

960301

RECEIVED

MAY 30 1996

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

**Return Rates of Adults
Released from Minnesota
Correctional Facilities
During 1992**

Information Technology and Research Unit
Minnesota Department of Corrections
300 Bigelow Building
450 North Syndicate Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55104
(612) 642-0301

January 31, 1995

The tables on the following pages present release and return information for adults released from Minnesota Correctional Facilities during 1992. Return information is broken down by race, gender, type of release (discharge, intensive community supervision [ICS], parole, or supervised release), and type of return (with a new sentence, 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 sorted first by OID, then by "status date" and "time of movement," from oldest to most recent. Additional files were created which contained the OID, admission date, and offense information 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 1992 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 reads through the first offender's status records until it finds a court-commit incarceration. It then continues reading through this offender's status records, looking for the offender's first release (supervised release, ICS, parole, discharge, or pardon) following the incarceration. If this release was in 1992, it then reads on to see if the offender was subsequently incarcerated again. If the release was prior to 1992, it continues looking through the offender's status records to see if there was a court-commit incarceration for which there was a 1992 release. If the offender has a 1992 release, a record is created in an output file for the offender, giving his OID, race, sex, age at incarceration, type of release, and "return category." ("Return categories" represent 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 proceeds in this manner to read each offender's adult status records, and to capture the needed information for 1992 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, ICS, paroles, and discharges to all be "releases," the program logic 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.

Similarly, multiple counting of returning offenders 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 was released in 1992, and returned after release.

In accordance with this approach, Tables 1 and 2 do not report all releases which occurred during 1992 (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 1992. The data are broken down by type of release, and by race (Table 1) and gender (Table 2). These numbers provide the denominators for the percentages given in the remaining tables. For instance, in Table 3, the 55 white adults who returned with a new court commitment within six months after their supervised release constitute 5% of the 1034 white supervised releasees shown in Table 1.

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.

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 1992, by race

	<i>Type of Release</i>				<i>Total</i>
	<i>Discharge</i>	<i>ICS</i>	<i>Parole</i>	<i>Supervised Release</i>	
Black	9	7	6	527	549
Hispanic	1	1		68	70
Indian	1		5	149	155
White	25	33	11	1034	1103
Other	1			16	17
Total	37	41	22	1794	1894

Table 2: "First releases" from Minnesota Correctional Facilities during 1992, by gender

	<i>Type of Release</i>				<i>Total</i>
	<i>Discharge</i>	<i>ICS</i>	<i>Parole</i>	<i>Supervised Release</i>	
Female	3	6		134	143
Male	34	35	22	1660	1751
Total	37	41	22	1794	1894

Table 3: 1992 Releasees returning to a MCF, by race: six-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>									
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>ICS</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Sup. 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>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Black—new sentence	1	11%					28	5%	29	5%
Black—w/o new sentence			3	43%			75	14%	78	14%
Black—Total	1	11%	3	43%			103	20%	107	19%
Hispanic—new sentence							2	3%	2	3%
Hispanic—w/o new sentence							5	7%	5	7%
Hispanic—Total							7	10%	7	10%
Indian—new sentence							7	5%	7	5%
Indian—w/o new sentence							23	15%	23	15%
Indian—Total							30	20%	30	19%
White—new sentence	7	28%					55	5%	62	6%
White—w/o new sentence			5	15%			121	12%	126	11%
White—Total	7	28%	5	15%			176	17%	188	17%
All races—new sentence	8	22%					92	5%	100	5%
All races—w/o new sentence			8	20%			224	12%	232	12%
All races—Total	8	22%	8	20%			316	18%	332	18%

Table 4: 1992 Releasees returning to a MCF, by race: twelve-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>									
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>ICS</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Sup. 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>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Black—new sentence	1	11%					71	13%	72	13%
Black—w/o new sentence			3	43%			102	19%	105	19%
Black—Total	1	11%	3	43%			173	33%	177	32%
Hispanic—new sentence							5	7%	5	7%
Hispanic—w/o new sentence							5	7%	5	7%
Hispanic—Total							10	15%	10	14%
Indian—new sentence							22	15%	22	14%
Indian—w/o new sentence							29	19%	29	19%
Indian—Total							51	34%	51	33%
White—new sentence	10	40%			1	9%	111	11%	122	11%
White—w/o new sentence			8	24%			149	14%	157	14%
White—Total	10	40%	8	24%	1	9%	260	25%	279	25%
All races—new sentence	11	30%			1	5%	209	12%	221	12%
All races—w/o new sentence			11	27%			285	16%	296	16%
All races—Total	11	30%	11	27%	1	5%	494	28%	517	27%

Table 5: 1992 Releasees returning to a MCF, by race: eighteen-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>									
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>ICS</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Sup. 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>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Black—new sentence	2	22%					97	18%	99	18%
Black—w/o new sentence			3	43%			112	21%	115	21%
Black—Total	2	22%	3	43%			209	40%	214	39%
Hispanic—new sentence							7	10%	7	10%
Hispanic—w/o new sentence							5	7%	5	7%
Hispanic—Total							12	18%	12	17%
Indian—new sentence					1	20%	30	20%	31	20%
Indian—w/o new sentence					1	20%	32	21%	33	21%
Indian—Total					2	40%	62	42%	64	41%
White—new sentence	10	40%			1	9%	147	14%	158	14%
White—w/o new sentence			9	27%			156	15%	165	15%
White—Total	10	40%	9	27%	1	9%	303	29%	323	29%
All races—new sentence	12	32%			2	9%	281	16%	295	16%
All races—w/o new sentence			12	29%	1	5%	305	17%	318	17%
All races—Total	12	32%	12	29%	3	14%	586	33%	613	32%

Table 6: 1992 Releasees returning to a MCF, by race: twenty-four month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>									
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>ICS</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Sup. 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>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Black—new sentence	2	22%					121	23%	123	22%
Black—w/o new sentence			3	43%			115	22%	118	21%
Black—Total	2	22%	3	43%			236	45%	241	44%
Hispanic—new sentence							9	13%	9	13%
Hispanic—w/o new sentence							5	7%	5	7%
Hispanic—Total							14	21%	14	20%
Indian—new sentence					1	20%	34	23%	35	23%
Indian—w/o new sentence					1	20%	34	23%	35	23%
Indian—Total					2	40%	68	46%	70	45%
White—new sentence	11	44%			1	9%	171	17%	183	17%
White—w/o new sentence			10	30%	1	9%	158	15%	169	15%
White—Total	11	44%	10	30%	2	18%	329	32%	352	32%
Other—new sentence							1	6%	1	6%
Other—w/o new sentence							1	6%	1	6%
Other—Total							2	13%	2	12%
All races—new sentence	13	35%			2	9%	336	19%	351	19%
All races—w/o new sentence			13	32%	2	9%	313	17%	328	17%
All races—Total	13	35%	13	32%	4	18%	649	36%	679	36%

Table 7: 1992 Releasees returning to a MCF, by gender: six-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>									
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>ICS</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Sup. 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>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Female—new sentence							4	3%	4	3%
Female—w/o new sentence							18	13%	18	13%
Female—Total							22	16%	22	15%
Male—new sentence	8	24%					88	5%	96	5%
Male—w/o new sentence			8	23%			206	12%	214	12%
Male—Total	8	24%	8	23%			294	18%	310	18%
Total—new sentence	8	22%					92	5%	100	5%
Total—w/o new sentence			8	20%			224	12%	232	12%
Grand Total	8	22%	8	20%			316	18%	332	18%

Table 8: 1992 Releasees returning to a MCF, by gender: twelve-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>									
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>ICS</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Sup. 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>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Female—new sentence	1	33%					7	5%	8	6%
Female—w/o new sentence							21	16%	21	15%
Female—Total	1	33%					28	21%	29	20%
Male—new sentence	10	29%			1	5%	202	12%	213	12%
Male—w/o new sentence			11	31%			264	16%	275	16%
Male—Total	10	29%	11	31%	1	5%	466	28%	488	28%
Total—new sentence	11	30%			1	5%	209	12%	221	12%
Total—w/o new sentence			11	27%			285	16%	296	16%
Grand Total	11	30%	11	27%	1	5%	494	28%	517	27%

Table 9: 1992 Releasees returning to a MCF, by gender: eighteen-month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>									
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>ICS</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Sup. 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>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Female—new sentence	1	33%					12	9%	13	9%
Female—w/o new sentence							22	16%	22	15%
Female—Total	1	33%					34	25%	35	24%
Male—new sentence	11	32%			2	9%	269	16%	282	16%
Male—w/o new sentence			12	34%	1	5%	283	17%	296	17%
Male—Total	11	32%	12	34%	3	14%	552	33%	578	33%
Total—new sentence	12	32%			2	9%	281	16%	295	16%
Total—w/o new sentence			12	29%	1	5%	305	17%	318	17%
Grand Total	12	32%	12	29%	3	14%	586	33%	613	32%

Table 10: 1992 Releasees returning to a MCF, by gender: twenty-four month follow-up

	<i>Type of release</i>									
	<i>Discharge</i>		<i>ICS</i>		<i>Parole</i>		<i>Sup. 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>	<i>n</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
Female—new sentence	1	33%					14	10%	15	10%
Female—w/o new sentence			1	17%			22	16%	23	16%
Female—Total	1	33%	1	17%			36	27%	38	27%
Male—new sentence	12	35%			2	9%	322	19%	336	19%
Male—w/o new sentence			12	34%	2	9%	291	18%	305	17%
Male—Total	12	35%	12	34%	4	18%	613	37%	641	37%
Total—new sentence	13	35%			2	9%	336	19%	351	19%
Total—w/o new sentence			13	32%	2	9%	313	17%	328	17%
Grand Total	13	35%	13	32%	4	18%	649	36%	679	36%