1984 (prior to this date, sentences imposed for adult felonies in Washington were indeterminate which meant that courts had wide discretion over whether to impose a prison sentence and the length of any sentence or not). Codified in Chapter 9.94A RCW the SRA contains the guidelines and procedures used by the courts to impose sentences for adult felonies. The SGC continues to advise the Legislature on necessary adjustments to the sentencing structure, and the Legislature has made many modifications to Washington State's sentencing laws.

Washington State's Sentencing Guideline Structure

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 9.94A.510 presents Washington State's sentencing grid (see Table 1). Under the Washington State's sentencing grid, the rows signify offense seriousness levels (range of I to XVI) while columns signify offender scores (also known as criminal history score) (denotes a measure of prior conviction history and ranges of 0 to 9 or more). Within each cell on the sentencing grid, a presumptive sentencing range is included (for example, an offense seriousness level of VII and an offender score of a 5 has a presumptive sentence range of 41 to 54 months); the range denotes standard minimum and maximum confinement term that may be imposed for a particular combination of offender score and seriousness level. Higher offender scores and offense seriousness level are associated with longer sentence lengths. It is important to note that not all offenses are ranked.

Table 1. Washington State's sentencing grid (RCW 9.94A.510)

Seriousness Level	Offender Score									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI	Life sentence without parole/death penalty for offenders at or over the age of eighteen. For offenders under the age of eighteen, a term of twenty-five years to life.									
XV	23y4m 240-320	24y4m 250-333	25y4m 261-347	26y4m 271-361	27y4m 281-374	28y4m 291-388	30y4m 312-416	32y10m 338-450	36y 370-493	40y 411-548
XIV	14y4m 123-220	15y4m 134-234	16y2m 144-244	17y 154-254	17y11m 165-265	18y9m 175-275	20y5m 195-295	22y2m 216-316	25y7m 257-357	29y 298-3897
XIII	12y 123-164	13y 134-178	14y 144-192	15y 154-205	16y 165-219	17y 175-233	19y 195-260	21y 216-288	25y 257-342	29y 298-397
XII	9y 93-123	9y11m 102-136	10y9m 111-147	11y8m 120-160	12y6m 129-171	13y5m 138-184	15y9m 162-216	17y3m 178-236	20y3m 209-277	23y3m 240-318
XI	7y6m 78-102	8y4m 86-114	9y2m 95-125	9y11m 102-136	10y9m 111-147	11y7m 120-158	14y2m 146-194	15y5m 159-211	17y11m 185-245	20y5m 210-280
X	5y 51-68	5y6m 57-75	6y 62-82	6y6m 67-89	7y 72-96	7y6m 77-102	9y6m 98-130	10y6m 108-144	12y6m 129-171	14y6m 149-198
IX	3y 31-41	3y6m 36-48	4y 41-54	4y6m 46-61	5y 51-68	5y6m 57-75	7y6m 77-102	8y6m 87-116	10y6m 108-144	12y6m 129-171
VIII	2y 21-27	2y6m 26-34	3y 31-41	3y6m 36-48	4y 41-54	4y6m 46-61	6y6m 67-89	7y6m 77-102	8y6m 87-116	10y6m 108-144
VII	18m 15-20	2y 21-27	2y6m 26-34	3y 31-41	3y6m 36-48	4y 41-54	5y6m 57-75	6y6m 67-89	7y6m 77-102	8y6m 87-116
VI	13m 12+-14	18m 15-20	2y 21-27	2y6m 26-34	3y 31-41	3y6m 36-48	4y6m 46-61	5y6m 57-75	6y6m 67-89	7y6m 77-102
V	9m 6-12	13m 12+-14	15m 13-17	18m 15-20	2y2m 22-29	3y2m 33-43	4y 41-54	5y 51-68	6y 62-82	7y 72-96
IV	6m 3-9	9m 6-12	13m 12+-14	15m 13-17	18m 15-20	2y2m 22-29	3y2m 33-43	4y2m 43-57	5y2m 53-70	6y2m 63-84
III	2m 1-3	5m 3-8	8m 4-12	11m 9-12	14m 12+-16	20m 17-22	2y2m 22-29	3y2m 33-43	4y2m 43-57	5y 51-68
II	0-90 days	4m 2-6	6m 3-9	8m 4-12	13m 12+-14	16m 14-18	18m 15-20	2y2m 22-29	3y2m 33-43	4y2m 43-57
I	0-60 days	0-90 days	3m 2-5	4m 2-6	5m 3-8	8m 4-12	13m 12+-14	16m 14-18	18m 15-20	2y2m 22-29
Numbers in the first horizontal row of each seriousness category represent sentencing midpoints in years(y) and months(m). Numbers in the second and third rows represent standard sentence ranges in months, or in days if so designated. 12+ equals one year and one day.										
As explained by WSIPP "the 16 cells in the lower left-hand corner of the guidelines grid include presumptive sentences to local jails. These cells are often referred to as the "southwest corner of the grid." While the majority of cells on the guidelines grid correspond with a prison sentence (i.e., 119 out of 135 cells include confinement terms longer than 12 months), the southwest corner of the grid typically accounts for roughly half of the sentences for ranked offenses.										
https://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=9.94A.510										

The Offender Score is calculated based on five factors: 1) Number of prior criminal convictions or juvenile dispositions 2) Relationship between any prior offense(s) and the current offense of conviction 3) Presence of other current convictions 4) Community custody status at the time the crime was committed 5) Length of crime-free time between offenses. Additionally, the scoring rules vary depending on the type of offense and circumstances of the current conviction. Some of the situational calculations include but are not limited to multipliers and community supervision points. There are instances that necessitate a scoring alteration in terms of points (such as points associated with juvenile adjudications) and multipliers were introduced in efforts to weight appropriate instances; sentence multipliers add additional time to the sentencing range for the current offense, based on criminal history which preceded the offense under adjudication. This means that the sentencing range is increased based upon the way the offender score is calculated when multipliers are brought into play. A community supervision (i.e., when an offender is sentenced to direct supervision under the jurisdiction of the Washington State Department of Corrections (WA DOC)) point is an additional point added when the current offense is committed while on community custody for a previous offense. While there are other circumstances, this report will only look at the

potential impact of multipliers and community supervision points on offender score and, potentially, recidivism.

Current Report

In 2019, Washington State passed legislation (Engrossed Substitute House Bill 1109) establishing the Washington State Criminal Sentencing Task Force to "review state sentencing laws … for the purpose of: (a) reducing sentencing implementation complexities and errors; (b) improving the effectiveness of the sentencing system; and (c) promoting and improving public safety" (401). To respond to the legislation, the SAC applied for and received the 2018 SJS Grant from BJS to assess and review sentencing guidelines and offender score. Specifically, the current report reviews Washington State's offender score, and other situational calculations associated to the offender score, on rates of recidivism rates.

Data Parameters and Methods

This report uses similar parameters as set forth by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP)'s May 2021 endeavor that evaluated how standard, non-drug sentences vary across the current offense seriousness level-based sentencing guideline grid and assessed how sentences may vary across an alternative, felony class-based guideline grid.

This report utilized adult felony conviction data from the Caseload Forecast Council (CFC) and criminal justice data from the Criminal History Database (CHD) maintained by the WSIPP.

- The CFC receives Judgment and Sentence (J&S) forms (i.e., sentencing documents) from each county for every felony sentence imposed in Washington State Superior Courts. Each J&S form is entered into the CFC database as a separate record.
- The WSIPP maintains the CHD which holds corrections and courts data. The CHD was utilized to obtain demographic characteristics (i.e., race, gender, and age at time of sentencing) and recidivism. Demographic values are limited to WSIPP values (i.e., gender was limited to the binary values of "male" and "female"; race was limited to "black," "white," "indigenous," or "asian" (note: for analysis purposes, this report will utilize the same operationalizations for race: (1) BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and/or people of color (BIPOC)) and (2) non-BIPOC).

As such, the data is sentence-based, not individual-based. Further operationalizations and data parameters include:

- Sentencing date is the date that the sentence was imposed. As CFC's database maintains records for each sentence, there are sentences with multiple offenses and subsequently, each offense receives its own penalty. It is important to note, that when offenders are convicted for multiple offenses, the sentence is typically driven by the most serious offense (offense with the longest confinement term), with sentences for additional offenses running concurrently; however, there are some examples where distinct sentences may be specified within the same case, and those sentences may be imposed to run consecutively. Similar to WSIPP's study endeavor, for this report, "sentences imposed on the same day were ordered to run concurrently and we included only the sentence for the most serious offense ... for individuals with sentences imposed on separate days, we included the sentence for the most serious offense."
- Offender score (RCW 9.94A.525), also known as criminal history score, is measured on the horizontal axis of the sentencing grid and is a sum of points accrued: (1) prior and current convictions, (2) prior juvenile adjudications, (3) offenses committed while on community custody, (4) other current convictions, and (5) community time without committing any crime that

subsequently results in a conviction. For this report, the sentence associated with the highest offender score on each sentencing date was utilized.

- Offense seriousness level (RCW 9.94A.520) is determined by the conviction offense. For this report, the sentence associated with the most serious offense on each sentencing date was utilized.
- Rank is measured as the ranking (i.e., highest standard sentence possible) of the seriousness of the multiple offenses within one sentencing. For this report, the sentence associated with the highest rank on each sentencing date was utilized.
- Date of offense is the date that the offense was committed. For this report, the sentence associated with most recent date offense on each sentencing date was utilized.
- Recidivism is operationalized under WSIPP's definition of recidivism event (i.e., any offense committed after a release to the community, during the follow-up period (i.e., a set period of time during which an individual's behaviors are monitored for recidivism events), that results in a Washington State court legal action (i.e., a conviction, deferred disposition, or diversion agreement as defined by Washington State statutes)).
- Community supervision point is determined by CFC's variable "ccppoint." In this report, community supervision point is evaluated as a binary variable – either the offender did or did not have a presence of a community supervision point
- Multiplier is determined by CFC's variable "pritype." In this report, multiplier was evaluated as a binary variable – either the offender did or did not have a presence of a multiplier

In sum, the current dataset included 8,737 unique sentencing events in the first-half of the calendar year (CY) 2015 (January 1, 2015 to June 30, 2015). Due to the missing or incomplete demographic data, the final dataset totaled 7,478 unique sentencing events.

Limitations

Limitations are discussed in this section to prepare the audience with the constraints of this work, and a number of limitations influenced the findings of this report.

First, the analyses are descriptive (e.g., generating summaries on means and counts) and non-generalizable in nature, results are modest, inferences and implications are limiting, and results should be interpreted cautiously. Causal relationships cannot be determined, and further analyses must be completed.

Second, the time frame of this sample employed for this endeavor was significantly limiting as this report only captured half of the 2015 calendar year's unique sentencing events. A 2015 sample was utilized in order to evaluate recidivism with a follow-up period of 36 months in the community (i.e., any offense committed after a release to the community, no later than June 30, 2018) which also resulted in a Washington State court legal action. With this limitation, the current sample did not provide a true representative sample of the Washington State's sentencing grid; specifically, the sample includes the "southwest corner of the grid" which, for most, are presumptive sentences of jail sentences and a less degree of severity in seriousness and offense score; this means that individuals that committed offenses with higher degrees of seriousness were likely not in the sample as these individuals would still be serving out their sentence. For example, the "northeast corner of the grid", as displayed in Table 1, was not representative in this sample. Furthermore, as this report utilized similar parameters set forth by the WSIPP's May 2021 endeavor which looking at 16,766 felony sentences issued in Washington State superior courts in FY 2019, it is important to note the potential that this sample was not representative; specifically, WSIPP found that their majority of sentences were for offenses ranked with a seriousness

level 5 or less (92% as compared to this report's 89%) and of those sentences for ranked offenses, the majority were for defendants with an offender score of 4 or less (67% as compared to this report's 69%). Additionally, with any endeavor that only utilizes criminal justice administrative data, any conclusions yielded from this work provide limitations. This report does not reflect the true magnitude or representation of the sentencing grid and results should be interpreted cautiously.

Third, the data from each agency also introduces limitations to this work. For example, while WSIPP offered recidivism data, this data was limited to recidivist events recorded in Washington State. If an offense occurred in a different state, this would likely not be present in the data sets used. This data might not reflect a true picture of potential crime committed by the sample. Additionally, as the data are compiled and maintained by different criminal justice agencies, this data utilized combined different administrative data sources. The siloed nature of Washington state's criminal justice records complicates the ability to link criminal justice data together. For example, one of the larger concerns in linking state administrative data is the lack of common entity identifiers across the different criminal justice data sets especially as there is no validation of names and demographic information (e.g., race, age, gender, etc.) or missing, inconsistent, unmatched, or incomplete data sets. Furthermore, in terms of missing, inconsistent, unmatched, or incomplete data, this can hamper data linkage and there is no true standardization of variables across these unique data sets which produces variability between identifiers.

Fourth, in terms of demographic assessment (i.e., gender, age, race), these results must be interpreted with caution due to the limitations of the data. It is important to note that any analysis of race across criminal justice decision points, and more specifically, this criminal justice data is negatively impacted by true reliability and validity; as race data can be misclassified. Additionally, any analyses of disproportionality, in terms of demographics, are based on comparisons of outcomes for individuals who are convicted of a criminal offense. This report's findings, as many other findings retrieved from criminal justice data, can be skewed due to the already documented disproportionate treatment in criminal justice. For example, equal dispensation of justice is a consistent concern of policymakers and the public (Donnelly, 2017; Heley & Eberhardt, 2018; Kovera, 2019; Monk, 2019). The evidence of differential treatment, unequal dispensation, and injustice in the "justice" system is significant (Kovera, 2019). However, the demographic variables are from the WSIPP database which combines data from multiple Washington state agencies and per WSIPP, "this database allows for a more robust collection of demographic data by drawing on multiple sources, reducing the likelihood of missing data." It is important to note that significant limitations in this sample might have impacted the rates of recidivism; for example, the sample did not include a true representative sample of the Washington's sentencing grid because most of the sample did not include offender scores of 9 or more. The findings should be interpreted with caution due to significant limitations and analyses are not causal (i.e., not involving causation).

While some limitations are identified in this report, there are likely more not listed that could impact information and conclusions yielded from this work.

Results

The analyses are descriptive (e.g., generating summaries on means and counts) and non-generalizable in nature.

Demographics

Table 2 shows the sample by overall demographics (i.e., age at time of sentencing, gender, race). More than a third (79.3%) of the sample was male and more than a third (80.1%) of the sample was not part of the BIPOC community. About a third of the sample (38.7%) were 26 to 35 years old at the time of

sentencing; the majority of the sample (84.0%) were less than 45 years old. As a supplement to Table 2, Table A1 shows the average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community.

Table 2. Demographics of the sample

	N	%		N	%
Age at Time of Sentencing			**Race**		
18 to 25	1,947	26.0	Asian	215	2.8
26 to 35	2,897	38.7	Black	971	13.0
36 to 45	1,444	19.3	Indigenous	304	4.1
>= 46	1,189	15.9	White	5,987	80.1
Gender					
Female	1,547	20.7			
Male	5,390	79.3			

Table 3 shows the counts of offense seriousness level and offender score by guideline grid cell for unique sentencing events. About a third of the sample (38.8%) had an offender score of 0, while 8.1% had an offender score of 9 or more. The majority of sentences for this report were for offenses ranked seriousness level 5 or less (88.9%). Of those sentences for ranked offenses, the majority were for offenders with an offender score of 4 or less (69.0%). The sample did not include a good representation of the Washington's sentencing grid as less than 10% of the sample had an offender score of 9 or more. Most of the sample consisted of the "southwest corner of the grid." As a supplement to Table 3, Table A2 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score by grid cell for unique sentencing events (i.e., the percentage distribution across the grid).

Table 3. Counts of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell

Seriousness Level	Offender Score										TOTAL
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	
XVI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
XV	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**26 (0.4%)**
XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**22 (0.3%)**
XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
XII	13	--	--	11	--	--	--	--	--	12	**52 (0.8%)**
XI	21	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**41 (0.6%)**
X	26	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**50 (0.7%)**
IX	31	--	14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**83 (1.2%)**
VII	39	28	19	15	12	16	--	--	--	16	**158 (2.3%)**
VII	61	20	28	19	26	17	13	10	--	24	**221 (3.3%)**
VI	34	12	10	12	--	--	--	--	--	19	**96 (1.4%)**
V	44	36	37	30	40	33	29	17	14	39	**319 (4.7%)**
IV	288	123	117	65	57	30	31	15	12	71	**809 (12.0%)**
III	508	254	207	122	109	100	50	41	29	75	**1,495 (22.1%)**
II	365	216	118	103	70	63	59	40	35	144	**1,213 (18.0%)**
I	723	366	262	186	129	120	85	60	51	186	**2,168 (32.1%)**
TOTAL	**2,176 (32.2%)**	**1,073 (15.9%)**	**831 (12.3%)**	**583 (8.6%)**	**459 (6.8%)**	**393 (5.8%)**	**290 (4.3%)**	**192 (2.8%)**	**153 (2.3%)**	**604 (8.9%)**	

Note: Approximately 9.7% of the sample (n = 723) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted.

Table 4 shows the counts of offense seriousness level and offender score by guideline grid cell and by gender for unique sentencing events. The majority of sentences for this report were for offenses ranked seriousness level 5 or less (85.2%) perpetrated by females, and offenses ranked seriousness level 5 or less (79.0%) perpetrated by males. Of those sentences for ranked offenses, the majority were for female offenders with an offender score of 4 or less (78.9%) and male offenders with an offender score of 4 or less (65.8%). Of those sentences for ranked offenses, the average offender score and seriousness level was higher for a male offender (see Table A1). As a supplement to Table 4, Table A3 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score by grid cell and gender for unique sentencing events (i.e., the percentage distribution across the grid) and Table A4 shows the offender score ratio for male and female offenders by seriousness level. As shown in Table A4, on average, female offenders had higher offender scores than male offenders, by seriousness level.

Table 4. Count by offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by gender

	Seriousness Level	Offender Score										TOTAL
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	
Female	**XVI**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
	XV	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**11**
	VII	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**41**
	VII	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**20**
	VI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**20**
	V	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**31**
	IV	58	24	20	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	**137**
	III	92	43	38	16	18	13	--	--	--	--	**233**
	II	140	67	31	25	19	18	--	--	--	20	**339**
	I	263	102	79	42	20	21	23	--	--	16	**579**
	TOTAL	**601**	**261**	**184**	**101**	**73**	**63**	**37**	**22**	**17**	**57**	
Male	**XVI**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**25**
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**22**
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
	XII	12	--	--	11	--	--	--	--	--	11	**50**
	XI	19	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**39**
	X	26	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**50**
	IX	22	--	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**72**
	VII	27	22	12	12	--	11	--	--	--	13	**117**
	VII	51	15	26	18	24	17	13	--	--	24	**201**
	VI	28	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	16	**76**
	V	36	27	33	30	35	32	29	16	12	38	**288**
	IV	230	99	97	55	52	26	28	13	--	64	**672**
	III	416	211	169	106	91	87	48	37	28	69	**1,262**
	II	225	149	87	78	51	45	51	34	30	124	**874**
	I	460	264	183	144	109	99	62	51	47	170	**1,589**
	TOTAL	**1,575**	**812**	**647**	**482**	**386**	**330**	**253**	**170**	**136**	**547**	

Note: Approximately 9.7% of the sample had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted.

Table 5 shows the counts of offense seriousness level and offender score by guideline grid cell and by the defendant's age at the time of sentencing date for unique sentencing events. Regardless of age, the majority of sentences for this report were for offenses ranked seriousness level 5 or less (18 to 25 years of age: 88.2%; 26 to 35 years of age: 90.0%, 36 to 45 years of age: 89.4%; 46 years of age and older: 86.6%) and of those sentences for ranked offenses, the majority were for offenders with an offender score of 4 or less (18 to 25 years of age: 85.8%; 26 to 35 years of age: 72.0%; 36 to 45 years of age: 71.2%; 46 years of age and older: 73.3%). Of those sentences for ranked offenses, the average offender score was higher for a 26- to 35-year-old offender, however, seriousness level was higher for an 18- to 25-year-old offender (See Table A1). As a supplement to Table 5, Table A5 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score by grid cell and age at time of sentencing for unique sentencing events (i.e., the percentage distribution across the grid).

Table 5. Count by offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing of sentencing.

	Seriousness	Offender Score										TOTAL
	Level	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	
18 to 25	XVI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**15**
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**15**
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IX	17	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**42**
	VII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**23**
	VII	20	--	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**67**
	VI	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**30**
	V	19	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**66**
	IV	97	50	47	22	26	10	--	--	--	--	**266**
	III	131	92	63	39	23	24	--	--	--	--	**405**
	II	114	72	32	43	22	17	16	10	--	16	**349**
	I	225	110	62	47	28	16	13	12	--	12	**528**
	TOTAL	**671**	**353**	**242**	**184**	**120**	**85**	**56**	**42**	**18**	**58**	
26 to 35	XVI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**14**
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**13**
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**24**
	VII	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11	**59**
	VII	21	--	10	--	14	--	--	--	--	12	**91**
	VI	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**37**
	V	12	12	13	17	14	--	12	--	--	18	**117**
	IV	84	36	39	25	22	13	18	--	--	32	**284**
	III	189	77	82	57	47	45	14	21	13	26	**571**
	II	150	96	51	34	33	33	32	18	20	60	**527**
	I	254	131	114	72	55	63	37	32	29	77	**864**
	TOTAL	**753**	**383**	**327**	**234**	**192**	**177**	**125**	**86**	**86**	**262**	
36 to 45	XVI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**10**
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**11**
	VII	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**40**
	VII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**30**
	VI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**14**
	V	--	--	--	--	--	12	--	--	--	12	**68**
	IV	47	27	19	--	--	--	--	--	--	19	**143**
	III	92	40	35	12	28	20	11	--	10	19	**276**
	II	58	22	23	16	12	--	--	--	--	42	**201**
	I	129	69	59	40	28	26	21	--	--	52	**444**
	TOTAL	**370**	**180**	**164**	**92**	**95**	**78**	**51**	**39**	**34**	**163**	
> = 46	**XVI**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**14**
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	X	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**23**
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	VII	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**36**
	VII	15	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**33**
	VI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**15**
	V	--	--	--	--	11	--	--	--	--	--	**68**
	IV	60	10	12	10	--	--	--	--	--	11	**116**
	III	96	45	27	14	11	11	13	--	--	22	**243**
	II	43	26	12	10	--	--	--	--	--	26	**136**
	I	115	56	27	27	18	15	14	10	--	45	**332**
	TOTAL	**382**	**157**	**98**	**73**	**52**	**53**	**58**	**25**	**15**	**121**	

Note: Approximately 9.7% of the sample had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted.

Table 6 shows the counts of offense seriousness level and offender score by guideline grid cell and by BIPOC community for unique sentencing events. The majority of sentences for this report were for offenses ranked seriousness level 5 or less (non-BIPOC: 69.7%; BIPOC: 64.6%) and of those sentences for ranked offenses, the majority were for offenders with an offender score of 4 or less (non-BIPOC: 85.8%; BIPOC: 72.0%). Of those sentences for ranked offenses, the average offender score and seriousness level was higher for an offender in the BIPOC community (See Table A1). As a supplement to Table 6, Table A6 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score by grid cell and BIPOC community for unique sentencing events (i.e., the percentage distribution across the grid) and Table A7 shows the offender score ratio for BIPOC and Non-BIPOC community offenders by seriousness level. As shown in Table A7, on average, BIPOC community offenders had higher offender scores than non-BIPOC community offenders, by seriousness level.

Table 6. Count by offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community.

	Seriousness Level	**Offender Score**										**TOTAL**
		0	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9 or more**	
non-BIPOC	**XVI**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**20**

	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**18**
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
	XII	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**40**
	XI	16	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**29**
	X	25	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**46**
	IX	25	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**59**
	VII	34	21	14	10	10	12	--	--	--	15	**126**
	VII	43	15	23	15	20	11	12	--	--	18	**167**
	VI	30	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	17	**81**
	V	34	29	30	26	36	25	22	14	--	27	**251**
	IV	231	100	92	49	43	24	24	--	--	54	**633**
	III	411	185	161	94	85	71	37	33	22	62	**1,161**
	II	293	180	96	81	57	51	47	29	26	109	**969**
	I	622	315	210	161	107	95	68	56	42	158	**1,834**
	TOTAL	**1,794**	**867**	**659**	**472**	**367**	**298**	**229**	**154**	**114**	**481**	
BIPOC	**XVI**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**12**
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**12**
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**24**
	VII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**32**
	VII	18	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**54**
	VI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**15**
	V	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	12	**68**
	IV	57	23	25	16	14	--	--	--	--	17	**176**
	III	97	69	46	28	24	29	13	--	--	13	**334**
	II	72	36	22	22	13	12	12	11	--	35	**244**
	I	101	51	52	25	22	25	17	--	--	28	**334**
	TOTAL	**382**	**206**	**172**	**111**	**92**	**95**	**61**	**38**	**39**	**123**	

Note: Approximately 9.7% of the sample had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted.

Recidivism

Rates of recidivism

Rates of recidivism by demographic variables (i.e., age at time of sentencing, BIPOC community, and gender), offender score, circumstances (e.g., multiplier, community supervision point) were evaluated using chi-square test of independence (i.e., a statistical test that measures if variables are related to one another).

Out of the sample utilized, 44% of the sample recidivated - less than half of the sample committed an offense after a release to the community, during the 36-month follow-up period, that resulted in a Washington State court legal action. Table 7 shows the distribution of individuals within the sample who recidivated (i.e., recidivators) by age at time of sentencing, BIPOC community, and gender while Table 8 shows the distribution of recidivators by grid cell. As a supplement to Table 7, Table A8 shows the average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community for recidivators.

Table 7. Distribution of recidivators by age at time of sentencing, BIPOC community, and gender

	Recidivism	No Recidivism
	N (%)	N (%)
Age at Time of Sentencing		
18 to 25	969 (29.4)	978 (23.4)
26 to 35	1,331 (40.4)	1,566 (37.4)
36 to 45	578 (17.6)	866 (20.7)
>= 46	413 (12.5)	776 (18.5)

	Recidivism	No Recidivism
	N (%)	N (%)
BIPOC Community		
Yes	1,316 (33.3)	832 (19.9)
No	2,633 (66.7)	3,354 (80.1)
Gender		
Female	709 (21.5)	838 (20.0)
Male	2,582 (78.5)	3,348 (80.0)

Table 8. Distribution of recidivators by grid cell

	Seriousness Level	Offender Score 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	TOTAL
Recidivators	XVI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**17 (0.5%)**
	VII	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**38 (1.2%)**
	VII	21	--	10	--	11	--	--	--	--	--	**63 (1.9%)**
	VI	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**27 (0.8%)**
	V	17	18	17	12	17	14	--	--	--	12	**133 (4.0%)**
	IV	112	46	54	34	25	14	10	--	--	--	**312 (9.5%)**
	III	212	109	101	56	51	47	24	20	10	19	**649 (19.7%)**
	II	180	118	56	50	40	34	38	24	19	57	**616 (18.7%)**
	I	357	173	139	88	68	68	49	33	24	84	**1,083 (32.9%)**
	TOTAL	**936 (28.4%)**	**482 (14.6%)**	**387 (11.8%)**	**257 (7.8%)**	**218 (6.6%)**	**188 (5.7%)**	**130 (4.0%)**	**96 (2.9%)**	**64 (1.9%)**	**184 (5.6%)**	
Non-Recidivators	XVI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**26 (0.7%)**
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**21 (0.6%)**
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	13	--	--	11	--	--	--	--	--	12	**51 (1.3%)**
	XI	21	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**41 (1.1%)**
	X	24	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**48 (1.3%)**
	IX	22	--	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**66 (1.7%)**
	VII	26	24	16	--	--	10	--	--	--	14	**120 (3.1%)**
	VII	40	13	18	13	15	13	13	--	--	23	**158 (4.1%)**
	VI	22	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	19	**69 (1.8%)**
	V	27	18	20	18	23	19	21	--	--	27	**186 (4.9%)**
	IV	176	77	63	31	32	16	21	--	10	62	**497 (13.0%)**
	III	296	145	106	66	58	53	26	21	19	56	**846 (22.2%)**
	II	185	98	62	53	30	29	21	16	16	87	**597 (15.7%)**
	I	366	193	123	98	61	52	36	27	27	102	**1,085 (28.5%)**
	TOTAL	**1,240 (32.5%)**	**591 (15.5%)**	**444 (11.6%)**	**326 (8.6%)**	**241 (6.3%)**	**205 (2.3%)**	**160 (4.2%)**	**96 (2.5%)**	**89 (2.3%)**	**420 (11.0%)**	

Note: Approximately 10.6% of the sample (n = 349) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted.

Results showed that out of the 44% of the sample who recidivated, 87.5% were younger than 46 years of age and the majority of recidivators were male. Lastly, findings revealed that 33.3% (1/3rd of the sample) of that sample who did recidivate was made up of individuals in the BIPOC community. As a supplement to Table 8, Table A9 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score by grid cell by specific demographics for unique sentencing events (i.e., the percentage distribution across the grid).

Rates of recidivism by gender

Findings show that there was no strong correlation between gender and recidivism, χ^2 (1, N = 7,477) = 2.61, p = .11, *NS*). Table 9 shows a crosstabulation table of the proportions of offenders, by gender and by recidivism. As a supplement to Table 9, Table A10 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score by grid cell by gender and Table A11 shows the offender score ratio by gender.

Table 9. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by gender

Recidivism		Gender		
		Female	Male	Total
Yes	Count	709_a	$2,582_a$	3,291
	% within recidivism	21.5%	78.5%	100.0%
	% within gender category	45.8%	43.5%	44.0%
	% of total	9.5%	34.5%	44.0%
No	Count	838_a	$3,348_a$	4,186
	% within recidivism	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	% within gender category	54.2%	56.5%	56.0%
	% of total	11.2%	44.8%	56.0%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Rates of recidivism by age at time of sentencing

Findings show that there was a strong correlation between age at time of sentencing and recidivism, χ^2 (3, N = 7,477) = 81.40, p < .001). Table 10 shows a crosstabulation table of the proportions, by age at time of sentencing and by recidivism. Findings suggest that the proportion of offenders who recidivated decreased with an increased age of 36 years of age and older. As a supplement to Table 10, Table A12 shows the percent of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing.

Table 10. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by **age at time of sentencing**

Recidivism		Age at time of sentencing				
		18 to 25	26 to 35	36 to 45	> = 46	Total
Yes	Count	969_a	$1,331_a$	578_b	413_c	3,291
	% within recidivism	29.4%	40.4%	17.6%	12.5%	100.0%
	% within age category	49.8%	45.9%	40.0%	34.7%	44.0%
	% of total	13.0%	17.8%	7.7%	5.5%	44.0%
No	Count	978_a	$1,566_a$	866_b	776_c	4,186
	% within recidivism	23.4%	37.4%	20.7%	18.5%	100.0%
	% within age category	50.2%	54.1%	60.0%	65.3%	56.0%
	% of total	13.1%	20.9%	11.6%	10.4%	56.0%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Rates of recidivism by BIPOC community

Findings show that there was no strong correlation between BIPOC community and recidivism, χ^2 (1, N = 7,477) = .02, p = .90, *NS*) (see Table 11). As a supplement to Table 11, Table A13 shows the percent of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community and Table A14 shows the offender score ratio by BIPOC community.

Table 11. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by BIPOC community

Recidivism		BIPOC Community Yes	BIPOC Community No	Total
Yes	**Count**	658_a	$2{,}633_a$	3,291
	% within recidivism	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
	% within BIPOC	44.2%	44.0%	44.0%
	% of total	8.8%	35.2%	44.0%
No	**Count**	832_a	$3{,}354_a$	4,186
	% within recidivism	19.9%	80.1%	100.0%
	% within BIPOC	55.8%	56.0%	56.0%
	% of total	11.1%	44.9%	56.0%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Rates of recidivism by offender score

Findings show that there was a strong correlation between offender score (M =2.41, SD = 2.88, SE = .03) and recidivism, χ^2 (9, N = 7,477) = 55.44, p < .001). Table 12 shows a crosstabulation table of the proportions of offenders, by offender score and by recidivism. Findings suggest that for the proportion of recidivators, the proportions of offenders decreased in their likelihood to recidivate as offender score increased from 0 to 8; though, the proportion of offenders with an offender score of 9 or more did show a peak increase in likelihood to recidivate. However, it is important to note that while a strong correlation was present within this descriptive finding, offender score does not have consistent intervals; for example, the offender score of 9 or more consists of a wide range of scores as compared to the offender score of 2 which consists of only one score, which can skew this finding.

Table 12. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by offender score

Recidivism		Offender score 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
Yes	**Count**	$1{,}285_a$	482_a	387_a	257_a	218_a	188_a	130_a	96_a	$64_{a,b}$	184_b
	% within recidivism	39.0%	14.6%	11.8%	7.8%	6.6%	5.7%	4.0%	2.9%	1.9%	5.6%
	% within offender score	44.3%	44.9%	46.6%	44.1%	47.5%	47.8%	44.8%	50.0%	41.8%	30.5%
	% of total	17.2%	6.4%	5.2%	3.4%	2.9%	2.5%	1.7%	1.3%	0.9%	2.5%
No	**Count**	$1{,}614_a$	591_a	444_a	326_a	241_a	205_a	160_a	96_a	$89_{a,b}$	420_b
	% within recidivism	38.6%	14.1%	10.6%	7.8%	5.8%	4.9%	3.8%	2.3%	2.1%	10.0%
	% within offender score	55.7%	55.1%	53.4%	55.9%	52.5%	52.2%	55.2%	50.0%	58.2%	69.5%
	% of total	21.6%	7.9%	5.9%	4.4%	3.2%	2.7%	2.1%	1.3%	1.2%	5.6%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results. Offender score does not have consistent intervals; for example, the offender score of 9 or more consists of a wide range of scores as compared to the offender score of 2 which consists of only one score, which can skew this finding.

Community Supervision Point

Rates of recidivism by community supervision point

Out of the sample utilized, 9.8% of the sample (n = 736) had a presence of a community supervision point. Table 13 shows the distribution of community supervision point by age at time of sentencing, BIPOC community, and gender and Table 14 shows the distribution of community supervision point by grid cell. As a supplement to Table 14, Table A15 shows the average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community for offenders with a presence of a community supervision point and Table A16 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell for recidivators with a presence of a community supervision point.

Table 13. Distribution of community supervision point by age at time of sentencing, BIPOC community, and gender

		Community Supervision Point	No Community Supervision Point
		N (%)	N (%)
Recidivators	**Age at Time of Sentencing**		
	18 to 25	85 (22.4)	884 (30.4)
	26 to 35	171 (45.1)	1,160 (39.8)
	36 to 45	83 (21.9)	495 (17.0)
	>= 46	40 (10.6)	373 (12.8)
	BIPOC Community		
	Yes	60 (15.8)	598 (20.5)
	No	319 (84.2)	2,314 (79.5)
	Gender		
	Female	64 (16.9)	645 (22.1)
	Male	315 (83.1)	2,267 (77.9)

		Community Supervision Point	No Community Supervision Point
		N (%)	N (%)
Non-Recidivators	**Age at Time of Sentencing**		
	18 to 25	76 (21.3)	902 (23.6)
	26 to 35	154 (43.1)	1412 (36.9)
	36 to 45	75 (21.0)	791 (20.7)
	>= 46	52 (14.6)	724 (18.9)
	BIPOC Community		
	Yes	63 (17.6)	769 (20.1)
	No	294 (82.4)	3,060 (79.9)
	Gender		
	Female	54 (15.1)	784 (20.5)
	Male	303 (84.9)	3,045 (79.5)

Table 14. Distribution of community supervision point by grid cell

	Seriousness Level	Offender Score 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	TOTAL
CSP x Recidivators	XVI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	VII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	VII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	VI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	V	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**11 (3.4%)**
	III	--	--	--	--	--	10	--	--	--	--	**49 (15.3%)**
	II	--	19	3	11	11	13	12	10	--	15	**106 (33.0%)**
	I	--	--	12	14	14	21	18	14	11	32	**137 (42.7%)**

	TOTAL		**20**	**23**	**38**	**40**	**50**	**36**	**33**	**21**	**56**	
		--	**(6.2%)**	**(7.2%)**	**(11.8%)**	**(12.5%)**	**(15.6%)**	**(11.2%)**	**(10.3%)**	**(6.5%)**	**(17.4%)**	
CSP x Non-Recidivators	**XVI**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	VII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**14 (4.4%)**
	VII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**16 (5.1%)**
	VI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	V	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**16 (5.1%)**
	IV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11	**29 (9.2%)**
	III	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**47 (14.9%)**
	II	--	19	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	23	**88 (27.8%)**
	I	--	--	--	--	--	13	--	--	--	36	**90 (28.5%)**
	TOTAL		**19**	**24**	**24**	**36**	**38**	**30**	**22**	**19**	**101**	
		--	**(6.0%)**	**(7.6%)**	**(7.6%)**	**(11.4%)**	**(12.0%)**	**(9.5%)**	**(7.0%)**	**(6.0%)**	**(32.0%)**	
No CSP x Recidivators	**XVI**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**2 (0.1%)**
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**17 (0.6%)**
	VII	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**33 (1.3%)**
	VII	21	--	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**58 (2.2%)**
	VI	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**27 (1.0%)**
	V	17	18	17	10	16	12	--	--	--	11	**125 (4.8%)**
	IV	112	46	53	32	23	12	10	--	--	--	**301 (11.5%)**
	III	212	109	94	49	42	37	18	--	--	16	**600 (22.9%)**
	II	176	99	53	39	29	21	26	14	11	42	**510 (19.5%)**
	I	357	172	127	74	54	47	31	19	13	52	**946 (36.1%)**
	TOTAL	**932**	**462**	**364**	**219**	**178**	**138**	**94**	**63**	**43**	**128**	
		(35.6%)	**(17.6%)**	**(13.9%)**	**(8.4%)**	**(6.8%)**	**(5.3%)**	**(3.6%)**	**(2.4%)**	**(1.6%)**	**(4.9%)**	
No CSP x Non-Recidivators	**XVI**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	13	--	--	**--**	--	--	--	--	--	--	**25 (0.7%)**
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**21 (0.6%)**
	XIII	**--**	--	--	**--**	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
	XII	13	--	--	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	**46 (1.3%)**
	XI	21	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**41 (1.2%)**
	X	24	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**48 (1.4%)**
	IX	22	--	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**59 (1.7%)**
	VII	26	24	16	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**106 (3.0%)**
	VII	40	13	18	13	13	11	10	--	--	16	**142 (4.1%)**
	VI	22	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	18	**66 (1.9%)**
	V	27	18	20	17	20	18	16	--	--	24	**170 (4.9%)**
	IV	176	77	57	29	30	13	19	--	--	51	**468 (13.4%)**
	III	296	145	100	59	50	46	21	20	14	48	**799 (22.9%)**
	II	182	79	58	47	21	21	17	--	--	64	**509 (14.6%)**
	I	366	193	115	91	52	39	28	22	23	66	**995 (28.5%)**
	TOTAL	**1,237**	**572**	**420**	**302**	**205**	**167**	**130**	**74**	**70**	**319**	
		(35.4%)	**(16.4%)**	**(12.0%)**	**(8.6%)**	**(5.9%)**	**(4.8%)**	**(3.7%)**	**(2.1%)**	**(2.0%)**	**(9.1%)**	

Note: Approximately 13.5% of the sample (n = 99) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. CSP = community supervision point. Low sample sizes might skew results. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted.

Results showed that 87.5% of the sample who had a presence of a community supervision point were younger than 46 years old. Also, findings revealed that the majority of individuals who had a presence of a community supervision point were male, similar. Lastly, results revealed that 16.7% of the sample who had a presence of a community supervision point were made up of individuals in the BIPOC community.

Rates of recidivism by presence of a community supervision point

Further results show that there was a strong correlation between community supervision point (M = 0.10, SD = 0.30, SE = .01) and recidivism, χ^2 (1, N = 7,477) = 18.53, p < .001). Table 15 shows a crosstabulation table of the proportions, by presence of a community supervision point and by recidivism. Findings suggest that out of the sample who had presence of a community supervision point (n = 736), 51.5% of that sample (n = 379) recidivated and 48.5% did not recidivate (n = 357); out of the sample who did not have a presence of a community supervision point (n = 6,741), 43.2% of that sample (n = 2,912) recidivated and 56.8% (n = 3,829) did not recidivate.

Table 15. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by community supervision point

Recidivism		Community Supervision Point Yes	Community Supervision Point No	Total
Yes	**Count**	379_a	$2{,}912_b$	3,291
	% within recidivism	11.5%	88.5%	100.0%
	% within community supervision point	51.5%	43.2%	44.0%
	% of total	5.1%	38.9%	44.0%
No	**Count**	357_a	$3{,}829_b$	4,186
	% within recidivism	8.5%	91.5%	100.0%
	% within community supervision point	48.5%	56.8%	56.0%
	% of total	4.8%	51.2%	56.0%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Rates of recidivism by presence of a community supervision point and by gender

Findings show that there was no significant association between community supervision point, gender, and recidivism, χ^2 (1, N = 736) = .42, p = .52, *NS*) suggesting that with the presence of a community supervision point, there is no correlation between gender and recidivism. Table 16 shows a crosstabulation table of the proportions of offenders with a presence of a community supervision point, by gender and by recidivism. As a supplement to Table 16, Table A17 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score by grid cell by gender and Table A18 shows the offender score ratio for male and female offender, who with a presence of a community supervision point, recidivated, by seriousness level.

Table 16. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by community supervision point and by gender

	Recidivism		Gender Female	Gender Male	Total
CSP	**Yes**	**Count**	64_a	315_a	379
		% within recidivism	16.9%	83.1%	100.0%
		% within gender	54.2%	51.0%	51.5%
		% of total	8.7%	42.8%	51.5%
	No	**Count**	54_a	303_a	357

		% within recidivism	15.1%	84.9%	100.0%
		% within gender	45.8%	49.0%	48.5%
		% of total	7.3%	41.2%	48.5%
No CSP	Yes	Count	645_a	$2,267_a$	2,912
		% within recidivism	22.1%	77.9%	100.0%
		% within gender	45.1%	42.7%	43.2%
		% of total	9.6%	33.6%	43.2%
	No	Count	784_a	$3,045_a$	3,829
		% within recidivism	20.5%	79.5%	100.0%
		% within gender	54.9%	57.3%	56.8%
		% of total	11.6%	45.2%	56.8%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. CSP = community supervision point. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Rates of recidivism by presence of a community supervision point and by age at time of sentencing

Findings show that there was no significant association between community supervision point, age at time of sentencing and recidivism, χ^2 (3, N = 736) = 81.40, p = .44, *NS*) suggesting that when there is a presence of a community supervision point, there is no correlation between age at time of sentencing and recidivism. Table 17 shows a crosstabulation table of the proportions of offenders with a presence of a community supervision point, by age at time of sentencing and by recidivism. As a supplement to Table 17, Table A19 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing for recidivators with a presence of a community supervision point.

Table 17. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by community supervision point and by age at time of sentencing

			Age at time of sentencing				
	Recidivism		18 to 25	26 to 35	36 to 45	> = 46	Total
Community Supervision Point	Yes	Count	85_a	171_a	83_a	40_a	379
		% within recidivism	22.4%	45.1%	21.9%	10.6%	100.0%
		% within age category	52.8%	52.6%	52.5%	43.5%	51.5%
		% of total	11.5%	23.2%	11.3%	5.4%	51.5%
	No	Count	76_a	154_a	75_a	52_a	357
		% within recidivism	21.3%	43.1%	21.0%	14.6%	100.0%
		% within age category	47.2%	47.4%	47.5%	56.5%	48.5%
		% of total	10.3%	20.9%	10.2%	7.1%	48.5%
No Community Supervision Point	Yes	Count	884_a	$1,160_b$	495_c	373_c	2,912
		% within recidivism	30.4%	39.8%	17.0%	12.8%	100.0%
		% within age category	49.5%	45.1%	38.5%	34.0%	43.2%
		% of total	13.1%	17.2%	7.3%	5.5%	43.2%
	No	Count	902_a	$1,412_b$	791_c	724_c	3,829
		% within recidivism	23.6%	36.9%	20.7%	18.9%	100.0%
		% within age category	50.5%	54.9%	61.5%	66.0%	56.8%
		% of total	13.4%	20.9%	11.7%	10.7%	56.8%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Rates of recidivism by presence of a community supervision point and by BIPOC community

Findings show that there was no significant association between community supervision point, BIPOC community, and recidivism, χ^2 (1, N = 736) = .44, p = .51, *NS*) suggesting that when there is a presence of a community supervision point, there is no correlation between BIPOC community and recidivism (see Table 18). As a supplement to Table 18, Table A20 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and

offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community for recidivators with a presence of a community supervision point, and Table A21 shows the offender score ratio for BIPOC and Non-BIPOC community offenders, who with a presence of a community supervision point, recidivated, by seriousness level.

Table 18. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by community supervision point and by BIPOC community

	Recidivism		BIPOC Community: Yes	BIPOC Community: No	Total
Community Supervision Point	Yes	Count	319_a	60_a	379
		% within recidivism	84.2%	15.8%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	52.0%	48.8%	51.5%
		% of total	43.3%	8.2%	51.5%
	No	Count	294_a	63_a	357
		% within recidivism	82.4%	17.6%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	48.0%	51.2%	48.5%
		% of total	39.9%	8.6%	48.5%
No Community Supervision Point	Yes	Count	$2{,}314_a$	598_a	2,912
		% within recidivism	79.5%	20.5%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	43.1%	43.7%	43.2%
		% of total	34.3%	8.9%	43.2%
	No	Count	$3{,}060_a$	769_a	3,829
		% within recidivism	79.9%	20.1%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	56.9%	56.3%	56.8%
		% of total	45.4%	11.4%	56.8%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Rates of recidivism by presence of a community supervision point and by offender score

Findings show that there was a significant association between community supervision point, offender score, and recidivism, χ^2 (9, N = 736) = 23.22, p < .001) suggesting that when there is a presence of a community supervision point, there is a strong correlation between offender score and recidivism. Table 19 shows a crosstabulation table of the proportions of offenders with a presence of a community supervision point, by offender score and by recidivism. Findings suggest that for the proportion of recidivators with the presence of a community supervision point, the proportions of offenders increased in their likelihood to recidivate as offender score increased from 2 to 5, and then, the proportions of offenders decreased in their likelihood to recidivate as offender score increased from 6 to 8; lastly, the proportion of offenders with an offender score of 9 or more did show a peak increase in likelihood to recidivate. However, it is important to note that while a strong correlation was present within this descriptive finding, offender score does not have consistent intervals; for example, the offender score of 9 or more consists of a wide range of scores as compared to the offender score of 2 which consists of only one score, which can skew this finding.'

Table 19. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by community supervision point and by offender score

	Recidivism		Offender score: 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
CSP	Yes	Count	62_a	$20_{a,b}$	$23_{a,b}$	38_a	$40_{a,b}$	$50_{a,b}$	$36_{a,b}$	$33_{a,b}$	$21_{a,b}$	56_b
		% within recidivism	16.4%	5.3%	6.1%	10.0%	10.6%	13.2%	9.5%	8.7%	5.5.%	14.8%
		% within offender score	58.5%	51.3%	48.9%	61.3%	52.6%	56.8%	54.5%	60.0%	52.5%	35.7%

		% of total	8.4%	2.7%	3.1%	5.2%	5.4%	6.8%	4.9%	4.5%	2.9%	7.6%
	No	**Count**	44_{a}	$19_{a,b}$	$24_{a,b}$	24_{a}	$36_{a,b}$	$38_{a,b}$	$30_{a,b}$	$22_{a,b}$	$19_{a,b}$	101_{b}
		% within recidivism	12.3%	5.3%	6.7%	6.7%	10.1%	10.6%	8.4%	6.2%	5.3%	28.3%
		% within offender score	41.5%	48.7%	51.1%	38.7%	47.4%	43.2%	45.5%	40.0%	47.5%	64.3%
		% of total	6.0%	2.6%	3.3%	3.3%	4.9%	5.2%	4.1%	3.0%	2.6%	13.7%
No CSP	**Yes**	**Count**	$1,223_{a}$	462_{a}	364_{a}	219_{a}	178_{a}	138_{a}	94_{a}	63_{a}	$43_{a,b}$	128_{b}
		% within recidivism	42.0%	15.9%	12.5%	7.5%	6.1%	4.7%	3.2%	2.2%	1.5%	4.4%
		% within offender score	43.8%	44.7%	46.4%	42.0%	46.5%	45.2%	42.0%	46.0%	38.1%	28.6%
		% of total	18.1%	6.9%	5.4%	3.2%	2.6%	2.0%	1.4%	0.9%	0.6%	1.9%
	No	**Count**	$1,570_{a}$	572_{a}	420_{a}	302_{a}	205_{a}	167_{a}	130_{a}	74_{a}	$70_{a,b}$	319_{b}
		% within recidivism	41.0%	14.9%	11.0%	7.9%	5.4%	4.4%	3.4%	1.9%	1.8%	8.3%
		% within offender score	56.2%	55.3%	53.6%	58.0%	53.5%	54.8%	58.0%	54.0%	61.9%	71.4%
		% of total	23.3%	8.5%	6.2%	4.5%	3.0%	2.5%	1.9%	1.1%	1.0%	4.7%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results. Low sample sizes might skew results. Offender score does not have consistent intervals; for example, the offender score of 9 or more consists of a wide range of scores as compared to the offender score of 2 which consists of only one score, which can skew this finding.

Multiplier

Rates of recidivism by multiplier

Out of the sample utilized, 62.3% of the sample had a presence of multiplier. Table 20 shows the distribution of multiplier by age at time of sentencing, BIPOC community, and gender and Table 21 shows the distribution of multiplier by grid cell. As a supplement to Table 21, Table A22 shows the average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community for offenders with a presence of a multiplier and Table A23 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell for recidivators, with a presence of a multiplier.

Table 20. Distribution of multiplier by age at time of sentencing, BIPOC community, and gender

		Multiplier	**No Multiplier**
		N (%)	**N (%)**
Recidivators	**Age at Time of Sentencing**		
	18 to 25	532 (24.9)	437 (37.8)
	26 to 35	901 (42.2)	430 (37.2)
	36 to 45	413 (19.4)	165 (14.3)
	>= 46	288 (13.5%)	125 (10.8)

		Multiplier	**No Multiplier**
		N (%)	**N (%)**
BIPOC Community			
	Yes	424 (19.9)	234 (20.2)
	No	1,710 (80.1)	923 (79.8)
Gender			
	Female	371 (17.4)	338 (29.2)
	Male	1,763 (82.6)	819 (70.8)

		Multiplier	**No Multiplier**
		N (%)	**N (%)**
Non-Recidivators	**Age at Time of Sentencing**		
	18 to 25	494 (19.6)	484 (29.2)
	26 to 35	1,004 (39.7)	562 (33.9)
	36 to 45	560 (22.2)	306 (18.4)
	>= 46	468 (18.5)	308 (18.6)

		Multiplier	**No Multiplier**
		N (%)	**N (%)**
BIPOC Community			
	Yes	536 (21.2)	296 (17.8)
	No	1,990 (78.8)	1,364 (82.2)
Gender			
	Female	426 (16.9)	412 (24.8)
	Male	2,100 (83.1)	1,248 (75.2)

Table 21. Distribution of multiplier, by grid cell

	Seriousness Level	Offender Score 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	TOTAL
Multiplier x Recidivators	XVI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	VII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	24 (1.3%)
	VII	--	--	--	--	10	--	--	--	--	--	36 (2.0%)
	VI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	V	--	--	--	--	12	12	--	--	--	11	84 (4.6%)
	IV	14	24	32	31	23	13	--	--	--	--	161 (8.7%)
	III	19	69	82	53	50	46	23	20	10	18	390 (21.2%)
	II	27	86	48	48	36	33	35	24	19	54	410 (22.2%)
	I	42	148	133	84	65	67	48	33	23	81	724 (39.3%)
	TOTAL	**110 (6.0%)**	**342 (18.6%)**	**315 (17.1%)**	**237 (12.9%)**	**202 (11.0%)**	**182 (9.9%)**	**122 (6.6%)**	**94 (5.1%)**	**63 (3.4%)**	**176 (9.5%)**	
Multiplier x Non-Recidivators	XVI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	13 (0.6%)
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	19 (0.9%)
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	13 (0.6%)
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11 (0.5%)
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	32 (1.4%)
	VII	--	12	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	13	74 (3.3%)
	VII	--	--	--	10	11	13	10	--	--	20	92 (4.2%)
	VI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	13	25 (1.1%)
	V	--	--	14	14	18	16	19	--	--	27	126 (5.7%)
	IV	14	35	44	22	30	14	18	--	--	61	254 (11.5%)
	III	29	80	84	54	50	48	25	20	19	54	463 (20.9%)
	II	20	66	50	49	27	26	18	16	16	82	370 (16.7%)
	I	50	163	111	91	59	51	35	25	26	101	1712 (32.2%)
	TOTAL	**127 (5.7%)**	**379 (17.1%)**	**342 (15.5%)**	**255 (11.5%)**	**212 (9.6%)**	**189 (8,5%)**	**138 (6.2%)**	**91 (4.1%)**	**84 (3.8%)**	**396 (17.9%)**	
No Multiplier x Recidivators	XVI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	XI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	IX	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	10 (0.9%)
	VII	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	14 (1.3%)
	VII	20	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	27 (2.5%)
	VI	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	21 (1.9%)
	V	14	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	49 (4.5%)
	IV	98	22	22	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	151 (13.7%)
	III	193	40	19	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	259 (23.6%)
	II	153	32	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	206 (18.7%)
	I	315	25	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	359 (32.7%)
	TOTAL	**826 (75.2%)**	**140 (12.7%)**	**72 (6.6%)**	**20 (1.8%)**	**16 (1.5%)**	--	--	--	--	--	
N	XVI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

XV	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**13 (0.8%)**
XIV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**12 (0.7%)**
XIII	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**--**
XII	12	--	--	10	--	--	--	--	--	--	**32 (2.0%)**
XI	17	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**28 (1.7%)**
X	24	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**37 (2.3%)**
IX	20	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**34 (2.1%)**
VII	24	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**46 (2.8%)**
VII	38	--	11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**66 (4.0%)**
VI	21	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**44 (2.7%)**
V	26	13	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**60 (3.7%)**
IV	162	42	19	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**243 (14.9%)**
III	267	65	22	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	**383 (23.5%)**
II	165	32	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**227 (13.9%)**
I	316	30	12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	**373 (22.9%)**
TOTAL	**1,113 (68.2%)**	**212 (13.0%)**	**102 (6.3%)**	**71 (4.4%)**	**29 (1.8%)**	**16 (1.0%)**	**22 (1.3%)**	--	--	**24 (1.5%)**	

Note: Approximately 13.0% of the sample (n = 604) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Results showed that 83.8% of the sample who had a presence of a multiplier were younger than 46 years old, and the majority of individuals who had a presence of a multiplier were male. Lastly, findings revealed that, 20.6% of that sample who did have a presence of a multiplier was made up of individuals in the BIPOC community.

Rates of recidivism by presence of a multiplier

Further results show that there was a significant association between multiplier and recidivism, χ^2 (1, N = 7,477) = 15.89, p < .001). Table 22 shows a crosstabulation table of the proportions of offenders, by the presence of a multiplier and by recidivism. Findings suggest that out of the sample who had presence of a multiplier (n = 2,817), 41.1% of that sample (n = 1,157) recidivated and 58.9% did not recidivate (n = 1,660); out of the sample who did not have a presence of a multiplier (n = 4,660), 45.8% of that sample (n = 2,134) recidivated and 54.2% (n = 2,526) did not recidivate.

Table 22. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by a multiplier

		Multiplier		
Recidivism		**Yes**	**No**	**Total**
Yes	**Count**	$1{,}157_a$	$2{,}134_b$	3,291
	% within recidivism	35.2%	64.8%	100.0%
	% within multiplier	41.1%	45.8%	44.0%
	% of total	15.5%	28.5%	44.0%
No	**Count**	$1{,}660_a$	$2{,}526_b$	4,186
	% within recidivism	39.7%	60.3%	100.0%
	% within multiplier	58.9%	54.2%	56.0%
	% of total	22.2%	33.8%	56.0%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Rates of recidivism by presence of a multiplier and by gender

Findings show that there was no significant association between multiplier, gender, and recidivism, χ^2 (1, N = 4,660) = .22, p = .64, *NS*) suggesting with the presence of a multiplier, there is no correlation between

gender and recidivism. Table 23 shows a crosstabulation table of the proportions of offenders with a presence of a multiplier, by gender and by recidivism. As a supplement to Table 23, Table A24 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by gender for recidivators with a presence of a multiplier and Table A25 shows the offender score ratio for male and female offender, who with a presence of a multiplier, recidivated, by seriousness level.

Table 23. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by multiplier and by gender

	Recidivism		Gender		Total
			Female	Male	
Multiplier	Yes	Count	371_a	$1{,}763_a$	2,134
		% within recidivism	17.4%	82.6%	100.0%
		% within gender	46.5%	45.6%	45.8%
		% of total	8.0%	37.8%	45.8%
	No	Count	426_a	$2{,}100_a$	2,526
		% within recidivism	16.9%	83.1%	100.0%
		% within gender	53.5%	54.4%	54.2%
		% of total	9.1%	45.1%	54.2%
No Multiplier	Yes	Count	338_a	819_b	1,157
		% within recidivism	29.2%	70.8%	100.0%
		% within gender	45.1%	39.6%	41.1%
		% of total	12.0%	29.1%	41.1%
	No	Count	412_a	$1{,}248_b$	1,600
		% within recidivism	24.8%	75.2%	100.0%
		% within gender	54.9%	60.4%	58.9%
		% of total	14.6%	44.3%	58.9%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Rates of recidivism by presence of a multiplier and by age at time of sentencing

Findings show that there was a significant association between multiplier, age at time of sentencing and recidivism, χ^2 (3, N = 4,660) = 39.35, p < .001) suggesting that when there is a presence of a multiplier, there is a strong correlation between age at time of sentencing and recidivism. Findings suggest that the proportion of offenders with a presence of a multiplier who recidivated decreased with age. Table 24 shows a crosstabulation table of the proportions of offenders with a presence of a multiplier, by age at time of sentencing and by recidivism. As a supplement to Table 24, Table A26 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing for recidivators with a presence of a multiplier.

Table 24. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by multiplier and by **age at time of sentencing**

	Recidivism		Age at time of sentencing				Total
			18 to 25	26 to 35	36 to 45	> = 46	
Multiplier	Yes	Count	532_a	$901_{a,b}$	$413_{b,c}$	288_c	2,134
		% within recidivism	24.9%	42.2%	19.4%	13.5%	100.0%
		% within age category	51.9%	47.3%	42.4%	38.1%	45.8%
		% of total	11.4%	19.3%	8.9%	6.2%	45.8%
	No	Count	494_a	$1{,}004_{a,b}$	$560_{b,c}$	468_c	2,526
		% within recidivism	19.6%	39.7%	22.2%	18.5%	100.0%
		% within age category	48.1%	52.7%	57.6%	61.9%	54.2%
		% of total	10.6%	21.5%	12.0%	10.0%	54.2%
No Mult	Yes	Count	437_a	430_a	165_b	125_b	1,157

	% within recidivism	37.8%	37.2%	14.3%	10.8%	100.0%
	% within age category	47.4%	43.3%	35.0%	28.9%	41.1%
	% of total	15.5%	15.3%	5.9%	4.4%	41.1%
No	Count	484_a	562_a	306_b	308_b	1,660
	% within recidivism	29.2%	33.9%	18.4%	18.6%	100.0%
	% within age category	52.6%	56.7%	65.0%	71.1%	58.9%
	% of total	17.2%	20.0%	10.9%	10.9%	58.9%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Rates of recidivism by presence of a multiplier and by BIPOC community

Findings show that there was no significant association between multiplier, BIPOC community, and recidivism, χ^2 (1, N = 736) = 1.29, p = .26, *NS*) suggesting that when there is a presence of a multiplier, there is no correlation between BIPOC community and recidivism (see Table 25). As a supplement to Table 25, Table A27 shows the percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community for recidivators with a presence of a multiplier and Table A28 shows the offender score ratio for BIPOC and Non-BIPOC community offenders, who with a presence of a multiplier, recidivated, by seriousness level.

Table 25. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by multiplier and by BIPOC community

			BIPOC Community		
	Recidivism		Yes	No	Total
Multiplier	Yes	Count	$1{,}710_a$	424_a	2,134
		% within recidivism	80.1%	19.9%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	46.2%	44.2%	45.8%
		% of total	36.7%	9.1%	45.8%
	No	Count	$1{,}990_a$	536_a	2,526
		% within recidivism	78.8%	21.2%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	53.8%	55.8%	54.2%
		% of total	42.7%	11.5%	54.2%
No Multiplier	Yes	Count	923_a	234_a	1,157
		% within recidivism	79.8%	20.2%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	40.4%	44.2%	41.1%
		% of total	32.8%	8.3%	41.1%
	No	Count	$1{,}364_a$	296_a	1,660
		% within recidivism	82.2%	17.8%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	59.6%	55.8%	58.9%
		% of total	48.4%	10.5%	58.9%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Rates of recidivism by presence of a multiplier and by offender score

Findings show that there was a significant association between multiplier, offender score, and recidivism, χ^2 (9, N = 4,660) = 61.96, p < .001) suggesting that when there is a presence of a multiplier, there is a strong correlation between offender score and recidivism. Table 26 shows a crosstabulation table of the proportions of offenders with a presence of a multiplier, by offender score and by recidivism. Findings suggest that for the proportion of recidivators with the presence of a multiplier, the proportions of offenders decreased in their likelihood to recidivate as offender score increased from 0 to 8; though, the proportion of offenders with an offender score of 9 or more did show a peak increase in likelihood to recidivate. However, it is important to note that while a strong correlation was present within this descriptive finding, offender score does not have consistent intervals; for example, the offender score of

9 or more consists of a wide range of scores as compared to the offender score of 2 which consists of only one score, which can skew this finding.

Table 26. Crosstabulation for rates of recidivism by multiplier and by offender score

			Offender score									
	Recidivism		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
Multiplier	Yes	Count	401_{a}	342_{a}	315_{a}	237_{a}	202_{a}	182_{a}	122_{a}	94_{a}	$63_{a,b}$	176_{b}
		% within recidivism	18.8%	16.0%	14.8%	11.1%	9.5%	8.5%	5.7%	4.4%	3.0%	8.2%
		% within offender score	47.7%	47.4%	47.9%	48.2%	48.8%	49.1%	46.9%	50.8%	42.9%	30.8%
		% of total	8.6%	7.3%	6.8%	5.1%	4.3%	3.9%	2.6%	2.0%	1.4%	3.8%
	No	Count	440_{a}	379_{a}	342_{a}	255_{a}	212_{a}	189_{a}	138_{a}	91_{a}	$84_{a,b}$	396_{b}
		% within recidivism	17.4%	15.0%	13.5%	10.1%	8.4%	7.5%	5.5%	3.6%	3.3%	15.7%
		% within offender score	52.3%	52.6%	52.1%	51.8%	51.2%	50.9%	53.1%	49.2%	57.1%	69.2%
		% of total	9.4%	8.1%	7.3%	5.5%	4.5%	4.1%	3.0%	2.0%	1.8%	8.5%
No Multiplier	Yes	Count	884_{a}	$140_{a,b}$	$72_{a,b}$	20_{b}	$16_{a,b}$	--	--	--	--	--
		% within recidivism	76.4%	12.1%	6.2%	1.7%	1.4%	--	--	--	--	--
		% within offender score	43.0%	39.8%	41.4%	22.0%	35.6%	--	--	--	--	--
		% of total	31.4%	5.0%	2.6%	0.7%	0.6%	--	--	--	--	--
	No	Count	$1{,}174_{a}$	$212_{a,b}$	$102_{a,b}$	71_{b}	$29_{a,b}$	$16_{a,b}$	$22_{a,b}$	--	--	$24_{a,b}$
		% within recidivism	70.7%	12.8%	6.1%	4.3%	1.7%	1.0%	1.3%	--	--	1.4%
		% within offender score	57.0%	60.2%	58.6%	78.0%	64.4%	72.7%	73.3%	--	--	75.0%
		% of total	41.7%	7.5%	3.6%	2.5%	1.0%	0.6%	0.8%	--	--	0.9%

Note: The column proportions test within the crosstabulation table assigns a subscript letter to the categories of the column variable. For each pair of columns, the column proportions (for each row) are compared using a z test. If a pair of values is significantly different, the values have different subscript letters assigned to them. Low sample sizes might skew results. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted. Offender score does not have consistent intervals; for example, the offender score of 9 or more consists of a wide range of scores as compared to the offender score of 2 which consists of only one score, which can skew this finding.

As further supplements, Table B1 and Table B2 are summary data tables by gender and by BIPOC community. These two tables summarize the respective demographics for easier comparisons within one page.

Predicting Recidivism

Predictive probability of offender score, community supervision point, and multiplier

Along with measuring if the variables are related to one another, this report looked at the predictive probability of offender score, community supervision point, and multiplier on the likelihood of recidivism. To evaluate how well these variables predict recidivism, the area under the curve (AUC) from receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analyses with its corresponding odds ratio tests were utilized. Note, for this section of analyses, the variables included were:

- Offender score
- Offender score with the absence of a community supervision point (i.e., calculated continuous score after community supervision point was subtracted from offender score)
- Offender score with the absence of a multiplier (i.e., calculated continuous score after multiplier was subtracted from offender score)
- Recidivism as the binary outcome variable (i.e., they did or did not recidivate)

First, the odds ratio tests assessed the change in relative risk in association; the odds ratio is the ratio between the odds of an outcome event of interest (i.e., in this analysis, the recidivist event) in one category of the predictor variables (i.e., offender score, offender score with the absence of a community supervision point, and offender score with the absence of a multiplier) versus the odds of the same event in the other category of the predictor(s) – simply, odds ratios represent how one event is more or less

likely to occur than another. For a significantly associated predictor of a binary outcome (i.e., the offender did or did not recidivate), estimates can be made on the probability of a random observation occurring or not occurring.

Findings revealed that:

- an offender with a higher offender score was 1.07 times more likely to recidivate than an offender with a lower offender score,
- an offender with a higher offender score with the absence of a community supervision point was 1.39 times more likely to recidivate than an offender with a lower offender score with the absence of a community supervision point, and
- an offender with a higher offender score with the absence of a multiplier was 1.48 times more likely to recidivate than an offender with a lower offender score with the absence of a multiplier.

Second, the AUC from ROC curve further evaluated the probability that a randomly selected offender who did not recidivate would have a lower offender score than a randomly selected offender who did recidivate. This measure, derived from the AUC, ranges from 0 to 1 where 0.5 means that there is 50% chance that an unsuccessful offender will have a higher score than a successful offender and 1 means perfect sorting – 100%, and that all unsuccessful offenders have higher risk scores than all successful offenders. In determining size of AUC values, Rice and Harris (2005)'s guidance was utilized (e.g., AUC values = .56 as small, .64 as moderate, and .71 as large). Table 27 shows AUCs for offender score, offender score with the absence of community supervision point, and offender score with the absence of multiplier.

Table 27. AUCs for offender score, community supervision point, and multiplier

				95% Confidence Interval	
	AUC	SE	Sig.	Lower	Upper
Offender score	0.495	0.011	0.579	0.476	0.513
Offender score w/absence of a community supervision point	0.495	0.010	0.600	0.476	0.514
Offender score w/absence of a multiplier	0.498	0.012	0.848	0.475	0.521

Findings showed that:

- offender score revealed an AUC value of .495 (95% CI: 0.48 – 0.51) which suggests that with any randomly drawn pair of individuals, one reoffending and the other not reoffending, the reoffending individual would have a higher offender score 49.5% of the time for recidivism.
- offender score with the absence of a community supervision point revealed an AUC value of .495 (95% CI: 0.48 – 0.51) which suggests that with any randomly drawn pair of individuals, one reoffending and the other not reoffending, the reoffending individual would have a higher offender score with the absence of a community supervision point 49.5% of the time for recidivism.
- offender score with the absence of a multiplier revealed an AUC value of .498 (CI: 0.48 – 0.52) which suggests that with any randomly drawn pair of individuals, one reoffending and the other not reoffending, the reoffending individual would have a higher offender score with the absence of a multiplier 49.8% of the time for recidivism.

Since the AUC value for all predictors were small, findings suggest that three predictors are no better at predicting recidivism than a variable that performs random guessing.

Discussion and Conclusion

While stated above, it merits repeating that this report provided analyses that were descriptive and non-generalizable in nature. The results are modest, and subsequently, inferences and implications are limiting, and results should be interpreted with caution. As the report was non-generalizable and was not a true representation of the entire population of data, causal relationships cannot be determined and conclusions, if any, are incredibly limiting – no recommendations outside of a need for further analyses, including true research endeavors are presented.

While this report was limiting, it did offer an opportunity to discuss the need to further assess and review sentencing guidelines and offender score for Washington, in efforts to have a true understanding of the impact of the sentencing grid on the criminal justice system.

An assessment of the Washington State sentencing grid and Washington State's offender score, and other situational calculations associated to the offender score, on rates of recidivism rates could also serve as a useful tool for policymakers and the public.

Disclaimer

This material utilizes confidential data from CFC and WSIPP. The views expressed here are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of the CFC, WSIPP, or other data contributors. Any errors are attributable to the author(s).

References

Donnelly, E. A. (2017). The politics of racial disparity reform: Racial inequality and criminal justice policymaking in the states. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *42*(1), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-016-9344-8

Heley, R. C., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2018). The numbers don't speak for themselves: Racial disparities and the persistence of inequality in the criminal justice system. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *27*(3), 183-187. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418763931

Knoth, L. (2021). Examining Washington State's sentencing guidelines: A report for the Criminal Sentencing Task Force (Document Number 21-05-1901). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Kovera, M. B. (2019). Racial disparities in the criminal justice system: Prevalence, causes, and a search for solutions. *Journal of Social Issues*, *75*(4), 1139-1164. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12355

Monk, E. P. (2019). The color of punishment: African Americans, skin tone, and the criminal justice system. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *42*(10), 1593-1612. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2018.1508736

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 9.94A. Sentencing Reform Act of 1981. https://leg.wa.gov/RCW/

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 9.94A.510. Table 1—Sentencing grid. https://leg.wa.gov/RCW/

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 9.94A.520. Offense seriousness level. https://leg.wa.gov/RCW/

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 9.94A.525. Offender Score. https://leg.wa.gov/RCW/

Appendixes

Table A1. Average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community

	N	Avg. Offender Score	Avg. Seriousness Level
Age at Time of Sentencing			
18 to 25	1,829	1.96	3.11
26 to 35	2,625	2.90	1.41
36 to 45	1,266	3.06	2.98
>= 46	1,034	2.90	0.63
Gender			
Female	1,416	1.81	2.41
Male	5,338	2.90	3.17
BIPOC Community			
Yes	1,321	2.64	2.98
No	5,448	2.86	3.26

Note: Approximately 9.7% of the sample (n = 723) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported.

Table A2. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell

Seriousness Level	Offender Score									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI										
XV	0.2%	0.1%								0.1%
XIV	0.1%		0.1%							
XIII										
XII	0.2%		0.1%	0.2%						0.2%
XI	0.3%		0.1%	0.1%						
X	0.4%			0.1%			0.1%			
IX	0.5%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%			0.1%
VII	0.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%		0.1%	0.2%
VII	0.9%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%
VI	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%			0.1%			0.3%
V	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.6%
IV	4.3%	1.8%	1.7%	1.0%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	1.1%
III	7.5%	3.8%	3.1%	1.8%	1.6%	1.5%	0.7%	0.6%	0.4%	1.1%
II	5.4%	3.2%	1.7%	1.5%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.5%	2.1%
I	10.7%	5.4%	3.9%	2.8%	1.9%	1.8%	1.3%	0.9%	0.8%	2.8%

Note: Approximately 9.7% of the sample (n = 723) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A3. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by gender

Seriousness Level	Offender Score	Females										Males									
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
	XVI																				
	XV					0.1%						0.2%	0.1%	0.1%							0.1%
	XIV											0.2%		0.1%							0.1%
	XIII																				
	XII	0.1%									0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%					0.2%
	XI	0.1%										0.4%		0.1%	0.1%						
	X											0.5%			0.1%			0.1%			0.1%
	IX	0.6%		0.1%	0.1%							0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%			0.1%
	VII	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%		0.1%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%
	VII	0.7%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%						1.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%
	VI	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%		0.1%				0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%			0.1%			0.3%
	V	0.6%	0.6%	0.3%		0.4%	0.1%		0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.7%
	IV	4.1%	1.7%	1.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	4.3%	1.9%	1.8%	1.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	1.2%
	III	6.5%	3.0%	2.7%	1.1%	1.3%	0.9%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%	7.8%	4.0%	3.2%	2.0%	1.7%	1.6%	0.9%	0.7%	0.5%	1.3%
	II	9.9%	4.7%	2.2%	1.8%	1.3%	1.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	1.4%	4.2%	2.8%	1.6%	1.5%	1.0%	0.8%	1.0%	0.6%	0.6%	2.3%
	I	18.6%	7.2%	5.6%	3.0%	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	0.6%	0.3%	1.1%	8.6%	4.9%	3.4%	2.7%	2.0%	1.9%	1.2%	1.0%	0.9%	3.2%

Note: Approximately 9.7% of the sample (n = 723) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A4. Offender score ratio for male and female offenders, by seriousness level

Seriousness Level	Offender Score Ratio	Male		Female	
		N	Avg. Offender Score	N	Avg. Offender Score
Total	1.60	5,338	2.9	1,416	1.8
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	1.85	25	2.2	--	4.0
14	--	22	2.6	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	1.17	50	3.9	--	4.5
11	0.00	39	2.0	--	0.0
10	--	50	2.2	--	--
9	0.16	72	2.8	11	0.5
8	0.83	117	3.1	41	2.6
7	0.29	201	3.4	20	1.0
6	0.79	76	3.2	20	2.5
5	0.57	288	4.2	31	2.4
4	0.76	672	2.5	137	1.9
3	0.72	1262	2.4	233	1.7
2	0.61	874	3.3	339	2.0
1	0.56	1589	2.9	579	1.6

Note: Approximately 9.7% of the sample (n = 723) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. To examine gender differences, the ratio of average offender score by female offenders as compared to male offenders were computed. A value of "1" indicates that the average offender score for female and male offenders were the same. A value greater than "1" indicates that, on average, the female offenders had higher offender scores than male offenders. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A5. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing

Offender Score

18 to 25

Seriousness Level	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
XVI	0.1%									
XV	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%							
XIV	0.2%	0.1%								
XIII										
XII	0.3%	0.1%		0.1%	0.1%	0.1%		0.1%		0.1%
XI	0.3%		0.2%	0.3%	0.1%					
X	0.3%			0.1%		0.1%				
IX	0.9%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%		
VII	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%				
VII	1.1%	0.3%	0.7%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%
VI	0.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%			0.1%	0.1%		0.2%
V	1.0%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%
IV	5.3%	2.7%	2.6%	1.2%	1.4%	0.5%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.5%
III	7.2%	5.0%	3.4%	2.1%	1.3%	1.3%	0.7%	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%
II	6.2%	3.9%	1.7%	2.4%	1.2%	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%	0.9%
I	12.3%	6.0%	3.4%	2.6%	1.5%	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%	0.2%	0.7%

26 to 35

Seriousness Level	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
XVI										
XV		0.1%								0.1%
XIV						0.1%				0.1%
XIII										
XII				0.2%						0.3%
XI	0.3%									0.1%
X	0.1%			0.2%						
IX	0.3%		0.1%	0.1%		0.1%				0.2%
VII	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%		0.2%	0.4%
VII	0.8%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.5%
VI	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%			0.1%			0.2%
V	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.7%
IV	3.2%	1.4%	1.5%	1.0%	0.8%	0.5%	0.7%	0.2%	0.3%	1.2%
III	7.2%	2.9%	3.1%	2.2%	1.8%	1.7%	0.5%	0.8%	0.5%	1.0%
II	5.7%	3.7%	1.9%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.2%	0.7%	0.8%	2.3%
I	9.7%	5.0%	4.3%	2.7%	2.1%	2.4%	1.4%	1.2%	1.1%	2.9%

36 to 45

Seriousness Level	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
XVI										
XV	0.3%	0.1%								0.1%
XIV	0.1%		0.2%		0.2%					0.1%
XIII										
XII	0.2%	0.1%		0.2%				0.1%		0.2%
XI	0.3%		0.2%	0.1%	0.1%					
X	0.4%	0.1%		0.1%				0.1%		0.2%
IX	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%		0.1%					
VII	0.9%	0.4%	0.7%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%
VII	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%		0.4%
VI	0.2%		0.2%	0.2%		0.1%				0.5%
V	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%	0.9%	0.3%	0.6%	0.1%	0.9%
IV	3.7%	2.1%	1.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.1%	1.5%
III	7.3%	3.2%	2.8%	0.9%	2.2%	1.6%	0.9%	0.7%	0.8%	1.5%
II	4.6%	1.7%	1.8%	1.3%	0.9%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	3.3%
I	10.2%	5.5%	4.7%	3.2%	2.2%	2.1%	1.7%	0.5%	1.1%	4.1%

> = 46

Seriousness Level	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
XVI										
XV	0.2%				0.1%					
XIV	0.3%		0.1%							
XIII										
XII	0.5%		0.3%	0.2%	0.2%		0.1%			0.1%
XI	0.3%							0.1%	0.1%	
X	1.2%		0.2%	0.2%		0.1%	0.6%			
IX	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%		0.1%	0.1%				0.1%
VII	1.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%		0.3%
VII	1.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%		0.4%
VI	0.7%	0.2%	0.1%		0.1%		0.1%			0.3%
V	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.4%	1.1%	0.8%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.5%
IV	5.8%	1.0%	1.2%	1.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	1.1%
III	9.3%	4.4%	2.6%	1.4%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%	0.2%	0.2%	2.1%
II	4.2%	2.5%	1.2%	1.0%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	2.5%
I	11.1%	5.4%	2.6%	2.6%	1.7%	1.5%	1.4%	1.0%	0.5%	4.4%

Note: Approximately 9.7% of the sample (n = 723) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A6. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community

Seriousness Level	Offender Score																			
	Non-BIPOC										BIPOC									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI											0.1%									0.1%
XV	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%							0.2%	0.3%								0.1%	0.1%
XIV	0.2%									0.2%		0.1%	0.2%			0.1%				
XIII																				
XII	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%						0.1%	0.2%			0.2%	0.1%	0.2%			0.1%	0.3%
XI	0.3%		0.1%	0.1%							0.4%		0.2%	0.2%	0.1%				0.1%	0.1%
X	0.5%			0.1%			0.1%			0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%				0.1%			
IX	0.5%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%			0.1%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%		0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%		0.2%
VII	0.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%		0.2%	0.1%
VII	0.8%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	1.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.1%	0.2%		0.5%
VI	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%			0.1%			0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%				0.2%
V	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.5%	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%	0.5%	0.9%
IV	4.3%	1.8%	1.7%	0.9%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	1.0%	4.3%	1.7%	1.9%	1.2%	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.2%	1.3%
III	7.6%	3.4%	3.0%	1.7%	1.6%	1.3%	0.7%	0.6%	0.4%	1.1%	7.4%	5.2%	3.5%	2.1%	1.8%	2.2%	1.0%	0.6%	0.5%	1.0%
II	5.4%	3.3%	1.8%	1.5%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%	0.5%	2.0%	5.5%	2.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	0.7%	2.7%
I	11.4%	5.8%	3.9%	3.0%	2.0%	1.7%	1.3%	1.0%	0.8%	2.9%	7.7%	3.9%	3.9%	1.9%	1.7%	1.9%	1.3%	0.3%	0.7%	2.1%

Note: Approximately 9.7% of the sample (n = 723) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A7. Offender score ratio for BIPOC and Non-BIPOC community offenders, by seriousness level

Seriousness Level	Offender Score Ratio	Non-BIPOC		BIPOC	
		N	Avg. Offender Score	N	Avg. Offender Score
Total	1.12	5,448	2.9	1,321	2.6
16	1.00	--	4.5	--	4.5
15	0.78	26	3.7	--	2.8
14	0.59	24	4.2	--	2.5
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	0.00	40	3.5	12	0.0
11	0.51	29	1.6	12	0.8
10	0.23	46	2.2	--	0.5
9	1.49	59	2.2	24	3.3
8	0.94	126	3.0	32	2.8
7	0.91	167	3.3	54	3.0
6	0.89	81	3.1	15	2.7
5	1.17	251	3.9	68	4.5
4	1.18	633	2.3	176	2.7
3	1.03	1,161	2.3	334	2.4
2	1.14	969	2.9	244	3.3
1	1.05	1,834	2.6	334	2.7

Note: Approximately 9.7% of the sample (n = 723) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. To examine racial differences, the ratio of average offender score by BIPOC community offenders as compared to non-BIPOC community offenders were computed. A value of "1" indicates that the average offender score for BIPOC and non-BIPOC community offenders were the same. A value greater than "1" indicates that, on average, the BIPOC community offenders had higher offender scores than non-BIPOC community offenders. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A8. Average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community for recidivators

	N	Avg. Offender Score	Avg. Seriousness Level
Age at Time of Sentencing			
18 to 25	908	2.00	2.65
26 to 35	1,196	2.72	2.38
36 to 45	487	2.98	2.39
>= 46	351	2.66	2.44
Gender			
Female	646	1.69	2.18
Male	2,296	2.77	2.56
BIPOC Community			
Yes	582	2.50	2.78
No	2,360	2.66	2.40

Note: Approximately 10.6% of the sample (n = 349) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A9. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell for recidivators

Seriousness Level	Offender Score									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI										
XV										
XIV										
XIII										
XII										
XI										
X	0.1%									
IX	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%							
VII	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%				0.1%
VII	0.7%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%		0.1%		
VI	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%						
V	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
IV	3.8%	1.6%	1.8%	1.2%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%
III	7.2%	3.7%	3.4%	1.9%	1.7%	1.6%	0.8%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
II	6.1%	4.0%	1.9%	1.7%	1.4%	1.2%	1.3%	0.8%	0.6%	1.9%
I	12.1%	5.9%	4.7%	3.0%	2.3%	2.3%	1.7%	1.1%	0.8%	2.9%

Note: Approximately 10.6% of the sample (n = 349) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A10. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by gender for recidivators

Seriousness Level	Offender Score																			
	Females										Males									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI																				
XV																				
XIV																				
XIII																				
XII																				
XI																				
X											0.1%									
IX	0.8%										0.2%	0.1%	0.1%							
VII	0.3%			0.3%	0.2%	0.3%				0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%				
VII	0.8%	0.2%	0.2%								0.7%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%		0.1%		
VI	0.5%	0.5%									0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%						
V	0.5%	0.8%	0.3%		0.2%			0.2%	0.3%		0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.5%	0.7%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
IV	3.1%	1.2%	1.4%	1.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%			4.0%	1.7%	2.0%	1.1%	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%
III	6.8%	3.1%	2.8%	0.6%	1.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.3%		0.5%	7.3%	3.9%	3.6%	2.3%	1.8%	1.8%	1.0%	0.8%	0.4%	0.7%
II	11.3%	5.7%	2.2%	2.0%	1.4%	1.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.3%	1.1%	4.7%	3.5%	1.8%	1.6%	1.4%	1.2%	1.5%	0.9%	0.7%	2.2%
I	20.1%	6.3%	6.0%	3.3%	2.0%	1.5%	2.3%	0.6%		0.9%	9.9%	5.7%	4.4%	2.9%	2.4%	2.5%	1.5%	1.3%	1.0%	3.4%

Note: Approximately 10.6% of the sample (n = 349) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A11. Offender score ratio for male and female offender who recidivated, by seriousness level

Seriousness Level	Offender Score Ratio	Male		Female	
		N	Avg. Offender Score	N	Avg. Offender Score
Total	0.61	2,296	2.8	646	1.7
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	0.0	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	7.0	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	0.0	--	--
9	0.00	12	1.8	--	0.0
8	1.73	30	2.1	--	3.6
7	0.18	56	2.4	--	0.4
6	0.34	21	1.5	--	0.5
5	0.64	119	4.0	14	2.6
4	0.80	260	2.1	52	1.7
3	0.69	544	2.4	105	1.6
2	0.55	446	3.3	170	1.8
1	0.56	804	2.9	279	1.6

Note: Approximately 10.6% of the sample (n = 349) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. To examine gender differences, the ratio of average offender score by female offenders as compared to male offenders were computed. A value of "1" indicates that the average offender score for female and male offenders were the same. A value greater than "1" indicates that, on average, the female offenders had higher offender scores than male offenders. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A12. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing for recidivators

18 to 25

Seriousness Level	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
XVI										
XV										
XIV										
XIII										
XII								0.1%		
XI										
X										
IX	0.6%	0.1%	0.2%		0.1%		0.1%			
VII	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%		0.0%	0.2%				
VII	1.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%		0.2%		
VI	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%						
V	0.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%
IV	5.0%	2.6%	3.1%	1.3%	1.4%	0.9%		0.2%		0.2%
III	7.0%	4.4%	4.0%	2.0%	1.4%	1.3%	0.8%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%
II	6.7%	4.6%	2.1%	2.3%	1.4%	1.2%	0.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%
I	12.7%	7.0%	3.5%	2.5%	1.8%	1.4%	1.0%	0.9%	0.2%	0.9%

26 to 35

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
0.1%									
0.1%									
0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%						
0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%				0.1%
0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.6%	0.1%		0.1%		
0.2%	0.3%	0.2%			0.1%				
0.4%	0.7%	0.3%	0.7%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%
3.1%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%
7.1%	2.7%	3.2%	2.5%	1.7%	1.8%	0.6%	0.9%	0.3%	0.5%
6.9%	4.3%	2.1%	1.7%	1.8%	1.3%	1.8%	0.9%	0.9%	1.8%
11.2%	5.6%	5.4%	2.4%	2.6%	2.8%	1.8%	1.7%	1.1%	3.3%

36 to 45

Seriousness Level	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
XVI										
XV										
XIV										
XIII										
XII										
XI										
X	0.2%									
IX										
VII	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.6%	0.2%				0.2%
VII	0.2%		0.2%		0.4%	0.2%				
VI	0.4%			0.4%						
V	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	1.0%	0.2%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%
IV	2.9%	1.2%	2.3%	1.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%		0.4%
III	6.2%	3.9%	2.9%	1.0%	2.9%	2.1%	1.0%	0.4%	0.6%	1.4%
II	4.7%	2.5%	1.4%	1.6%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.8%	1.0%	3.3%
I	12.1%	5.1%	5.7%	3.9%	3.1%	3.1%	2.1%	0.4%	1.4%	3.9%

> = 46

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
0.9%	0.6%		0.3%		0.6%				
1.1%									
0.6%									
0.6%	1.4%	1.1%	0.6%	0.9%	0.6%	0.3%		0.9%	0.3%
4.6%	0.6%	0.6%	1.1%			0.6%			0.3%
9.4%	5.1%	3.7%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	1.4%	0.3%	0.3%	1.4%
4.0%	3.7%	1.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%		3.7%
14.0%	4.8%	4.0%	4.8%	1.7%	2.0%	2.6%	0.9%	0.6%	5.1%

Note: Approximately 10.6% of the sample (n = 349) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A13. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community for recidivators

Seriousness Level	Offender Score																			
	Non-BIPOC										BIPOC									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI																				
XV																				
XIV																				
XIII																				
XII																				
XI																				
X	0.1%																			
IX	0.3%		0.1%								0.5%		0.2%							
VII	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%				0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%				
VII	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%			0.1%			1.5%	0.3%	0.5%		0.5%			0.2%		
VI	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%							0.0%	0.3%	0.2%							
V	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.7%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	1.0%
IV	3.6%	1.4%	1.9%	1.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%		0.3%	4.5%	2.4%	1.7%	1.2%	0.9%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%		0.5%
III	7.1%	3.5%	3.3%	2.0%	1.6%	1.4%	0.8%	0.7%	0.3%	0.7%	7.5%	4.6%	3.9%	1.5%	2.2%	2.4%	0.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.3%
II	6.0%	4.1%	2.1%	1.7%	1.4%	1.1%	1.2%	0.7%	0.6%	1.8%	6.7%	3.6%	1.2%	1.9%	1.2%	1.4%	1.7%	1.2%	0.7%	2.4%
I	13.1%	6.4%	4.7%	3.1%	2.4%	2.4%	1.6%	1.3%	0.9%	3.1%	8.4%	3.9%	4.6%	2.4%	2.1%	2.1%	1.9%	0.5%	0.5%	1.7%

Note: Approximately 10.6% of the sample (n = 349) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A14. Offender score ratio for BIPOC and Non-BIPOC community offenders who recidivated, by seriousness level

Seriousness Level	Offender Score Ratio	Non-BIPOC		BIPOC	
		N	Avg. Offender Score	N	Avg. Offender Score
Total	0.93	2,360	2.7	582	2.5
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	0.0	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	0.0	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	0.0	--	--
9	3.71	10	0.5	--	1.9
8	1.07	27	2.4	11	2.5
7	1.08	41	2.1	22	2.3
6	1.77	23	1.1	--	2.0
5	1.36	106	3.6	27	4.9
4	1.12	237	1.9	75	2.2
3	1.00	505	2.2	144	2.2
2	1.12	488	2.8	128	3.1
1	1.01	919	2.6	164	2.6

Note: Approximately 10.6% of the sample (n = 349) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. To examine racial differences, the ratio of average offender score by BIPOC community offenders as compared to non-BIPOC community offenders were computed. A value of "1" indicates that the average offender score for BIPOC and non-BIPOC community offenders were the same. A value greater than "1" indicates that, on average, the BIPOC community offenders had higher offender scores than non-BIPOC community offenders. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A15. Average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community for offenders with a presence of a community supervision point

	N	Avg. Offender Score	Avg. Seriousness Level
Age at Time of Sentencing			
18 to 25	143	4.49	2.62
Recidivator	75	4.45	2.29
Non-recidivator	68	4.53	2.99
26 to 35	289	5.80	2.58
Recidivator	145	5.46	1.91
Non-recidivator	144	6.13	3.26
36 to 45	132	6.14	2.58
Recidivator	68	5.71	1.12
Non-recidivator	64	6.59	3.02
>= 46	73	6.16	2.41
Recidivator	33	5.91	1.76
Non-recidivator	40	6.38	2.95
Gender			
Female	103	4.24	2.16
Recidivator	57	4.46	1.89
Non-recidivator	46	3.98	2.48
Male	585	5.33	2.42
Recidivator	315	4.62	1.74
Non-recidivator	270	6.16	3.22
BIPOC Community			
Yes	107	5.99	2.71
Recidivator	54	5.33	2.06
Non-recidivator	53	6.66	3.38
No	530	5.54	2.54
Recidivator	267	5.32	2.04
Non-recidivator	263	5.76	3.06

Note: Approximately 13.5% of the sample (n = 99) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A16. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell for recidivators **with a** presence of a community supervision point

Seriousness Level	Offender Score									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI										0.2%
XV										
XIV										
XIII								0.2%	0.2%	0.5%
XII										
XI										
X				0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%		0.2%
IX				0.2%	0.5%	0.5%		0.2%	0.3%	1.4%
VII				0.2%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	1.1%
VII							0.3%			0.2%
VI				0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	0.6%
V		0.0%	1.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	2.2%
IV		0.0%	2.0%	2.2%	2.7%	2.7%	1.7%	1.1%	0.9%	1.7%
III	1.1%	6.0%	1.1%	2.7%	3.1%	3.3%	2.5%	3.0%	1.7%	6.0%
II		0.2%	3.1%	3.3%	3.6%	5.3%	4.1%	3.0%	2.4%	10.7%
I										0.2%

Note: Approximately 13.5% of the sample (n = 99) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A17. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by gender for recidivators with a presence of a community supervision point

Seriousness Level	Offender Score: Females 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	Males 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI																				
XV																				
XIV																				
XIII																				
XII																				
XI																				
X																				
IX																				
VII				1.8%	1.8%					1.8%						0.4%				0.4%
VII										1.8%				0.4%	0.8%	0.4%		0.4%		
VI																				
V							1.8%	5.3%	1.8%	1.8%				0.8%	0.4%	0.8%		0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
IV							8.8%			7.0%			0.4%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%		0.4%		1.1%
III					7.0%								2.7%	2.7%	1.9%	3.8%	2.3%	2.3%	0.4%	0.8%
II	3.5%	7.0%		3.5%	1.8%	8.8%					0.8%	5.7%	1.1%	3.4%	3.8%	3.0%	4.2%	2.7%	2.7%	5.3%
I		1.8%	8.8%	8.8%	12.3%	3.5%							2.7%	3.4%	2.7%	7.2%	4.9%	5.3%	4.2%	10.6%

Note: Approximately 13.5% of the sample (n = 99) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A18. Offender score ratio for male and female offender, who with a presence of a community supervision point, recidivated, by seriousness level

Seriousness Level	Offender Score Ratio	Male		Female	
		N	Avg. Offender Score	N	Avg. Offender Score
Total	0.97	315	4.62	57	4.46
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	--	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	--	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	--	--	--
9	--	--	--	--	--
8	0.76	--	7.0	--	5.3
7	1.96	--	4.6	--	9.0
6	--	--	--	--	--
5	1.33	--	5.5	--	7.3
4	1.34	11	5.5	--	7.3
3	0.84	44	4.8	--	4.0
2	0.56	86	4.9	14	2.8
1	0.51	108	6.3	20	3.2

Note: Approximately 13.5% of the sample (n = 99) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. To examine gender differences, the ratio of average offender score by female offenders as compared to male offenders were computed. A value of "1" indicates that the average offender score for female and male offenders were the same. A value greater than "1" indicates that, on average, the female offenders had higher offender scores than male offenders. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A19. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing for recidivators with a presence of a community supervision point

Offender Score

Seriousness Level	18 to 25										26 to 35									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
XVI																				
XV																				
XIV																				
XIII																				
XII																				
XI																				
X																				
IX																				
VII						1.3%														0.7%
VII				1.3%		1.3%		1.3%							1.4%					
VI																				
V								1.3%						1.4%		0.7%				
IV				1.3%	1.3%	2.7%		1.3%		1.3%					0.7%					1.4%
III			1.3%	4.0%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	1.3%				3.4%	1.4%	3.4%	2.8%	0.7%	2.1%		0.7%
II	1.3%	8.0%	1.3%	5.3%	4.0%	8.0%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%		1.4%	5.5%	1.4%	3.4%	3.4%	2.1%	4.8%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%
I			5.3%	8.0%	5.3%	2.7%	8.0%	2.7%	1.3%	2.7%		0.7%	2.1%	3.4%	4.1%	9.0%	4.1%	6.2%	4.1%	11.0%

Seriousness Level	36 to 45										> = 46									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
XVI																				
XV																				
XIV																				
XIII																				
XII																				
XI																				
X																				
IX																				
VII				1.5%	1.5%					1.5%										
VII																				
VI																				
V					1.5%				1.5%	1.5%						3.0%				
IV			1.5%	1.5%																
III				2.9%	2.9%	4.4%	1.5%	1.5%		2.9%			3.0%			3.0%	6.1%			
II		2.9%		2.9%	2.9%	4.4%	2.9%	4.4%	1.5%	5.9%	3.0%	9.1%			3.0%	3.0%	6.1%			15.2%
I			7.4%	2.9%	4.4%	5.9%	4.4%	1.5%	4.4%	13.2%				3.0%	3.0%	6.1%	9.1%	6.1%	3.0%	15.2%

Note: Approximately 13.5% of the sample (n = 99) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A20. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community for recidivators with a presence of a community supervision point

Seriousness Level	Offender Score																			
	Non-BIPOC										BIPOC									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI																				
XV																				
XIV																				
XIII																				
XII																				
XI																				
X																				
IX																				
VII				0.4%	0.4%	0.4%				0.7%										
VII				0.4%		0.4%		0.4%							1.4%					
VI																				
V				0.7%	0.4%	0.7%			0.4%									0.7%		0.7%
IV			0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%				1.1%					0.7%			0.7%		
III			2.6%	1.9%	2.6%	3.7%	1.9%	1.9%	0.4%	1.1%				1.4%	1.4%		0.7%	0.7%		
II	1.1%	6.4%	1.1%	3.4%	3.7%	4.1%	3.4%	2.2%	2.6%	4.5%	0.7%	1.4%		1.4%	0.7%	1.4%	2.1%	2.8%	0.7%	2.1%
I		0.4%	2.6%	5.2%	4.5%	6.0%	4.5%	5.2%	3.7%	10.5%			3.4%		1.4%	3.4%	4.1%		0.7%	2.8%

Note: Approximately 13.5% of the sample (n = 99) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A21. Offender score ratio for BIPOC and Non-BIPOC community offenders, who with a presence of a community supervision point, recidivated, by seriousness level

Seriousness Level	Offender Score Ratio	Non-BIPOC		BIPOC	
		N	Avg. Offender Score	N	Avg. Offender Score
Total	0.96	315	4.7	57	4.5
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	--	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	--	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	--	--	--
9	--	--	--	--	--
8	--	--	6.0	--	--
7	0.80	--	5.0	--	4.0
6	--	--	--	--	--
5	0.00	--	4.7	--	0.0
4	1.01	--	5.4	--	5.5
3	0.93	43	4.8	--	4.5
2	1.16	87	4.7	19	5.4
1	0.89	114	6.0	23	5.3

Note: Approximately 13.5% of the sample (n = 99) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. To examine racial differences, the ratio of average offender score by BIPOC community offenders as compared to non-BIPOC community offenders were computed. A value of "1" indicates that the average offender score for BIPOC and non-BIPOC community offenders were the same. A value greater than "1" indicates that, on average, the BIPOC community offenders had higher offender scores than non-BIPOC community offenders. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A22. Average offender score and seriousness level by age at time of sentencing, gender, and BIPOC community for offenders with a presence of a multiplier

	N	Avg. Offender Score	Avg. Seriousness Level
Age at Time of Sentencing			
18 to 25	936	3.20	2.85
Recidivator	489	3.16	2.52
Non-recidivator	447	3.23	3.21
26 to 35	1,678	4.25	2.76
Recidivator	785	3.92	2.28
Non-recidivator	893	4.54	3.18
36 to 45	820	4.34	2.72
Recidivator	332	4.14	2.28
Non-recidivator	488	4.48	3.02
>= 46	622	4.05	2.84
Recidivator	237	3.73	2.33
Non-recidivator	385	4.25	3,16
Gender			
Female	700	3.14	2.28
Recidivator	322	3.00	2.02
Non-recidivator	378	3.26	2.50
Male	3,356	4.17	2.89
Recidivator	1,521	3.89	2.42
Non-recidivator	1,835	4.41	3.28
BIPOC Community			
Yes	822	4.16	3.12
Recidivator	362	3.93	2.27
Non-recidivator	460	4.34	3.44
No	3,234	3.95	2.70
Recidivator	1,481	3.69	2.70
Non-recidivator	1,753	4.18	3.07

Note: Approximately 15.8% of the recidivated sample (n = 291) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A23. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell for recidivators **with a** presence of a multiplier

Seriousness Level	Offender Score									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI										
XV										
XIV										
XIII										
XII								0.1%		
XI										
X										
IX	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%		0.1%			
VII	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%				0.1%
VII	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%		0.2%		0.1%
VI	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%				
V	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.7%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.6%
IV	0.8%	1.3%	1.7%	1.7%	1.2%	0.7%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.5%
III	1.0%	3.7%	4.4%	2.9%	2.7%	2.5%	1.2%	1.1%	0.5%	1.0%
II	1.5%	4.7%	2.6%	2.6%	2.0%	1.8%	1.9%	1.3%	1.0%	2.9%
I	2.3%	8.0%	7.2%	4.6%	3.5%	3.6%	2.6%	1.8%	1.2%	4.4%

Note: Approximately 15.8% of the recidivated sample (n = 291) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A24. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by gender for recidivators **with a presence of a multiplier**

Seriousness Level	Offender Score: Females 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	Males 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI																				
XV																				
XIV																				
XIII																				
XII																		0.1%		
XI																				
X																				
IX											0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%		0.1%			
VII				0.6%	0.3%	0.6%				0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%				0.1%
VII											0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.7%	0.3%		0.2%		0.1%
VI		0.3%									0.1%		0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%				
V	0.6%	0.3%			0.3%			0.3%	0.6%		0.1%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.7%	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.7%
IV	0.9%	1.2%	1.6%	2.2%	0.9%	0.3%	0.6%				0.7%	1.3%	1.8%	1.6%	1.3%	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.6%
III	0.6%	2.5%	5.3%	0.9%	2.5%	1.6%		0.6%		0.9%	1.1%	4.0%	4.3%	3.3%	2.8%	2.7%	1.5%	1.2%	0.7%	1.0%
II	2.8%	5.9%	3.7%	3.4%	2.5%	2.2%	1.2%	1.2%	0.6%	1.6%	1.2%	4.4%	2.4%	2.4%	1.8%	1.7%	2.0%	1.3%	1.1%	3.2%
I	5.3%	10.2%	11.2%	6.2%	4.0%	3.1%	4.7%	1.2%		1.9%	1.6%	7.6%	6.4%	4.2%	3.4%	3.7%	2.2%	1.9%	1.5%	4.9%

Note: Approximately 15.8% of the recidivated sample (n = 291) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A25. Offender score ratio for male and female offender, who **with a** presence of a multiplier, recidivated, by seriousness level

Seriousness Level	Offender Score Ratio	Male		Female	
		N	Avg. Offender Score	N	Avg. Offender Score
Total	0.77	1,521	3.89	322	3.00
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	--	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	7.0	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	--	--	--
9	--	--	2.4	--	--
8	1.47	18	3.3	--	4.8
7	--	36	3.5	--	--
6	0.36	--	2.8	--	1.0
5	0.78	77	5.1	--	4.0
4	0.32	136	7.9	25	2.6
3	0.89	342	3.5	48	3.1
2	0.75	329	4.2	81	3.2
1	0.72	570	4.0	154	2.9

Note: Approximately 15.8% of the recidivated sample (n = 291) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. To examine gender differences, the ratio of average offender score by female offenders as compared to male offenders were computed. A value of "1" indicates that the average offender score for female and male offenders were the same. A value greater than "1" indicates that, on average, the female offenders had higher offender scores than male offenders. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A26. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by age at time of sentencing for recidivators **with** a presence of a multiplier

Offender Score

Seriousness Level	18 to 25										26 to 35									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
XVI																				
XV																				
XIV																				
XIII																				
XII								0.2%												
XI																				
X																				
IX		0.2%			0.2%		0.2%				0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%						
VII		0.2%			0.0%	0.4%					0.1%			0.5%	0.1%	0.1%				0.1%
VII		0.4%	0.4%	1.0%	0.4%	0.4%		0.4%				0.3%	0.5%	0.1%	0.8%	0.1%		0.1%		
VI			0.2%	0.2%								0.1%				0.1%				
V		0.2%	0.6%		0.2%	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.6%	0.8%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.9%
IV	0.8%	1.8%	2.7%	1.8%	2.5%	1.6%		0.4%		0.4%	0.5%	1.3%	1.0%	1.7%	1.3%	0.5%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%
III	1.0%	5.3%	5.3%	3.5%	2.7%	2.5%	1.2%	1.2%	0.6%		0.5%	2.3%	4.1%	3.6%	2.5%	2.7%	0.9%	1.4%	0.4%	0.8%
II	2.0%	5.5%	2.9%	3.9%	2.0%	2.2%	1.4%	1.2%	0.6%	1.2%	1.4%	5.1%	2.8%	2.5%	2.5%	1.8%	2.5%	1.4%	1.4%	2.5%
I	2.0%	10.2%	6.1%	4.3%	2.7%	2.7%	1.6%	1.6%	0.4%	1.4%	1.7%	7.8%	7.8%	3.7%	3.9%	4.1%	2.7%	2.5%	1.5%	5.0%

Seriousness Level	36 to 45										> = 46									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 +
XVI																				
XV																				
XIV																				
XIII																				
XII																				
XI																				
X																				
IX																				
VII			0.6%	0.3%	0.9%	0.3%				0.3%	0.4%	0.4%		0.4%		0.8%				
VII											0.4%									0.4%
VI			0.3%		0.6%	0.3%					0.4%				0.4%					
V		0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.9%	0.9%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	1.7%	0.4%	0.8%	0.8%	0.4%		1.3%	0.4%
IV	0.6%	1.2%	2.7%	1.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%		0.6%	1.7%	0.4%	0.8%	1.7%			0.4%			0.4%
III	0.3%	3.6%	3.6%	1.5%	3.9%	2.7%	1.5%	0.6%	0.9%	2.1%	3.8%	5.5%	5.1%	1.3%	1.7%	1.7%	2.1%	0.4%	0.4%	2.1%
II	0.6%	2.7%	2.1%	2.4%	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%	1.5%	4.8%	1.7%	4.2%	2.1%	0.4%	0.4%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%		5.1%
I	2.7%	6.3%	8.4%	5.4%	4.5%	4.5%	3.0%	0.6%	2.1%	5.4%	4.2%	6.8%	5.9%	6.8%	2.5%	3.0%	3.8%	1.3%	0.8%	7.2%

Note: Approximately 15.8% of the recidivated sample (n = 291) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A27. Percentage of offense seriousness level and offender score, by grid cell and by BIPOC community for recidivators with a presence of a multiplier

Seriousness Level	Offender Score																			
	Non-BIPOC										BIPOC									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 or more
XVI																				
XV																				
XIV																				
XIII																				
XII								0.1%												
XI																				
X																				
IX		0.1%	0.1%	0.1%							0.3%	0.3%			0.3%		0.3%			
VII	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%				0.1%		0.3%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.6%				
VII	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%		0.1%				0.6%	0.6%		0.8%	0.8%		0.3%		0.3%
VI	0.1%	0.1%		0.1%		0.1%							0.3%		0.3%					
V	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	0.7%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%			0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.3%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	1.7%
IV	0.8%	1.1%	1.9%	1.7%	1.3%	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	0.6%	1.9%	1.1%	1.7%	1.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.3%	0.8%
III	0.7%	3.4%	4.4%	3.0%	2.5%	2.2%	1.2%	1.1%	0.5%	1.1%	2.2%	5.0%	4.7%	2.5%	3.6%	3.6%	1.4%	1.1%	0.8%	0.6%
II	1.6%	4.9%	2.8%	2.6%	2.0%	1.8%	1.7%	1.1%	1.0%	2.7%	1.1%	3.9%	1.7%	2.8%	1.9%	1.9%	2.8%	1.9%	1.1%	3.9%
I	2.6%	8.9%	7.4%	4.7%	3.6%	3.7%	2.5%	2.0%	1.4%	4.9%	1.1%	4.4%	6.6%	3.9%	3.3%	3.3%	3.0%	0.8%	0.8%	2.5%

Note: Approximately 15.8% of the recidivated sample (n = 291) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table A28. Offender score ratio for BIPOC and Non-BIPOC community offenders, who **with a** presence of a multiplier, recidivated, by seriousness level

Seriousness Level	Offender Score Ratio	Non-BIPOC		BIPOC	
		N	Avg. Offender Score	N	Avg. Offender Score
Total	1.07	1,481	3.69	362	3.93
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	--	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	7.0	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	--	--	--
9	1.38	--	2.0	--	2.8
8	0.84	16	3.9	--	3.3
7	1.27	24	3.2	12	4.1
6	1.33	--	2.3	--	3.0
5	1.29	64	4.7	20	6.1
4	1.17	128	3.1	33	3.6
3	0.92	298	3.5	92	3.2
2	1.20	327	3.9	83	4.7
1	1.01	616	3.7	108	3.8

Note: Approximately 15.8% of the recidivated sample (n = 291) had an unranked offense seriousness level and therefore the total does not equate to 100%. Unranked offenses were not included in the calculations listed in Table. Due to missing, incomplete, unmatched, or inconsistent data, results may be under reported. To examine racial differences, the ratio of average offender score by BIPOC community offenders as compared to non-BIPOC community offenders were computed. A value of "1" indicates that the average offender score for BIPOC and non-BIPOC community offenders were the same. A value greater than "1" indicates that, on average, the BIPOC community offenders had higher offender scores than non-BIPOC community offenders. Due to low N standards, cells with N < 10 have been redacted. Low sample sizes might skew results.

Table B1. Summary of Tables 2, 7, 13, 16, 20, 23, A4, A11, A18, and A25

	Sample N (%)	Recid N (%)	Non-Recid N (%)	CSP Recid N (%)	CSP Non-Recid N (%)	No CSP Recid N (%)	No CSP Non-Recid N (%)	Mlt Recid N (%)	Mlt Non-Recid N (%)	No Mlt Recid N (%)	No Mlt Non-Recid N (%)
Female	1,547 (20.7)	709 (21.5)	838 (20.0)	64 (16.9)	54 (15.1)	645 (22.1)	784 (20.5)	371 (17.4)	426 (16.9)	338 (29.2)	412 (24.8)
Male	5,390 (79.3)	2,582 (78.5)	3,348 (80.0)	315 (83.1)	303 (84.9)	2,267 (77.9)	3,045 (79.5)	1,763 (82.6)	2,100 (83.1)	819 (70.8)	1,248 (75.2)

	Recidivism		Gender: Female	Gender: Male	Total
Community Supervision Point	Yes	Count	64[a]	315[a]	379
		% within recidivism	16.9%	83.1%	100.0%
		% within gender	54.2%	51.0%	51.5%
		% of total	8.7%	42.8%	51.5%
	No	Count	54[a]	303[a]	357
		% within recidivism	15.1%	84.9%	100.0%
		% within gender	45.8%	49.0%	48.5%
		% of total	7.3%	41.2%	48.5%
No Community Supervision Point	Yes	Count	645[a]	2,267[a]	2,912
		% within recidivism	22.1%	77.9%	100.0%
		% within gender	45.1%	42.7%	43.2%
		% of total	9.6%	33.6%	43.2%
	No	Count	784[a]	3,045[a]	3,829
		% within recidivism	20.5%	79.5%	100.0%
		% within gender	54.9%	57.3%	56.8%
		% of total	11.6%	45.2%	56.8%

Multiplier

	Recidivism		Gender: Female	Gender: Male	Total
	Yes	Count	371[a]	1,763[a]	2,134
		% within recidivism	17.4%	82.6%	100.0%
		% within gender	46.5%	45.6%	45.8%
		% of total	8.0%	37.8%	45.8%
	No	Count	426[a]	2,100[a]	2,526
		% within recidivism	16.9%	83.1%	100.0%
		% within gender	53.5%	54.4%	54.2%
		% of total	9.1%	45.1%	54.2%

No Multiplier

	Recidivism		Gender: Female	Gender: Male	Total
	Yes	Count	338[a]	819[b]	1,157
		% within recidivism	29.2%	70.8%	100.0%
		% within gender	45.1%	39.6%	41.1%
		% of total	12.0%	29.1%	41.1%
	No	Count	412[a]	1,248[b]	1,600
		% within recidivism	24.8%	75.2%	100.0%
		% within gender	54.9%	60.4%	58.9%
		% of total	14.6%	44.3%	58.9%

Recidivators

SL	OS Ratio	Male N	Male Avg. OS	Female N	Female Avg. OS
Total	1.60	5,338	2.9	1,416	1.8
16	--	--	0.0	--	--
15	1.85	25	2.2	--	4.0
14	--	22	2.6	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	1.17	50	3.9	--	4.5
11	0.00	39	2.0	--	0.0
10	--	50	2.2	--	--
9	0.16	72	2.8	11	0.5
8	0.83	117	3.1	41	2.6
7	0.29	201	3.4	20	1.0
6	0.79	76	3.2	20	2.5
5	0.57	288	4.2	31	2.4
4	0.76	672	2.5	137	1.9
3	0.72	1262	2.4	233	1.7
2	0.61	874	3.3	339	2.0
1	0.56	1589	2.9	579	1.6

Recidivators with Community Supervision Point

SL	OS Ratio	Male N	Male Avg. OS	Female N	Female Avg. OS
Total	0.61	2,296	2.8	646	1.7
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	0.0	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	7.0	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	0.0	--	--
9	0.00	12	1.8	--	0.0
8	1.73	30	2.1	--	3.6
7	0.18	56	2.4	--	0.4
6	0.34	21	1.5	--	0.5
5	0.64	119	4.0	14	2.6
4	0.80	260	2.1	52	1.7
3	0.69	544	2.4	105	1.6
2	0.55	446	3.3	170	1.8
1	0.56	804	2.9	279	1.6

Recidivators with Multiplier

SL	OS Ratio	Male N	Male Avg. OS	Female N	Female Avg. OS
Total	0.97	315	4.62	57	4.46
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	--	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	--	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	--	--	--
9	--	--	--	--	--
8	0.76	--	7.0	--	5.3
7	1.96	--	4.6	--	9.0
6	--	--	--	--	--
5	1.33	--	5.5	--	7.3
4	1.34	11	5.5	--	7.3
3	0.84	44	4.8	--	4.0
2	0.56	86	4.9	14	2.8
1	0.51	108	6.3	20	3.2

Recidivators with Multiplier

SL	OS Ratio	Male N	Male Avg. OS	Female N	Female Avg. OS
Total	0.77	1,521	3.89	322	3.00
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	--	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	7.0	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	--	--	--
9	--	--	2.4	--	--
8	1.47	18	3.3	--	4.8
7	--	36	3.5	--	--
6	0.36	--	2.8	--	1.0
5	0.78	77	5.1	--	4.0
4	0.32	136	7.9	25	2.6
3	0.89	342	3.5	48	3.1
2	0.75	329	4.2	81	3.2
1	0.72	570	4.0	154	2.9

Note: Complete notes are included in respective tables for guidance in reading tables. SL = Seriousness Level; OS = Offender Score; Recid = Recidivator; CSP = Community Supervision Point; Mlt = Multiplier

Table B2. Summary of Tables 2, 7, 13, 16, 18, 25, A7, A14, A21, and A28

	Sample N (%)	Recid N (%)	Non-Recid N (%)	CSP Recid N (%)	CSP Non-Recid N (%)	No CSP Recid N (%)	No CSP Non-Recid N (%)	Mlt Recid N (%)	Mlt Non-Recid N (%)	No Mlt Recid N (%)	No Mlt Non-Recid N (%)
BIPOC	1,490 (19.9)	1,316 (33.3)	832 (19.9)	60 (15.8)	63 (17.6)	598 (20.5)	769 (20.1)	424 (19.9)	536 (21.2)	234 (20.2)	296 (17.8)
Non-BIPOC	5,987 (80.1)	2,633 (66.7)	3,354 (80.1)	319 (84.2)	294 (82.4)	2,314 (79.5)	3,060 (79.9)	1,710 (80.1)	1,990 (78.8)	923 (79.8)	1,364 (82.2)

			BIPOC Community		
	Recidivism		Yes	No	Total
Community Supervision Point	**Yes**	**Count**	319$_a$	60$_a$	379
		% within recidivism	84.2%	15.8%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	52.0%	48.8%	51.5%
		% of total	43.3%	8.2%	51.5%
	No	**Count**	294$_a$	63$_a$	357
		% within recidivism	82.4%	17.6%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	48.0%	51.2%	48.5%
		% of total	39.9%	8.6%	48.5%
No Community Supervision Point	**Yes**	**Count**	2,314$_a$	598$_a$	2,912
		% within recidivism	79.5%	20.5%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	43.1%	43.7%	43.2%
		% of total	34.3%	8.9%	43.2%
	No	**Count**	3,060$_a$	769$_a$	3,829
		% within recidivism	79.9%	20.1%	100.0%
		% within BIPOC	56.9%	56.3%	56.8%
		% of total	45.4%	11.4%	56.8%

Multiplier

		BIPOC Community		
Recidivism		Yes	Male	Total
Yes	**Count**	1,710$_a$	424$_a$	2,134
	% within recidivism	80.1%	19.9%	100.0%
	% within BIPOC	46.2%	44.2%	45.8%
	% of total	36.7%	9.1%	45.8%
No	**Count**	1,990$_a$	536$_a$	2,526
	% within recidivism	78.8%	21.2%	100.0%
	% within BIPOC	53.8%	55.8%	54.2%
	% of total	42.7%	11.5%	54.2%

No Multiplier

		BIPOC Community		
Recidivism		Yes	Male	Total
Yes	**Count**	923$_a$	234$_a$	1,157
	% within recidivism	79.8%	20.2%	100.0%
	% within BIPOC	40.4%	44.2%	41.1%
	% of total	32.8%	8.3%	41.1%
No	**Count**	1,364$_a$	296$_a$	1,600
	% within recidivism	82.2%	17.8%	100.0%
	% within BIPOC	59.6%	55.8%	58.9%
	% of total	48.4%	10.5%	58.9%

Recidivators

SL	OS Ratio	Non-BIPOC N	Non-BIPOC Avg. OS	BIPOC N	BIPOC Avg. OS
Total	1.12	5,448	2.9	1,321	2.6
16	1.00	--	4.5	--	4.5
15	0.78	26	3.7	--	2.8
14	0.59	24	4.2	--	2.5
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	0.00	40	3.5	12	0.0
11	0.51	29	1.6	12	0.8
10	0.23	46	2.2	--	0.5
9	1.49	59	2.2	24	3.3
8	0.94	126	3.0	32	2.8
7	0.91	167	3.3	54	3.0
6	0.89	81	3.1	15	2.7
5	1.17	251	3.9	68	4.5
4	1.18	633	2.3	176	2.7
3	1.03	1,161	2.3	334	2.4
2	1.14	969	2.9	244	3.3
1	1.05	1,834	2.6	334	2.7

Recidivators with Community Supervision Point

SL	OS Ratio	Non-BIPOC N	Non-BIPOC Avg. OS	BIPOC N	BIPOC Avg. OS
Total	0.93	2,360	2.7	582	2.5
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	0.0	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	0.0	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	0.0	--	--
9	3.71	10	0.5	--	1.9
8	1.07	27	2.4	11	2.5
7	1.08	41	2.1	22	2.3
6	1.77	23	1.1	--	2.0
5	1.36	106	3.6	27	4.9
4	1.12	237	1.9	75	2.2
3	1.00	505	2.2	144	2.2
2	1.12	488	2.8	128	3.1
1	1.01	919	2.6	164	2.6

Recidivators with Multiplier

SL	OS Ratio	Non-BIPOC N	Non-BIPOC Avg. OS	BIPOC N	BIPOC Avg. OS
Total	0.96	315	4.7	57	4.5
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	--	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	--	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	--	--	--
9	--	--	--	--	--
8	--	--	6.0	--	--
7	0.80	--	5.0	--	4.0
6	--	--	--	--	--
5	0.00	--	4.7	--	0.0
4	1.01	--	5.4	--	5.5
3	0.93	43	4.8	--	4.5
2	1.16	87	4.7	19	5.4
1	0.89	114	6.0	23	5.3

Recidivators with Multiplier

SL	OS Ratio	Non-BIPOC N	Non-BIPOC Avg. OS	BIPOC N	BIPOC Avg. OS
Total	1.07	1,481	3.69	362	3.93
16	--	--	--	--	--
15	--	--	--	--	--
14	--	--	--	--	--
13	--	--	--	--	--
12	--	--	7.0	--	--
11	--	--	--	--	--
10	--	--	--	--	--
9	1.38	--	2.0	--	2.8
8	0.84	16	3.9	--	3.3
7	1.27	24	3.2	12	4.1
6	1.33	--	2.3	--	3.0
5	1.29	64	4.7	20	6.1
4	1.17	128	3.1	33	3.6
3	0.92	298	3.5	92	3.2
2	1.20	327	3.9	83	4.7
1	1.01	616	3.7	108	3.8

Note: Complete notes are included in respective tables for guidance in reading tables. SL = Seriousness Level; OS = O