

RECEIVED

MAY 30 1996

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OFFICE BUILDING
ST. PAUL, MN 55155

**Return Rates of Adults
Released from Minnesota
Correctional Facilities
During 1991**

The tables on the following pages present release and return information for adults released from Minnesota Correctional Facilities during 1991. Return information is broken down by race, sex, type of release (discharge, parole, or supervised release), and type of return (with a new court commitment, or without ["technical violators"]).

Return rates are determined using CMIS status, sentence, and identification files. The status database (OIDSTS) contains one or more records corresponding to each change in an offender's status. Each OIDSTS record stores the date, status action, supervising authority, and offender location corresponding to that status. ("Statuses" include "incarcerated," "supervised release," "on parole," "fugitive," "in hospital," and so on. The "status action" gives additional information about the inmate's status; for instance, status actions that commonly appear with a status of "incarcerated" include court commitment, transfer, and return from release.)

A file was created containing a combination of status and identification (race, sex, age) information for each adult OIDSTS record in CMIS. The records in this new file were ordered first by OID, then by "status date," from oldest to most recent. Another file was created which contained the OID and admission date for each adult sentence stored in CMIS, also sorted in the same way. A computer program was written to read through these files, identify the 1991 releases, and then see whether they subsequently returned to a Minnesota Correctional Facility. A simplified description of the logic employed is given below.

The program read through the first offender's status records until it found a court-commit incarceration. It then continued reading through this offender's status records, looking for the offender's first release (supervised release, parole, discharge, or pardon) following the incarceration. If this release was in 1991, it then read on to see if the offender was subsequently incarcerated again. If the release was prior to 1991, it continued looking through the offender's status records to see if there was a court-commit incarceration for which there was a 1991 release. If the offender had a 1991 release, a record was created in an output file for the offender, giving his OID, race, sex, age at incarceration, type of release, and "return category." ("Return categories" represented all possible outcomes: no return to a MCF, return with a new sentence within a period of 6, 12, 18, etc. months, or return without a new sentence within various time intervals.) The program proceeded in this manner to read each offender's adult status records, and to capture the needed information for 1991 releasees.

As described above, not every "incarceration" status record qualifies as a "commitment"—the beginning step of the search for an offender's commitment, release, and return; only court-commit incarcerations begin this sequence. Also, not every release is considered by the program logic—just the "first release" after the inmate's court-commit incarceration. This logic results in findings which exclude double-counting of inmates, are consistent with a natural understanding of the concept of "return rates," and are obtainable from the source data. One release (the first) is counted per court commitment, and one return (the first...if there are any returns at all) corresponding to that release is counted. Examples of how this works are described below.

An inmate who goes on supervised release and does not return to prison will have an OIDSTS record documenting his supervised release, and eventually will have an OIDSTS record with the status of "discharged." While the computer program considers supervised releases, paroles, and

discharges to all be "releases," the logic used avoids double-counting this inmate in determination of return rates by only counting his first release from prison (his supervised release). Double-counting is avoided not only within the release-year of interest, but also from one year to another, in using the program for analysis of other release-years.

Similarly, multiple counting of technical violators is not done by the program. For example, suppose the following sequence of events occurs:

- a) an offender is incarcerated due to a court commitment
- b) he is placed on supervised release
- c) he returns as a technical violator (without a new court commitment)
- d) after some time in prison he is again placed on supervised release
- e) he returns to prison once again

Events a, b, and c constitute a commitment-release-return sequence that the program would count (assuming that the supervised release is in the target year). However, events d and e would not be counted as a release and return in the report. Thus the return data in this report shows the number of court commitments for which the offender returned after release.

In accordance with this approach, Tables 1 and 2 do not report all releases which occurred during 1991 (that information is available from sources such as the "Monthly Institution Admission and Release Report"). As indicated by the table headings, Tables 1 and 2 give the number of inmates for whom their first release following a court-commitment occurred during 1991. These numbers provide the denominators for the percentages given in the remaining tables. For instance, in Table 3, the 43 white adults who returned with a new court commitment after a supervised release constitute 4% of the 1015 white supervised releasees shown in Table 1.

Tables 1 and 2 give the number of "first releases" from Minnesota Correctional Facilities during 1991, by race and gender respectively. Tables 3 through 6 give return rate information by race, for returns within a period of 6, 12, 18, or 24 months respectively. The findings in each table are cumulative. For example, Table 3 shows how many offenders were re-admitted to prison within six months of their release date. Table 4 shows how many offenders were reincarcerated within twelve months of release—this includes those who were readmitted within six months. For each combination of race, release type, and return type, the number of returning offenders is given, as well as the percentage they represent of all offenders in that race/release type category. None of the offenders of "other" or "Japanese" race shown in Table 1 returned within 24 months, so these race categories are not shown in Tables 3 through 6.

Tables 7 through 10 correspond to Tables 3 through 6, except that returning offenders are classified by gender instead of race.

Table 1

"First releases" from Minnesota Correctional Facilities during 1991, by race

	<i>Type of Release</i>			<i>Total</i>
	<i>Discharge</i>	<i>Parole</i>	<i>Supervised Release</i>	
American Indian	3	2	128	133
Black	8	8	412	428
Hispanic	0	0	48	48
Japanese	0	0	1	1
Other	0	0	5	5
White	15	17	1015	1047
Total	26	27	1609	1662

Table 2

"First releases" from Minnesota Correctional Facilities during 1991, by gender

	<i>Type of Release</i>			<i>Total</i>
	<i>Discharge</i>	<i>Parole</i>	<i>Supervised Release</i>	
Female	2	0	128	130
Male	24	27	1481	1532
Total	26	27	1609	1662

Table 3

1991 Releasees returning to a MCF, by race: six-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>							
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Supervised Release</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
American Indian								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	7	5%	7	5%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	18	14%	18	14%
Subtotal	0	0%	0	0%	25	20%	25	19%
Black								
With new court commitment	2	25%	0	0%	21	5%	23	5%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	1	13%	54	13%	55	13%
Subtotal	2	25%	1	13%	75	18%	78	18%
Hispanic								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%	2	4%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	11	23%	11	23%
Subtotal	0	0%	0	0%	13	27%	13	27%
White								
With new court commitment	2	13%	0	0%	43	4%	45	4%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	4	24%	76	7%	80	8%
Subtotal	2	13%	4	24%	119	12%	125	12%
Total	4	15%	5	19%	232	14%	241	15%

Table 4

1991 Releasees returning to a MCF, by race: twelve-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>							
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Supervised Release</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
American Indian								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	18	14%	18	14%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	26	20%	26	20%
Subtotal	0	0%	0	0%	44	34%	44	33%
Black								
With new court commitment	3	38%	1	13%	52	13%	56	13%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	1	13%	77	19%	78	18%
Subtotal	3	38%	2	25%	129	31%	134	31%
Hispanic								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	7	15%	7	15%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	12	25%	12	25%
Subtotal	0	0%	0	0%	19	40%	19	40%
White								
With new court commitment	4	27%	0	0%	95	9%	99	9%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	4	24%	104	10%	108	10%
Subtotal	4	27%	4	24%	199	20%	207	20%
Total	7	27%	6	22%	391	24%	404	24%

Table 5

1991 Releasees returning to a MCF, by race: eighteen-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>							
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Supervised Release</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
American Indian								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	26	20%	26	20%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	1	50%	26	20%	27	20%
Subtotal	0	0%	1	50%	52	41%	53	40%
Black								
With new court commitment	3	38%	3	38%	82	20%	88	21%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	1	13%	84	20%	85	20%
Subtotal	3	38%	4	50%	166	40%	173	40%
Hispanic								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	8	17%	8	17%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	12	25%	12	25%
Subtotal	0	0%	0	0%	20	42%	20	42%
White								
With new court commitment	4	27%	0	0%	127	13%	131	13%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	4	24%	112	11%	116	11%
Subtotal	4	27%	4	24%	239	24%	247	24%
Total	7	27%	9	33%	477	30%	493	30%

Table 6

1991 Releasees returning to a MCF, by race: twenty-four month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>							
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Supervised Release</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
American Indian								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	30	23%	30	23%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	1	50%	27	21%	28	21%
Subtotal	0	0%	1	50%	57	45%	58	44%
Black								
With new court commitment	3	38%	5	63%	100	24%	108	25%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	1	13%	87	21%	88	21%
Subtotal	3	38%	6	75%	187	45%	196	46%
Hispanic								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	11	23%	11	23%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	12	25%	12	25%
Subtotal	0	0%	0	0%	23	48%	23	48%
White								
With new court commitment	6	40%	1	6%	154	15%	161	15%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	4	24%	115	11%	119	11%
Subtotal	6	40%	5	29%	269	27%	280	27%
Total	9	35%	12	44%	536	33%	557	34%

Table 7

1991 Releases returning to a MCF, by gender: six-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>							
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Supervised Release</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Female								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	2%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	8	6%	8	6%
Subtotal	0	0%	0	0%	10	8%	10	8%
Male								
With new court commitment	4	17%	0	0%	71	5%	75	5%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	5	19%	151	10%	156	10%
Subtotal	4	17%	5	19%	222	15%	231	15%
Total	4	15%	5	19%	232	14%	241	15%

Table 8

1991 Releases returning to a MCF, by gender: twelve-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>							
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Supervised Release</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Female								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	4	3%	4	3%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	12	9%	12	9%
Subtotal	0	0%	0	0%	16	13%	16	12%
Male								
With new court commitment	7	29%	1	4%	168	11%	176	11%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	5	19%	207	14%	212	14%
Subtotal	7	29%	6	22%	375	25%	388	25%
Total	7	27%	6	22%	391	24%	404	24%

Table 9

1991 Releasees returning to a MCF, by gender: eighteen-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>							
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Supervised Release</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Female								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	10	8%	10	8%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	12	9%	12	9%
Subtotal	0	0%	0	0%	22	17%	22	17%
Male								
With new court commitment	7	29%	3	11%	233	16%	243	16%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	6	22%	222	15%	228	15%
Subtotal	7	29%	9	33%	455	31%	471	31%
Total	7	27%	9	33%	477	30%	493	30%

Table 10

1991 Releasees returning to a MCF, by gender: twenty-four month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>							
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Supervised Release</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Female								
With new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	15	12%	15	12%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	0	0%	13	10%	13	10%
Subtotal	0	0%	0	0%	28	22%	28	22%
Male								
With new court commitment	9	38%	6	22%	280	19%	295	19%
Without new court commitment	0	0%	6	22%	228	15%	234	15%
Subtotal	9	38%	12	44%	508	34%	529	35%
Total	9	35%	12	44%	536	33%	557	34%

NCC 310 1973
 TV 247 1577