

142844



STATE OF NEW YORK

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

THE STATE OFFICE BUILDING CAMPUS

ALBANY, N.Y. 12226

THOMAS A. COUGHLIN III
COMMISSIONER

CHESTER H. CLARK
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

DIVISION OF PROGRAM PLANNING, RESEARCH & EVALUATION

OVERVIEW OF DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP RESEARCH ON
RETURN RATES OF PARTICIPANTS IN
MAJOR PROGRAMS
1992

Since 1980, the New York State Department of Correctional Services (DOCS) has conducted and published follow-up research reports on the return rates of participants in major programs.

This overview summarizes the findings of this ongoing research, which has included studies of the High School Equivalency, Alcohol & Substance Abuse Treatment, Network, Work Release, Pre-Release, Family Reunion and College Programs. In recent years, this series of reports has been expanded to incorporate two major initiatives: the Shock Incarceration Program and the Earned Eligibility Program.

The present overview updates and expands the preceding summary (1989) by incorporating recent follow-up research and by providing more detailed statistical information on the individual studies.

In general terms, the reports in this series have consistently found that satisfactory participants in these programs have lower return rates than unsatisfactory program participants and the Department's overall return rate.

These reports clearly suggest the value of offering substantial program services in terms of community protection. The reduction of the return rates of program participants also serves to contain the cost of imprisonment.

May 1992

142849

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

New York State Department of
Correctional Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

**OVERVIEW OF DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP RESEARCH ON
RETURN RATES OF PARTICIPANTS IN
MAJOR PROGRAMS**

Since 1980, the New York State Department of Correctional Services (DOCS) has conducted and published follow-up research reports on the return rates of participants in major programs. Prior to reviewing the findings of these reports, it is essential to briefly consider the background and objective of this research as well as the research methodology utilized in these standardized reports.

Historical Background. In the late 1970's and early 1980's, the effectiveness of correctional programs came under severe criticism, and overly optimistic claims of program effectiveness were challenged. As a result, the funding for many correctional programs was cut (in whole or part) nationally.

This critical viewpoint was characterized by the well-known book of Martinson et. al. entitled Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment (1975). This book was commonly interpreted to say that institutional correctional programs do not work (i.e., they do not reduce recidivism). More precisely, the book concludes that the impact of correctional programs on recidivism generally had not been documented by statistical research.

In recent years, the more successful treatment programs exhibit an ability to appropriately target the needs of offenders who are being treated. This matching of program design and offender needs has shown great promise in prison treatment programs. (D.A. Andrews et.al. "Does Correctional Treatment Work?," Criminology, Vol 28, Number 3, 1990, pp. 369-404). This research supports the Department's position that positive participation of inmates in programs is beneficial to these inmates and to society by reducing the likelihood that these participants will involve themselves in post-release behavior that will return them to custody.

Central Theme of Department Research: Issue of Satisfactory Participation. Consistent with this perspective, the Department's Division of Program Planning, Research and Evaluation developed a series of follow-up research on participants in various programs.

The central theme of this research has been the issue of "satisfactory participation." Based on a review of the literature and basic common sense, this research has consistently investigated the relationship between satisfactory participation in various programs and post-release return rates. It has been the hypothesis of this research series that satisfactory participation in major programs is positively related to lower return rates. In other words, satisfactory participants will return to Department custody at a lower rate than unsatisfactory participants. To date, the findings of the Department's research have consistently supported this hypothesis.

This research has carefully avoided the extravagant claims of the near miraculous rehabilitation of offenders, which typified certain programs in the late 1960's and early 1970's. On the contrary, reports in this series have consistently concluded with cautious claims of program effectiveness. Specifically, these reports have often highlighted the crucial contribution that inmate motivation provides to satisfactory participation in the surveyed programs.

In essence, this research has concluded that the impact of these programs may be jointly attributed to both inmate motivation and the programs themselves.

Selection of Programs for Follow-Up Research. The Division of Program Planning, Research and Evaluation works closely with program administrators in the selection of programs for follow-up research.

Essentially, the Department has developed programs designed to target the identified problem areas of the offenders who are committed to its custody. For example, the majority of commitments have substance abuse problems and low educational levels which are believed to be related to a higher likelihood of recidivism. The Department provides programs designed to address these problems and the Department's follow-up research is designed to ascertain the impact of these programs in reducing the return rates of the involved offenders.

Importance of Comparison Groups. The identification of appropriate comparison groups is an important element in recidivism studies. A finding that a target group of program participants has a specified return rate is almost meaningless if not related to some expected return rate of a comparison group.

For this reason, the Department's program follow-up research utilizes the Department's overall return rate for baseline comparison purposes. The Department's Division of Program Planning, Research and Evaluation publishes five year follow-up reports on the recidivism rate of released offenders on an annual basis. This long established series of annual reports provides return rate data on the Department's overall inmate population.

In addition to utilizing the Department's overall return rate, these program follow-up studies develop specialized comparison groups. Typically, these comparison groups are composed of offenders who failed to complete and/or participate satisfactorily in the surveyed program. These comparison groups of unsatisfactory program participants are closely similar to the satisfactory program participants. The major difference between the two groups is the nature of their program participation.

In recent years, the Department's follow-up research on the Shock Incarceration and Earned Eligibility Programs has developed even more refined comparison groups.

Standardized Research Methodology. This ongoing report series utilizes a standardized research methodology.

All studies in this twelve year period utilize a standard definition of recidivism: return to the Department's custody with a new sentence or for a parole violation.

In addition, individuals in these studies are tracked for a minimum follow-up period of 12 months to insure reliable return rates.

Moreover, this research series emphasizes the need to replicate previous research findings on individual programs by conducting subsequent studies. As such, this research series adheres to the basic research tenet that research findings should be subjected to critical examination in replication studies using different samples of program participants.

Use of Tests of Statistical Significance. As part of the Department's ongoing efforts to enhance its follow-up research, the Department has made increasing use of tests of statistical significance to assess the results of the various studies.

The basic purpose of the statistical test is to determine if the observed difference in the return rates of the satisfactory program participants and the comparison group may be reasonably attributed to chance or to a real difference between the two groups.

In Department research, the statistical test used is the chi-square test, which is a common and widely accepted test of statistical significance. A very rigorous level of statistical significance ($p < .01$) is utilized in Department research. This level of significance allows the Department to conclude that the observed difference in return rates would only occur 1 time in a hundred by chance alone. In other words, the Department can be 99% confident that the observed difference is a real difference in the return rates of the two groups.

Return Rates of Participants in Different Programs Cannot be Directly Compared. Before reviewing the various reports, it should be emphasized that the findings of any individual follow-up study should not be directly compared with the findings of any other study for a number of programmatic and methodological reasons.

Programmatically, the participants in these programs and the programs themselves vary greatly in terms of a wide range of factors. Due to this variability, a comparison of the return rates for the participants between these programs is meaningless.

Methodologically, a direct comparison of these studies is precluded due to differences in the length of the follow-up periods. A sample of program participants in the community for two years would obviously be expected to have a higher return rate than a sample in the community for only one year.

Overall Impact of Positive Programming. Prior to reviewing the results of the series of follow-up studies of specific programs, it is appropriate to examine the overall impact of positive programming as demonstrated by the findings of Department research concerning the Earned Eligibility Program.

Earned Eligibility Program. In 1987, the Department launched the Earned Eligibility Program (EEP) which evaluates an inmate's overall program performance. The objective of this program is to increase the rate of release at their initial Parole Board hearing of those inmates who have demonstrated an overall pattern of progress in appropriate programs without endangering the community. Specifically, it was the program's goal to increase the percentage of satisfactory program participants released at their initial Parole hearings without increasing their return rate.

As is evident from this capsule program description, the EEP is not actually a program service in the same sense of the term as the High School Equivalency Program or the Shock Incarceration Program. The EEP is more accurately considered as a review procedure that evaluates and documents the inmate's overall program progress. If an inmate is deemed to have met the minimum standards for progress, than an EEP certificate is awarded.

In each Annual Program Report to the Legislature, the Department has compared the return rates of satisfactory program participants who were awarded a certificate of Earned Eligibility to the Department's pre-program return rate. This follow-up research has involved the largest samples of any of the Department studies over 26,000 in the latest Annual Report prepared in December 1991.

While the goal of the EEP is to increase releases while maintaining the pre-program return rate, the EEP Certificate cases return at a lower rate than the pre-program release population. Moreover, this lower return rate has been consistently found to be statistically significant. This finding of statistical significance strongly supports the basic premise of the program that inmates who participate positively in appropriate programs are good release risks.

Summaries of Follow-Up Research on Specific Programs. In light of these findings on the overall impact of positive programming, the following section presents brief summaries of the Department's research in specific program areas. For each program area, a capsule program description is presented and the most recent study in that area is highlighted. (A listing of the Department's individual follow-up reports is appended.)

Appended to this overview is a set of summary tables, which provide more detailed statistical information on the individual reports in a standardized fashion. These capsule profiles indicate the size of the samples, the follow-up periods and the return rates of the samples of satisfactory and unsatisfactory participants. For the more recent studies, results of the chi-square test of statistical significance are also presented. These statistical summaries are designed to allow the interested reader to readily review this quantitative information without increasing the length and complexity of the text by incorporating the statistics in the text.

Family Reunion Program. The first study in this ongoing series was the initial follow-up study of participants in the Family Reunion Program in 1980.

At that time, the Family Reunion Program, which allowed inmates to receive extended and private visits by family members, was highly controversial. Earlier research had found that program participants typically planned to reside with the family members who visited them while incarcerated. This follow-up study was designed to ascertain whether or not this encouraged maintenance of family ties assisted the program participants in avoiding further criminal activity (as measured by return to the Department). The results of this follow-up study were very encouraging: released program participants returned to the Department at a lower rate than the overall release population.

In 1986, a second follow-up study of Family Reunion Program participants was conducted. This study replicated the preceding study using a larger and more recent sample of program participants. This replication study had similar findings: program participants returned to the Department at a lower rate than the Department's total release population.

Work Release Program. In view of the critical legislative and public review of the Department's work release program, this program was selected as the subject of a series of follow-up studies beginning in 1983.

Work Release is the major component of the Department's overall temporary release program. Under the work release program, eligible inmates are allowed to leave the correctional facility for a specified number of hours each day for employment purposes. At the end of the individual's work day, the inmate returns to the correctional facility.

The series began with the relatively small community based program at the Rochester Correctional Facility. This initial report was followed by a study of the Fishkill Program, which is a component of a large medium security facility. The third study in the series focused on the large New York City based work release facility at Edgecombe. The fourth study was a comparison report on the New York City Work Release Program for women at Parkside. The last survey in this series concerned the Hudson Work Release Program.

In 1988, an overview of these five studies was issued. This overview highlighted the consistent findings of this series research.

Despite the wide variation in the involved inmate population and facility programs, satisfactory participants in work release programs consistently have significantly lower return rates than unsatisfactory participants and the Department's overall return rate.

High School Equivalency Program. The Department provides a range of academic education programs for inmates without high school diplomas, which culminate in the high school equivalency test preparation program. The test of General Education Development (GED) is developed by the American Council on Education to assess skills, concepts and application of knowledge generally associated with each of the major content areas at the high school level. The policies and conditions under which GED certificates may be issued and administration of the GED testing program are set in New York by the State Education Department.

The follow-up research in this area was designed to address the question, "Is the acquisition of a high school equivalency diploma while incarcerated related to the offender's likelihood of return to Department's custody following release?" In 1989, the question was examined in the Department's largest program follow-up study to date. This 1989 research, which replicated a smaller 1986 study, tracked over 15,000 cases, including over 4,000 inmates who received GED's while incarcerated. This major study found a statistically significant difference between the return rates of those inmates who earned a GED and those who did not. This study clearly indicates that those offenders who earned a GED were less likely to return than a comparable sample of offenders who did not achieve their GED.

Inmate College Program. Inmates with high school diplomas may enroll in classes presented in Department facilities by colleges and universities.

Similar to the Department research on the GED Program, two studies (in 1983 and 1991) addressed the question of whether completing a college degree while incarcerated is also related to post-release recidivism as measured by return to Department custody.

This research has found that inmates who earned a college degree while incarcerated had a statistically significant lower return rate than those who dropped out or were administratively removed from their college programs.

Drug and Alcohol Services. In view of the increasing need to address the substance abuse problems of commitments to the Department, the Department has greatly expanded its Alcohol and Substance Abuse Treatment (ASAT) Program. Facility ASAT programs provide specialized counseling to inmates with a history of alcohol or drug abuse. An ongoing series of follow-up studies have tracked participants in these programs.

This six report series consists of three reports on the non-residential Woodbourne ASAT Program, two report on the residential ASAT Program at Mt. McGregor and, most recently, a study of the residential ASAT Program at Collins.

These reports have consistently found that satisfactory participants in ASAT programs (residential and non-residential) have a lower return rate than unsatisfactory participants.

In addition to this ongoing research on the Department's ASAT Program, a separate report examined the Stay-N-Out Program, which is a substance abuse program operated by a private organization under Department contract at two NYC facilities. This report also found encouraging results: satisfactory program participants returned at a lower rate than unsatisfactory participants.

Overall, this research series has consistently found that satisfactory participation in substance abuse programs does appear to reduce the likelihood of recidivism.

Pre-Release Program. The Department's Pre-Release Program has been the subject of three follow-up studies. In the Department's pre-release centers, trained inmate peer counselors assist inmates, who are approaching release, in a variety of practical areas.

A 1986 report on satisfactory participants in the established pre-release centers at Fishkill, Wallkill and Green Haven was replicated in 1989 with similarly positive findings.

This continuing series was expanded in 1989 to include an examination of the return rates of the inmates who serve as peer counselors in pre-release centers. This study found that the peer counselors had a substantially lower return rate than the Department's overall release population. This expanded research serves to illustrate the evolving nature of the Department's program follow-up research. As program administrators and research staff work together on various areas, the research approaches in these areas are refined and expanded.

Network Program. The Department has produced a two report series of follow-up studies on the Network Program, which is an intensive counseling program based on the therapeutic community model.

The return rate of those inmates who perform satisfactorily in this demanding program was found to be notably lower than unsatisfactory participants.

This research served to highlight the potential value of the Network Program as one of the basic components of the Department's major initiative -- the Shock Incarceration Program.

Shock Incarceration Program. The Department's newest series of program follow-up studies has concerned the Shock Incarceration Program which was enacted by legislation in 1987. The Department's Shock Incarceration Program is a six month program of rigorous physical activity, intensive regimentation, discipline and drug abuse treatment, which prepares successful participants for early parole consideration.

Prior to the release of the first cohort of program graduates, the Department began working with the Division of Parole on a joint protocol for follow-up research.

The initial follow-up study of the first six platoons of Shock graduates was issued in 1989. Subsequent follow-up reports and annual Legislative Reports have continued this effort.

The Department's ongoing research on the Shock Incarceration Program illustrates the increasing sophistication of the agency's recidivism studies. In concert with the Division of Parole, the Department has developed three different comparison groups for study purposes.

(1). a "pre-shock" group of comparable young offenders who were admitted to DOCS custody prior to program implementation

(2). a "considered" group of commitments who met the legal eligibility criteria and were screened for Shock participation, but did not enter the program, and

(3). a "removal" group of unsatisfactory participants who entered but did not graduate from the program

While the expressed goal of the program is to accelerate the release of program graduates without increasing the risk to the community, follow-up research has actually found that program graduates have lower return rates than the comparison groups.

As reported in the most current study, the 1992 Annual Report to the Legislature, program graduates had statistically significant lower return rates than all three comparison groups.

This finding of a statistically significant lower return rate for Shock graduates has substantial programmatic significance in view of the cost savings generated by the accelerated release of these graduates. In essence, these findings serve to document the program's achievement of its expressed legislative objective of treating and releasing specially selected prisoners prior to their court set minimum terms without compromising community protection.

Conclusion. In very brief terms, the Department's ongoing series of program follow-up studies has consistently found that satisfactory participants in major Department programs have lower return rates than unsatisfactory participants.

At this point, it is appropriate to comment on the overall utilization of this multifaceted series. The proposition is often advanced that the purpose of such a research series should be to determine which programs are effective and to concentrate greater resources on these programs.

This proposed approach appears to envision an evaluation system as a competitive process, such as television ratings or classroom grades, which has the objective of arranging programs in some sort of rank order.

This model seems to ignore the obvious fact that different programs have different objectives and involve different types of offenders with different program needs. As such, the findings of recidivism research on different programs are not directly comparable.

A hypothetical example serves to illustrate the fallacy of such a simplistic model for the utilization of evaluation research. Hypothetically suppose that research found that the participants in the GED Program had a lower return rate than participants in the Department's ASAT Program.

Under this model, one might erroneously conclude that the Department should thus concentrate its resources on the GED Program and terminate or reduce the ASAT Program. While the Department does not believe this was the intended interpretation of this common proposition, this model reflects a common misunderstanding of the proper utilization of research data in program evaluation. Inmates have different and multiple problems that require a comprehensive set of various programs.

In conclusion, it is the Department's position that the follow-up studies of the Earned Eligibility Program supports this position that a comprehensive package of program services should be offered to enable offenders to address their varying and multiple problem areas.

**LISTING OF DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP STUDIES OF
PARTICIPANTS IN MAJOR PROGRAMS**

FAMILY REUNION PROGRAM

1. Follow-Up Survey of Post-Release Criminal Behavior of Participants in Family Reunion Program (1980)
2. Follow-Up Study Sample of Family Reunion Program Participants (1986)

WORK RELEASE PROGRAM

1. Follow-Up Study Sample of Rochester Work Release Participants (1983)
2. Follow-Up Study Sample of Fishkill Work Release Participants (1984)
3. Follow-Up Study Sample of Edgecombe Work Release Participants (1985)
4. Follow-Up Study Sample of Parkside Work Release Participants (1987)
5. Follow-Up Study Sample of Hudson Work Release Participants (1988)
6. Overview of the Department's Follow-Up Research Series Concerning Facility Work Release Programs (1988)

GED PROGRAM

1. Follow-Up Study of a Sample Of Offenders Who Earned High School Equivalency Diplomas While Incarcerated (1986)
2. Follow-Up Study of a Sample of Offenders Who Earned High School Equivalency Diplomas While Incarcerated (1989)

**LISTING OF DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP STUDIES OF
PARTICIPANTS IN MAJOR PROGRAMS (Cont'd)**

COLLEGE PROGRAM

1. Follow-Up Study Sample of Inmate College Program Participants (1983)
2. Analysis of Return Rates of The Inmate College Program Participants (1991)

DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE PROGRAMS

1. Follow-Up Study of a Sample of Participants in the Woodbourne Alcohol and Substance Abuse Programs (1983).
2. Analysis of Return Rate of Participants in Woodbourne Alcohol Program (1984)
3. Follow-Up Study of Sample of Mt. McGregor Alcohol and Substance Treatment Program (1985)
4. Follow-Up Study of Sample of Mt. McGregor Alcohol and Substance Abuse Treatment Program (1987)
5. Follow-Up Study Sample of Woodbourne Alcohol Program Participants (1987)
6. Follow-Up Study of a Sample of Participants in the Stay-N-Out Program (1987)
7. Follow-Up Study of a Sample of Participation in the Collins Alcohol and Substance Abuse Program (1991)

PRE-RELEASE PROGRAM

1. Follow-Up Study of Sample of Pre-Release Program Participants (1986)
2. Follow-Up Study of Sample of Pre-Release Program Participants (1989)
3. Follow-Up Study of Sample of Pre-Release Program Peer Counselors Program Participants (1989)

**LISTING OF DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP STUDIES OF
PARTICIPANTS IN MAJOR PROGRAMS (Cont'd)**

NETWORK PROGRAM

1. Outcome Analysis of 1982 Network Program Release (1984)
2. Follow-Up Study of Sample of Participants in the Network Program (1987)

SHOCK INCARCERATION PROGRAM

1. Initial Follow-Up Study of Shock Graduates (1989)
2. Follow-Up Study of First Six Platoons of Shock Graduates (1989)
3. Shock Incarceration Program Follow-Up Study (1990)
4. Shock Incarceration Program Follow-Up Study (1991)
5. The Fourth Annual Report to the Legislative (1992) (Most recent legislative report)

EARNED ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM

1. Earned Eligibility Program: Statistical Report - July 1987 Through September 1991 (1991) (Most recent legislative report)

EARNED ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM

PROGRAM	FOLLOW-UP PERIOD	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE
ALL INMATES AWARDED A CERTIFICATE OF EARNED ELIGIBILITY	12-51 MOS	26,126	34.8%	30.9%

Results of test of statistical significance: Difference between actual and projected return rates of inmates awarded a certificate of earned eligibility is significant at .01 level ($p < .01$).

FAMILY REUNION PROGRAM							
		SATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS			UNSATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS		
PROGRAM	FOLLOW-UP PERIOD	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE
WALKKILL, ATTICA, GREAT MEADOW, EASTERN, GREEN HAVEN, AUBURN, CLINTON & FISHKILL	13-48 MOS	204	26.5%	19.6%	237	NOT APPLICABLE	

FACILITY WORK RELEASE PROGRAMS

		SATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS			UNSATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS		
FACILITY	FOLLOW-UP PERIOD	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE
ROCHESTER	13-60 MOS	291	23.7%	15.8%	74	27.0%	28.4%
FISHKILL	13-60 MOS	179	29.6%	15.6%	22	INSUFFICIENT SAMPLE FOR FOLLOW-UP	
EDGECOMBE	13-36 MOS	318	28.0%	11.6%	74	23.0%	23.0%
PARKSIDE	13-36 MOS	162	17.2%	9.2%	29	17.2%	31.0%
HUDSON	13-36 MOS	160	26.9%	8.1%	48	25.0%	16.7%

Results of test of statistical significance: difference between the return rates of the satisfactory and unsatisfactory participants is significant at .01 level ($p < .01$) at each facility (except Hudson).

EDUCATION PROGRAMS							
		SATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS			UNSATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS		
PROGRAM	FOLLOW-UP PERIOD	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE
GED	12-42 MOS	4,226	34.8%	34.0%	11,294	34.6%	39.1%
Results of test of statistical significance: difference between the return rates of the offenders who earned a GED while incarcerated and those who did not is significant at .01 level (p<.01).							
INMATE COLLEGE PROGRAM	12-48 MOS	356	41.0%	26.4%	630	41.0%	44.6%
Results of test of statistical significance: difference between the return rates of the offenders who completed a college degree while incarcerated and those who dropped out or were removed prior to earning a degree is significant at .01 level (p<.01).							

DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE PROGRAMS

		SATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS			UNSATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS		
PROGRAM	FOLLOW-UP PERIOD	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE
WOODBOURNE ASAT	13-48 MOS	339	27.4%	23.3%	82	25.6%	28.0%
MT.MCGREGOR ASAT	13-48 MOS	105	28.3%	20.9%	8	INSUFFICIENT SAMPLE FOR FOLLOW-UP	
STAY-N-OUT	13-60 MOS	220	40.0%	38.2%	156	37.8%	51.3%
COLLINS ASAT	12-48 MOS	498	35.7%	34.3%	72	36.1%	50.0%

Results of test of statistical significance: difference between the return rates of the satisfactory and unsatisfactory ASAT program in the Collins program is significant at .01 level ($p < .01$).

PRE-RELEASE PROGRAM							
		SATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS			UNSATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS		
PROGRAM	FOLLOW-UP PERIOD	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE
PARTICIPANTS PRE-RELEASE PROGRAMS AT WALLKILL, FISHKILL & GREEN HAVEN	13-24 MOS	540	19.6%	16.8%	237	21.1%	21.9%
PRE-RELEASE PEER COUNSELORS	12-32 MOS	116	25.9%	14.7%	NOT APPLICABLE		

NETWORK PROGRAM							
		SATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS			UNSATISFACTORY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS		
FACILITY(IES)	FOLLOW-UP PERIOD	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE	TOTAL SAMPLE	PROJECTED RETURN RATE	ACTUAL RETURN RATE
ALL FACILITIES	13-60 MOS	147	39.5%	24.5%	221	35.9%	37.1%

SHOCK INCARCERATION PROGRAM

**RETURN RATES FOR SHOCK GRADUATES AND
THE COMPARISON GROUPS
CONTROLLING FOR TIME OF EXPOSURE
ANALYZING A MARCH 1988 TO MARCH 1990
RELEASE COHORT ON MARCH 1991**

TIME FRAME FOR PARTICIPANTS LEAVING PROGRAM	FOLLOW-UP PERIOD	GRADUATES		PRE-SHOCK		CONSIDERED		REMOVALS	
		NUMBER OF RELEASES	RETURN RATE						
3/88 TO 3/90	12 MOS.	1,641	13.8%	1,418	18.5%	1,662	20.1%	366	22.4%
3/88 TO 9/89	18 MOS.	981	28.7%	1125	34.0%	883	36.1%	182	40.1%
3/88 TO 3/89	24 MOS.	582	39.7%	827	43.5%	378	46.8%	68	51.5%

Results of tests of statistical significance: Differences are significant at the .01 level between the Shock graduates and the Comparison groups for the twelve and eighteen month follow-up periods.