NEBRASKA JUDICIAL BRANCH

Post-Release Supervision

Quarterly Report: Q2 2026

Neb. Rev. Stat. §29-2274

LB631, §21

November 2, 2026



Post-Release Supervision
Quarterly Report
Q2: April 1, 2026, to June 30, 2026

November 2, 2026

This report was completed in compliance with Neb. Rev. Stat. §29-2274, LB631 passed by the 108th Nebraska State Legislature and signed into law by the Governor on April 16, 2024, effective July 19, 2024. Beginning on October 1, 2024, the Office of Probation Administration shall submit a quarterly report to the Judiciary Committee and Appropriations Committee of the Legislature.

Acknowledgments
This report was produced by the Adult Probation and Rehabilitative Services, IT, and Research and Data (R&D) teams in the Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation (AOCP). These teams, each with unique expertise, work with the AOCP and its invested parties to provide relevant, valuable data for evidence-based decision-making. The report is a collaborative effort based on the input and analysis of the following individuals:

Administrative Office of Courts and Probation Leadership:
Gene Cotter, *Probation Administrator*
Bob Denton, *Deputy Administrator for Adult Probation and Rehabilitative Services*
Jacey Rader, *Deputy Administrator for Operations*

Adult Probation and Rehabilitative Services Team:
Michael Tolley, *Probation Programs and Services Specialist*

IT Team:
Sherri Dennis, *Interim Chief Information Officer*
Casey Tribolet, *Lead Interim IT Director*
RayLynn Coble, *IT Applications Analyst*

Research and Data Team:
Hazel Delgado, *Director of Research and Data*
Brandon Helding, *Research and Data Specialist*
Rick Hixson, *Lead Report Analyst*

Suggested citation:
Administrative Office of Courts and Probation (2026). *Post-Release Supervision Quarterly Report, Q2 2026*. Nebraska Judicial Branch, November 2026.

Table of Contents

POST-RELEASE SUPERVISION QUARTERLY REPORT OVERVIEW 4
EVIDENCE FOR STRUCTURED COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND COGNITIVE-BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS 4
STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS OF NEB. REV. STAT. §29-2274 (LB631, 2024) 5
§(1)(a) Number of Individuals 5
§(1)(b) Number of Beds and Days 5
§(1)(c) Types of Programming 5
§(1)(d) Risk Scores 7
§(2) Redaction 8
CONCLUSION 9
LIMITATIONS 9
REFERENCES 10

POST-RELEASE SUPERVISION QUARTERLY REPORT OVERVIEW

The Administrative Office of the Courts and Probation (AOCP) is within the Judicial Branch of government. In performing its function, Nebraska Probation strives to achieve intertwined community safety goals, risk reduction, and behavior change. Trusted and valued by Nebraska's courts and citizens, Probation's dedicated professional staff have provided quality investigations, supervision, and service for over sixty years. Nebraska Probation is driven by the understanding that a system founded on research-supported, evidence-based policies and practices will produce positive individual outcomes.

Post-release supervision (PRS) is a structured system of oversight that individuals are subject to after their release from incarceration, administered by Probation. This mechanism serves as a critical component of the criminal justice continuum, facilitating the reintegration of formerly incarcerated individuals into society while safeguarding public safety. Intended to provide community supervision for individuals released from prison for lower-level felony offenses, Nebraska policymakers enacted Legislative Bill (LB) 605 in 2015.

LB605, or the Justice Reinvestment Act, was introduced to address three challenges facing the state's criminal justice system at that time: (1) overcrowded prisons housing a large number of people convicted of nonviolent, low level offenses; (2) the felony sentencing system was failing to ensure that people sentenced to prison received post-release supervision or pay victim restitution; (3) the parole system lacked the resources necessary to handle the growing parole population effectively. The intent of LB605 was "to slow Nebraska's prison population growth, ease prison overcrowding, contain corrections spending, and reinvest a portion of savings in strategies that can reduce recidivism and increase public safety".

LB605 expanded the use of Probation in lieu of incarceration, ensuring more individuals receive supervision upon release from prison. During their supervision period, individuals must comply with a set of court-ordered conditions, including intensive supervision by the supervising probation officer, maintaining employment, and refraining from criminal activity. The overarching objective of PRS is to reduce recidivism by providing a framework of accountability and support, thereby enhancing the prospects for successful reintegration and reducing the burden on the justice system.

EVIDENCE FOR STRUCTURED COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND COGNITIVE-BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS

A substantial body of peer-reviewed meta-analytic research has demonstrated that structured, evidence-based correctional interventions—particularly those incorporating cognitive-behavioral techniques and Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) design features—are associated with measurable reductions in recidivism and improvements in community safety. For example, a recent meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and quasi-experimental studies of community correction programs found that full program participation significantly reduced recidivism overall, although results varied by participant participation levels (Duan et al., 2023).

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS OF NEB. REV. STAT. §29-2274 (LB631, 2024)

§(1)(a) Number of Individuals

As of June 30, 2026, there were a total of 1,103 individuals on post-release supervision (PRS) (**§(1)(a)(i)**). From April 1, 2026, through June 30, 2026, there were a total of 97 individuals on PRS who were successfully discharged (**§(1)(a)(ii)**), while 122 individuals on PRS were unsuccessfully discharged (**§(1)(a)(iii)**).

From April 1, 2026, through June 30, 2026, there were a total of 75 individuals on PRS who experienced a revocation (**§(1)(a)(viii)**). Of those individuals, 27 were revoked for technical violations (**§(1)(a)(iv)**), 42 were revoked for law violations (**§(1)(a)(v)**), and 6 for 'other' reasons.

As of June 30, 2026, 25 individuals on PRS have absconded and not yet completed the conditions of their PRS (**§(1)(a)(vi)**). From April 1, 2026, through June 30, 2026, 81 individuals on PRS were sent to jails to serve custodial sanctions (**§(1)(a)(vii)**).

§(1)(b) Number of Beds and Days

The data requested for the number of beds used for custodial sanctions and the number of days such beds are used (**§(1)(b)**) are not available within our reporting environment and fall under each county jail.

As a proxy, from April 1, 2026, through June 30, 2026, 81 individuals on PRS were committed to 110 custodial sanctions, for a total of 1,669 days -- or number of days in jail (beds used in jail) (**§(1)(b)**).

§(1)(c) Types of Programming

Programming for individuals on PRS plays a crucial role in supporting their successful reintegration into society and reducing the risk of recidivism. Housed within Nebraska Probation's Reporting Centers and Service Centers, programs are designed to address the varied needs of individuals transitioning from incarceration to the community, providing them with the necessary tools and resources to lead productive lives while also promoting public safety. Meta-analytic research indicates that structured community correction programs generally produce lower recidivism rates compared with alternative conditions (e.g., incarceration, unstructured intervention), though the effects are typically modest and depend substantially on program quality (Duan et al., 2023).

Specifically, reporting centers across Nebraska were established to provide a central location for a continuum of services for individuals under supervision in their communities, promoting community safety, accountability, and rehabilitation. By pooling state and county resources, these reporting centers provide structured programming that targets an individual's need and enhances their ability to make long-lasting positive changes and to be a successful member of the community. These programs and services are evidence-based and tailored to meet the needs of individuals with a wide range of challenges. Services are provided by local community invested parties, bridging criminal justice and behavioral health. Reporting Centers engage high-risk

individuals in structured supervision activities targeted to reduce the likelihood of the individual to reoffend. This model is consistent with policy analyses emphasizing structured assessment, targeted services, and graduated responses rather than exclusive reliance on surveillance and revocation (Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2019).

Programming encompasses a wide range of services, including educational and vocational training, substance use and mental health treatment, cognitive-behavioral therapy targeting criminal thinking and promoting healthy coping strategies, and life skills development. Each of these programs is tailored to target specific risk factors as identified in the most recent validated risk assessment, with the overall goal of promoting stability and self-sufficiency. Across the contemporary community corrections literature, structured program participation is associated with reductions in recidivism relative to comparison conditions, though results vary and should be interpreted in light of study quality and implementation fidelity (Duan et al., 2023). These findings indicate that the effectiveness of supervision is shaped more by how well a program is implemented than by its nominal designation.

The targeting of specific risk factors and barriers in these programs is guided by an actuarial-based, normed, and validated risk assessment tool aligned with the RNR framework (Bonta & Andrews, 2017). This tool is used to systematically assess each individual's likelihood of reoffending and to identify unique criminogenic needs (i.e., risk factors that are empirically associated with criminal behavior). Specifically, dynamic risk factors (including antisocial attitudes, antisocial peer associations, substance misuse, and employment instability) have been identified as among the strongest predictors of recidivism in community-sentenced populations (Bonta & Andrews, 2017; Yukhnenko et al., 2020). By relying on empirical data and validated measures, the assessment helps inform decision-making, ensuring that resources are allocated efficiently and interventions are tailored to the individual's specific risk profile. Although strict adherence to RNR principles does not automatically produce superior outcomes in every context (Duan et al., 2023), the underlying principles of structured assessment and targeted intervention remain supported in the broader literature.

Within Nebraska Probation, the Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI) is administered at the beginning of PRS and again upon discharge, permitting structured evaluation of changes in assessed criminogenic needs over time. The continued use of validated assessment instruments to guide supervision intensity and case planning is consistent with established best practice standards (Bonta & Andrews, 2017). Ongoing reassessment enables documentation of changes in dynamic risk domains and evaluation of whether programming aligns with assessed need throughout supervision.

Case management targets risk reduction by focusing on the assessed criminogenic need areas. Among the types of programming offered to individuals on post-release supervision, those that target criminogenic needs are particularly vital. Programs such as cognitive-behavioral therapy, substance use treatment, and mental health services are designed to address antisocial thinking patterns, behavioral health concerns, and impulse control issues. By focusing on those areas, these

interventions aim to mitigate the root causes of criminal behavior, thereby reducing the likelihood of recidivism. Educational and vocational programs, while not strictly criminogenic, contribute meaningfully to rehabilitation by targeting associated factors such as unemployment. Employment instability has been identified as a dynamic risk factor for recidivism, and interventions that strengthen job readiness or employability can therefore play an important supportive role in reducing reoffending (Yukhnenko et al., 2020).

Another core component of PRS is behavioral health treatment and cognitive behavioral therapy, particularly for individuals with a history of substance use or mental health needs. These services, including counseling, group therapy, and access to rehabilitation, are intended to address the underlying drivers of behavior, while cognitive behavioral approaches focus on changing thinking patterns and strengthening prosocial decision making. Alongside this, Nebraska's PRS framework also relies on education and workforce programming as a practical pathway to stability. This includes GED preparation, adult basic education, job readiness training, and vocational certifications that build marketable skills. Taken together, these approaches address both behavioral and structural risk factors, especially the well-established connection between unemployment and recidivism, by supporting individuals in obtaining stable employment and reducing reliance on illegal sources of income. Consistent with the broader evidence base, no single intervention produces outcomes on its own, but supervision models that combine structured supervision, validated risk assessment, trained officers, and targeted programming are more likely to produce better results than approaches that rely primarily on monitoring or surveillance (Duan et al., 2023; Labrecque et al., 2023).

More broadly, this programming plays a critical role in Nebraska's efforts to promote successful reintegration and reduce recidivism among individuals on post-release supervision. When delivered within structured, assessment-informed supervision systems—incorporating validated risk and need assessments, targeted interventions, trained officers, and coordinated service delivery—these approaches align with the evidence base linking such models to improved supervision outcomes. At the same time, outcomes remain contingent on key implementation factors, including population characteristics, intervention dosage, program fidelity, and broader contextual conditions.

§(1)(d) Risk Scores

To evaluate changes in individuals' risk levels during PRS, it is necessary to compare their risk scores at two critical points: when an individual began serving a sentence of imprisonment and upon discharge from PRS (**§(1)(d)**). Risk assessment tools are foundational to effective PRS because they provide a structured way to distinguish levels of recidivism risk and to identify criminogenic needs that are empirically associated with reoffending. By systematically identifying these needs, officers can better align interventions with the factors most closely linked to future offending.

Probation uses the Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI) risk assessment tool in conjunction with a presentence investigation (PSI) ordered by the court. Individuals are assessed at the beginning of the PRS sentence and reassessed upon discharge. This structured comparison

of assessed criminogenic needs over time permits evaluation of measurable change and promotes proportionality in supervision, ensuring that higher-risk individuals receive appropriately intensive services while lower-risk individuals are not unnecessarily over-supervised. When combined with structured programming and fidelity to evidence-informed practices, assessment functions as a decision-support framework that aligns resource allocation with public safety objectives (Labrecque et al., 2023). However, predictive validity should not be conflated with intervention effectiveness; reductions in risk scores do not necessarily translate to reductions in recidivism, as outcomes depend on implementation quality, dosage, program structure, and participant characteristics (Duan et al., 2023). Below are the risk assessment scores at the PSI stage compared to risk assessment scores at the time of discharge (see Table 1, which includes only individuals with more than one LS/CMI score so that change scores could be calculated pursuant to statutory considerations).

Table 1

Average Change in Risk Assessment Score using the LS/CMI by Discharge Type, April through June 2026 (this only includes individuals with more than one LS/CMI score)

PRS Discharge Type	Number of Probationers	Average LS/CMI Score at PSI Stage	Average LS/CMI Score at Discharge	Change between Averages In LS/CMI Score
Early Release	25	25.1	19.0	6.1
Revoked	65	30.5	32.9	-2.4
Unsatisfactory	42	28.2	29.1	-0.9
Completed	67	26.9	20.9	6.0
Other	2	28.0	26.5	1.5

It is important to note that all individuals listed above are on PRS and are at high risk of recidivism; thus, any risk reduction should be interpreted as meaningful progress. For individuals who have committed a sexual offense, officers also use the Vermont Assessment for Sex Offender Risk – 2 (VASOR-2) and the Sex Offender Treatment Progress Scale (SOTIPS). For individuals with a domestic violence-related charge, officers also assess for domestic violence risk using the DV Matrix.

§(2) Redaction

All personally identifiable information on individuals under post-release supervision has been removed.

CONCLUSION

This report details Neb. Rev. Stat. §29-2274, LB631, passed by the 108th Nebraska State Legislature and signed into law by the Governor on April 16, 2024, with an effective date of July 19, 2024.

For the second quarter of 2026, 97 individuals on PRS were successfully discharged, while 122 individuals on PRS were unsuccessfully discharged. Of those individuals who were unsuccessfully discharged, 75 experienced revocations, with 36.0% revoked for technical violations, 56.0% for law violations, and 8.0% for "other" revocations. As of the end of the second quarter of 2026, 25 individuals on PRS absconded and had not yet completed their PRS. 81 individuals on PRS were sent to county jails to serve 110 custodial sanctions.

The continuum of programming offered to individuals on post-release supervision plays a critical role in their successful reintegration into society and in reducing recidivism. Educational, vocational, substance abuse, and mental health treatment, cognitive-behavioral therapy, and life skills programs each address key factors that can either support or hinder an individual's ability to lead a productive life after incarceration. By providing targeted interventions and resources, these programs not only enhance personal development but also contribute to public safety by reducing the likelihood of reoffending. Ensuring the continued availability and effectiveness of such programming is vital for fostering long-term stability and positive outcomes for individuals on post-release supervision.

LIMITATIONS

Many times, individuals begin PRS having received minimal, if any, programming prior to completing the carceral portion of their sentence and entering PRS. This leaves limited time and resources to address these issues, which could hinder effective reintegration.

It is important to note that among individuals who experienced a revocation of post-release supervision, 6 cases (8.0%) have been classified as "other", as a result of data entry errors. We are limited to reporting the data as it has been recorded in our environment. Efforts are currently underway to address and correct data entry errors. Due to the complexity of the data reconciliation process, it was not possible to complete these corrections in time for the present report. Despite this ongoing data integrity effort, we are committed to providing the most accurate data available at the time of this report.

REFERENCES

Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2017). The psychology of criminal conduct (6th ed.). Routledge.

Council of State Governments Justice Center. (2019). Confined and costly: How supervision violations are filling prisons and burdening budgets. Council of State Governments Justice Center. https://csgjusticecenter.org/confinedandcostly/

Duan, W., Wang, Z., Yang, C., & Ke, S. (2023). Are risk-need-responsivity principles golden? A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials of community correction programs. Journal of Experimental Criminology. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-022-09550-w

Jimenez, A., Delgado, R. H., Vardsveen, T., & Weiner, R. (2018). Validation of the Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI) for the Nebraska Probation population. Nebraska Judicial Branch.

Labrecque, R. M., Viglione, J., & Caudy, M. S. (2023). The impact of community supervision officer training programs on officer and client outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Justice Quarterly, 40(4), 587–611. https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2022.2120062

Yukhnenko, D., Blackwood, N., & Fazel, S. (2020). Risk factors for recidivism in individuals receiving community sentences: A systematic review and meta-analysis. CNS Spectrums, 25(2), 252–263. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1092852919001056

