125

37475

CHARLOTTE HOUSE PRE-RELEASE CENTER FOR WOMEN:
A PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS AND A RECIDIVISM FOLLOW UP

Prepared by:

Joseph Landolfi
Research Assistant

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Frank A. Hall
Commissioner

October 1976

INTRODUCTION

Following the enactment of the 1972 Correctional Reform
Act the Massachusetts Department of Correction, recognizing the
valuable rehabilitative potential of community resources, began
implementing a system of community correctional programs.[1] The
1972 Correctional Reform Act (Chapter 777) removed the legal
barriers to community programming. This act enabled the Commis-
sioner of Corrections to authorize the establishment of small,
separately operated community based facilities to which offenders
could be transferred prior to their release on parole. These
facilities were either directly operated by or sub-contracted to
the Department of Correction.[2]

One example of a contract house is the program established
by Charlotte House, a private organization contracted in 1973 to
provide residential facilities for 12 women who are still incar-
cerated in the state prison system but have 12 months or less of
their sentence to serve.

Friends of Framingham, Incorporated, was initially organized
in 1948. Originally, the organization worked for change in
legislative and administrative policy concerning contemporary
practices of penology. In 1962 the Friends of Framingham became
directly involved with corrections in Massachusetts and channeled
their energies toward opening a half-way house for women. The
house opened its doors in 1964 and during the next 8 years served
approximately 200 women from MCI Framingham on a post-release
basis.

In 1973, the halfway house, renamed Charlotte House, contracted
with the Massachusetts Department of Correction to convert from
post-release status to pre-release status. As its first community
residential facility for women, Charlotte House hoped to establish
a smooth transition between total institutionalization and the
nearly complete freedom of parole for the ex-offender. Charlotte

---

[1]For a description and interim evaluation of these programs
see, Landolfi, Joseph, Interim Report on Community Rehabilitation
System - November 1972 - August 1973 Massachusetts Department of
Correction, April 1974, Unpublished.

[2]For a research evaluation of Pre-Release programs operated
directly by the Department of Correction see LeClair, Daniel P.,
An Analysis of Recidivism Among Residents Released from Boston
State and Shirly Pre-Release Centers During 1972-1973. Massachusetts
Department of Correction, August, 1975.

House is working to provide the female offender with skills which will lessen the burden facing her upon her return to the community. While residing at the facility, the offender will participate in work or educational programs and will receive counseling and other support services that will hopefully facilitate her re-adjustment into society.

The services rendered by Charlotte House do not end once a resident is released on parole. Counselling is available to former residents and follow up contacts are maintained to aid the ex-offender with any problems she may encounter in the community.

Research Design

The present study was designed with the purpose of answering the following research questions:

1. What variables distinguish between individuals who complete and individuals who do not complete their assignments to the Charlotte House Pre-Release Program?

2. Are those inmates who ended their terms of incarceration in Charlotte House less likely to be reincarcerated within one year of their release than are similar types of inmates who did not participate in the pre-release program?

Samples:

In determining the existence of characteristics distinguishing between program completers and program non-completers a population consisting of residents admitted to and released from Charlotte House since the inception of the program in September 1973 through December 1975 was chosen (N=40).

In measuring the reduction of further criminal behavior, a population consisting of all residents released from Charlotte House, either by permit of the Parole Board or a certificate of discharge, during the years 1973 and 1974 was chosen (N=22).

Residents who were categorized as program non-completers were not included in the recidivism analysis. Non-completers were either terminated from the Charlotte House program and returned to MCI Framingham or were declared escapees. The majority of the non-completion sample tended to have later release dates and therefore, could not be included in the one year recidivism follow-up analysis.

Data Collection

Data collected for both samples consisted of commitment, social background and criminal history variables. This material was generated by the Massachusetts Department of Correction Community Rehabilitation Systems (CRS) computerized data base. Booking and probation data was provided by the data base maintained by the Correction/Parole Information System Unit.

Base Expectancy Tables:

Because of the possible existence of a non-random selection process in the assignment of clients to pre-release programs, Expected Rates of recidivism were constructed and applied to the Charlotte House pre-release sample. The Expected Rate of recidivism for the pre-release sample was then compared to the Actual Rate of recidivism for the Charlotte House release sample. Tests of statistical significance were used in comparison to determine whether a low or high risk population was chosen in the process of selection for program participants.

FINDINGS

Variables Distinguishing Between Program Completers and Program Non-Completers:

Of the 40 individuals who participated in the Charlotte House community program, since the inception of the program through December 1975, 33 (83%) successfully terminated from the house. The remaining 7 (17%) were either returned to MCI Framingham as program non-completers or declared escapees. A program completion was defined as any resident who successfully completed her stay at Charlotte Hose and was released to the streets either by permit of the Parole Board or a certificate of discharge. A program non-completion was defined as any resident who did not complete her stay at the house but was instead declared an escapee or was returned to MCI Framingham.

In determining the existence of characteristics distinguishing between program completers and program non-completers, a multi-variate analysis was conducted on the total sample. A statistical comparison of commitments, personal history background characteristics and criminal history background characteristics on each of the program completers and each of the program non-completers was carried out to determine whether or not any significant differences existed between these two sub-samples.

Because of the relatively small size of the sample, not surprisingly there were no statistically significant differences between any of the variables of the two sub-samples. A complete statistical breakdown by variable for the two samples is documented in appendix I.

Results of Recidivism Follow-up Analysis:

In measuring the reduction of further criminal behavior, the standard used will be recidivism rates. A recidivist is defined as any subject who is returned for whatever reason to a Federal or State Prison or to a county house of correction or to a Jail for 30 days or more. The follow-up period will be exactly one full year from the date of the subject's release from Charlotte House. It should be noted that a person can be returned either as a parole violator or on a new conviction for a new offense.

Of the 22 individuals who successfully competed the Charlotte House pre-release program in 1973 and 1974, only 3 recidivated. This results in an overall recidivism rate of 13.6%.

This figure appears low when compared to the recidivism rates for the total walled institutions' release population. The most recent recidivism figures available for the releasees from the walled institutions are for the releasees in the year 1972. For that year the combined reicidivism rate for MCI's Concord, Walpole, Framingham, Norfolk and Forestry Camps was 22%. The low rate computed for Charlotte House releasees take on more significance when compared to the 1972 recidivism rate of MCI Framingham, the institution from which Charlotte House draws its residents. These figures are presented in Table I below.

TABLE I

Differential Recidivism Rate by Institution for 1972 Releasees			
Institution of Release	Number of Releases	Percent of Total Releases	Recidivism Rate
MCI Concord	800	(52)	27%
MCI Walpole	182	(12)	21%
MCI Framingham	124	(8)	18%
MCI Norfolk	318	(21)	15%
Forestry Camps	126	(8)	14%
TOTAL	1,550	(100)	22%

To place the comparison between Charlotte House pre-release program with the overall releasee population from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions in perspective, a test of selection biases is necessary. It is necessary to analyze the Charlotte House pre-release population in terms of selection factors to determine whether or not low risk recidivists were in fact selected for transfer into the facility. This was accomplished by determining the expected recidivism rates for the pre-release population through the use of base expectancy tables. The specific base expectancy table utilized was constructed on a population of women released from MCI Framingham during the year 1971. This table is presented below as Table II; and the specific risk categories are summarized and presented below as Table III.

TABLE II

Base Expectancy Table		
Total Sample RR = 29%	Number of Narcotic Offenses RR = 20%	Age 34 or younger At time of Release RR = 26%
		Age 35 or older At time of Release RR =0.0%
	One or More Narcotic Offenses RR = 45%	

TABLE III

Base Expectancy Risk Categories		
Category Number	Description	Recidivism Rate
I	No Narcotic Arrests, Age 34 or Younger	26.0%
II	No Narcotic Arrests, Age 35 or Older	0.0%
III	One or More Narcotic Offenses	45.0%

The base Expectancy Risks Categories as summarized in Table III above, were applied to the Charlotte House Pre-Release population. This procedure resulted in an expected recidivism rate of 34.0% for the Charlotte House sample.

Because of the possible existence of a non-random selection process in the transfer of inmates from MCI-Framingham to Charlotte House, a comparison between the 1972 MCI Framingham release population and the Charlotte House release population will be made. To test for a possible selection bias this study will

compare the actual rate of recidivism for 1972 Framingham releases (18%) with the expected rate of recidivism for 1973 and 1974 Charlotte House releases (34%).

Comparisons between these two release groups show a basic difference, and when the Chi Square goodness of fit test was applied the difference was found to closely approach statistical significance.[3] The comparative figures and the results of the statisitcal test of significance are presented in Table IV, below:

TABLE IV

Comparison Between Rate of Recidivism for Framingham Releases and Expected Rate of Recidivism for Charlotte House Releases		
	Framingham Releases Rate of Recidivism	Expected Rate of Recidivism	Chi Square Test & Probability Level
Charlotte House Releases	18%	34%	$x^2=3.82$, P .05 1df

The data in Table IV indicates that the expected recidivism rate of Charlotte House releasees was higher than the actual recidivism rate of MCI Framingham. Because this difference approaches statistical significance a strong argument can be made for the existence of a selection process. Because the Charlotte House expected rate was so high, an argument could be made in support of the contention that high risks were selected dispro-portionately for transfer to Charlotte House.

Expected Rates of Recidivism Compared to Observed Rates:

---

[3]To determine Statistical significance, the x^2 Goodness of fit Test was utilized:

$$x^2 = \sum \frac{(observed - expected)^2}{expected}$$

In order to test the second hypothesis this study compared the expected recidivism rate of the Charlotte House releases with their actual rate. Selective factors, to the extent that they exist will be controlled for by using the expected rates of recidivism.

When we compare the expected rate with the actual rate, we see that releases from Charlotte House had a considerably lower rate than expected. Table V below summarizes this finding.

TABLE V

Expected Rates of Recidivism Compared to Observed Rate, Charlotte House Population	
Expected Rate	34.0%
Observed Rate	13.6%

Using the Chi Square goodness of fit test it was determined that the difference between Charlotte House expected rate of recidivism and its actual rate was statistically significant at the .05 significant level.[4]

Controlling for a possible selection bias the results of this comparison between expected and actual recidivism rates supports the contention, then, that those residents who participated in the Charlotte House pre-release program were, in fact, less likely to be reincarcerated within one year of their release than are similar types of inmates who did not participate in the pre-release program.

In summation the present evaluation resulted in two major findings. First, some evidence was found that individuals who were transferred to Charlotte House from MCI Framingham tended to exhibit high risk recidivist characteristics. This finding supports the contention that a non-random selection process in the transfer

---

[4] $x^2 = 4.06$, P .05, 1df

of inmates to Charlotte House may not have occurred. However, to the extent that a selection bias did occur it was in the direction of high rather than low recidivism risks being chosen for transfer to the Charlotte House program. This finding adds further significance to the low recidivism rates calculated for Charlotte House releases. Secondly, it was determined that individuals who had completed the Charlotte House pre-release program exhibited a mubh lower rate of recidivism than similar types of individuals who did not participate in the pre-release program; and a significantly lower actual recidivism rate than their expected recidivism rate.

In conclusion, the present research evaluation of the Charlotte House pre-release program has found that there is a reintegrative or rehabilitative quality afforded to pre-release program participants that does, in fact, significantly reduce high levels of recidivism associated with correctional institution releasees.

APPENDIX I

CHARLOTTE HOUSE

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. PRESENT OFFENSE CATEGORY						
Manslaughter	3	(43)	3	(9)	6	(15)
Assault with Intent to Commit Murder	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
Armed Robbery	0	(0)	4	(12)	4	(10)
Assault and Assault and Battery	0	(0)	1	(3)	2	(5)
Mayhem	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
Stealing	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
Larceny from the Person	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
Larceny	2	(29)	2	(6)	4	(10)
Forgery and Uttering	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
Prostitution	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
Narcotics	2	(29)	16	(49)	18	(45)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
2. RACE						
White	3	(43)	10	(30)	13	(33)
Black	4	(57)	21	(64)	25	(63)
Asiatic	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
3. MARITAL STATUS						
Married	2	(29)	7	(23)	9	(24)
Single	4	(57)	19	(61)	23	(61)
Divorced	0	(0)	3	(10)	3	(8)
Widowed	1	(14)	1	(3)	2	(5)
Separated	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	31	(100)	38	(100)

Missing Observations = 2

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
4. ADDRESS PRIOR TO INCARCERATION						
Boston	5	(71)	23	(77)	28	(76)
Cambridge	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
Nahant	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
Fall River	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
Worcester	1	(14)	0	(0)	1	(3)
Springfield	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
Outside New England	1	(14)	3	(10)	4	(11)
TOTAL	7	(100)	30	(100)	37	(100)

Missing Observations = 3

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL						
Clerical and Sales	1	(14)	13	(42)	14	(37)
Semi Professional	1	(14)	2	(7)	3	(8)
Protection	2	(29)	8	(26)	10	(26)
Manual	2	(29)	8	(26)	10	(26)
Unemployed	1	(14)	0	(0)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	31	(100)	38	(100)

Missing Observations = 2

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
6. TIME AT MOST SKILLED POSITION						
2 Months	2	(33)	0	(0)	2	(6)
3 Months	2	(33)	4	(14)	6	(17)
4 Months	2	(33)	5	(17)	7	(20)
5 Months	0	(0)	3	(10)	3	(9)
6 Months	0	(0)	3	(10)	3	(9)
7 Months	0	(0)	7	(24)	7	(20)
8 Months	0	(0)	3	(10)	3	(9)
9 Months	0	(0)	4	(14)	4	(11)
TOTAL	6	(100)	29	(100)	35	(100)

Missing Observations = 5

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
7. TIME ON JOB OF LONGEST DURATION						
2 Months	2	(33)	0	(0)	2	(6)
3 Months	2	(33)	3	(10)	5	(14)
4 Months	2	(33)	2	(7)	4	(11)
5 Months	0	(0)	4	(14)	4	(11)
6 Months	0	(0)	5	(17)	5	(14)
7 Months	0	(0)	8	(28)	8	(23)
8 Months	0	(0)	3	(10)	3	(9)
9 Months	0	(0)	4	(14)	4	(11)
TOTAL	6	(100)	29	(100)	35	(100)

Missing Observations = 5

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
8. LAST GRADE COMPLETED						
4th Grade	1	(14)	0	(0)	1	(3)
5th Grade	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
6th Grade	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
7th Grade	1	(14)	1	(3)	2	(5)
8th Grade	1	(14)	2	(6)	3	(8)
9th Grade	1	(14)	5	(15)	6	(15)
10th Grade	0	(0)	5	(15)	5	(13)
11th Grade	1	(14)	5	(15)	5	(15)
High School Graduate	1	(14)	6	(18)	7	(18)
Some College	1	(14)	5	(15)	6	(15)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
9. DRUG USE						
No History	2	(29)	12	(38)	14	(36)
No Specific Use	0	(0)	4	(13)	4	(10)
Heroin Use	5	(71)	10	(31)	15	(39)
Other Use	0	(0)	6	(19)	6	(15)
TOTAL	7	(100)	32	(100)	39	(100)

Missing Observations = 1

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
10. TOTAL NUMBER OF COURT APPEARANCES						
First Offense	0	(0)	5	(15)	5	(13)
2 to 5	3	(43)	13	(39)	16	(40)
6 to 10	2	(29)	4	(12)	6	(15)
11 to 15	1	(14)	6	(18)	7	(18)
16 to 20	1	(14)	3	(9)	4	(10)
21 to 25	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
Over 25	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
11. NUMBER OF PRIOR COURT APPEARANCES FOR PERSON OFFENSES						
None	4	(57)	21	(64)	25	(62)
1	1	(14)	2	(6)	3	(8)
2	1	(14)	4	(12)	5	(13)
3	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
4	0	(0)	3	(9)	3	(8)
5	1	(14)	0	(0)	1	(3)
6 or More	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
12. NUMBER OF PRIOR COURT APPEARANCES						
FOR PROPERTY OFFENSES						
None	3	(43)	14	(42)	17	(43)
1	1	(14)	3	(9)	4	(10)
2	0	(0)	5	(15)	5	(13)
3	1	(14)	3	(9)	4	(10)
4	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
5	0	(0)	3	(9)	3	(8)
6 to 10	1	(14)	1	(3)	2	(5)
11 or More	1	(14)	2	(6)	3	(5)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
13. NUMBER OF PRIOR COURT APPEARANCES						
FOR NARCOTIC OFFENSES						
None	3	(43)	16	(49)	19	(48)
1	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
2	0	(0)	4	(12)	4	(10)
3	2	(29)	3	(9)	5	(13)
5	0	(0)	3	(9)	3	(8)
6 to 10	2	(29)	2	(6)	4	(10)
11 or More	0	(0)	3	(9)	3	(7)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
14. NUMBER OF PRIOR COURT APPEARANCES						
FOR ESCAPE OFFENSES						
None	6	(86)	32	(97)	38	(95)
One	1	(14)	1	(3)	2	(5)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
15. NUMBER OF JUVENILE INCARCERATIONS						
None	6	(86)	32	(97)	38	(95)
2	1	(14)	1	(3)	2	(5)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
16. NUMBER OF COUNTY INCARCERATIONS						
None	7	(100)	29	(88)	36	(90)
1	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
2	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
3	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
17. NUMBER OF STATE OR FEDERAL INCARCERATIONS						
None	5	(71)	28	(85)	33	(83)
1	2	(29)	3	(9)	5	(13)
2	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
5	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
18. NUMBER OF JUVENILE PAROLES						
None	6	(86)	32	(97)	38	(95)
1	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
2	1	(14)	0	(0)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
19. NUMBER OF JUVENILE PAROLE VIOLATIONS						
Not Applicable	6	(86)	32	(97)	38	(95)
1	1	(14)	1	(3)	2	(5)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
20. NUMBER OF ADULT PAROLES						
None	5	(71)	31	(94)	36	(90)
1	2	(29)	1	(3)	3	(8)
4	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
21. NUMBER OF ADULT PAROLE VIOLATIONS						
Not Applicable	5	(71)	31	(94)	36	(90)
None	2	(29)	1	(3)	3	(8)
3	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
22. TOTAL ADULT INCARCERATIONS						
None	5	(71)	25	(76)	30	(75)
1	2	(29)	4	(12)	6	(15)
2	0	(0)	1	(4)	1	(3)
3	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
5	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
23. TOTAL INCARCERATIONS						
None	4	(57)	24	(73)	28	(70)
1	2	(29)	4	(12)	6	(15)
2	1	(14)	2	(6)	3	(8)
3	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
5	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
24. AGE AT INCARCERATION						
18	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
19	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
20	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
21	0	(0)	5	(15)	5	(13)
22-25	5	(71)	7	(21)	12	(30)
26-29	2	(29)	10	(30)	12	(30)
30-34	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
35-39	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
40-44	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
45 and Over	0	(0)	1	(3)	2	(5)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
25. AGE AT FIRST ARREST						
13-14	1	(14)	3	(9)	4	(10)
16-17	1	(14)	5	(15)	6	(15)
18-19	0	(0)	5	(15)	5	(13)
20-21	1	(14)	5	(15)	6	(15)
22-23	3	(43)	2	(6)	5	(13)
24-25	1	(14)	6	(18)	7	(18)
28-33	0	(0)	3	(9)	3	(8)
35-38	0	(0)	3	(9)	3	(8)
39 and Over	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
26. AGE AT FIRST DRUG ARREST						
Not Applicable	4	(50)	15	(47)	19	(48)
17-18	0	(0)	3	(9)	3	(8)
20-21	1	(13)	2	(6)	3	(8)
22-23	2	(25)	2	(6)	4	(10)
24-25	1	(13)	5	(16)	6	(15)
26-28	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
35 and Over	0	(0)	3	(9)	3	(8)
TOTAL	8	(100)	32	(100)	40	(100)

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
27. AGE AT ENTRY INTO CRS PROGRAM						
19-20	0	(0)	4	(12)	4	(10)
21-22	1	(14)	4	(12)	5	(13)
23-24	0	(0)	4	(12)	4	(10)
25-26	4	(57)	3	(9)	7	(18)
27-28	1	(14)	5	(15)	6	(15)
29-30	1	(14)	6	(18)	7	(18)
36-41	0	(0)	4	(12)	4	(10)
47 or Over	0	(0)	3	(9)	3	(8)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
28. TIME SERVED IN MCI						
2-6 Months	3	(43)	17	(52)	20	(50)
7-12 Months	1	(14)	6	(18)	7	(18)
13-18 Months	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
19-24 Months	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
25-30 Months	2	(29)	2	(6)	4	(10)
31-36 Months	1	(14)	3	(9)	4	(10)
Over 36 Months	0	(0)	2	(6)	2	(5)
TOTAL	7	(100)	33	(100)	40	(100)
29. TIME IN CRS PROGRAM						
1 Month	1	(14)	4	(13)	5	(14)
2 Months	2	(29)	4	(13)	6	(16)
3 Months	0	(0)	7	(23)	7	(19)
4 Months	4	(57)	3	(10)	7	(19)
5 Months	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
6 Months	0	(0)	3	(10)	3	(8)
7 Months	0	(0)	2	(7)	2	(5)
9 Months	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
10 Months	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
11 Months	0	(0)	2	(7)	2	(5)
12 Months	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
More Than 12 Months	0	(0)	1	(3)	1	(3)
TOTAL	7	(100)	30	(100)	37	(100)

Missing Observations = 3

VARIABLE	NON-COMPLETIONS		COMPLETIONS		TOTAL SAMPLE	
30. TIME IN MONTHS TO FIRST PAROLE ELIGIBILITY DATE						
Beyond PE Date	1	(25)	7	(29)	8	(29)
1 Month	2	(50)	3	(13)	5	(18)
2 Months	0	(0)	2	(8)	2	(7)
3 Months	0	(0)	4	(17)	4	(14)
4 Months	0	(0)	1	(4)	1	(4)
5 Months	0	(0)	1	(4)	1	(4)
6 Months	0	(0)	1	(4)	1	(4)
8 Months	0	(0)	1	(4)	1	(4)
9 Months	0	(0)	1	(4)	1	(4)
Over 1 Year	1	(25)	3	(13)	4	(14)
TOTAL	4	(100)	24	(100)	28	(100)

END