

MUTUAL AGREEMENT PROGRAM:
TIME SERVED AND OUTCOME ANALYSIS REPORT



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

DIVISION OF CORRECTIONS
OFFICE OF SYSTEMS AND EVALUATION
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701

BULLETIN C-18

FEBRUARY 1979

59470

S T A T E O F W I S C O N S I N

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Donald E. Percy, Secretary

DIVISION OF CORRECTIONS

Allyn R. Sielaff, Administrator

Lee Roy Black, Ph.D., Deputy Administrator

PREPARED BY:

Stephen M. Puckett, Planning Analyst
Office of Systems and Evaluation

OFFICE OF SYSTEMS AND EVALUATION

Paul H. Kusuda, Director

Perry C. Baker, Deputy Director, Statistics and Evaluation Section
Theodore H. Johnson, Deputy Director, Systems Development Section

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction and Background.....	1
II. Methodology.....	2
Data Collection.....	3
Data Analysis.....	4
III. MAP's Effect on Time Served.....	5
Operationalization of Variables.....	5
Bivariate Relationships to the Treatment Variable.....	7
Summary of Bivariate Relationships.....	9
Statistical Controls Introduced.....	10
Discussion of Results.....	12
IV. MAP's Effect on Parole.....	16
Operationalization of the Variables.....	16
Results of Bivariate Relationships.....	18
A. Parole Outcome Results.....	18
B. Employment Outcome Results.....	20
C. Skill Level of Employment.....	21
D. Number of Jobs Held.....	24
E. Unemployment Outcome.....	24
F. Education Status Outcome.....	27
V. Summary of Report Findings.....	29
Appendix I: Summary Tables Relating to Time Served.....	31
Appendix 2: Institution and Field Forms Used in the Collection of Data for Time Served and Parole Outcome Report.....	39
Appendix 3: Regression Analysis Relating to Time Served for Re-Released Residents.....	50
Appendix 4: Summary Statistics Relating to Residents Involvement With the Mutual Agreement Program for Calendar Years 1975, 1976 and 1977.....	54

DOCUMENT DIGESTDepartment of Health
and Social Services*Document Title:* MUTUAL AGREEMENT PROGRAM:
TIME SERVED AND OUTCOME ANALYSIS REPORT

This Digest summarizes the above document dated:

The purpose of this publication is to inform Division of Corrections staff and others about the length of time served by correctional institution residents released via the Mutual Agreement Program (MAP) and subsequent outcome of those releases after being followed-up statistically for one year on parole. MAP has been an integral part of Division of Corrections plans to achieve efficiency and effectiveness for Division-wide programs made available to residents. With cooperation of the Department of Health and Social Services' Parole Board, the Division has used MAP as a vehicle for coordinating, implementing, and completing program commitments made by institution residents. One hopeful product of the residents' commitment is a reduced length of stay (as a target parole date); another is success on parole.

Calendar year 1976 and 1977 MAP and not-MAP releases were used in the analysis on time served. Results in 1976 show that MAP releases possibly shortened their stay by 4.8 percent or approximately 1.75 months than had they elected to pursue the regular parole process. MAP releases for 1977 shortened the length of stay by 6.8 percent or approximately 3.2 months.

Parole follow-up outcomes in 1975 showed approximately 91 percent of the MAP releases studied as successful; not-MAP releases, approximately 87 percent successful. For 1976 releases after one year, both MAP and not-MAP releases reported 91 percent of the cases studied as successful. Parole outcomes for other success indicators such as employment status, unemployment reasons, or education status do not show significant difference existing between the MAP and not-MAP groups.

The report is presented in four parts consisting of methodology, time served analysis, parole outcome analysis, and summary. In addition, four appendices are attached. Those appendices are 1) summary tables relating to time served analysis, 2) examples of institution and parole questionnaire forms, 3) regression analysis for time served relating to re-released residents, and 4) summary statistics on residents involvement with MAP for calendar years 1975, 1976, and 1977.

MUTUAL AGREEMENT PROGRAM:
TIME SERVED AND OUTCOME ANALYSIS REPORT

Introduction and Background

The Division of Corrections implemented the Mutual Agreement Program (MAP) late in 1974 subsequent to a pilot project at the Wisconsin Correctional Institution in 1973. A systematic data collection and dissemination of information procedure was established. This system has produced information on annual admissions and releases from our correctional institutions and other short analytic reports required for MAP.

This report relates information about MAP to essential questions relating to MAP's achieving desired results as originally specified in the project's funding proposal. Basically, two questions have been asked about MAP. First, is there a demonstrative impact of reducing the amount of time served by MAP residents? Second, is there a demonstrative impact of success on parole by residents completing MAP contracts in the institutions?

The most recently-published report about MAP releases (August 1978) shows that the percent of correctional institution residents released via MAP increased from 20.4 percent of the total released population in 1975 to 42.4 percent in 1977. This is a rather high proportion of individuals being released via MAP, considering that an average of 21 percent of the average daily population for 1977 actually had MAP contracts.

Part I deals with the methodology of this report, i.e., the means of data analysis, conceptual problems of data collection, and the subsequent interpretations.

Part II covers the analysis pertaining to MAP's impact on time served. An operationalization of the variables is followed by the actual data analysis and conclusions.

Part III of this report responds to the question of success on parole. Again, after operationalizing the variables, data analysis and conclusions are provided. The issues of recidivism and employment success are emphasized in this section.

Part I - Methodology

Current MAP eligibility standards qualify a variety of institution residents as potential users of the program. Residents, regardless of length of sentence or type of offense, are eligible at some point during their incarceration, to prepare a contract up to a duration of three years. Because of this eligibility, the Parole Board has refused to negotiate with some residents, based on paroling criteria in effect at the time of the negotiation. The evaluation research is performed in a quasi-experimental model of analysis. Comparison group assignments occur through natural selection during residents' incarceration, thus accommodating eligibility standards.

From information obtained through a monthly release listing and compared with the MAP statistical information system, residents were assigned to the various statistical comparison groups as they are released from the institution.

The operational definition for the statistical comparison group assignments were as follows:

1. MAP: The MAP group was comprised of residents who successfully completed their negotiated or renegotiated MAP contract and were released from the institutions via contract components.
2. Non-MAP: The non-MAP group was comprised of residents who at the point of release from the institution had no formal referral to MAP reported.
3. Non-contract: The non-contract group was comprised of residents released from the institution who at the point of release had either been referred to MAP or negotiated for a MAP contract but for one reason or another failed to receive a contract. Residents who were refused negotiation by the Parole Board were included in this category.

4. Cancelled contract: The cancelled group was comprised of residents who at the point of release from the institution had their MAP contract cancelled. Voluntary and involuntary (contract violations) cancellations were included in this group.
5. Not-MAP, as might be presumed, was a composite of non-MAP, non-contract, and cancelled contract groups.

The natural selection process is important in the analysis of MAP's impact to the Division of Corrections. Rather than to force residents to participate in the program, emphasis has been on voluntary application or referral. This procedure is basically a sound one for program implementation, but it makes the evaluation more problematic. The quasi-experimental research method is dependent upon statistically controlling differences in the comparison groups identified above.

Data Collection

Since October 1974, data have been collected from MAP Coordinators and Institution Representatives relating to the degree of resident involvement with MAP. Substantial descriptive information is produced in annual statistical bulletins relating to residents admitted into MAP as well as residents released from institutions via MAP. Also, Division of Corrections, Bureau of Community Corrections Staff (Probation and Parole Agents) are instrumental in providing follow-up information on persons regardless of comparison group assignments. (See Appendix 2 for examples of institution and field forms.)

Background or social demographic data were obtained from the adult supplemental history data on computer tapes utilized by staff of the Office of Systems and Evaluation.

Several constraints or shortcomings of the data will have an impact on interpretation of the data, but more importantly, they obscure results. The following is a list of constraints and other concerns of which the reader should be aware.

1. Only residents released from adult correctional institutions were included in this report. Residents released in 1976 and 1977 were included in the length of stay analysis. However, because of the duration of the follow-up period, residents released in 1977 were not included in the follow-up analysis.
2. Residents with more than one referral into MAP during a single stay had the most intensive involvements reported. Residents with multiple stays had each incarceration treated independently.
3. MAP eligibility and selection processes were not statistically controlled--the eligibility criteria for residents in 1975 were more restrictive than current requirements.
4. Certain data elements of the background information are fixed in time. For example, length of sentence was reported at admission and not updated. In some instances, court modifications to sentences which lengthen or shorten residents' sentences may occur.
5. Data reporting failures were common for the follow-up information. Probation and Parole Agents, particularly in high personnel turnover areas such as Milwaukee, failed to report information in a scheduled manner as desired or did not report at all. Some resident data forms which were to be submitted in three to four month intervals were reported several months later. Problems in identifying a resident's parole agent added to the confusion.

Data Analysis

Part II begins by operationalizing the variables included in the length of stay analysis. Bivariate relationships are illustrated as a means of identifying necessary statistical controls. Essentially, MAP status is the treatment variable, and percent of time served is the dependent variable. Type of release, prior felony convictions, sentence length, type of offense, prior institutional experiences, age, sex, race, and county of commitment are independent variables. The goal of Part II is to ascertain how much of the statistical variance is explained by the independent variables acting together to predict a time savings. (Reduction of length of stay.)

Part III begins with operationalization of the variables involved in the outcome analysis. Bivariate analysis, as a statistical method of explaining the events that occur during the follow-up history of each resident on parole, is performed. The goal of this section is to understand what contribution if any, MAP makes to parole success. The concept of parole success transcends the issue of recidivism and also relates to employment or education gains that might be achieved.

Part II: MAP's Effect on Time Served

As identified in Part I, MAP status was the treatment variable under consideration in this report. Part II provides information relating to the impact of MAP on time served. In this analysis, several variables, operationalized below, were deemed to be influential to the amount of time served: offense, length of sentence, length of stay, age, race, sex, number of previous convictions, prior institutional experience, type of admission, type of release, and county of commitment.

All variables except MAP status were taken from the adult supplemental history system utilized for reporting purposes by staff of the Office of Systems and Evaluation. Only calendar years 1976 and 1977 releases were included in this analysis. A total of 2,940 release cases were available for the analysis of time savings.

Operationalization of Variables

1. Length of stay is reported on release document C-357 to the nearest month for all persons released from Wisconsin correctional facilities in 1976 and 1977. Table 3 (Appendix 1) shows a mean length of stay of 21.5 months for all releases. The median was 18.1 months.
2. Length of sentence is that of the major sentence imposed by the courts and reported on admission document C-356. The mean length of sentence for 1976 and 1977 releases was 53.2 months.

3. Offense, reported on admission document C-356, is the most serious infraction committed by the offender, and is usually determined through comparison of length of sentences when more than a single offense is involved. Unarmed Burglary was the most frequently reported offense, representing nearly 30.7 percent of the 1976-77 releases. Armed Robbery (11.2 percent), Forcery (8.7 percent), and Controlled Substances violations (7.1 percent) were next in order of offender group sizes.
4. Age is reported at admission on admission document C-356. For both calendar year releases the mean age of the residents was 25.5 years, the median being 22.9 years.
5. Race is reported at admission on admission document C-356. Approximately, 66 percent of the releases were White, 30 percent Black, and 4 percent other.
6. Sex is reported at admission on admission document C-356. Approximately, 94 percent of the releases were males, while 6 percent were females.
7. Number of previous convictions are reported on admission document C-356. Approximately, 58 percent of the releases had no previous conviction reported, 25 percent had one, and 17 percent had two or more. This variable was reported for first admissions only, thus excluding about 16 percent of the population readmitted because of parole revocation.
8. Prior penal experience is reported on admission document C-356. Approximately, 57 percent had no previous penal experience, 21 percent had previous state, federal, or other state penal experiences, and 21 percent had only jail experience reported. The data reported were relative to first admissions only.
9. Type of admission is reported on admission document C-356. Approximately 48 percent were admissions with only a new sentence reported. An additional 31 percent had a new sentence in addition to the status of probation violator. Nearly 9 percent had a new sentence as well as being a parole or mandatory release violator. Approximately, 12 percent were probation, parole, or mandatory release violators without a new sentence.

10. Type of release is reported on release document C-357. Approximately, 84 percent of the releases were first releases and 16 percent, re-releases. Of first releases, nearly 65 percent of the cases were released to adult parole and 15 percent to mandatory release. About 7 percent of all re-releases were to adult parole and 6 percent to adult mandatory release.

Bivariate Relationships to the Treatment Variable

1. MAP status and offense: Table 1 (Appendix 1) shows that within most offense groups there was a nearly equal distribution of MAP status types. However, two offense groups had significant disparities. First, the armed robbery offense contained 13.5 percent of the MAP cases and 10.8, 11.4, and 8.6 percent of the cancelled, no contract, and non-MAP cases respectively. Second, a large proportion of cancelled cases had unarmed burglary listed as the major offense compared with the other status groups.
2. MAP status and length of sentence: Table 2 (Appendix 1) shows that a greater proportion of non-MAP releases had sentences less than two years. Nearly 25 percent of the non-MAP releases had sentences less than 2 years as compared with only 6 percent for MAP releases. In addition, nearly 40 percent of the MAP cases had sentences of 4 years to less than 8 years as compared with 21 percent for non-MAP, 30 percent for non-contract, and 35 percent for cancelled contract releases. The median length of sentence for MAP releases was 47.5 months as opposed to nearly 36 months for the other MAP status groups.
3. MAP Status versus time served: Table 3 (Appendix 1) shows that nearly 43 percent of the non-MAP releases served less than one year while MAP releases show only 9 percent in this category. A far greater number of MAP releases served one year to less than one and one-half years than the other MAP status groups. The median time served was 19 months for MAP, 23 months for cancelled, 19 months for non-contract, and 13 months for non-MAP releases.
4. MAP status versus age: Table 4 (Appendix 1) identifies non-MAP releases as older adults. The median age reported at admission for MAP releases was 23 years, while cancelled releases was 21; non-contract, 22; and non-MAP, 24 years of age.

5. MAP status and race: Table 5 (Appendix 1) shows MAP releases to have a larger percentage of Black releases compared with non-MAP releases. The cancelled and non-contract releases were almost equal in this proportion.
6. MAP status versus sex: Table 6 (Appendix 1) shows that MAP releases had proportionately fewer males than non-MAP releases but more than the cancelled and non-contract release groups.
7. MAP status versus number of prior convictions: Table 7 (Appendix 1) shows that MAP had a greater proportion of releases with one prior conviction reported than the three comparison groups.
8. MAP status versus prior penal experience: Table 8 (Appendix 1) identifies MAP as having a larger proportion of residents who had state or federal institution experiences and jail experiences reported.
9. MAP status versus type of admission: Table 9 (Appendix 1) shows the largest proportion of releases was new sentence first admissions. Approximately 52 percent of the MAP releases fell into this category while cancelled, non-contract, and non-MAP had 45 percent, 49 percent, and 44 percent respectively. Nearly 91 percent of all MAP releases had new sentences while non-MAP had only 76 percent of their cases so reported. Non-MAP releases were disproportionately represented by readmitted parole violators or mandatory release violators without new sentences.
10. MAP status versus type of release: Table 10 (Appendix 1) shows a disproportionate distribution in types of releases. Approximately 91 percent of MAP cases were first releases compared with 75 percent for non-MAP. In addition, 90 percent of the MAP cases were first released to adult parole, while less than half of cancelled, non-contract and non-MAP releases were reported as first releases. Nearly 44 percent of the non-MAP releases (first and re-release) were released on mandatory release, discharge-court order, or direct discharge, while MAP was represented by only 1.1 percent of its residents in the same categories.

Summary of Bivariate Relationships:

The above presentation of bivariate relationships with the treatment variable illustrate differences among the four categories of MAP statuses. In summary, MAP releases had longer sentences (excluding life sentences), longer lengths of stay, were usually first admissions with new sentences, first releases to adult parole, slightly younger, and had more cases with prior convictions and penal experiences compared with non-MAP releases.

Except for length of sentence (which is lower), the non-contract and cancelled contract releases resembled the MAP group more so than non-MAP releases.

Eligibility criteria for MAP had an obvious impact on the type of release profiles of MAP status groups. Of 1,152 MAP releases, 638 (or 56 percent) were released in 1977. The 638 releases reflected over 42 percent of the 1,195 total reported releases in 1977. The 514 MAP releases for 1976 reflected over 36 percent of the total releases for that year. Certain operational changes occurring in the MAP program make these figures significant for further interpretation.

The 1976 MAP releases resulted from contracts written in 1975 and early 1976 when eligibility criteria included only residents within three years of mandatory release without detainers that could affect the sentencing structure. The eligibility criteria thus imposed restrictions such that residents who qualified for MAP had relatively short sentences, shorter anticipated length of stays, and less severe property-oriented offense patterns.

By May 1976, MAP eligibility was opened or expanded so that most residents could qualify and could apply for MAP at an earlier point in their incarceration period. At this time, the number of referrals and subsequent negotiations rose dramatically only to be offset by a new administrative policy enabling the Parole Board to refuse to negotiate contracts based on paroling criteria in effect at the time of negotiations. Nonetheless, the impact of open eligibility was critical in changing the composite profile of the release group. Persons with short sentences, particularly if readmitted to institutions, or persons with court modifications of their current sentence, found MAP to be a disadvantage.

This part of the report will analyze the effect of MAP in reducing the amount of time served in Wisconsin's correctional institutions. The methodology used in the analysis is quasi-experimental in scope. MAP and non-MAP groups are non-equivalent comparison groups. Persons are assigned to comparison groups on the basis of their contact with MAP at the time of release. The non-equivalent basis of the comparison groups was thoroughly demonstrated above and summarized here. For subsequent analysis, the technique of statistically controlling for differences among the comparison groups is essential if MAP is to be assessed as the treatment variable for the analysis of time served.

Statistical Controls Introduced

In the analysis that follows, a statistical technique of multiple regression analysis will be used to adjust for pre-existing differences between the various comparison groups. As presented above, MAP release background characteristics compared with canceled, non-MAP, and non-contract releases were not equivalent to each other. In addition, the greatest differences were between MAP and non-MAP releases.

Two types of control were used in this analysis. First, certain types of statistical controls were performed within the multiple regression procedure. Second, subjective statistical controls were introduced before the regression procedure to minimize distortion created through exogeneous (outside) variables. One example of an exogeneous variable is the procedure and technique of parole itself. The granting of parole lies outside the Division of Corrections but within the Department of Health and Social Services. Ultimately, the paroling criterion is affected by courts, legislation, and community pressures many of which are not easily identified.

Subjective Statistical controls were as follows:

1. Controlling for year of release: The population size for the time-served analysis was 2,490 residents for 1976 and 1977 combined. The impact of MAP eligibility standards in 1975 and 1976 would be reflected for persons released in 1976 and 1977 respectively. Consequently, each year was treated separately with the independent variables and the subsequent time savings reported.

2. Controlling for MAP status: The comparison groups of cancelled contract and non-contract releases were included with the non-MAP releases for a new group hereafter titled "not-MAP." The sample sizes for non-contract and canceled releases were too small to warrant independent treatment. The new "not-MAP" group will be compared with MAP releases.
3. Controlling for first admissions: First admissions were comprised of probation violators without a new sentence, probation violators with a new sentence, or offenders with only a new sentence. The treatment of these groups by paroling procedures is more equal than for readmitted residents where legislative and court mandate may directly or indirectly affect release. Approximately 77 percent of the not-MAP cases were first admissions. The MAP release group was represented by approximately 86 percent of the cases as first admissions.
4. Controlling for first release: Residents first released to adult parole or mandatory release were selected for the regression analysis. Information on MAP releases showed that 90 percent of the cases were reported as first release to adult parole or mandatory release as compared with 73 percent for not-MAP.
5. Controlling length of sentence and length of stay: Both variables were disproportionately distributed among the MAP status groups. In addition the two variables were closely associated ($r = .747$), and taken together they account for a large proportion of variance with the treatment variable and MAP status. These variables were combined into a ratio that reflects percentage of sentence time served by all residents released. The variables of length of sentence and length of stay remained in the regression procedure to provide statistical control for within-group disparities, but the new variable of percent of sentence time served was made the dependent variable.

Discussion of Results

Table 1 presents summary data about percentage of sentence time served utilizing the stepwise regression procedure of the computerized Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The statistical requirements for inclusion in the stepwise procedure were made liberal.^{/1} Those variables not meeting these statistical requirements were excluded and are shown as such on the table.

A total of 13 independent variables in 1976 explained 47 percent of the total variance contributing to percent of sentence served. The interaction of two variables, length of sentence and length of stay, accounted for nearly 45 percent of the total variance explained. The treatment variable of MAP release shows a negative slope (beta) of .0482 or a reduction in percent of time served by 4.82 percent.

A total of 12 independent variables in 1977 explained 42 percent of the total variance contributing to percent of sentence served. Like 1976, two variables, length of sentence and length of stay accounted for most of the variance (39 percent), but not as much as in 1976. The treatment variable, MAP release, contributed nearly 2 percent to the total variance explained. MAP release had a negative slope of .0678 or a reduction in percent of time served by 6.78 percent.

Two types of analyses for the residents released through MAP are presented. First, the beta provides information for reviewing the total percent of sentences served by MAP releases. Second, the beta provides information to show how much time those persons released via MAP may have served if MAP did not exist.

Regarding the first type analysis, the betas (Table 1) provide the data needed to develop the descriptive formula for percent of time served. Hypothetically, a resident first released to adult parole or mandatory release in 1976 had the following characteristics: 36 month sentence, property offense, White male,

^{/1} Independent variables meeting 0.01 significance level of the F ratio and 0.0001 tolerance level were included in the stepwise regression with the most significant variables entered first. A tolerance level of 0.0 signifies a perfect linear relationship between that variable and other independent variables.

Table 1

Summary Equation of Percentage of Time Served Regressed (Stepwise) on Parole and Sentencing Variables For Residents First Released From Wisconsin's Correctional Institutions For Calendar Years 1976 and 1977

1976			1977				
Step	Variable	Beta	R ²	Step	Variable	Beta	R ²
1	Sentence	-.0055	.09091	1	Sentence	-.0043	.10471
2	Stay	.0175	.44889	2	Stay	.0129	.38604
3	Person offense	-.1085	.45868	3	MAP Release	-.0678	.40428
4	MAP Release	-.0482	.46565	4	Person offense	-.0816	.41305
5	Property offense	-.0572	.46878	5	Age	-.0029	.41524
6	Black	-.0598	.47089	6	Prior convictions	.0167	.41790
7	Males	-.0491	.47202	7	Property offense	-.0398	.42041
8	White	-.0339	.47274	8	Males	-.0419	.42140
9	Previous inst. experience	.0185	.47324	9	White	.0106	.42180
10	Age	-.0011	.47378	10	Previous jail experience	.0111	.42200
11	Previous jail experience	.0118	.47409	11	Previous inst. experience	.0083	.42209
12	Prior convictions	.0060	.47431	12	Milwaukee County commitments	-.0019	.42210
13	Milwaukee County commitments	-.0066	.47440				
	Constant (Not MAP (Other offenses (No penal experience (Other non-White (Other counties (Females	.6067	-		Constant (Not MAP (Other offenses (No penal experience (Other non-White (Other counties (Females	.6226	-
	Excluded penal experience not reported				Excluded (Black (Penal experience not reported		
	Multiple R = .6888				Multiple R = .6497		
	R ² = .4744				R ² = .4221		
	Standard Error = .2161				Standard Error = .2070		
	Number of cases = 1,123				Number of cases = 1,195		

20 years of age with a previous conviction, jail experience, committed from Milwaukee County, and would serve 59.2 percent of his sentence by participating in MAP. Had this individual not participated in MAP, he might have served 64.1 percent of his sentence.

A similar person released in 1977 via participation in the Mutual Agreement Program would have served 52.9 percent of his sentence. By not participating in MAP, 59.7 percent of the total sentence probably would have been served.

Regarding the second of the above-mentioned analysis methods, Table 2 provides data relating to length of sentence and length of stay involving those persons for whom the stepwise regression procedures were performed.

Table 2
Summary Statistics for Length of Sentence and
Length of Stay by 1976 and 1977 Calendar Year Releases

	1976		1977	
	Not MAP	MAP	Not MAP	MAP
Length of Sentence				
Mean	50.9	48.2	46.0	53.0
Median	35.8	36.4	35.6	47.6
Number of cases	658	465	625	570
Length of Stay				
Mean	21.9	22.4	22.3	22.1
Median	17.9	18.5	18.0	19.7
Number of cases	658	465	625	570

For persons participating in MAP and released in 1976 via MAP contract, the reduction of 4.82 percentage points from the total percent of sentence served was an estimated time savings to them. The median length of sentence in 1976 for MAP releases was 36.4 months. The percent reduction amounts to 1.75 months per resident. Since 465 MAP releases occurred in 1976, total time saving may be estimated as 815.8 months. This may be translated to an equivalence of opening 44 additional beds for 18.5 months, or a savings of \$597,699 based on fiscal year 1977 per capita cost for adult correctional institutions.

From another point of view, had MAP not existed for those 465 persons, the median length of stay for the total sentence would have increased by 0.9 months. Rather than an 18.5 month median length of stay, a 19.4 month median would have existed.

For persons released via MAP contracts in 1977, the reduction of 6.78 percent from the total percent of sentence served amounts to a savings of 3.22 months on a median sentence of 47.6 months. For the 570 MAP releases in 1977, a total time saving of 1,839.6 months was possible. That would be equivalent to opening 93.4 beds for a median stay of 19.7 months, or a gross savings to the Division of Corrections of \$1,351,186 (FY 1977 per capita costs). From an alternative view, had MAP not existed, those individuals would have served 6.78 percent more time incarcerated, or an average of 1.3 months longer than the current median of 19.7 months. That is, the median length of stay would have been 21.0 months.

Caution was taken to assure that the reduction in total percent of time served applied only to residents released via MAP. Because of the quasi-experimental approach a firm statement cannot be made that the not-MAP releases would have been affected by MAP. Without MAP, however, it is apparent that more time would have been served by those actually released via MAP and that the problems relating to population pressures would have been readily noticeable.

A similar analysis for residents re-released from Wisconsin's correctional institutions via MAP is provided in Appendix 3. The conclusion for re-releases was different in that re-releases in 1976 actually served more time than if MAP had not existed. However, 1977 releases showed a relatively large decrease in total percent of time served. That result was predominantly a function of the change between 1975 and 1976 of eligibility requirements for MAP participants.

Part III: MAP's Effect on Parole

The goal of this section of the outcome evaluation is to assess MAP's contribution to parole success. The concept of parole success transcends the issue of recidivism and relates to employment or education gains that might have been achieved.

An analytical inference will be made of bivariate relationship between MAP status and such variables as parole status, employment, skill level of employment, number of jobs held, reason for unemployment, and education status. Information on each of the variables was collected through a MAP follow-up procedure that is part of the MAP information system.

This follow-up procedure required Probation and Parole Agents to respond to individualized questionnaires transmitted to them on a quarterly basis for each MAP and selected not-MAP participant released from the adult institutions. Certain methodological difficulties encountered during the data collection as described in Part I of this report made necessary the use of alternative sources of information. This was especially crucial in the parole status reporting on MAP versus not-MAP releases.

The follow-up analysis will be limited to residents released from adult correctional institutions in 1975 and 1976. Each of the residents was followed for one year subsequent to release, and the data utilized for analysis were based on the cumulative reports submitted by the Agents.

Operationalization of the Variables

1) MAP status was reported on each of the follow-up questionnaires sent to the Probation and Parole Agents and recorded in the MAP information system. Table 3 records the number of releases for 1975 and 1976 that related to the follow-up questionnaires. MAP releases represented over half of those cases followed up. For equivalent treatment of the release groups, the status of non-MAP, non-contract, and cancelled MAP releases were combined in a category called not-MAP for the remainder of this analysis.

Table 3
MAP Status of Population Samples on
Residents Released from Adult Correctional Institutions
in Calendar Years 1975 and 1976

MAP Status	Total		1975		1976	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Total</u>	<u>1,403</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>454</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>949</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Non-MAP	200	14.2	59	13.0	141	15.3
Non-Contract	301	21.5	115	25.3	186	19.5
Cancelled	137	9.8	29	6.4	108	11.3
MAP	765	54.5	251	55.3	514	53.9

2) Parole status was obtained through use of a specialized computer program combining information from the MAP information system and the parole termination information system. Information on parole termination was taken from the case closing summary (Form C-18) of the Division of Corrections. The data included information relating to successful and unsuccessful termination from parole and reasons for unsuccessful termination.

3) Employment status information was provided by agents on the follow-up questionnaire (MAP Form 110). Each questionnaire noted the degree of employment; viz., full-time, part-time, or unemployed.

4) Skill level of employment was reported on the MAP follow-up questionnaire (MAP Form 110) and related to the responses given for employment according to six response categories: skilled, professional, semi-skilled, unskilled, other, and not reported.

5) Reason for unemployment was reported on the follow-up questionnaire (MAP Form 110) as the agent's impression relating to the unemployment situation of the parolee. In some instances the reason for unemployment was not known and so reported.

6) Education status, like employment, was reported on the follow-up questionnaire on three levels: full-time, part-time, or none.

Results of Bivariate Relationships

A. Table 4 illustrates the results of the outcomes of residents followed up for one year subsequent to release. A total of 135 releases (30 percent of releases) were successfully discharged from parole. Nearly 11 percent of the 1975 releases were unsuccessful terminations of parole. As a group, 1975 MAP releases had over 91 percent (229 releases) considered successful when followed-up for one year. Nearly 27 percent of the cases (67 releases) were terminated by discharged from parole. In addition, 65 percent of the MAP releases were still on parole one year after release. The not-MAP releases had a smaller proportion of cases on parole after one year and had nearly 34 percent of the cases terminated by discharge. The not-MAP releases were nearly five percentage points higher in the proportion of unsuccessful cases.

For 1976 releases, over 9 percent of the total were unsuccessful terminations while 20 percent were discharged from parole. The remaining 71 percent of the cases were residents still on parole status subsequent to the year cut-off date for outcome reporting.

The MAP release group in 1976 had 91 percent of the cases identified as successful outcomes one year subsequent to release. Nearly 77 percent or 395 releases remained on parole while 14 percent or 72 cases were terminated by discharges. Not-MAP releases also had 91 percent of their releases in 1976 as successful outcomes after one year. However, only 63 percent or 276 cases remained on parole while 27 percent were discharged. The MAP and not-MAP release group had similar failure rates, that is unsuccessful parole terminations after a one year period.

Data for persons released in 1977 were unavailable in the format presented above for 1975 and 1976 releases. Because one year had to lapse before success application could be determined, an alternative indicator may be used. Between January 1, 1975 and December 31, 1977, a total of 2,595 releases were reported in the MAP information system. A total of 1,403 of these releases were MAP participants (representing 54 percent of the total cases studied). By February 1978 (the last date for which follow-up information was reported and prepared for computer processing) 88 MAP releases were reported as returned to the institution. This represents 6.3 percent

Table 4
 Outcomes for One-Year Follow-up of
 1975 and 1976 MAP and Selected Not-MAP
 Releases from Adult Institutions By Type of Outcome

Type of Outcome	1975						1976					
	Total		MAP		Not-MAP		Total		MAP		Not-MAP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Total</u>	<u>454</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>251</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>203</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>949</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>514</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>435</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Successful</u>	<u>405</u>	<u>89.2</u>	<u>229</u>	<u>91.2</u>	<u>176</u>	<u>86.7</u>	<u>861</u>	<u>90.7</u>	<u>467</u>	<u>90.9</u>	<u>394</u>	<u>90.6</u>
Remained on parole	270	59.5	162	64.5	108	53.2	671	70.7	395	76.9	276	63.4
Discharged, no further activity	135	29.7	67	26.7	68	33.5	190	20.0	72	14.0	118	27.2
<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>8.8</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>9.4</u>
Convicted of another offense	28	6.1	15	6.0	13	6.4	41	4.3	25	4.9	16	3.7
Revocation substituted for new conviction	3	0.7	1	0.4	2	1.0	4	0.4	2	0.4	2	0.5
Charged but not yet convicted	10	2.2	3	1.2	7	3.4	28	3.0	10	1.9	18	4.1
Arrested but not yet charged	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	1	0.2
Absconded	8	1.8	3	1.2	5	2.5	14	1.5	10	1.9	4	0.9

of the total MAP releases. Of the 1,192 not-MAP releases, reported between January 1975 through December 1977, 100 cases (or 8.4 percent) were reported as returned.

Besides those cases (from January 1975 through December 1977) reported as returned to the institution by February 1978, an additional failure indicator is the number of cases reported as absconded. From the base of 2,595 total releases, 112 parolees were reported as absconders. For the 1,043 MAP releases, 63 were reported as absconders, or 4.5 percent of the total. Not-MAP releases had 49 cases reported, or 4.1 percent of the cases.

The above presentation of return and absconder rates applicable to the January 1975 and December 1977 time period completely disregards the period of time on parole; thus, no effort can be made to relate MAP's impact on time on parole. The previous analysis using 1975 and 1976 releases followed for one year subsequent to their release shows MAP to be slightly (based on percentages) ahead of their not-MAP counterpart but the difference is not statistically significant.

B. Table 5 provides information relating to the employment status of parolees followed-up one year after release. The reported status was based on information submitted by Probation and Parole Agents on the MAP follow-up questionnaire. The questionnaires were sent to the agents quarterly and returned after completion. Circumstances prevented some questionnaires from being returned and others were returned with incomplete information (usually resulting from offenders who had been discharged or terminated from parole). The information reported, however, was cumulated to the anniversary date of release to make a one-year follow up. Questionnaires that were not returned or completed resulted in the case being classified as not reported.

Table 5 shows that nearly 14 percent of the cases lacked information for reporting for both calendar years 1975 and 1976. The number of cases involved was 64 in 1975 and 129 in 1976. A corrected percentage column is provided to show percentages excluding the dropouts (persons not reported). Thus comparisons can be made only on reported data.

Approximately 37 percent of the releases in 1975 followed-up one year were

employed full-time and 10.5 percent part-time. MAP releases had 39.2 percent reported full-time and 9.5 part-time employment while not-MAP releases had 34.2 full-time and 12.0 part-time. The differences between MAP and not-MAP releases relating to employment for 1975 appear to be nonsignificant.

1976 releases followed up one year showed nearly 40 percent of the releases having full-time and 14 percent part-time employment reported. MAP releases showed 44 percent reported full-time and 11 percent part-time employment. Not-MAP releases had fewer persons reported as full-time employed (34.6 percent) but a larger proportion as part-time employed (17.1 percent). The proportion of reported unemployed parolees differed minimally between MAP and not-MAP releases.

C. Relating to the reported employment status was a question asking the Parole Agent to identify the skill level of employment. Table 6 shows 191 cases for 1975 with sufficient information to report on skill level of employment. Excluding the cases not reported and unemployed, MAP releases in 1975 had 7.7 percent and 41.0 percent respectively reported for skilled and semi-skilled levels of employment. Not-MAP releases reported 12.2 and 39.2 percent respectively. In addition, MAP releases had nearly 49 percent as unskilled as compared with 43 percent for not-MAP.

Table 5
 Employment Status Reported on Parolees Followed-up
 One Year from Their Respective Release Date for Adult Residents
 Released from Wisconsin Correctional Institutions in 1975 and 1976

Employment Status	1975 Releases								
	Total			MAP			Not-MAP		
	#	%	Corrected % (#390)	#	%	Corrected % (#232)	#	%	Corrected %
<u>Total</u>	454	100.0	100.0	251	100.0	100.0	203	100.0	100.0
Full-time	145	31.9	37.2	91	36.2	39.2	54	26.6	34.2
Part-time	41	9.1	10.5	22	8.8	9.5	19	9.4	12.0
Unemployed	204	44.9	52.3	119	47.4	51.3	85	41.9	53.8
Not Reported	64	14.1	-	19	7.6	-	45	22.1	-

Employment Status	1976 Releases								
	Total			MAP			Not-MAP		
	#	%	Corrected % (#820)	#	%	Corrected % (#458)	#	%	Corrected % (# 362)
<u>Total</u>	949	100.0	100.0	514	100.0	100.0	435	100.0	100.0
Full-time	325	34.2	39.6	200	38.9	43.7	125	28.7	34.6
Part-time	113	11.9	13.8	51	9.9	11.1	62	14.3	17.1
Unemployed	382	40.3	46.6	207	40.3	45.2	175	40.2	48.3
Not Reported	129	13.6	-	56	10.9	-	73	16.8	-

/1 Includes parolees who are participating in education programs.

Table 6
Skill Level Reported on Parolees Followed-up One Year From
Their Respective Release Date For Adult Residents Released From
Wisconsin Correctional Institutions in 1975 and 1976 and Who Were Reported Employed

Skill Level	1975 Releases								
	Total			MAP			Not-MAP		
	#	%	Corrected % (# 191)	#	%	Corrected % (# 117)	#	%	Corrected % (# 74)
<u>Total</u>	<u>454</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>251</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>203</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Skilled	18	4.0	9.4	9	3.6	7.7	9	4.4	12.2
Semi-Skilled	77	17.0	40.3	48	19.1	41.0	29	14.3	39.2
Unskilled	89	19.6	46.6	57	22.7	48.7	32	15.8	43.2
Professional and Other	7	1.6	3.7	3	1.2	2.6	4	2.0	5.4
Unemployed	204	44.8	-	119	47.4	-	85	41.8	-
Not Reported	59	13.0	-	15	6.0	-	44	21.7	-

Skill Level	1976 Releases								
	Total			MAP			Not-MAP		
	#	%	Corrected % (# 461)	#	%	Corrected % (# 263)	#	%	Corrected % (# 198)
<u>Total</u>	<u>949</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>514</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>435</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Skilled	56	5.8	12.1	36	7.0	13.7	20	4.6	10.1
Semi-Skilled	159	16.8	34.5	96	18.7	36.5	63	14.5	31.8
Unskilled	224	23.6	48.6	120	23.3	45.6	104	23.9	52.5
Professional and Other	22	2.3	4.8	11	2.2	4.2	11	2.5	5.6
Unemployed	382	40.3	-	207	40.2	-	175	40.2	-
Not Reported	106	11.2	-	44	8.6	-	62	14.3	-

Releases for 1976 followed up one year had over half of the cases shown as not reported or unemployed. Excluding these cases, MAP releases had nearly 14 percent and 37 percent of the cases in skilled or semi-skilled employment levels while not-MAP releases had 10 percent and 32 percent reported for the same categories. Nearly 46 percent of the MAP releases and 53 percent of the not-MAP releases reported unskilled employment levels.

The 1975 MAP releases had fewer persons in skilled and semi-skilled jobs but more reported as unskilled than their not-MAP counterparts. Releases in 1976 showed a reverse in this trend such that MAP releases had a larger proportion of persons as skilled and semi-skilled but a smaller proportion in unskilled jobs. In addition, 1975 releases had fewer (proportionally) persons in skilled employment than 1976.

D. Because the employment picture is seldom static for offenders, a question relating to the number of jobs held (full or part-time) was included in the follow-up questionnaires. Approximately 57 percent of the cases had no information reported in 1975 and almost 55 percent in 1976. Of those reported for 1975, most (71 percent) had only one job for that year. Information about persons released in 1976 was similar, with nearly 73 percent having only one job reported by the end of the one year follow-up.

MAP releases for the 1975 follow-up showed a greater proportion of cases (nearly 77 percent) having one job compared with not-MAP releases (nearly 64 percent). MAP releases had less than half of the proportion of cases having two jobs, but slightly more for cases having three or more jobs.

MAP releases for the 1976 follow-up had a slightly larger proportion of cases with only one job compared with not-MAP releases (75 percent versus 69 percent). MAP releases having two jobs increased proportionally from 1975 but were somewhat fewer than the percentage of cases reported for not-MAP (19 percent versus 24 percent).

The percent of cases with three or more jobs was relatively small for both MAP and not-MAP cases, and only one percentage point separated the two groups.

E. The unemployment picture was an important factor in the analysis since, as shown in Table 5, nearly 45 percent of the 1975 releases and 40 percent of the 1976 releases were reported as unemployed. One question asked of the Probation and Parole Agent was his/her belief as to why the parolee was unemployed. Table 8 shows the range of answers provided by the agents. The greatest single response for 1975 and 1976 was the "not reported" or

"not applicable" category. When unemployment occurred and a response as to why it occurred was given, "the parolee was not able to find a job" was the most frequently reported category (41 percent in 1975 and in 1976).

MAP releases in 1975 had 42 percent of the cases identified as not being able to find a job compared with 40 percent for not-MAP. Proportionally fewer MAP releases in 1975 refused a job or were laid off, but more were dismissed or quit their jobs when compared to not-MAP releases. Almost 16 percent of the MAP releasees enrolled in school while nearly 72 percent of not-MAP releasees did the same.

Table 7

Number of Jobs Held Reported on Parolees Followed-up One Year
From Their Respective Date of Release for Adult Residents
Released from Wisconsin Correctional Institutions in 1975 and 1976

Number of Jobs Held	1975 Releases								
	Total			MAP			Not-MAP		
	#	%	Corrected % (# 193)	#	%	Corrected % (# 108)	#	%	Corrected % (# 85)
Total	454	100.0	100.0	251	100.0	100.0	203	100.0	100.0
One Job	137	30.2	71.0	83	33.1	76.9	54	26.6	63.5
Two Jobs	42	9.3	21.8	16	6.4	14.8	26	12.8	30.6
Three or More Jobs	14	3.1	7.2	9	3.6	8.3	5	2.5	5.9
Not Reported	261	57.4	-	143	56.9	-	118	58.1	-

Number of Jobs Held	1976 Releases								
	Total			MAP			Not-MAP		
	#	%	Corrected % (# 430)	#	%	Corrected % (# 247)	#	%	Corrected % (# 183)
Total	949	100.0	100.0	514	100.0	100.0	435	100.0	100.0
One Job	312	32.9	72.6	185	36.0	74.9	127	29.2	69.4
Two Jobs	92	9.7	21.4	48	9.3	19.5	44	10.1	24.1
Three or More Jobs	26	2.7	6.0	14	2.7	5.7	12	2.8	6.6
Not Reported	519	54.7	-	267	51.9	-	252	57.9	-

Table 8

Reason for Unemployment Reported on Parolees Followed-up One Year
From Their Respective Release Date For Adult Residents
Released From Wisconsin Correctional Institutions in 1975 and 1976

Reason For Unemployment	1975 Releases									1976 Releases								
	Total			MAP			Not-MAP			Total			MAP			Not-MAP		
	#	%	Corr. % # 230	#	%	Corr. % # 134	#	%	Corr. % # 96	#	%	Corr. % # 534	#	%	Corr. % # 284	#	%	Corr. % # 250
Total	454	100.0	100.0	251	100.0	100.0	203	100.0	100.0	949	100.0	100.0	514	100.0	100.0	435	100.0	100.0
Dismissed	16	3.5	7.0	11	4.4	8.2	5	2.5	5.2	39	4.1	7.3	24	4.7	8.5	15	3.4	6.0
Laid off	12	2.6	5.1	4	1.6	3.0	8	3.9	8.3	27	2.8	5.1	15	2.9	5.3	12	2.8	4.8
Quit	22	4.8	9.6	15	6.0	11.2	7	3.4	7.3	44	4.6	8.2	20	3.9	7.0	24	5.5	9.6
Enrolled in School	32	7.0	13.9	21	8.4	15.7	11	5.4	11.5	61	6.4	11.4	37	7.2	13.0	24	5.5	9.6
Could not find a job	94	20.8	40.9	56	22.3	41.8	38	18.7	39.6	221	23.4	41.4	120	23.3	42.2	101	23.2	40.4
Refused or did not want job	20	4.4	8.7	7	2.8	5.2	13	6.4	13.5	41	4.3	7.7	17	3.3	6.0	24	5.5	9.6
Other	34	7.5	14.8	20	8.0	14.9	14	6.9	14.6	101	10.6	18.9	51	9.9	18.0	50	11.5	20.0
Not Applic- able or not Reported	224	49.4	-	117	46.5	-	107	52.8	-	415	43.8	-	230	44.8	-	185	42.6	-

MAP and not-MAP releases in 1976 were similar to those in 1975 in that 42 percent and 40 percent respectively could not find a job. Proportionally, fewer MAP releases refused to quit their jobs while more were dismissed or laid off. Like 1975 releases, MAP releases in 1976 had a slightly larger proportion of cases reported as enrolled in school.

F. Education status on each parolee was provided by parole agents. Because parolees did not participate in education "Not applicable" comprised a major response category. However, as with other information items, a large number of cases had no information provided. In 1975 approximately 23 percent and in 1976, 16 percent of the follow-up cases were placed in a "not reported" category because of lack of information. As with employment status discussed above, much of this "failure to report" resulted from cases being discharged or terminated, and the parole agent had little information to report. In some instances the parolee moved to a different supervisory area or out of state, thus making the reporting of information much more difficult.

Excluding the "not reported" category, approximately 17.5 and 12.3 percent of the cases participated in education programs for calendar years 1975 and 1976 respectively. In 1975, MAP releases had almost 16 percent of the cases in full-time education and 4.5 percent in part-time. Not-MAP releases had 11 percent and 3 percent respectively in the same categories.

MAP releases in 1976 had 10 percent in full-time and 4 percent in part-time education while not-MAP releases were represented by 7 percent and 2.5 percent for the same education levels.

Table 9
 Education Status Reported on Parolees Followed-up
 One Year from Their Respective Release Date for
 Adult Residents Released from Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
 in 1975 and 1976

Education Status	1975 Releases								
	Total			MAP			Not-MAP		
	#	%	Corrected % (# 348)	#	%	Corrected % (#202)	#	%	Corrected % (# 146)
Total	454	100.0	100.0	251	100.0	100.0	203	100.0	100.0
Full-time	48	10.6	13.8	32	12.7	15.8	16	7.9	11.0
Part-time	13	2.9	3.7	9	3.6	4.5	4	2.0	2.7
Not Applicable	287	63.2	82.5	161	64.1	79.7	126	62.1	86.3
Not Reported	106	23.3	-	49	19.6	-	57	28.0	-

Education Status	1976 Releases								
	Total			MAP			Not-MAP		
	#	%	Corrected % (# 797)	#	%	Corrected % (# 441)	#	%	Corrected % (# 356)
Total	949	100.0	100.0	514	100.0	100.0	435	100.0	100.0
Full-time	71	7.5	8.9	46	8.9	10.4	25	5.7	7.0
Part-time	27	2.8	3.4	18	3.5	4.1	9	2.1	2.5
Not Applicable	699	73.7	87.7	377	73.3	85.5	322	74.0	90.5
Not Reported	152	16.0	-	73	14.3	-	79	18.2	-

Part IV Summary of Report Findings

- A. The time served analysis section of this report demonstrates that under controlled conditions, residents participating in the Mutual Agreement Program and released after completing contract conditions probably serve less time than if they had been released through the regular parole process. Those controlled conditions limited the analysis to residents who were first released through adult parole or mandatory release.

Residents released in 1976 via MAP to adult parole or mandatory release had a length of stay reduction of 4.82 percent. A 20-year old, White male resident with a 36-month sentence admitted after conviction of a property offense and having a previous conviction, jail experience, and commitment from Milwaukee County served approximately 59.2 percent of the sentence. Had the same resident been released through the regular parole process, he would have served approximately 64.1 percent of his sentence in the state institution.

A similar resident released in 1977 via MAP served 52.9 percent of his sentence. A percent reduction in length of stay for 1977 MAP releases amounted to nearly 6.78 percent.

The analysis provided shows that MAP releases receive a favorable reduction in time served compared to what they might have received if in fact they had gone the regular parole process.

- B. The one-year follow-up outcome reports for residents released via MAP in 1975 and 1976 did not show significantly greater successful outcomes than the not-MAP counterparts. Although the parole outcomes for MAP releases showed a higher proportion of persons still on parole after one year compared with not-MAP outcomes, the differences in proportions were neutralized because greater proportions of not-MAP releases reached the discharge status. This, to some extent, was a reciprocal action of the types of

releases falling within the MAP and not-MAP groups. As demonstrated in the time-served analysis, larger proportions of not-MAP releases were released to mandatory release which enabled them to be eligible to early discharge sooner than MAP releases.

In other parole outcome results, marginal differences were found. In total, the outcome success of MAP releases was equivalent to the not-MAP comparison group after a one year follow-up.

APPENDIX 1

SUMMARY TABLES RELATING TO TIME SERVED

Table 1
OFFENSE BY MAP STATUS
For Persons Released From Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
in 1976 and 1977

OFFENSE	Total		MAP		Cancelled		Non-Contract		Non-MAP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	2,940	100.0	1,156	100.0	222	100.0	492	100.0	1,070	100.0
Murder, first degree	1	0.0	-	-	-	-	1	0.2	-	-
Murder, all other degrees	50	1.7	11	1.0	2	0.9	6	1.2	31	2.9
Manslaughter	41	1.4	20	1.7	4	1.8	8	1.6	9	0.8
Robbery, unarmed	198	6.7	89	7.7	17	7.7	32	6.5	60	5.6
Robbery, armed	327	11.2	155	13.4	24	10.8	56	11.4	92	8.6
Assault	115	3.9	41	3.5	5	2.3	23	4.7	46	4.3
Injury by Conduct Regardless of life	31	1.1	19	1.6	1	0.4	4	0.8	7	0.7
Burglary, unarmed	904	30.7	359	31.1	88	39.6	148	30.1	309	28.9
Theft	195	6.6	69	6.0	9	4.1	33	6.7	84	7.9
Auto theft	164	5.6	45	3.9	20	9.0	26	5.3	73	6.8
Forgery	256	8.7	109	9.4	12	5.4	37	7.5	98	9.2
Sex assaults	103	3.5	33	2.9	2	0.9	27	5.5	41	3.8
Sex, all other related offenses	49	1.7	26	2.2	1	0.4	5	1.0	17	1.6
Controlled substance and other drug	210	7.1	85	7.4	14	6.3	33	6.7	78	7.3
Property, all others related	198	6.7	74	6.4	19	8.6	36	7.3	69	6.4
Other offenses	96	3.3	21	1.8	4	1.8	16	3.3	55	5.1
Not Reported	2	0.1	-	-	-	-	1	0.2	1	0.1

Table 2
 LENGTH OF SENTENCE BY MAP STATUS
 For Residents Released From Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
 in 1976 and 1977

LENGTH OF SENTENCE	Total		MAP		Cancelled		Non-Contract		Non-MAP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Total</u>	<u>2,940</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,156</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>492</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,070</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Less than 1 year	10	0.4	1	0.1	-	-	1	0.2	8	0.8
1 year, less than 2	421	14.3	66	5.7	14	6.3	77	15.7	264	24.7
2 years, less than 3	559	19.0	199	17.2	45	20.3	108	22.0	207	19.3
3 years, less than 4	689	23.4	311	26.9	73	32.9	113	23.0	192	17.9
4 years, less than 5	273	9.3	139	12.0	28	12.6	43	8.7	63	5.9
5 years, less than 6	435	14.8	224	19.4	34	15.2	65	13.2	112	10.5
6 years, less than 7	115	3.9	54	4.7	7	3.2	24	4.8	30	2.8
7 years, less than 8	91	3.1	46	4.0	9	4.1	16	3.3	20	1.9
8 years, less than 9	66	2.2	31	2.7	4	1.8	7	1.4	24	2.2
9 years, less than 10	17	0.6	5	0.4	-	-	3	0.6	9	0.8
10 years, less than 11	123	4.2	54	4.7	4	1.8	14	2.8	51	4.8
11 years or more	136	4.6	26	2.2	4	1.8	20	4.1	86	8.0
Not Reported	5	0.2	-	-	-	-	1	0.2	4	0.4
Mean (in months)	53.2		53.0		46.0		48.2		57.6	
Median (in months)	36.2		47.5		36.3		36.1		35.8	
Minimum value (in months)	2		9		12		6		2	
Maximum value (in months)	996		612		180		360		996	

Table 3
 LENGTH OF STAY BY MAP STATUS
 For Residents Released From Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
 in 1976 and 1977

LENGTH OF STAY	Total		MAP		Cancelled		Non-Contract		Non-MAP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Total</u>	<u>2,940</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,156</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>492</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,070</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Less than 6 months	163	5.5	2	0.2	2	0.9	4	0.8	155	14.4
6 months, less than 1 year	502	17.1	102	8.8	6	2.7	83	16.9	311	29.1
1 year, less than 1-1/2 years	692	23.5	349	30.2	38	17.2	105	21.3	200	18.7
1-1/2 years, less than 2 years	598	20.2	282	24.3	74	33.2	131	26.7	111	10.4
2 years, less than 2-1/2 years	423	14.4	237	20.6	38	17.2	58	11.8	90	8.4
2-1/2 years, less than 3 years	158	5.4	43	3.7	27	12.2	36	7.3	52	4.9
3 years, less than 4 years	231	7.9	94	8.1	25	11.3	44	8.9	68	6.4
4 years, less than 5 years	87	3.0	31	2.7	8	3.6	19	3.9	29	2.7
5 years or more	78	2.7	16	1.4	4	1.7	12	2.4	46	4.3
Not Reported	8	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	0.7
Mean (in months)	21.5		22.6		26.1		22.7		19.0	
Median (in months)	18.1		19.4		22.6		18.9		13.0	
Minimum value (in months)	1		4		2		2		1	
Maximum value (in months)	179		135		102		123		179	

Table 4
AGE BY MAP STATUS
For Residents Released From Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
in 1976 and 1977

AGE	Total		MAP		Cancelled		Non-Contract		Non-MAP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Total</u>	<u>2,940</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,156</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>492</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,070</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Less than 20 years</u>	<u>615</u>	<u>20.9</u>	<u>227</u>	<u>19.6</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>33.2</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>23.4</u>	<u>199</u>	<u>18.6</u>
17	48	1.6	9	0.8	8	3.6	17	3.4	14	1.3
18	261	8.9	88	7.6	33	14.8	49	10.0	91	8.5
19	306	10.4	130	11.2	33	14.8	49	10.0	94	8.8
<u>20 years less than 25</u>	<u>1,157</u>	<u>39.4</u>	<u>495</u>	<u>42.8</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>41.9</u>	<u>204</u>	<u>41.5</u>	<u>365</u>	<u>34.1</u>
20	294	10.0	128	11.1	24	10.7	55	11.2	87	8.1
21	259	8.8	115	9.9	25	11.3	41	8.4	78	7.3
22	230	7.8	92	8.0	17	7.7	44	8.9	77	7.2
23	206	7.1	87	7.5	13	5.9	40	8.1	66	6.2
24	168	5.7	73	6.3	14	6.3	24	4.9	57	5.3
<u>25 years less than 30</u>	<u>554</u>	<u>18.8</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>20.8</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>13.1</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>17.5</u>	<u>199</u>	<u>18.6</u>
25	156	5.3	71	6.2	9	4.1	23	4.7	53	5.0
26	114	3.9	52	4.5	7	3.2	16	3.3	39	3.6
27	103	3.5	42	3.6	7	3.2	18	3.7	36	3.4
28	100	3.4	43	3.7	2	0.9	16	3.3	39	3.6
29	81	2.7	32	2.8	4	1.7	13	2.5	32	3.0
<u>30 years less than 35</u>	<u>265</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>99</u>	<u>8.6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>8.5</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>10.7</u>
30	73	2.5	27	2.4	2	0.9	14	2.8	30	2.8
31	59	2.0	22	1.9	3	1.4	9	1.9	25	2.3
32	53	1.8	19	1.6	3	1.4	6	1.2	25	2.3
33	39	1.3	15	1.3	1	0.4	8	1.6	15	1.4
34	41	1.4	16	1.4	1	0.4	5	1.0	19	1.9
<u>35 years less than 40</u>	<u>123</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>5.3</u>
<u>40 years or more</u>	<u>226</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>6.1</u>	<u>136</u>	<u>12.7</u>
Mean (in months)	25.5		24.6		23.1		24.6		27.3	
Median (in months)	22.9		22.7		21.0		22.3		24.0	

Table 5
RACE BY MAP STATUS
For Residents Released From Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
in 1976 and 1977

RACE	Total		MAP		Cancelled		Non-Contract		Non-MAP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	2,940	100.0	1,156	100.0	222	100.0	492	100.0	1,070	100.0
White	1,932	65.7	718	62.1	136	61.3	302	61.3	776	72.6
Black	882	30.0	397	34.4	77	34.6	171	34.8	237	22.1
Other	126	4.3	41	3.5	9	4.1	19	3.9	57	5.3

Table 6
SEX BY MAP STATUS
For Residents Released From Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
in 1976 and 1977

SEX	Total		MAP		Cancelled		Non-Contract		Non-MAP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	2,940	100.0	1,156	100.0	222	100.0	492	100.0	1,070	100.0
Males	2,779	94.5	1,089	94.2	207	93.2	461	93.7	1,022	95.5
Females	161	5.5	67	5.8	15	6.8	31	6.3	48	4.5

Table 7
 NUMBER OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS BY MAP STATUS
 For Residents Released From Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
 in 1976 and 1977

NUMBER OF PRIOR CONVICTIONS	Total		MAP		Cancelled		Non-Contract		Non-MAP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	2,940	100.0	1,156	100.0	222	100.0	492	100.0	1,070	100.0
None Reported	1,714	58.3	626	54.2	129	58.1	294	59.8	665	62.1
One	746	25.4	342	29.5	64	28.8	119	24.2	221	20.7
Two	252	8.6	106	9.2	18	8.1	35	7.1	93	8.7
Three	228	7.7	82	7.1	11	5.0	44	8.9	91	8.5

Table 8
 REPORTED PRIOR PENAL EXPERIENCE BY MAP STATUS
 For Residents Released From Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
 in 1976 and 1977

REPORTED PENAL EXPERIENCE	Total		MAP		Cancelled		Non-Contract		Non-MAP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	2,940	100.0	1,156	100.0	222	100.0	492	100.0	1,070	100.0
None Reported	1,686	57.3	629	54.4	124	55.9	293	59.6	640	59.8
State or Federal Institutions	628	21.4	257	22.2	39	17.5	106	21.5	226	21.1
Jail Sentence	626	21.3	270	23.4	59	26.6	93	18.9	204	19.1

Table 9
 TYPE OF ADMISSION BY MAP STATUS
 For Residents Released From Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
 in 1976 and 1977

TYPE OF ADMISSION	Total		MAP		Cancelled		Non-Contract		Non-MAP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Total</u>	<u>2,940</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,156</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>492</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,070</u>	<u>100.0</u>
New sentence	1,406	47.8	597	51.6	100	45.0	242	49.2	467	43.6
New sentence, probation violator	911	31.0	402	34.8	87	39.2	148	30.1	274	25.6
New sentence, parole (MR) violator	252	8.6	79	6.8	22	9.9	60	12.2	91	8.5
Probation violator	89	3.0	40	3.5	6	2.7	9	1.8	34	3.2
Parole or MR violator	251	8.5	32	2.8	7	3.2	28	5.7	184	17.2
Other	31	1.1	6	0.5	-	-	5	1.0	20	1.9

Table 10
 TYPE OF RELEASE BY MAP STATUS
 For Residents Released From Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
 in 1976 and 1977

TYPE OF RELEASE	Total		MAP		Cancelled		Non-Contract		Non-MAP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Total</u>	<u>2,940</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,156</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>492</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,070</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>First Release</u>	<u>2,459</u>	<u>83.6</u>	<u>1,049</u>	<u>90.7</u>	<u>197</u>	<u>88.7</u>	<u>411</u>	<u>83.5</u>	<u>802</u>	<u>75.0</u>
YO parole	14	0.5	6	0.5	-	-	3	0.6	5	0.5
Adult parole	1,903	64.7	1,034	89.5	110	49.5	242	49.2	517	48.3
Adult Mandatory Release	440	15.0	5	0.4	85	38.2	152	30.9	198	18.5
Discharge - Court Order	77	2.6	4	0.3	1	0.5	12	2.4	60	5.6
Direct Discharge	12	0.4	-	-	1	0.5	1	0.2	10	0.9
Other	13	0.4	-	-	-	-	1	0.2	12	1.2
<u>Re-Release</u>	<u>481</u>	<u>16.4</u>	<u>107</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>11.3</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>16.5</u>	<u>268</u>	<u>25.0</u>
Adult parole	209	7.1	102	8.9	10	4.5	28	5.8	69	6.4
Adult mandatory release	190	6.5	4	0.3	14	6.3	40	8.1	132	12.3
Discharge - Court Order	9	0.3	-	-	-	-	4	0.8	5	0.5
Direct Discharge	70	2.4	1	0.1	1	0.5	8	1.6	60	5.6
Other	3	0.1	-	-	-	-	1	0.2	2	0.2

APPENDIX 2

INSTITUTIONS AND FIELD FORMS USED IN THE COLLECTION OF DATA FOR
TIME SERVED AND PAROLE OUTCOME REPORT

CASE CLOSING SUMMARY

Institution of release (1-2)	Date of termination (3-8)	Case Number (9-15)	County of residence at termination (16-17)
Name	(Mo., Day, Yr.)	Sex (18)	Race (19)
District/area code (20-24)	Date placed on supervision (25-30)	Date of birth (31-36)	Age at termination (37-38)
	(Mo., Day, Year)	(Mo., Day, Yr.)	

- (39) Type of termination
 1. Discharge
 2. Early discharge
 3. Closed
 4. Off records
 5. Revocation
 6. Death report
 7. Other _____

- (40-41) Type of case
 01. State probation
 02. Intrastate Milw., adult case
 03. Intrastate Milw., juvenile case
 04. Juv. regular prob.
 05. Juv. "C" probation
 10. Adult parole
 11. Juv. parole, adult institution
 20. Juv. aftercare, juv. institution
 30. CSH, courtesy cases
 31. CSH, "S" cases
 40. Other _____

- (42) Employment during period of supervision
 1. Generally full-time employment
 2. Generally part-time employment
 3. Generally unemployed
 4. Combination of 2 & 3
 9. Not reported

- (43) Income at termination
 0. No income, unemployed
 1. \$400.00 plus
 2. \$200.00-\$399.99
 3. \$1.00-\$199.99
 9. Not reported

- (44) Marital status at termination
 1. Single
 2. Married
 3. Divorced or separated
 4. Widowed
 9. Not reported

- (45) Maintenance level achieved during period of supervision
 1. Entirely self-supporting
 2. Partially self-supporting
 3. Supported by others
 9. Not reported

- (46) Received public assistance during period of supervision
 0. None recorded
 1. Aid to dependent children
 2. Old age assistance
 3. Aid to the blind
 4. Aid to totally and permanently disabled
 5. General relief
 6. Federal Aid Program
 7. Other _____
 9. Not reported

- (47) Made court-ordered payments for the support of others while on supervision
 1. Yes
 2. No
 9. Not reported (if yes, record amount _____)

- (48) Residence during most of supervision
 1. Alone
 2. With spouse
 3. With parents
 4. With other relatives
 5. Group home
 6. Foster home
 7. Half-way house
 8. Other _____
 9. Not reported

- (49) Use of institutional training during parole period
 0. Not a parole case
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. No institutional training
 9. Not reported

- (50) School enrollment during period of supervision
 0. Not enrolled
 1. Full-time academic school
 2. Part-time academic school
 3. Full-time vocational school
 4. Part-time vocational school
 5. Combination of 2 & 4
 6. Other _____
 9. Not reported

- (51) Educational progress during supervision
 0. Not applicable
 1. Excellent
 2. Satisfactory
 3. No progress
 4. Regression
 9. Not reported

- (52) Vocational progress during supervision
 0. Not applicable
 1. Excellent
 2. Satisfactory
 3. No progress
 4. Regression
 9. Not reported

- (53) School behavior problems during supervision
 0. Not in school
 1. Very serious problems
 2. Serious problems
 3. Moderate problems
 4. Minimal problems
 5. No problems
 9. Not reported

- (54) Disruptive use of alcohol
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Unknown
 9. Not reported

- (55) Drug usage during period of supervision
 1. Yes (specify type) _____
 2. No
 3. Unknown
 9. Not reported

- (56) History of drug usage
 0. No use, no history of use, unknown
 1. History of drug usage

- (57) Relationship with agent
 0. None, no contacts
 1. Very limited relationship
 2. Productive & useful relationship
 3. Negative relationship
 9. Not reported

- (58) Was probation or parole plan carried out?
 0. No plan made
 1. Yes
 2. Yes, with modification
 3. No
 9. Not reported

- (59) Prognosis as to committing further offenses within one year
 0. Not applicable (use for death, revocation)
 1. Not probable
 2. Probable
 3. Highly probable
 9. Not reported

OVER

- (60) Goals
1. Goals are quite unrealistic, negative or poorly defined
 2. Goals generally unrealistic and not well defined
 3. Goals are fairly realistic; more positive than negative
 4. Goals appear realistic and generally positive
 5. Highly motivated towards positive, realistic goals
 9. Not reported

- (61) Social Identification
1. Identification entirely with delinquent individuals
 2. Identification mainly with delinquent individuals
 3. Some identifications with positive authority figures
 4. Moderate identifications with positive authority figures
 5. Strong identifications with positive authority figures
 9. Not reported

Date of violation (63-68)	Date of revocation (69-74)
(Mo., Day, Yr.)	(Mo., Day, Yr.)

- (75) Reason for revocation
0. Conviction of another offense
 1. Revocation substituted for new conviction
 2. Charged with another offense but not yet convicted
 3. Arrested but not charged
 4. Absconded
 - X. Other rules violations

- (76-78) Most serious violation
- | | |
|---|--|
| 001 Murder, first degree
002 Murder, second degree
003 Murder, third degree
010 Manslaughter, abortion
(death of mother)
019 Negligent homicide
100 Robbery (unarmed)
101 Robbery (armed)
200 Assault, battery
201 Mayhem
202 Aggravated assault, battery
203 Injury by conduct regardless of life
204 Injury by negligent use of weapon
301 Burglary (armed)
302 Burglary (unarmed)
303 Entry into locked vehicle
400 Theft (except auto)
409 Receiving stolen property
430 Auto theft
460 Fraud
461 Embezzlement
462 Transfer of encumbered property
500 Forgery
501 Worthless checks, issuance of
600 Rape
601 Attempted rape
609 Statutory rape (carnal knowledge & abuse)
631 Sexual intercourse without consent
632 Incest
633 Indecent behavior with child
634 Adultery
635 Sexual perversion (sodomy)
636 Lewd & lascivious behavior
638 Prostitution, pandering, commercialized
vice
639 Obscene matter | 710 Narcotic drug use and/or possession
711 Narcotic drug sale, manufacture, or
distribution
720 Marijuana use and/or possession
721 Marijuana sale, manufacture, or
distribution
730 Other dangerous drug use and/or
possession
731 Other dangerous drug sale, manufacture,
or distribution
740 Other drug violations (specify statute
number)
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/> 750 Weapons, concealed or reckless use of,
explosives
780 Escape
800 Other offenses (not classified elsewhere)
801 Attempt, except rape
802 Possession of burglarious tools
810 Abortion
815 Arson
820 Bigamy
825 Conspiracy, solicitation, bribery
830 Extortion (threats)
835 Gambling
840 Kidnapping, abduction
850 Malicious destruction of property
855 Abandonment, non-support
860 Perjury
870 Contributing to delinquency of minor
871 Enticing a minor
910 Prostitution (female)
920 Disorderly conduct, vagrancy, drunkenness
981 Absconding
982 Illegitimate pregnancy
984 Problem drinking
985 Uncontrollable
986 Traffic violation
988 Truancy
989 Other juvenile rules violations (specify) |
|---|--|
- (79) Type of most serious violation
1. Felony
 2. Misdemeanor
 3. Juvenile delinquency

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
DIVISION OF CORRECTIONS
C-356 (4-74)

PAGE 1
INITIAL DATA

REPORT OF OFFENDER ADMITTED
TO WISCONSIN ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

INSTITUTION (1-2)

- Prison
- Reformatory
- Home for Women
- Wisconsin Correctional Institution
- Wisconsin Correctional Camp System

DATE ADMITTED

(3-8)

NUMBER

(9-15)

NAME (16-35)

(Last First Middle)

TYPE OF ADMISSION (36-37)

- ~~00 New sentence--Not a probation, parole or mandatory release violator~~
- ~~0Y New sentence upon expiration of previous sentence, with continuance of imprisonment~~
- ~~01 New sentence--state probation violator~~
- ~~02 New sentence--Milwaukee probation violator~~
- ~~03 New sentence--returned from adult parole~~
- ~~04 New sentence--returned from mandatory release~~
- ~~05 New sentence--returned from juvenile parole (WSR or WHW)~~
- ~~06 New sentence--returned from juvenile parole (WSB or WSG)~~
- ~~13 Returned from adult parole--no new sentence~~
- ~~14 Returned from mandatory release--no new sentence~~
- 9Y Other (specify) _____

MONTH AND YEAR OF BIRTH

(38-41)

AGE ON ADMISSION

(42-43)

PLACE OF BIRTH (Code)

(44-45)

SEX AND RACE (46)

Male		Female
0	White	5
1	Black	6
2	Native American	7
3	Mexican Origin	8
4	Other	9

MARITAL STATUS (47)

- 1 Single
- 2 Married
- 3 Separated
- 4 Divorced
- 5 Widowed

OFFENSE (Code)

(48-50)

TYPE OF COMMITMENT (51)

- 3 Sex deviate
- 5 Adult--felony
- 6 Adult--misdemeanor

PLEA AND SENTENCE (52)

Guilty		Not Guilty
1	Single	5
2	Concurrent	6
3	Consecutive	7

LENGTH OF SENTENCE (53-55)

Years Months

XXO Life Sentence

COUNTY OF COMMITMENT

(Code)

(56-57)

**REPORT OF OFFENDER ADMITTED
TO WISCONSIN ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION**

PREVIOUS FELONY CONVICTIONS (58)

- 0 None
- 1 One
- 2 Two
- 3 Three or more

**PREVIOUS PENAL INSTITUTION
EXPERIENCE (59)**

- 0 None recorded
- 1 WSP or WHW
- 2 WSR
- 3 WSP or WSR
- 4 Prison or reformatory in other state
- 5 Federal prison
- 6 Military prison
- 7 Jail sentence

JUVENILE INSTITUTION EXPERIENCE(60)

- 0 None recorded
- 1 WSB or WSG
- 2 WCC
- 3 WCC and WSB or WSG
- 4 Other children's institution in Wisconsin
(excluding Colony)
- 5 Other children's institution outside state

GRADE COMPLETED (61)

- 0 Less than fourth
- 1 Fourth
- 2 Fifth
- 3 Sixth
- 4 Seventh
- 5 Eighth
- 6 Ninth
- 7 Tenth
- 8 Eleventh
- 9 Twelfth or more
- X Unknown

ACHIEVEMENT TEST (62)

- 0 Less than 3.5
- 1 3.5 - 4.4
- 2 4.5 - 5.4
- 3 5.5 - 6.4
- 4 6.5 - 7.4
- 5 7.5 - 8.4
- 6 8.5 - 9.4
- 7 9.5 - 10.4
- 8 10.5 - 11.4
- 9 11.5 or more
- X Not tested

INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATE (63)

- 1 Superior and above
- 2 Bright normal
- 3 Average or normal
- 4 Dull normal
- 5 Borderline
- 6 Defective
- X Not tested

STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
DIVISION OF CORRECTIONS
C-357 (4-74)

REPORT OF OFFENDER RELEASED FROM
WISCONSIN ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Institution: Prison Reformatory Home for Women WCI WCCS
(1-2)

Number _____
(9-15)

Name _____
(16-35)

A. For all releases:

_____ Date released
(46-51)

DETAINER (54)

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

TYPE OF RELEASE (55-56)

- 1 Expiration of sentence
- 2 Pardon
- 3 Commutation
- 5 Parole
- 6 Conditional pardon
- 7 Mandatory release
- 9 Death
- X2 Discharge court order
- X4 Release from voluntary return from
parole or mandatory release or
release from admission pending hearing
- X Other (specify)

B. For re-releases only:

_____ Date sentence began
(36-41)

Number of paroles and man-
_____ datory releases since sen-
(42) tence began

Number of months served in
_____ institution since sentence
(43-45) began

Number of months served
_____ in institution since
(57-59) last admission

C-357 - Page 2

C. For first releases only:

MINIMUM SENTENCE (60)

- 0 None
- 1 Under six months
- 2 Six months, less than 12
- 3 One year, less than 2
- 4 Two years, less than 3
- 5 Three years, less than 5
- 6 Five years, less than 6
- 7 Six years, less than 10
- 8 Ten years, less than 20
- 9 Twenty years and over

GROUP COUNSELING: Number of sessions attended (64)

- 0 None
- 1 1 - 5
- 2 6 - 10
- 3 11 - 15
- 4 16 - 20
- 5 21 - 25
- 6 26 - 30
- 7 31 - 35
- 8 36 - 40
- 9 41 or more

WORK RECORD (61)

- 0 No work record
- Work record:
- 1 Satisfactory
- 2 Most satisfactory
- 3 Neither satisfactory or unsatisfactory
- 4 Mostly unsatisfactory
- 5 Unsatisfactory
- 9 No evaluation

DISCIPLINARY ACTION: Loss of privileges (65)

- 0 None
- 1 One loss
- 2 Two losses
- 3 Three losses
- 4 Four losses
- 5 5 - 9 losses
- 6 10 - 14 losses
- 7 15 - 19 losses
- 8 20 - 24 losses
- 9 25 or more losses

CAMP OR FARM ASSIGNMENT (62)

- 0 None
- 1 Less than 1 month
- 2 1 - 3 months
- 3 3 - 5 months
- 4 6 - 11 months
- 5 12 or more months

DISCIPLINARY ACTION: Lock-ups (66)

- 0 None
- 1 One lock-up
- 2 Two lock-ups
- 3 Three lock-ups
- 4 Four lock-ups
- 5 Five lock-ups
- 6 Six lock-ups
- 7 Seven lock-ups
- 8 Eight lock-ups
- 9 Nine or more lock-ups

EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL PROGRESS (63)

- 0 No educational participation
- Progress:
- 1 Excellent
- 2 Good
- 3 Fair
- 4 Poor
- 9 No evaluation

PROCESS QUESTIONNAIRE

1) NAME: LAST	FIRST	MI	2) NUMBER (SUFFIX)	3) DATE: MO	DAY	YR	4) INSTITUTION CODE
(1-19)			(20-25) (26)	(27-32)			(33-34)

5) REFERRAL SOURCE CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (35)
 1 A AND E
 2 RESIDENT'S REQUEST
 3 OTHER (SPECIFY) _____

6) PROPOSAL DEVELOPED AFTER REFERRAL CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (36)
 1. YES 2. NO

7) PROPOSED CONTRACT CONTENTS
 A. WORK ASSIGNMENT _____ (37-38)
 B. EDUCATION _____ (39-41) _____ (42-44)
 C. TREATMENT _____ (45-48) _____ (49-52)
 D. DISCIPLINE _____ (53)
 E. TRANSFER(S) _____ (54-57) _____ (58-61)
 F. TARGET RELEASE DATE (62-67) _____ Mo _____ DAY _____ YR
 G. DATE PROPOSAL DEVELOPED (68-73) _____ Mo _____ DAY _____ YR

8) DISPOSITION OF PROPOSED CONTRACT CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (74)
 1 PROPOSAL ACCEPTED FOR NEGOTIATIONS
 2 CLIENT WITHDREW PROPOSAL (SPECIFY) _____
 3 PROPOSED CONTRACT NOT ACCEPTABLE, NEW PROPOSAL DEVELOPED (SPECIFY WHOM BY TITLE) _____
 4 OTHER (SPECIFY) _____

9) INDICATE THE DEGREE OF FAVORABLENESS OF THE PROPOSED CONTRACT BY EACH OF THE FOLLOWING SOURCES CIRCLE OR CHECK ONE RESPONSE ONLY FOR EACH SOURCE

	FAVOR- ABLE	UN FAVOR- ABLE	NO ANS- WER (6)	NOT APPLI- CABLE (7)	NOT NOTI- FIED (8)
PAROLE AGENT (75-76)	1 2 3 4 5		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
WORK RELEASE (77-78)	1 2 3 4 5		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CAMP SYSTEM (79-80)	1 2 3 4 5		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PROGRAM REVIEW (81-82)	1 2 3 4 5		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10) NEGOTIATION CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (83)
 1 NEGOTIATION COMPLETED OR PROPOSAL SUBMITTED
 NEGOTIATION SUSPENDED BUT RESUMED LATER ALLIR
 2 COUNTER PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY III
 3 COUNTER PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY PR
 4 COUNTER PROPOSAL SUBMITTED JOINTLY BY IR AND PR
 5 COUNTER PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY CLIENT
 6 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WAS OBTAINED (BY WHOM AND WHY) _____

11) DISPOSITION OF PROPOSED CONTRACT AFTER NEGOTIATION CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (84)
 1 CONTRACT RECEIVED
 2 PROPOSAL REJECTED BY IR
 3 PROPOSAL REJECTED BY PB
 4 COUNTER PROPOSAL REJECTED BY IR
 5 COUNTER PROPOSAL REJECTED BY PB
 6 COUNTER PROPOSAL REJECTED BY CLIENT
 7 NO CONTRACT RECEIVED BECAUSE ALL PARTIES COULD NOT MUTUALLY AGREE TO A CONTRACT
 8 NO CONTRACT RECEIVED, PRG COULD NOT APPROVE
 9 CLIENT WITHDREW (WHY) _____

12) DATE CONTRACT BECAME EFFECTIVE (85-90) _____ Mo _____ DAY _____ YR

100-1
 13) CONTRACT CONTENTS
 A. WORK ASSIGNMENT _____ (35-36)
 B. EDUCATION _____ (37-39) _____ (40-42)
 C. TREATMENT _____ (43-46) _____ (47-50)
 D. DISCIPLINE _____ (51)
 E. TARGET RELEASE DATE (52-57) _____ Mo _____ DAY _____ YR

14) TRANSFERS

	PLACE	DATE Mo/DAY/YR	REASON
1	(58-59)	(60-65)	(66-67)
2	(68-69)	(70-75)	(76-77)
3	(78-79)	(80-85)	(86-87)

100-2
 15) REMARKS:

PROGRAM CHANGE OR PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

1. NAME: LAST (1-19)	FIRST (20-25)	MI (26)	2. NUMBER (SUFFIX) (27-32)	3. DATE: MO (33-34)	DAY (35)	YR (36)	4. INSTITUTION CODE (37-40)
-------------------------	------------------	------------	-------------------------------	------------------------	-------------	------------	--------------------------------

5. AREA OF PROGRAM CHANGE OR PROBLEM Circle one of the following (35)

- 1 Work assignment
- 2 Education
- 3 Treatment
- 4 Discipline
- 5 Transfer
- 6 Release date
- 7 Other (specify) _____

6. REASON FOR CHANGE OR PROBLEM Circle one of the following (36)

- 1 Services not deliverable by institution
- 2 Release date not deliverable
- 3 Previous criminal history found
- 4 Client violated in corresponding area
- 5 Client requested change in area
- 6 Other (specify) _____

7. CHANGE OR PROBLEM RESULTED IN Circle one of the following (37)

- 1 No action taken
- 2 Client withdrew, contract cancelled
- 3 Client violated, contract cancelled
- 4 Client renegotiated
- 5 Other (specify) _____

8. IF RENEGOTIATION OCCURS, Circle one of the following (38)

- 1 New contract received
- 2 Old contract continued
- 3 Old contract cancelled, all parties could not mutually agree
- 4 Client withdrew
- 5 Other (specify) _____

9. IF RENEGOTIATION RESULTS IN RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT, SPECIFY CHANGES IN THOSE AREAS AFFECTED

- A Work assignment _____ (39-40)
- B Education _____ (41-43)
- C Treatment _____ (44-47)
- D Discipline _____ (48)
- E Transfer _____ (49-52)

F Target release date _____ (53-58)
Mo Day Yr

10. DATE RENEGOTIATED CONTRACT BECAME EFFECTIVE _____ (59-64)
Mo Day Yr

100=3

11. REMARKS: _____

MAP FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

1. NAME: LAST	FIRST	MI	2. NUMBER (SUFFIX)	3. DATE: Mo	DAY	Yr
(1-19)			(20-26)	(27-32)		

4. PERIOD OF TIME ON PAROLE, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (33)

- 1 LESS THAN FOUR MONTHS
- 2 4 MONTHS, LESS THAN 8 MONTHS
- 3 3 MONTHS, LESS THAN 12 MONTHS
- 4 12 MONTHS, LESS THAN 18 MONTHS
- 5 18 MONTHS OR MORE

NOTE: ALL OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS SHOULD BE ANSWERED FROM INFORMATION KNOWN ABOUT THE CLIENT DURING THE PREVIOUS FOUR MONTHS ON PAROLE. IF CLIENT HAS NOT BEEN ON PAROLE FOR FOUR MONTHS, USE THAT INFORMATION AVAILABLE SINCE HIS/HER RELEASE.

5. RESIDENCE, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (34)

- 1 PARENTS
- 2 SPOUSE
- 3 FAMILY OTHER THAN ABOVE
- 4 INDEPENDENTLY
- 5 OTHER

6. PAROLE STATUS, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (35-36)

- 1 PAROLE MAINTAINED, NO PROBLEMS
- 2 RETURNED TO INSTITUTION, TECHNICAL VIOLATION
- 3 RETURNED TO INSTITUTION, COURT ACTION (PREVIOUS OFFENSE)
- 4 RETURNED TO INSTITUTION, COURT ACTION (NEW OFFENSE)
- 5 REVOCATION PENDING, TECHNICAL VIOLATION
- 6 REVOCATION PENDING, COURT ACTION
- 7 TECHNICAL VIOLATION OCCURRED, PAROLE CONTINUED
- 8 COURT ACTION OCCURRED, PAROLE CONTINUED
- 9 COURT ACTION OCCURRED, JAIL TIME RECEIVED, PAROLE CONTINUED
- 10 COURT ACTION OCCURRED, PROBATION RECEIVED, PAROLE CONTINUED
- 11 ABSCONDED
- 12 DISCHARGE
- 13 OTHER (SPECIFY) _____

7. BEHAVIORAL ADJUSTMENT, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ROW

	NOT APPLICABLE	VERY GOOD	GOOD	AVERAGE	POOR	VERY POOR	UNKNOWN
MARITAL ADJUSTMENT (37)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT (38)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
EDUCATIONAL ADJUSTMENT (39)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY (40)		1	2	3	4	5	6
COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT (41)		1	2	3	4	5	6
COMMUNITY ACCEPTANCE (42)		1	2	3	4	5	6
OVERALL PAROLE ADJUSTMENT (43)		1	2	3	4	5	6

8. EMPLOYMENT STATUS, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (44)

- 1 FULL TIME
- 2 PART TIME
- 3 UNEMPLOYED (OMIT QUESTIONS 9-13)

9. WHAT IS CLIENT'S JOB TITLE? _____

10. SKILL LEVEL OF CURRENT EMPLOYMENT, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (45)

- 1 SKILLED
- 2 SEMI-SKILLED
- 3 UNSKILLED
- 4 PROFESSIONAL
- 5 OTHER _____

11. NUMBER OF JOBS HELD DURING LAST FOUR MONTHS _____ (46-47)
12. CLIENT'S AVERAGE GROSS INCOME PER MONTH, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (48)
- | | | |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1 \$200 OR LESS | 4 \$401 TO \$500 | 7 \$701 TO \$800 |
| 2 \$201 TO \$300 | 5 \$501 TO \$600 | 8 \$801 OR OVER |
| 3 \$301 TO \$400 | 6 \$601 TO \$700 | |
13. HOW MUCH PREPARATION WOULD YOU SAY THAT THE LAST PERIOD OF INCARCERATION WAS ABLE TO GIVE THE CLIENT FOR HIS CURRENT JOB, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (49)
- | | | |
|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 1 ALL OF IT | 3 ABOUT HALF | 5 VERY LITTLE OF IT |
| 2 MORE THAN HALF | 4 LESS THAN HALF | 6 NONE OF IT |
14. HOW LONG HAS CLIENT BEEN UNEMPLOYED (IN WEEKS)? _____ (50-51)
15. TYPE OF COMPENSATION OR TRANSITION FUNDS PAID TO CLIENT, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (52)
- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 NONE | 4 PURCHASE OF SERVICE |
| 2 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS | 5 UNION FUNDS |
| 3 SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS | 6 OTHER (SPECIFY) _____ |
16. REASON FOR UNEMPLOYMENT, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (53)
- | | | |
|----------------|--|-------------------------|
| 1 CLIENT FIRED | 4 ENROLLED IN SCHOOL | 7 OTHER (SPECIFY) _____ |
| 2 LAID OFF | 5 CLIENT COULD NOT FIND A JOB | |
| 3 QUIT | 6 CLIENT REFUSED OR DID NOT WANT A JOB | |
17. EDUCATION, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (54)
- | |
|-------------------------------|
| 1 FULL TIME |
| 2 PART TIME |
| 3 NONE (OMIT QUESTIONS 18-22) |
18. WHAT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IS CLIENT CURRENTLY TAKING _____
19. WHAT IS THE ANTICIPATED DURATION OF THE PROGRAM, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (55)
- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 1 ONE SEMESTER | 3 THREE SEMESTERS |
| 2 TWO SEMESTERS | 4 FOUR SEMESTERS OR MORE |
20. WILL A DIPLOMA OR CERTIFICATE BE RECEIVED UPON COMPLETION OF THE PROGRAM? (56)
- | | | |
|-------|------|---|
| 1 YES | 2 NO | IF YES, INDICATE THE TYPE OF DIPLOMA OR CERTIFICATE _____ |
|-------|------|---|
21. TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITY PROGRAM TAKEN AT, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (57)
- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY | 3 HIGH SCHOOL |
| 2 TECHNICAL | 4 OTHER (SPECIFY) _____ |
22. SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR PAYING FOR THE PROGRAM, CIRCLE ONE OR MORE SOURCES (58-59)
- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1 PURCHASE OF SERVICE | 5 SCHOLARSHIP OR GRANT, OTHER THAN HEAB | 9 WSES (GETA) |
| 2 VA | 6 LOAN | 10 OTHER (SPECIFY) _____ |
| 3 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS | 7 HIGHER EDUCATION AIDS BOARD | |
| 4 DVR | 8 AID THROUGH ACADEMIC INSTITUTION | |

	A LOT	SOME	A LITTLE	VERY LITTLE	NOT APPLICABLE	UNKNOWN
23. HAS CLIENT'S PARTICIPATION IN MAP CONTRIBUTED TO HIS ADJUSTMENT WHILE ON PAROLE, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (60)	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. HAS CLIENT'S PARTICIPATION IN MAP CONTRIBUTED TO HIS EMPLOYABILITY IN HIS COMMUNITY, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (61)	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. HAS CLIENT ABUSED THE USE OF ALCOHOL, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (62)	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. HAS CLIENT ABUSED THE USE OF DRUGS, CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE ONLY (63)	1	2	3	4	5	6

FOR PDR USE ONLY - COHORT CODE (64) _____

(100) _____

APPENDIX 3

REGRESSION ANALYSIS RELATING TO TIME SERVED
FOR RE-RELEASED RESIDENTS

Table 1 presents the summary equation of percentage of time served utilizing the stepwise regression procedure of the computerized Statistical Package for Social Services (SPSS). The analysis was performed on information about re-released residents from Wisconsin Correctional Institutions in 1976 and 1977. Variables not meeting certain statistical requirements were excluded in the analysis but are shown in the table.

A total of ten variables in 1976 explained 46 percent of the total variance contributing to percent of sentence served. The interaction of two variables, length of sentence and length of stay, accounted for nearly 41 percent of the total variance explained. The treatment variable of MAP release shows a positive slope (beta) of .0730 or an increase in percent of time served by 7.3 percent.

A total of 10 variables in 1977 explained 42 percent of the total variance contributing to percent of sentence served. Again, length of stay and length of sentence contributed a combined total of nearly 40 percent of total variance explained. The treatment variable of MAP release shows a negative slope (beta) of .0916 or a reduction in percent of time served by 9.2 percent.

Table 1
 Summary Equation of Percentage of Time Served Regressed (Stepwise)
 on Parole and Sentencing Variables For Residents Re-Released From
 Wisconsin's Correctional Institutions for Calendar Years 1976 and 1977

1976				1977			
Step	Variable	Beta	R ²	Step	Variable	Beta	R ²
1	Stay	.0161	.12037	1	Sentence	-.0033	.17372
2	Sentence	-.0034	.40581	2	Stay	.0141	.39869
3	Age	.0047	.41753	3	MAP Release	-.0916	.40829
4	MAP	.0730	.42417	4	Milw. County Commitment	-.0716	.41567
5	Property Offense	-.1479	.42824	5	Property Offense	.0392	.41778
6	Person Offense	-.1886	.43623	6	Black	-.1185	.41858
7	Males	.1774	.43965	7	White	-.0961	.42008
8	Milw. County Commitment	.0134	.44206	8	Age	.0009	.42054
9	White	-.2900	.44317	9	No prior convictions	.0779	.42101
10	Black	-.3035	.45668	10	Males	.1032	.42185
Constants (Females		.4500	-	Constants (Not MAP		.3992	-
(Not MAP				(Other Offenses			
(Other Offenses				(No Penal experience			
(No penal experience				(Other non-White			
(Other non-White				(Other counties			
(Other counties				(Females			
Excluded (No previous convictions				Excluded (Person offense			
(Penal experience not reported				(Penal experience not reported			
(Previous institution experience				(Previous institution experience			
(Previous jail experience				(Previous jail experience			
Multiple R = .675 ⁷				Multiple R = .6495			
R ² = .4567				R ² = .4219			
Standard Error = .3126				Standard Error = .3225			
Number of Cases = 184				Number of Cases = 212			

A complete reversal in trend was realized between the two years. The predominate cause for this was the restricted eligibility requirements that most releasees had in 1976 versus those released in 1977.

The result of the data shows that if we had a hypothetical MAP person as a re-released offender to parole, mandatory release or discharge, with the following characteristics in 1976: a 36 month sentence, property offense, White male, 20 years of age, and was committed from Milwaukee County, that person would serve approximately 24.8 percent of his sentence by participating in MAP. The percent of sentence served relates only to the amount of time between readmission and re-release. It does not include the proportion of time served as a first released offender.

A similar person re-released in 1977 via MAP participation would serve approximately 21.2 percent of sentence. Again, this relates only to the time between re-admission and re-release.

It's apparent that persons who were re-released in 1976 actually had more time added to their probable length of stay by participating in MAP. Results in 1977 show MAP as having an opposite effect, i.e., reducing probable length of stay.

The effect of MAP discussed here is not one where comparison is made between MAP and not-MAP releases. The comparison is made on the impact of MAP to those persons participating in the program and comparing the data to the probable data had MAP not existed for these same individuals.

Table 1
 Number of Referrals Resulting in MAP Contracts
 For Adult Residents of Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
 in 1975, 1976 and 1977

	Total		1975		1976		1977	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Referrals	5,197	100.0	1,410	100.0	1,553	100.0	2,234	100.0
Contracts Signed	2,573	49.5	797	56.5	823	53.0	953	42.7
Median Length (in months) of Contract Duration	9.0		8.8		9.0		9.5	

Table 2
 Number of Cancellations for Adult Residents
 Residents Reported as Having MAP Contracts in Wisconsin Correctional Institutions
 in 1975, 1976 and 1977

	Total	
	Number of Cases	Percent of Cases
<u>Contracts Signed</u>	<u>2,573</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Cancelled</u>	<u>593</u>	<u>23.1</u>
Voluntary	189	7.4
Involuntary	404	15.7

Table 3
 Number of Residents Released Via MAP From
 Wisconsin Correctional Institutions Compared to the Number of Contracts Signed

	Total	
	Number of Cases	Percent of Cases
<u>Total Contracts Signed</u>	<u>2,573</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Total Number Released via MAP</u> ^{/1}	<u>1,401</u>	<u>54.5</u>
1975	249	9.7
1976	514	20.0
1977	638	24.8

^{/1} The remaining cases on MAP contracts by the end of 1977 were carried over into 1978, or were persons whose contracts were cancelled.

APPENDIX 4
SUMMARY STATISTICS RELATING TO
RESIDENTS INVOLVEMENT WITH THE MUTUAL AGREEMENT PROGRAM
FOR CALENDAR YEARS 1975, 1976 AND 1977

Table 4
Length of Stay Differentials
For Residents in MAP who Had
Renegotiations That Affected Their Target Parole Date

	All Original Contracts	Number of Contracts Days Added	Number of Contracts Days Removed
Total Cases	2,573	123	89
Median	9.0 Months	29 Days	21.5 Days

END