AN EVALUATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS FURLOUGH EXPERIENCE NOVEMBER 1972 - AUGUST 1973

Frank A. Hall
Commissioner

Researcher: Joanne O'Malley
Research Analyst

Daniel P. LeClair
Social Science Research Specialist

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

The researcher would like to express her appreciation for assistance in preparing this report to the staff of the Correction and Parole Information System project, specifically Ed Callahan and Ira Baline. This report could not have been completed without the technical assistance with computer programming provided by Ed Callahan, and the assistance of Ira Baline in data preparation.

Further acknowledgement must go to Bev Byer, formerly an intern from the University of Massachusetts, for her assistance in data collection.

Joanne O'Malley
January 23, 1974

INTRODUCTION

> "The basic obligation of the Massachusetts Department of Correction is the protection of society. Part of this duty is to provide for the humane care and custody of those whom the courts have sentenced to the state correctional system. A more challenging aspect of this obligation is to provide a truly corrective experience for sentenced offenders so that they will be better equipped to lead productive and law-abiding lives. For, if a man is returned to society more embittered, vengeful, demoralized, and incapable of social and economic survival than when he first came to prison, then we certainly will have failed in our obligation to protect society. Our goal is to return a man to society with the knowledge and skills necessary to earn an honest living, with a reasonable sense of social responsibility and self-value, and with an increased capacity for self-control, judgment, and realistic optimism. Thus, the reintegration of the offender into community life is the primary concern of the Department of Correction." **

Correctional admisistrators have recognized the serious limitations of rehabilitative programs within the artificial structure of an institution, and have begun to place emphasis on the development of programs which will enable the offender to make a more satisfactory adjustment to life in the community.

The protection of society, however, involves much more than the inmate's isolation from the community as 98% of all offenders sentenced to state correctional facilities eventually return to the community and 85% of these offenders are released to the community within three years of the date of their sentence. Therefore, the Department of Correction is also responsible for providing the offender with a positive and corrective experience that will encourage and facilitate the adoption of more productive and law-abiding lives.

**Taken from Department of Correction Philosophy, Department Order 1000.1

Community-based corrections provides a system of specific programs and services in the community which are designed to prepare selected inmates, prior to their parole eligibility, for their release from prison. This system provides a series of transitional stages to facilitate the offender's reintegration into the community.

These stages form a continuumof treatment programs from initial incarceration to release from parole supervision. The continuumof treatment includes: 1) assessment of individual needs at the Reception and Diagnostic Center; 2) institutional counseling and training programs; 3) education release, work release, and furloughs to the community on a temporary basis; 4) residence in a pre-release and/or post-release community-based facility with specific house rules and regulations and counseling services; and 5) follow-up services such as parole advocacy (sponsored by the Special Impact program at Concord) and general parole supervision.

The final component of this system of community-based corrections is research and evaluation. The Research and Planning Division of the Department of Correction will publish a series of statistical and evaluative reports on each of these stages along the continum of community-based corrections. This report on the furlough program is the first of that series.

Both components, treatment and research, combine to form a coordinated system of correctional services which follows the incarcerated offender from initial commitment to release and follow-up after release. This system is designed to meet the correctional needs of both the individual offender and the community.

It has been suggested that temporary release can be an effective tool by which to bridge the gap that has generally existed between the offender's treatment within an institution and his supervision within the community.

The contribution of furlough programs to the achievement of reintegration cannot be ignored. Furloughs aid the offender's post-release adjustment by aiding him in (1) reinforcing family ties; (2) firming up parole plans, i.e., arranging a job, a home and other contacts necessary to adjust to re-entry into the community; and (3) testing newly learned social skills and insights that may have developed in institutional counseling experiances.

A study of California's furlough program found that program participants did better on parole than nonparticipants; i.e., 60% of participants compared with 42% of nonparticipants experienced no difficulty on parole. (Holt and Miller). Although these findings should be interpreted with caution, Markley found that officials at community treatment centers state that offenders who have had contact with the community prior to release, have lower rates of recidivism than those offenders not having such contact.

The preservation and reinforcement of family ties is an essential component of reintegration into normal community life. Studies have shown that those inmates having strong family ties, and who have been able to maintain those ties during their incarceration, are more successful on release than those offenders without such support. (Ohlin, Glaser, Holt and Miller) A study of Oregon's furlough program concluded that "leaves do have a very significant positive value to inmates in reestablishing and/or maintaining family relationships, tend to be correlated with advances in institutional programming, and will prove to be positively related to release adjustment." (Reed)

Recognition of the positive influence of community and family support on post-release adjustment, and of the need to build and rebuild solid ties between the offender and the community, with special emphasis on family ties, led to the development of a furlough program in Massachusetts.

applications which was introduced at the end of March, i.e., all applications from MCI Walpole and all applications from other institutions that required the Commissioner's approval underwent a thorough screening after the furlough board had made its recommendation.

TABLE I

THE FURLOUGH PROGRAM OUTCOME EXPERIENCE BY MONTH

	NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING FIRST FURLOUGH THAT MONTH		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
November 1972	397	(7.03)	218	(11.22)	0	(0.00)	(0.00)
December 1972	760	(13.46)	279	(14.36)	7	(7.45)	(0.92)
January 1973	452	(8.01)	106	(5.46)	3	(3.19)	(0.66)
February 1973	616	(10.91)	72	(3.71)	14	(14.89)	(2.27)
March 1973	590	(10.45)	114	(5.87)	20	(21.28)	(3.39)
April 1973	472	(8.36)	296	(15.23)	9	(9.57)	(1.91)
May 1973	580	(10.28)	305	(15.70)	9	(9.57)	(1.55)
June 1973	642	(11.37)	265	(13.64)	13	(13.83)	(2.02)
July 1973	675	(11.96)	161	(8.29)	13	(13.83)	(1.93)
August 1973	461	(8.17)	127	(6.54)	6	(6.38)	(1.30)
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	1943	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	(1.66)

TABLE II

FURLOUGH EXPERIENCE BY INSTITUTIONAL SECURITY LEVEL

	NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		AVERAGE POPULATION		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE	NO. INDIVIDUALS FURLOUGHED	AVERAGE NO. FURLOUGHS PER INDIVIDUALS FURLOUGHED
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%		
ximum Security CI Walpole, CI Concord)	1107	(19.61)	976	(46.65)	33	(35.11)	2.98	567	1.95
ium Security CI Norfolk, CI Bridgewater)	1811	(32.08)	817	(39.05)	33	(35.11)	1.82	751	2.41
imum Security CI Framingham, restry, CI Shirley, ston Pre-Rel.)	2727	(48.31)	299	(14.29)	28	(29.79)	1.03	625	4.36
AL	5645	(100.00)	2092	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	1.67	1943	2.90

TABLE III

FURLOUGH OUTCOME EXPERIENCE BY INSTITUTION

	NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		AVERAGE POPULATION		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE	NO. OF INDIVIDUALS FURLOUGHED	AVERAGE NO. OF FURLOUGHS PER INDIVIDUAL FURLOUGHED
	N	%	N	%	N	%			
MCI Bridgewater ***	184	(3.26)	158	(7.55)	9	(9.57)	4.89	90	2.04
MCI Concord *	976	(17.29)	417	(19.93)	29	(30.85)	2.97	459	2.13
MCI Framingham **	382	(6.77)	94	(4.49)	8	(8.51)	2.09	142	2.69
MCI Norfolk ***	1627	(28.82)	659	(31.50)	24	(25.53)	1.48	661	2.46
MCI Walpole *	131	(2.32)	559	(26.72)	4	(4.26)	3.05	108	1.21
Forestry **	929	(16.46)	133	(6.36)	11	(11.70)	1.18	275	3.38
MCI Shirley **	505	(8.95)	38	(1.82)	4	(4.26)	.79	92	5.49
Boston Pre-Rel. **	911	(16.15)	34	(1.63)	5	(5.32)	.55	116	7.85
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	2092	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	1.67	1943	2.90

* Maximum Security

** Minimum Security

*** Medium Security

OFFENSE

A comparison of the resident population and the furlough population by offense (appendix i) indicates that the furlough population contained significantly more narcotic offenders (13.1%) than did the resident population, (10.6%) and significantly more property offenders (16.3%) than did the resident population (14.5%). Conversely, the furlough population contained significantly fewer (5.2%) sex offenders than did the resident population (8.4%). These discrepancies may be explained by the large proportion of property offenders (62.1%) and narcotic offenders (49.8%) at those institutions that represent the largest proportion of furloughs granted (65.6%), i.e., MCI Concord, MCI Framingham, Forestry, MCI Shirley, and Boston Pre-Release;[1] and the small proportion of sex offenders (12.7%) at these institutions.

MINIMUM SENTENCE

The second variable found to be related to program participation is minimum sentence (appendix ii). A comparison of the resident population and the furlough population on this variable indicates that significantly more furloughees were serving indeterminate sentences, (38.6)[2] than were in the population, (28.7) ($P = < .001$). In addition, while this category was overrepresented in the furlough population all other minimum sentence categories were significantly under represented in the furlough population. (Significance levels range from .05 to .001).

This discrepancy may be explained by the large proportion of residents,

1 See Patrician, Robert, "A Description of the Residents of Massachusetts Correctional Institutions on January 1, 1973". (Correction and Parole Information System Project: Massachusetts Department of Correction) August, 1973. 20 pages.

2 That is, no minimum sentence was set by the court.

RACE

Race is another variable related to participation in the furlough program (see appendix v). Statistical comparison of the two populations indicates that the furlough population contained significantly fewer (3.6%) whites than did the resident population ($P=<.01$). This under-representation may be explained by the large proportion of non-whites in the populations of MCI Framingham (36.9%), MCI Shirley (33.3%), and Boston Pre-Release (48.0%). These institutions account for 31.9% of the total number of furloughs granted, but account for only 7.9% of the total resident population. It is likely therefore, that the racial composition of the furlough population would be a reflection of the racial composition of the populations at these institutions.

MARITAL STATUS

The fifth variable that is related to program participation is marital status. (appendix vi) Statistical comparisons between the resident population and the furlough population indicate that married residents are significantly over-represented in the furlough population ($P=<.01$ and $P=<.05$ respectively). These discrepancies may be related to an assumption that married residents are better risks for furlough than single or divorced residents. However, as will be shown later in this report, married inmates are not less inclined to escape.

MONTHS TO PAROLE ELIGIBILITY

The last variable that is related to program participation is months to parole eligibility. (appendix vii) A statistical comparison resident population and the furlough population indicates that the furlough population contained significantly more (59.5%) residents within eighteen

slight under-representation with respect to the proportion of escapes in the narcotic offense (-5.7%) and the sex offenses (-1.9%) categories. However, a statistical analysis of these figures failed to show that these differences were significant.

Finally, a breakdown of the escape rates for each offense category shows a range from zero to 6.4%. These rates should be interpreted with caution, however, for these rates taken alone may prove misleading. For example, the highest rates of escape are found for those sentenced for larceny of a motor vehicle (6.4%) and for escape (3.6%), but each of these categories represent less than one percent of the total number of furloughs granted, and less than five percent of the total escapes. On the other hand, those sentenced for armed robbery represent the largest proportion of furloughs granted (23.9%), and also the largest proportion of escapees (34.0%), but this offense category shows an escape rate of 2.4%.

Because these proportions are so disparate, it may be more appropriate to compare the escape rates of the major offense categories. These rates range from a high of 2.0% in the offense against property category, to a low of .9% in the sex offense category, for an over-all escape rate of 1.7%.

MINIMUM SENTENCE

Escape rates for minimum sentence categories range from zero to 2.5. (see appendix ii) The highest rate of escape is found in the 15-19 year sentence category. However, this category represents only 2.8% of the total number of furloughs granted and less than 5% of the total escapees. The second highest rate (2.1) is found in the indeterminate sentence category. This rate may reflect the high escape rate from MCI Concord (2.1), since a large proportion of MCI Concord furloughs are in this category (80.9%) (see appendix iii).

PART III

DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED ON FURLOUGH

Data was also collected on difficulties encountered by furloughees. These difficulties were categorized as 1) returning late, 2) being arrested on furlough, and 3) other. Included in the other category are difficulties such as returning intoxicated, being involved in an accident, being injured, and attempting to introduce contraband into the institution. Difficulty rates were computed on the basis of the number of difficulties encountered and the number of furloughs granted in each category of the variable under analysis.

Table IV presents a breakdown of the furlough program and difficulty rates by each month from November, 1972 through August, 1973. The difficulty rates ranged from a low of 1.0 in November, to a high of 12.2 in May. The rate of difficulty encountered by furloughees seemed to be relatively stable from December through March, but this rate had been very sporadic from April through August, and its fluctuations do not seem to be related to either the proportion of furloughs granted, or to any administrative changes in the program.

Also presented in Table IV is a breakdown of the type of difficulty encountered by furloughees each month. These figures indicate that the "returned late" category accounts for the largest proportion (87.9%) of difficulties encountered. Conversely, the "new arrest" category accounts for only 3.5% of the total difficulties encountered and this category accounts for less than .3% of the total number of furloughs granted.

Table V presents a breakdown of difficulties encountered by furloughees at the institutional level. Rates of difficulty range from a low of 1.4 for MCI Norfolk, to a high of 14.3 for MCI Shirley. Further analysis

indicates that MCI Concord, MCI Shirley, and Forestry are significantly ($P = < .001$) over-represented in the difficulty category, while MCI Norfolk is significantly ($P = < .001$) under-represented in this category. These differences may very possibly reflect simply the varying background characteristics of the resident population at each institution.

Analysis of the background characteristics of furloughees who encountered no difficulty and those who encountered difficulty on furlough shows that five variables are descriptive of the type of furloughee who has encountered difficulty on furlough (all are at the .001 level of significance.) These are: 1) offense, 2) minimum sentence, 3) months to parole eligibility, 4) age at furlough, and 5) drug use. A discussion of these follows:

OFFENSE CATEGORY

The first variable associated with outcome on furlough is offense category (appendix viii). A comparison of the difficulty/no difficulty dichotomy indicates that there are significantly fewer (11%) person offenders in the difficulty category, and there are significantly more (5.9%) drug offenders in the difficulty category.

A further breakdown by specific offense indicates that 17.8% of those furloughees having no difficulty had been sentenced for first or second degree murder, or manslaughter; and only 5.1 of those having difficulty had been sentenced for these offenses. Conversely, only 4.9% of those having no difficulty had been sentenced for drug offenses (other than sale), while 10.3 of those having difficulty had been sentenced for drug offenses.

Difficulty rates for offense categories range from a low of zero to a high of 14.9. The highest rate of 14.9 is found in the larceny of a motor vehicle category, but it should be noted that this category represents only .8% of the total number of furloughs and less than 2% of the total difficulties encountered. The next highest rate (14.3%) is found in the drug offense

category. This category represents less than six percent of the total number of furloughs, but more than ten percent of the total difficulties encountered. These figures would seem to indicate that drug offenders have a disproportionate amount of difficulty conforming to the conditions of the furlough agreement.

MINIMUM SENTENCE

The second variable that is strongly related to furlough outcome is minimum sentence (appendix ix). A comparison of those serving definite and indeterminate sentences indicates that significantly more (16%) furloughees serving indeterminate sentences encountered difficulty on furlough. A comparison of those serving life or death, and those not serving life or death indicates that significantly fewer (8.3%) furloughees serving life or death sentences encountered difficulty on furlough.

A breakdown of difficulty rates suggests that the difficulty rate decreases as minimum sentence increases. These rates range from zero for both those serving a death sentence and those serving thirty to forty years to 10.5 for those serving indeterminate sentences. It should be noted, however, that minimum sentence is strongly related to the characteristics of the resident populations at each institution. For example, a large proportion of the resident populations of MCI Concord (81.1%), MCI Shirley (95.8%), MCI Framingham (86.9%) and Boston Pre-Release (92.0%), are serving indeterminate sentences, and these institutions account for 78.3% of the total number of difficulties encountered on furlough (see Table V). Additional analysis is necessary, therefore, to determine the strength of the relationship between minimum sentence and outcome on furlough.

rates by age indicates that there is a highly significant (P= .01) inverse correlation between the two variables, i.e., as age increases, difficulty rate decreases.

DRUG HISTORY

Finally, drug use is strongly related to furlough outcome (appendix xii). The furlough population was divided on the basis of whether or not any drug involvement was mentioned in the furloughee's probation summary. Analysis of this variable indicates that significantly more (10.8%) of those furloughees who have a history of drug use encountered difficulty on furlough. Further analysis, however, failed to specify the type of drug use that is most strongly associated with difficulty. In addition, because information regarding drug use was not available for more than twenty-two percent of the furlough population, the strength of the relationship between drug use and outcome on furlough may not be reliable.

Table VI illustrates the categories of each of the above variables that are associated with high and low difficulty rates.

PART IV

PREDICTIVE ATTRIBUTE ANALYSIS

The analysis in part III provided a profile of those variables that differentiate high and low difficulty clusters. The following analysis will provide a further breakdown of these clusters and will determine the strength of the relationship between difficulty/no difficulty and the aforementioned variables.

In order to determine the effects each of the variables in the analysis upon the difficulty/no difficulty criterion, it is necessary to hold constant the effects of all other variables. This may be done statistically with predictive attribute analysis.[1]

The furlough population was dichotomized according to the difficulty/no difficulty criterion. Escapees were excluded from the analysis, because preliminary analysis determined that there is no significant relationship between escape and having difficulty.

The first division was made on the basis of the institution from which furloughed. This is not unexpected because of the difference in both difficulty rates and population characteristics at each institution. No further division could be made on either the Bridgewater or Walpole furlough subsets.

---

1 Predictive attribute analysis is a divisive hierarchial method of clustering individuals based on prediction of the difficulty/no difficulty criterion. All variables are dichotomized according to presence or absence of a given attribute. Analysis proceeds by repeatedly dividing groups in two. The attribute chosen for splitting is then the one which is most strongly related to the dependent variable (difficulty). The process then begins again, each subgroup being dealt with separately, until a pre-specified stopping point is reached. The stopping point of this analysis was determined by one of two conditions, a) if chi square was not significant or b) if less than two percent of the population (N=112) remained in the subset.

Both MCI Concord and Forestry were split on the basis of age. In the case of both of these subsets (institution), those older than twenty-four encountered less difficulty on furlough than those who were twenty-four or younger. This finding coincides with the findings in the previous analysis.

In no case did minimum sentence determine the division of a subset. This analysis indicates that minimum sentence is more strongly related to another independent variable rather than outcome; i.e., institution and/or offense.

These findings are summarized in Table VII, which appears on the following page.

S U M M A R Y

Although the influence of furloughs on post-release adjustment cannot be measured at this time, the Massachusetts furlough experience has been a positive one.

From November 6, 1972 through August 31, 1973, 5645 furloughs were granted in Massachusetts. The program has provided 1943 individuals with an average of 2.9 furloughs. Only 94 furloughees failed to return and were declared escapees, and those furloughees who encountered difficulty accounted for less than eight percent of the total furloughs granted.

A thorough analysis of the characteristics of escapees could not be completed because of the exceedingly small proportion of furloughees in this category (1.7%) and initial analysis failed to yield any significant association between escape and any background characteristics, or program variables.

Initial analysis of the difficulty/no difficulty dichotomy indicates that five variables are predictive of furlough outcome. These are: 1) offense, 2) minimum sentence, 3)months to parole eligibility, 4) age at furlough, and 5) drug use. Further analysis, however,indicates that the effect of minimum sentence on outcome "washed out" when controlling for the effect of offense.

Finally, a predictive attribute analysis provides an expected difficulty rate for the furlough population by institution. This analysis may be helpful as an aid in decision-making, but it should be noted that 87.9% of the total number of difficulties encountered were "returning late from furlough."

The trend toward community-based corrections requires a system of programs of graduated release. A furlough program is an indispensable component of such a system. This analysis has described the Massachusetts furlough experience in the first ten months of the program. The trend during this period has been

APPENDICES

APPENDIX ii

FURLOUGH PROGRAM EXPERIENCE BY MINIMUM SENTENCE

	RESIDENT POPULATION		TOTAL FURLOUGHS GRANTED		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Indeterminate	566	(28.73)	2176	(38.55)	46	(48.94)	(2.11)
1-5 Years	540	(27.41)	1368	(24.23)	17	(18.08)	(1.24)
6-10 Years	382	(19.40)	819	(14.51)	16	(17.02)	(1.95)
11-14 Years	77	(3.91)	166	(2.94)	2	(2.13)	(1.20)
15-19 Years	86	(4.36)	158	(2.80)	4	(4.26)	(2.53)
20-29 Years	31	(1.57)	59	(1.04)	1	(1.06)	(1.70)
30-40 Years	8	(.41)	6	(.11)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
LIFE	248	(12.59)	513	(9.09)	2	(2.13)	(.39)
DEATH	32	(1.62)	17	(.30)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
Not Available	0	(00.00)	363	(6.43)	6	(6.38)	(1.65)
TOTAL	1970	(100.00)	5645	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	(1.66)

APPENDIX iv

FURLOUGH PROGRAM EXPERIENCE BY AGE AT FURLOUGH

	RESIDENT POPULATION		TOTAL FURLOUGHS GRANTED		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
AGE AT FURLOUGH							
16-19 Years	106	(5.38)	371	(6.57)	9	(9.57)	(2.43)
20-24 Years	564	(28.63)	1732	(30.68)	34	(36.17)	(1.96)
25-29 Years	485	(24.62)	1234	(21.86)	22	(23.40)	(1.78)
30-34 Years	351	(17.82)	890	(15.77)	12	(12.77)	(1.35)
35-39 Years	142	(7.21)	365	(6.47)	5	(5.32)	(1.37)
40-44 Years	108	(5.48)	306	(5.42)	4	(4.26)	(1.31)
45-49 Years	70	(3.55)	194	(3.44)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
50 or Older	80	(4.06)	187	(3.31)	3	(3.19)	(1.60)
Not Available	64	(3.25)	366	(6.48)	5	(5.32)	(1.37)
TOTAL	1970	(100.00)	5645	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	(1.67)

APPENDIX vi

FURLOUGH PROGRAM EXPERIENCE BY MARITAL STATUS

	RESIDENT POPULATION		TOTAL FURLOUGHS GRANTED		NUMBER OF ESCAPES		ESCAPE RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
MARITAL STATUS							
Married	490	(24.87)	1544	(27.35)	33	(35.10)	(2.14)
Single	995	(50.51)	2612	(46.27)	44	(46.81)	(1.68)
Divorced	248	(12.59)	606	(10.74)	8	(8.51)	(1.32)
Widowed	45	(2.28)	121	(2.14)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
Separated	112	(5.68)	335	(5.93)	3	(3.19)	(.90)
Not Available	80	(4.06)	427	(7.56)	6	(6.38)	(1.40)
TOTALS	1970	(100.00)	5645	(100.00)	94	(100.00)	(1.66)

APPENDIX viii

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY OFFENSE

	TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		TOTAL NUMBER OF NON DIFFICULTIES		DIFFICULTIES (OTHER THAN ESCAPE)		DIFFICULTY RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
OFFENSES VS PERSON							
Murder 1	175	(3.1)	171	(3.34)	3	(.70)	(1.71)
Murder 2	345	(6.1)	339	(6.62)	5	(1.17)	(1.45)
Manslaughter	416	(7.4)	399	(7.79)	14	(3.26)	(3.36)
Armed Robbery	1347	(23.9)	1212	(23.66)	103	(24.01)	(7.65)
Other	786	(13.9)	703	(13.72)	64	(14.92)	(8.14)
TOTAL	3069	(54.4)	2824	(55.14)	189	(44.06)	(6.16)
SEX OFFENSES							
Rape	157	(2.8)	148	(2.89)	8	(1.86)	(5.10)
Assault to Rape	52	(.9)	49	(.96)	2	(.47)	(3.85)
Other	15	(.3)	15	(.29)	0	(00.00)	(0.00)
TOTAL	224	(4.0)	212	(4.14)	10	(2.33)	(4.46)
PROPERTY OFFENSES							
Burglary	520	(9.2)	472	(9.22)	41	(9.56)	(7.88)
Larceny of M.V.	47	(.8)	37	(.72)	7	(1.63)	(14.89)
Other	448	(7.9)	394	(7.69)	44	(10.26)	(9.82)
TOTAL	1015	(18.0)	903	(17.63)	92	(21.46)	(9.06)
NARCOTIC OFFENSES							
Drugs	299	(5.3)	250	(4.88)	44	(10.26)	(14.72)
Sale of Heroin	452	(8.0)	404	(7.89)	44	(10.26)	(9.73)
Sale of Narcotic Drugs	114	(2.0)	100	(1.95)	14	(3.26)	(12.28)
TOTAL	865	(15.3)	754	(14.72)	102	(23.78)	(11.79)
OTHER OFFENSES							
Escape	28	(.5)	26	(.51)	1	(.23)	(3.57)
Weapons	40	(.7)	36	(.70)	4	(.93)	(10.00)
Other	37	(.7)	33	(.64)	3	(.70)	(8.11)
TOTAL	105	(1.9)	95	(1.85)	8	(1.86)	(7.62)
Not Available	367	(6.5)	334	(6.52)	28	(6.53)	(7.62)
TOTAL	5645	(100.0)	5122	(100.00)	429	(100.00)	(7.60)

APPENDIX x

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY MONTHS TO PAROLE ELIGIBILITY

MONTHS TO PAROLE ELIGIBILITY	TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS N	%	TOTAL NUMBER OF NON DIFFICULTIES N	%	DIFFICULTY N	%	DIFFICULTY RATE %
Beyond	1026	(18.17)	889	(17.36)	117	(27.27)	(11.40)
0-6 Months	1487	(26.34)	1324	(25.85)	143	(33.33)	(9.62)
7-12 Months	549	(9.72)	494	(9.64)	46	(10.72)	(8.38)
13-18 Months	322	(5.70)	301	(5.88)	18	(4.20)	(5.59)
19-24 Months	165	(2.92)	149	(2.91)	12	(2.80)	(7.27)
25-48 Months	471	(8.34)	452	(8.82)	14	(3.26)	(2.97)
49-72 Months	233	(4.13)	224	(4.37)	6	(1.40)	(2.58)
Greater than 72	147	(2.60)	138	(2.69)	5	(1.17)	(3.40)
LIFE	513	(9.09)	503	(9.82)	8	(1.86)	(1.56)
DEATH	17	(.30)	17	(.33)	0	(00.00)	(00.00)
Not Available	715	(12.67)	631	(12.32)	60	(13.99)	(8.39)
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	5122	(100.00)	429	(100.00)	(7.60)

APPENDIX xii

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY DRUG USE *

	TOTAL NUMBER OF FURLOUGHS		TOTAL NUMBER OF NON DIFFICULTIES		DIFFICULTY		DIFFICULTY RATE
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
No Mention of Drug Use	2645	(46.86)	2469	(48.20)	140	(32.63)	(5.29)
Mention of Drug Use	1704	(30.19)	1499	(29.27)	172	(40.09)	(10.09)
Not Available	1296	(22.96)	1154	(22.53)	117	(27.27)	(9.03)
TOTAL	5645	(100.00)	5122	(100.00)	429	(100.00)	(7.60)

* Mention of drug use in probation summary.