

112

THE MASSACHUSETTS FURLOUGH PROGRAM:

A COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT

February, 1976

Prepared by:

Faye Farrington  
Program Evaluation Analyst

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Frank A. Hall  
Commissioner

Approved by Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent  
PUBLICATION # 874 - 49 - 400 - 3/76 CR

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express her appreciation to the following persons:

Susan Glinski and Thomas Cannon for their efforts in creating the necessary data files; Bob Patrician for his invaluable assistance in programming; and Eleanor O'Brien and Linda Collins for their excellent clerical services in the preparation of this report.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
I. <u>SUMMARY OF FURLOUGH PROGRAM ENABLING LEGISLATION AND DEPARTMENTAL FURLOUGH POLICY</u>	1
A. Legislative Authorization of the Furlough Program	1
B. Types of Furloughs	2
C. Eligibility	2
D. Screening Process	3
E. Notification of Police	4
F. Abuse of Furlough Privilege	5
II. <u>SUMMARY OF FURLOUGH STATISTICS</u>	6
A. Overall Furlough Statistics	6
B. Definition of Escape	6
C. Voluntary Returns	6
D. Escapees at Large	7
E. Yearly Trends	7
F. Furlough Statistics by Individuals Furloughed	7
G. Proportion of Population Furloughed	11
H. Data on Furloughs Granted to Lifers	15
I. Disposition of Prosecuted Escape Cases	16

III. DESCRIPTION OF INDIVIDUALS FURLOUGHED

A. Comparison of Resident Population with Furloughed Population	20
B. Comparison of Individuals Furloughed Successfully with Individuals Declared Escapees	26
C. Comparison of Individuals Furloughed Successfully with Individuals Experiencing Difficulty on Furlough	34
APPENDIX	35

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
<u>I</u>	Number of Furloughs and Escapes Since the Inception of the Program through October 25, 1975	8
II	Yearly Furlough Statistics	9
III	Yearly Furlough Escape Rates by Individual	12
IV	Individual Furlough Escape Rate by Type of Facility	13
V	Number of Individuals Furloughed Monthly During 1975 In Proportion to Total Population by Institutional Security Level	14
VI	Furlough Experience for Residents Serving Life Sentences	16
VII	Legal Outcome of Escape from Furlough Cases	17
VIII	Residential Furloughee Populations by Offense Category	20
IX	Resident and Furloughee Populations by Minimum Sentence	21
X	Resident and Furloughee Populations by Race	22
XI	Resident and Furloughee Populations by Age	23
XII	Resident and Furloughee Populations by Marital Status	24
XIII	Resident and Furloughee Populations by Military Service	25

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
XIV	Furlough Outcome by General Offense Category	26
XV	Furlough Outcome by Specific Offense	28
XVI	Furlough Outcome by Minimum Sentence	29
XVII	Furlough Outcome by Race	30
XVIII	Furlough Outcome by Age	31
XIX	Furlough Outcome by Marital Status	32
XX	Furlough Outcome by Military Service Discharge	33

APPENDIX

<u>Table No.</u>		
1	Individual Furlough Experience by Offense	36
2	Individual Furlough Experience by Minimum Sentence	38
3	Individual Furlough Experience by Race	39
4	Individual Furlough Experience by Age	40
5	Individual Furlough Experience by Marital Status	41
6	Individual Furlough Experience by Military Service Discharge	42

I. SUMMARY OF FURLOUGH LEGISLATION  
AND DEPARTMENTAL FURLOUGH POLICY

A. Legislative Authorization of the Furlough Program

The furlough program for inmates of Massachusetts Correctional facilities was authorized by Section 90A of the Correctional Reform Act (Chapter 777) which became effective on October 15, 1972. Specifically the law permitted the Commissioner of Correction to "extend the limits of the place of confinement of a committed offender at any state correctional facility by authorizing such committed offender under prescribed conditions to be away from such correctional facility but within the commonwealth for a specified period of time. . . ". Further provisions of this law include: (1) Residents may be released on furlough no more than 14 days in the course of a year and (2) inmates serving a life sentence or a sentence for a violation or attempt to violate certain specified violent crimes (e.g. attempts to murder, manslaughter, armed robbery, kidnapping, etc.) may be furloughed only upon recommendation of the Superintendent and the approval of the Commissioner.

Section 90A also delineated the purposes for which a furlough may be granted. These purposes are:

- a) to attend the funeral of a relative;
- b) to visit a critically ill relative;
- c) to obtain medical, psychiatric, psychological or other social services when adequate services are not available at the facility and cannot be obtained by temporary placement in a hospital;
- d) to contact prospective employers;
- e) to secure a suitable residence for use upon release on parole or discharge;
- f) for any other reason consistent with reintegration of a committed offender into the community.

In order to supplement the legislative provisions of the Correctional Reform Act, the Department of Correction implemented a set of rules and regulations which govern the administration of the furlough program. This directive, which recently underwent significant revision, created three distinct types of furloughs, established basic eligibility requirements, instituted a thorough screening process, authorized procedures for certification of residents for furlough, provided for the automatic notification of proper law

enforcement officials, and formulated definitive policies for the handling of residents who abuse the furlough privileges. The key aspects of these guidelines are cited below.

B. Types of Furloughs

Three types of furloughs were established by D.O. 4670.1A: (1) a "Furlough" is an extension of the limits of the place of confinement for a trustworthy resident at a state correctional facility; (2) an "Emergency Furlough" is a furlough that is approved for a resident where a serious and generally personal situation exists which requires the resident's immediate presence in the community; and (3) an "Emergency Furlough Under Escort" is an emergency furlough granted to a resident who requires close supervision while in the community. A resident on emergency furlough under escort must be accompanied by two correctional officers or one correctional officer and a correctional staff member who possesses a commission as a special state police officer.

C. Eligibility

A resident is eligible for 14 furlough days during the course of his furlough year, which commences from the date of final approval of an initial furlough and ends twelve months later. A furlough day consists of twenty-four hours or forty-eight half hour periods.

The revised furlough rules and regulations which became effective May 28, 1975, established minimum eligibility restrictions which require residents to serve a certain portion of their sentences prior to becoming eligible for furlough. Specifically, the following conditions will apply:

"A resident shall be eligible to be considered for a furlough under the following conditions:

- (a) a resident serving life sentences for murder in the first degree or a sentence of death shall be required to serve five years from the effective date of sentence, except for emergency furloughs under escort;
- (c) a resident who upon initial commitment to the care and custody of the department is within eighteen months of



parole eligibility shall be eligible immediately for a furlough;

- (d) all other residents shall be required to serve twenty percent of the time between the effective date of sentence and their parole eligibility date, but no more than three years, except for emergency furloughs under escort."

These eligibility restrictions, which became effective May 28, 1975, will apply to all residents confined at state correctional facilities with the following exception: Residents who have successfully completed a furlough without an escort or residents whose applications for initial furloughs without escort have received final approval, as of May 28, 1975, will continue to be eligible for furloughs.

Furloughs under escort may be granted to residents immediately following commitment. Residents classified as sexual dangerous persons pursuant to G.L. c. 123A are ineligible for furloughs by statute.

#### D. Screening Process

A resident who desires a furlough must complete an application form in which he must state the intended purpose of his furlough, the amount of time requested, dates of departure and return, destination, transportation arrangements and projected expenses. This application is submitted to the furlough coordinator who determines the resident's eligibility for furlough, confirms the details of the resident's plans in the community, and forwards the application to the furlough committee. The furlough coordinator is also responsible for all administrative details and record-keeping relative to the furlough program.

The furlough committee is a classification committee of no less than three and no more than five institutional staff members designated by the superintendent, at least one of whom shall be a correctional officer. It is the furlough committee's responsibility to evaluate the inmate's application, personally interview the applicant, and to inform, in writing, the superintendent and resident of the committee's recommendations and reasons for such recommendation.

It is the responsibility of the Superintendent to review all furlough applications, relevant material and the recommendations of

the furlough committee in order to determine whether to authorize or deny the furlough application. In the case of residents who are not "special offenders" the final authorization of furlough rests with the Superintendent. However, applications for furlough made by residents who are special offenders (i.e., those residents serving sentences for specified violent crimes against the person). The Superintendent may reject the resident's application or recommend to the Commissioner that such furlough be granted.

When a furlough application reaches the Commissioner's office, it is carefully reviewed and researched by the Commissioner's Furlough Office, which consists of a Furlough Coordinator and several case workers. A recommendation is made by the Furlough Office and the application then receives final consideration and authorization by the Commissioner.

The new rules and regulations established a process of certification whereby the Commissioner (in the case of a special offender) may authorize a resident to receive furloughs for one furlough year or a part of the furlough year without obtaining the additional approval of the highest approving authority (Commissioner or Superintendent) for each individual furlough during the period of certification. At present, all furlough applications approved by the furlough committee must also be reviewed by the Superintendent and in the case of special offenders, by the Commissioner. The certification process simplifies the review procedure for residents who have established a solid history of furlough success. However, residents receiving furlough certification will continue to be required to submit applications for each separate furlough and have it reviewed by the furlough committee, and in the case of special offenders, also by the Superintendent. The Commissioner or Superintendent, whomever is the highest certifying authority, may, at any time, revoke the certification of a resident.

#### E. Notification of Police

Administrative regulations require the written notification of the Chief of Police of the community the furlougee designates as his destination and the Department of Public Safety, at least one week prior to the release of a resident on furlough. District

Attorneys or other law enforcement agencies may be notified upon their written request.

F. Abuse of Furlough Privilege

If a resident fails to return to the state correctional facility at the designated time, a disciplinary report will automatically be filed for being "out of place", regardless of prior notification to the facility that such resident will be returning late. Failure of a resident to return within two hours of the designated time is declared an escape, again regardless of prior notification, and appropriate law enforcement officials are notified immediately of the escape.

## II. SUMMARY OF FURLOUGH STATISTICS

### A. Overall Furlough Statistics

The furlough program for residents of Massachusetts correctional facilities has been extensively implemented since the program commenced operation in November of 1972. Between that time and October 25, 1975, the Massachusetts Department of Correction has allowed a total of 23,202 furloughs. In 344 cases, residents have failed to return to their respective facility within two hours of their prescribed time of return, resulting in a 1.5% "escape from furlough" rate. (see Table I).

### B. Definition of Escape

It is very important to note that the Department of Correction furlough statistics define an "escape from furlough" in accordance with Departmental Order 4670.1A entitled "Furloughs - Rules and Regulations". According to Section 11.4 (c):

Failure of the resident to return to the state correctional facility within two hours of his designated time of return shall be considered an escape regardless of prior notification to the facility by the resident of his reasons for being late. The superintendent or his designee shall notify, forthwith, appropriate law enforcement officials of the escape".

### C. Voluntary Returns

As a result of the stringent adherence to this definition of an escape, furlough escape statistics frequently include residents who may more appropriately be classified as "late returns", i.e., they returned to their respective correctional facility voluntarily within a matter of hours of their having been placed on escape status. While returning late certainly constitutes a serious violation of the furlough privilege and will result in institutional disciplinary action, their inclusion in the escape statistics does serve to inflate the escape rate. In fact, over a fourth (27.9%, N=96) of the 344 reported escapes did in fact return within 24 hours to their respective facilities of their own volition. (see Table I). If these individuals were omitted

from the escape statistics, the adjusted escape rate would be 1.1%, which is significantly lower than the official rate of 1.5%.

#### D. Escapees at Large

The escapee at large statistics indicate that most furlough escapees (84.9%) have been returned to custody. (see Table I). As of October 25, 1975, 52 residents, or 15.2% of the total number of escapes, remained on escape status. The remaining individuals either returned voluntarily or were apprehended by law enforcement authorities.

#### E. Yearly Trends

If furlough statistics are analyzed on a yearly basis (see Table II), it can be seen that the furlough escape rate has been steadily declining since the inception of the program. In the first year of the program (11-6-72 through 11-5-73), the escape rate was 1.6%. During the second year (11-6-73 through 11-5-74), the escape rate fell to 1.5% and the rate declined even further to 1.3% in the third year (11-6-74 through 10-25-75). It should also be noted that in the second year of the program's operation, the total number of furloughs granted rose by 17%. The Department of Correction therefore has successfully managed to increase the number of furloughs with a corresponding decrease in the number of escapes.

#### F. Furlough Statistics by Individuals Furloughed

An individual analysis of individual escape statistics for the first three years of the program's operation, specifically November 6, 1972 through October 25, 1975, produced three major conclusions. First, the number of individuals receiving furloughs during the course of a year is in a process of decline; secondly, the yearly individual escape rate has fluctuated widely during these three years and thirdly, the escape rate has been consistently inflated by a large number of late returns, particularly at the pre-release center.

The most striking finding of this analysis is the significant decrease in the number of individuals who have been selected for

TABLE I

NUMBER OF FURLONGHS AND ESCAPES SINCE THE INCEPTION OF THE PROGRAM THROUGH OCTOBER 25, 1975

Massachusetts Correctional Facility	No. of Furloughs Granted	Total No. of Residents De- clared Escapees	Overall Furlough Escape Rate	No. Declared Escape, but returned vol- untarily with- in 24 hours	No. Declared Escape, but did not return vol- untarily with- in 24 hours	Furlough Es- cape Rate (ex- cluding volun- tarily returns within 24 hours)	No. of Escapes at Large on 10/25/77
Bridgewater	729	22	3.0	2	20	2.7	2
Concord	3,012	109	3.6	35	74	2.5	7
Framingham	1,996	22	1.1	11	11	.6	5
Norfolk	4,623	85	1.8	3	82	1.8	29
Walpole	708	15	2.1	1	14	2.0	6
Shirley							
Pre-Release	1,783	26	1.5	17	9	.5	0
Doston							
Pre-Release	4,901	19	0.4	12	7	.1	0
Charlotte House	204	2	1.0	2	0	0.0	0
Rox Community							
Rehab. Center	467	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0
Monroe	919	14	1.5	4	10	1.1	1
Plymouth	1,308	17	1.3	5	12	.9	2
Warwick	676	11	1.6	3	8	1.2	0
Coolidge House	898	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0
RDC	6	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0
Temporary							
Housing	1	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0
Brooke House	844	1	0.1	0	1	.1	0
699 House	91	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0
Norfolk							
Pre-Release	26	1	3.8	1	0	0.0	0
TOTAL	23,202	344	1.5	96	248	1.1	52

TABLE II.

YEARLY FURLOUGH STATISTICS

Massachusetts Correctional Facility	F I R S T Y E A R			S E C O N D Y E A R			T H I R D Y E A R			T O T A L		
	11/6/72 to 11/5/73			11/6/73 to 11/5/74			11/6/74 to 10/25/75			Furloughs Escapes Rate		
	Furloughs	Escapes	Rate	Furloughs	Escapes	Rate	Furloughs	Escapes	Rate	Furloughs	Escapes	Rate
Bridgewater	228	11	4.8	292	5	1.7	209	6	2.9	729	22	3.0
Concord	1,205	37	3.1	936	36	3.8	871	36	4.1	3,012	109	3.6
Framingham	510	8	1.6	733	5	.7	753	9	1.2	1,996	22	1.1
Norfolk	1,876	31	1.7	1,570	39	2.5	1,177	15	1.3	4,623	85	1.8
Walpole	131	4	3.1	286	7	2.4	291	4	1.4	708	15	2.1
Shirley												
Pre-Release	631	5	0.8	524	12	2.3	628	9	1.4	1,783	26	1.5
Boston												
Pre-Release	1,164	5	0.4	2,004	9	0.4	1,733	5	.3	4,901	19	0.4
Charlotte House	22	0	0.0	100	1	1.0	82	1	1.2	204	2	1.0
Rox. Community												
Rehab. Center	0	0	0.0	107	0	0.0	370	0	0.0	477	0	0.0
Monroe	340	3	0.9	331	6	1.8	248	5	2.0	919	14	1.5
Plymouth	443	5	1.1	442	2	0.5	423	10	2.4	1,308	17	1.3
Warwick	353	4	1.1	242	6	2.5	81	1	1.2	676	11	1.6
Brocke House	0	0	0.0	358	1	0.3	486	0	0.0	844	1	0.1
Coolidge House	0	0	0.0	394	0	0.0	504	0	0.0	898	0	0.0
Temporary												
Housing	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	1	0	0.0	1	0	0.0
RDC	0	0	0.0	4	0	0.0	2	0	0.0	6	0	0.0
699 House	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	91	0	0.0	91	0	0.0
Norfolk												
Pre-Release	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	26	1	3.8	26	1	3.8
TOTAL	6,903	113	1.6	8,323	129	1.5	7,976	102	1.3	23,202	344	1.5

furlough privileges. During the first year of the program's operation 1,910 individual residents were released on furlough whereas in the third year, only 1,482 residents were allowed furloughs, a reduction of 22%. (see Table III).

This restriction of the furlough program however is not uniform throughout the correctional system. What has occurred in fact, is a curbing of the furlough program at the major correctional institutions (i.e. MCI's Walpole, Concord, Norfolk, Bridgewater, Framingham and Forestry paralleled by an expansion of the program at the pre-release centers and contract facilities. The number of individuals furloughed at the Massachusetts Correctional Institutions had dropped from 1,966<sup>1</sup> in the first year to only 1,346 in the third year, representing a decline of 32%. Conversely, the number of individuals furloughed from a pre-release setting have nearly doubled, climbing from 264 individuals to a high of 496, an increase of 88%.

An analysis of escape rates by individuals furloughed for the first three years of the program was also conducted. During the first year of the program, the overall individual escape rate was 5.9%. It rose to 7.5% during the second year but dropped to 6.8% in the third year. (see Table III).

If a dichotomization by type of facility is made, two distinct trends emerge. For residents furloughed from MCI's, the escape rate has steadily risen from 5.2% in the first year to 6.5% in the third. The corresponding escape rates for the pre-release population show greater variation with a high of 5.4% in the second year and a low of 3.2% in the third.

The third major point of interest in this analysis concerns the fact that residents who are declared escapees but who return voluntarily to their respective facility within 24 hours of their designated time of return, account for an increasingly large proportion of the reported escapes. In the first year of the program's operation, 18 or 16% of the total escapes, were classified as "late returns" compared to 43 or 43% of the total in the third year.

<sup>1</sup> The total figures for the statistics in this table are greater than in Table III because these statistics duplicate residents who were furloughed from more than one facility.



In Table IV, it can be observed that the incidence of late returns is a growing phenomenon for both MCI's and pre-release facilities. In the third year, over a third of the escapes from MCI's were late returns and at the pre-release centers nearly all (88%) of the residents reported as escapes did in fact return to the facility within 24 hours of the due time of return.

G. Proportion of Population Furloughed

Although the furlough program has been implemented to some degree in every state correctional facility, the extent of its implementation varies widely in respect to the security level of the facility. In Table V data regarding the average proportion of the total population that was furloughed in the course of a month for 1975 is presented. As can be seen the maximum and medium security correctional institutions (MCI's Walpole, Concord, Bridgewater and Norfolk) furlough only a small proportion of their resident populations each month. In contrast, the state operated community correctional facilities<sup>2</sup> and privately contracted pre-release houses, furlough substantial proportions of their populations in conjunction with its comprehensive re-integrative programming. For example, MCI-Walpole furloughs less than five percent of its total population during the course of an average month whereas Boston State Pre-Release Center furloughs nearly 90 percent of its resident population monthly.

2 A "community correctional facility" is a state correctional facility where residents are confined, who are within 18 months of parole eligibility and are participating in education, training or employment programs, or who are confined in a state correctional facility which has minimum security status. (D.O. 4670.1A)

TABLE III

YEARLY FURLOUGH ESCAPE RATES BY INDIVIDUAL

Y E A R	Number of Individuals Furloughed	Number of Individuals Declared Escape	Overall Furlough Escape Rate	No. Declared Escape but returned vol- untarily with- in 24 hours		No. Declared Escape, but did not return vol- untarily within 24 hours	Escape Rate (Excludes voluntary re- turns within 24 hours)
				N	% of Total Escapes		
First Year (11-6-72 to 11-5-73)	1,910	113	5.9%	18	(15.9%)	95	5.0%
Second Year (11-6-73 to 11-5-74)	1,704	128	7.5%	34	(26.6%)	94	5.5%
Third Year (11-6-74 to 10-25-75) *	1,482	101	6.8%	43	(42.6%)	58	3.9%

\*Data is not given through November 5, 1975 because the November furlough data had not been incorporated in the CAPMIS data base at the time of this writing.

INDIVIDUAL FURLOUGH ESCAPE RATE BY TYPE OF FACILITY

Y E A R	Number of Individuals Furloughed	Number of Individuals Declared Escape	Overall Furlough Escape Rate	No. Declared Escape but returned vol- untarily with- in 24 hours		No. Declared Escape, but did not return vol- untarily within 24 hours	Adjusted Escape Rate (Excludes voluntary re- turns within 24 hours)
				N	% of Total		
<u>FIRST YEAR</u>							
MCI	1,966	103	5.2%	17	(17%)	86	4.4%
Pre-Release	264	10	3.8%	1	(10%)	9	3.4%
<u>SECOND YEAR</u>							
MCI	1,681	105	6.2%	17	(16%)	88	5.2%
Pre-Release	425	23	5.4%	17	(74%)	6	1.4%
<u>THIRD YEAR</u>							
MCI	1,346	87	6.5%	30	(34%)	57	4.2%
Pre-Release	496	16	3.2%	14	(88%)	2	0.4%

TABLE V

NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS FURLOUGHED MONTHLY

DURING 1975 IN PROPORTION TO TOTAL POPULATION

BY INSTITUTIONAL SECURITY LEVEL

	<u>AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION</u>	<u>AVERAGE NUMBER FURLOUGHED PER MONTH</u>	<u>PROPORTION TO POPULATION</u>
<u>MAXIMUM SECURITY</u>			
MCI Walpole	537	25	4.7%
MCI Concord	407	60	14.7%
MCI Bridgewater	128	15	11.7%
Reception Diagnostic Center	42	0	0.0%
<u>MEDIUM SECURITY</u>			
MCI Norfolk	619	91	14.7%
<u>STATE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL FACILITY</u>			
Boston State Pre-Release	48	43	89.6%
Norfolk Pre-Release	17	12	70.6%
Shirley Pre-Release	56	43	76.8%
MCI Framingham	132	53	40.2%
MCI Warwick	11	6	54.5%
MCI Monroe	37	19	51.4%
MCI Plymouth	46	31	67.4%
<u>PRIVATE CONTRACT FACILITY</u>			
Charlotte House	9	5	55.6%
Brooke House	10	9	90.0%
Coolidge House	11	11	100.0%
Roxbury CRC	16	10	62.5%
699 House	7	6	85.7%
Temporary Housing Project/BSP	16	11	68.8%
Drug Treatment Program	11	0	0.0%
<u>TOTAL</u>	2,160	450	20.8%

#### H. Data on Furloughs Granted to Lifers

From November, 1972 through April, 1975 a total of 1,788 furloughs were granted to offenders serving life sentences. Seventeen residents were declared escapees, resulting in an escape rate of 1.0%, a figure which compares favorably to the overall escape rate of 1.5%. Two hundred and seven individual lifers have been granted furloughs since November 1972. (see Table VI).

Several other interesting facts regarding lifer participation in the furlough program are worth mentioning. First, the lifer population as a whole is less likely to receive a furlough compared to the total population. Of all the individuals furloughed, only 8.0% were lifers despite the fact that lifers comprise 14.3% of the total population.<sup>3</sup>

In addition, lifers who are permitted furloughs do not receive them as frequently as other residents. The average number of days between furloughs for lifers was 50.1 days compared to 35.0 days for all residents furloughed.

#### First Degree Murder

Between November 1972 through April 1974, a total of 560 furloughs were granted to 67 individuals serving life sentence for First Degree Murder. This represents an average of 8.4 furloughs per individual. Among the furloughs, there were seven escapes, for an escape rate of 1.3% and a success rate of 98.7%. This compares favorably to the overall escape rate of 1.5%.

#### Second Degree Murder

A total of 1,171 furloughs were granted to 133 individual second degree lifers, for an average of 8.8 furloughs per individual. Among the 1,171 furloughs there were ten escapes for an escape rate of .9% and a success rate of 99.1%. Again this compares favorably to the overall escape rate of 1.5%.

<sup>3</sup> This difference is statistically significant at the .001 chance level. ( $\chi^2 = 48.4806$ )

TABLE VI

FURLOUGH EXPERIENCE FOR RESIDENTS

SERVING LIFE SENTENCES

NOVEMBER, 1972 TO APRIL, 1975

	<u>Number of Furloughs</u>	<u>Number of Escapes</u>	<u>Escape Rate</u>
First Degree Murder	560	7	1.3%
Second Degree Murder	1,171	10	.9%
Other Lifers	47	0	0.0%
Total # Furloughs to Lifers	1,788	17	1.0%
Total # Furloughs to Non-Lifers	17,221	277	1.6%
Total # Furloughs to All Residents	18,999	294	1.5%

I. Disposition of Prosecuted Escape Cases

An investigation of the legal outcome of the 344 cases of escape from furlough revealed that a large percentage (38.4%) of the escape cases were never prosecuted. (see Table VII). When criminal prosecution of the escape charge did occur, the most frequent disposition (15.4%) was a new sentence to be served from and after the resident's current sentence. Generally the new sentence consisted of a one to three month stint at a county House of Correction. Probation was also a fairly common disposition (9.9%) as was the receipt of a concurrent sentence (6.4%). Twenty-four (7.0%) cases are still pending before the courts, eleven (3.2%) offenders are currently incarcerated in out-of-state correctional facilities, and 52 (15.1%) of the escapees remain at large.

TABLE VII

LEGAL OUTCOME OF ESCAPE FROM FURLOUGH CASES\*

<u>Disposition</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Not Prosecuted	132	(38.4)
Not Guilty	3	(.9)
Probation	34	(9.9)
New Sentence, Concurrent	22	(6.4)
New Sentence, From and After	53	(15.4)
Sentence Suspended	3	(.9)
Case Pending	24	(7.0)
In Custody, Out-of-State Facilities	11	(3.2)
Resident Deceased	1	(.3)
At-Large	52	(15.1)
Disposition Unknown	7	(2.0)
TOTAL	344	(100.0)

\*As of October 25, 1975

### III. DESCRIPTION OF INDIVIDUALS FURLOUGHED

#### Research Questions

In order to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the furlough program, an intensive analysis was undertaken of the individuals who have received furloughs. The analysis sought to answer a variety of questions, specifically: What are the characteristics of the residents who have received furloughs? Do residents who receive furloughs differ from the total resident population? Do residents who are declared escapes possess any distinguishing characteristics as compared to residents who are furloughed successfully? Do residents who manage to return from furlough on time but who encounter other difficulties associated with furlough differ from the successful residents in any significant manner?

#### Methodology

In order to respond to these queries, data was obtained regarding selected characteristics of the total universe of individuals who were furloughed during the first two and one half years of the program's operation (November, 1972 through April, 1975). Two distinct analyses were conducted. First, the general population was compared to the total universe of furloughed residents in order to discover any possible differences between the two populations that could indicate a selection differential. The general population comparison group was derived by combining the 1974 and 1975 releasee populations with the total population on January 1, 1975. In this manner, all residents who were incarcerated between January 1, 1973 and January 1, 1975, are included providing a close approximation of the entire population since the inception of the furlough program.

Secondly, a predictive attribute analysis of furlough outcome was performed via a trichometization of the furlougee population into three groups: (1) residents whose furloughs were all concluded without problem (2) residents who failed to return within two hours of their required time of return and were consequently



declared escapes; and (3) residents who returned at the proper time but encountered other difficulties associated with furlough, such as a new arrest, attempting to smuggle contraband into the facility or returning under the influence of alcohol or drugs. The two problem groups (i.e., escapes and difficulties) were in turn matched with the success group with the aim of developing a prediction table which would classify residents into high and low escape and difficulty risk groups.

#### Data Elements

Six variables were available for this analysis: primary offense, minimum sentence, age, race, marital status and military service experience.

#### Population

The total number of individuals who received furloughs from the inception of the program in November of 1972 through the end of April, 1975 was 3,080 residents. A total of 18,999 furloughs were granted to these individuals for a mean of 6.2 furloughs per individual furloughed.

Of these 3,080 individuals, 2,656 residents have had consistently successful furloughs, in terms of returning to the facility at the proper time and not encountering other difficulties associated with furlough.

The number of individuals who were declared escapees during this time period was 287. Since there was a total of 294 reported escapes, seven individuals were declared escapes from furlough on two occasions.

In addition, there were 137 residents who had difficulties while on furlough despite returning on schedule.

The complete statistical data utilized for the following analysis is located in Tables I to VI in the Appendix. In the succeeding narrative, only those findings which merit statistical significance, as determined by the Chi Square test of significance, will be discussed. A systematic relationship will be assumed if

the Chi Square test yields a probability of .05 or less, i.e., the relationship could occur by chance less than five times out of 100.

A. Comparison of Resident Population with Furloughed Population

Offense —

The comparison between the resident population and residents who have received furloughs in terms of general offense category (see Table VIII) resulted in two highly significant findings. Specifically:

- offenders serving sentences for sex-related offenses are significantly underrepresented in the population of furloughed residents. Whereas sex offenders constituted 8.3% of the resident population, only 5.9% of the furloughees were incarcerated for a sex offense.
- offenders serving sentences for narcotic offenses are significantly overrepresented in the population of furloughed residents. Although 15.2% of the furloughees were narcotic offenders, only 11.9% of the resident population fell into this offense category.

TABLE VIII

RESIDENT AND FURLOUGHEE POPULATIONS  
BY OFFENSE CATEGORY

<u>Offense Category</u>	<u>Resident Population</u>		<u>Furloughee Population</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Offenses vs. Persons	2,434	(58.3)	1,623	(57.4)
Offenses vs. Property	732	(17.5)	518	(18.3)
Sex Offenses	346	(8.3)	167	(5.9)
Narcotic Offenses	496	(11.9)	430	(15.2)
Other Offenses	166	(4.0)	91	(3.2)
<u>TOTAL</u>	4,174	(100.0)	2,829	(100.0)

### Minimum Sentence

Two significant relationships emerge from the comparison between the resident and furloughed populations in regard to minimum sentence:

- Residents serving indeterminate sentence (i.e., no set minimum) are significantly underrepresented (40.8%) among the furloughees compared to the general resident population (44.1%).
- Conversely, the furloughed population has significantly more residents serving a minimum sentence of between one to nine years.

TABLE IX

RESIDENT AND FURLOUGHEE POPULATIONS  
BY MINIMUM SENTENCE

<u>Minimum Sentence</u>	<u>Resident Population</u>		<u>Furloughee Population</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Indeterminate	1,826	(44.1)	1,059	(40.8)
1 - 9 years	1,511	(36.5)	1,047	(40.3)
10 years or more	801	(19.4)	492	(18.9)
<u>TOTAL</u>	4,138	(100.0)	2,598	(100.0)

### Race

No differences exist between the general resident population and furloughed residents in terms of race (see Table X). The proportion of residents in each major racial group (i.e., black, white and other) are virtually identical.

TABLE X

RESIDENT AND FURLONGHEE POPULATIONS  
BY RACE

<u>Race</u>	<u>Resident Population</u>		<u>Furlonghee Population</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
White	2,730	(65.6)	1,829	(6.5)
Black	1,398	(33.6)	963	(34.2)
Other	35	(0.8)	21	(0.8)
<u>TOTAL</u>	4,163	(100.0)	2,813	(100.0)

Age

The comparison of the total resident population and the total furlough population in terms of age, revealed that younger offenders (16 - 19 years) were slightly overrepresented in the furloughee population. (see Table XI).

TABLE XI

RESIDENT AND FURLOUGHEE POPULATIONS  
BY AGE

<u>Age</u>	<u>Resident Population</u>		<u>Furloughee Population</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
16 - 19 Years	251	(5.9)	239	(8.5)
20 - 24 Years	1,390	(32.9)	961	(34.1)
25 - 29 Years	1,087	(25.7)	701	(24.9)
30 - 39 Years	999	(23.6)	630	(22.4)
40 - 49 Years	319	(7.6)	205	(7.3)
50 Years or More	179	(4.2)	81	(2.9)
<u>TOTAL</u>	4,225	(100.0)	2,817	(100.0)

Marital Status

An interesting relationship exists between marital status and having been furloughed with single residents being underrepresented in the furloughed population. Conversely, married residents are overrepresented among the furloughees. (see Table XII).

TABLE XII

RESIDENT AND FURLOUGHEE POPULATIONS  
BY MARITAL STATUS

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Resident Population</u>		<u>Furloughee Population</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Single	2,389	(57.7)	1,517	(54.2)
Married	1,026	(24.8)	770	(27.5)
Divorced	431	(10.4)	301	(10.8)
Widowed	67	(1.6)	48	(1.7)
Separated	227	(5.5)	163	(5.8)
<u>TOTAL</u>	4,140	(100.0)	2,799	(100.0)

Military Service

No significant relationship appeared between military service background and participation in the furlough program. (see Table XIII).

TABLE XIII

RESIDENT AND FURLONGHEE POPULATIONS  
BY MILITARY SERVICE

<u>Military Service</u>	<u>Resident Population</u>		<u>Furlonghee Population</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
No Military Service	3,105	(75.6)	2,097	(75.6)
Military Service	1,000	(24.4)	678	(24.4)
<u>TOTAL</u>	4,105	(100.0)	2,775	(100.0)

B. Comparison of Individuals Furloughed Successfully with  
Individuals Declared Escapees

A comparison was also conducted of residents who have been furloughed successfully and residents whose furlough history included a furlough which resulted in an escape (i.e., not having returned within two hours of the designated time of return).

General Offense Category

In terms of general offense category, it was found that offenders who are incarcerated for sex-related offenses were significantly more inclined to have established consistently successful furlough histories. (see Table XIV). Although sex-offenders comprised 6.4% of the furlough success population, only 2.6% of the escapee group were sex-offenders. It should also be noted that, as discussed previously, sex-offenders are less apt to receive furloughs compared to other offense categories. However, they are the only general offense group which has demonstrated a significantly positive furlough experience.

TABLE XIV

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY  
GENERAL OFFENSE CATEGORY

<u>Offense Category</u>	<u>Individuals Furloughed Successfully</u>		<u>Individuals Declared Escape</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Offenses vs. Persons	1,383	(56.9)	163	(60.8)
Offenses vs. Property	448	(18.4)	50	(18.7)
Sex Offenses	156	(6.4)	7	(2.6)
Other Offenses	444	(18.3)	48	17.9)
<u>TOTAL</u>	2,431	(100.0)	268	(100.0)

Specific Offense

An analysis of the success and escape groups in reference to the specific offense for which they are incarcerated (see Table XV) resulted in the following significant findings:



- Residents whose major committing offense was Unarmed Robbery were significantly overrepresented in the escapee population. Although residents incarcerated for this offense comprised 5.1% of the successfully furloughed population, the comparable proportion of the escapee population was 9.0%.
- Residents whose primary offense was larceny of a motor vehicle were also overrepresented in the escapee population.
- Residents who were incarcerated on a charge of rape have demonstrated significantly more successful furlough experience. Although rapists account for 3.4% of the successful furloughees, the same offense category comprised only 1.1% of the escapee population.
- Narcotic offenders also have exhibited significantly more successful furlough histories with 15.1% successful compared to only 13.4% having escaped.
- Residents who are serving sentences for the offense of escape from a correctional institution were also disproportionately overrepresented in the escapee category.

TABLE XV

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY SPECIFIC OFFENSE

	<u>Individuals Furloughed</u>		<u>Individuals</u>	
	<u>Successfully</u>		<u>Declared Escape</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>OFFENSES VS. PERSON</u>				
Murder 1	59	(2.4)	7	(2.6)
Murder 2	119	(4.9)	10	(3.7)
Manslaughter	166	(6.8)	16	(6.0)
Armed Robbery	684	(28.1)	74	(27.6)
Unarmed Robbery	125	(5.1)	24	(9.0)
Other	230	(9.5)	32	(11.9)
<u>OFFENSES VS. PROPERTY</u>				
Burglary	252	(10.4)	18	(6.7)
Larceny of Motor Vehicle	22	(.9)	6	(2.2)
Other	174	(7.2)	26	(9.7)
<u>SEX OFFENSES</u>				
Rape	82	(3.4)	3	(1.1)
Other	74	(3.0)	4	(1.5)
<u>OTHER OFFENSES</u>				
Narcotic	368	(15.1)	36	(13.4)
Escape	15	(.6)	5	(1.9)
Other	61	(2.5)	7	(2.6)
<u>TOTAL</u>	2,431	(100.0)	268	(100.0)

### Minimum Sentence

An analysis of the relationship between minimum sentence and furlough outcome indicated that two categories of minimum sentence indicated a significant tendency of being declared as escape. First, residents who were serving indeterminate minimum sentences comprised 40.4% of the success group and 44.2% of the escape group. (see Table XVI).

Second, residents whose minimum sentence was ten to fourteen years revealed a greater propensity to escaping also with 10.4% of escapes falling in this category compared to only 6.2% of the successfully furloughed.

It should be noted that residents who are serving life sentences are more highly represented in the success population than in the escape group. This difference however is not statistically significant.

TABLE XVI

#### FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY MINIMUM SENTENCE

<u>Minimum Sentence</u>	<u>Individuals Furloughed</u>		<u>Individuals</u>	
	<u>Successfully</u>		<u>Declared Escape</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Indeterminate	899	(40.4)	110	(44.2)
1-3 Years	284	(12.8)	24	(9.6)
4-6 Years	412	(18.5)	40	(16.1)
7-9 Years	212	(9.5)	21	(8.4)
10-14 Years	139	(6.2)	26	(10.4)
15-19 Years	69	(3.1)	8	(3.2)
20-29 Years	18	(.8)	3	(1.2)
30 or More	7	(.3)	0	(0.0)
Life	185	(8.3)	17	(6.8)
TOTAL	2,225	(100.0)	249	(100.0)

Race

In the course of this analysis, it was found that race is a significant factor as regards furlough outcome with black residents displaying a significantly greater inclination towards escaping from furlough. (See Table XVII). The proportion of black residents in the successful population is 33.3% whereas blacks comprised 42.7% of the escapee group.

TABLE XVII

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY RACE

<u>Race</u>	<u>Individuals</u> <u>Furloughed Successfully</u>		<u>Individuals</u> <u>Declared Escape</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
White	1,594	(65.9)	151	(56.6)
Black	805	(33.3)	114	(42.7)
Other	19	(.8)	2	(.7)
<u>TOTAL</u>	2,418	(100.0)	267	(100.0)

Age

In assessing the possibility of a relationship between age and success on furlough it was discovered that younger offenders (i.e., less than thirty years old) were significantly more inclined to escape from furlough. Of the success population, 67.2% were under thirty years of age compared to 73.1% of the escape group. (see Table XVIII).

TABLE XVIII

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY AGE

<u>Age</u>	<u>Individuals</u>		<u>Individuals</u>	
	<u>Furloughed</u>	<u>Successfully</u>	<u>Declared</u>	<u>Escape</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
16-19 Years	203	(8.4)	26	(9.7)
20-24 Years	818	(33.8)	101	(37.7)
25-29 Years	605	(25.0)	69	(25.7)
30-34 Years	365	(15.1)	38	(14.2)
35-39 Years	178	(7.4)	16	(6.0)
40-44 Years	109	(4.5)	9	(3.4)
45-49 Years	68	(2.8)	7	(2.6)
50 or Older	73	(3.0)	2	(.7)
<u>TOTAL</u>	2,419	(100.0)	268	(100.0)

Marital Status

No statistical significant difference between the successful and escape furloughed populations with regard to marital status was found. (see Table XIX).

TABLE XIX

FURLOUGH OUTCOME BY MARITAL STATUS

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Individuals Furloughed</u>		<u>Individuals</u>	
	<u>Successfully</u>		<u>Declared Escape</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Single	1,315	(54.6)	139	(52.5)
Married	658	(27.3)	78	(29.4)
Divorced	249	(10.3)	34	(12.8)
Widowed	46	(1.9)	0	(0.0)
Separated	139	(5.8)	14	(5.3)
<u>TOTAL</u>	2,407	(100.0)	265	(100.0)

An analysis of furlough outcome with the variable regarding military service discharge indicated no significant relationship. (see Table XX).

TABLE XX  
FURLOUGH OUTCOME  
BY MILITARY SERVICE DISCHARGE

<u>Type of Discharge</u>	<u>Individuals Furloughed</u>		<u>Individuals</u>	
	<u>Successfully</u>		<u>Declared Escape</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
No Military Service	1,795	(75.2)	210	(80.5)
Honorable Discharge	103	(4.3)	5	(1.9)
Dishonorable Discharge	7	(.3)	0	(0.0)
Bad Conduct/General				
Discharge	47	(2.0)	5	(1.9)
Discharge Unknown	435	(18.2)	41	(15.7)
<u>TOTAL</u>	2,387	(100.0)	261	(100.0)

C. Comparison of Individuals Furloughed Successfully with  
Individuals Experiencing Difficulty on Furlough

Returning at the proper time however is not the sole criterion of success on furlough. Occasionally a resident has abused the furlough privilege by returning to the facility under the influence of alcohol or narcotic drugs, attempting to smuggle contraband into the facility or by committing a new offense while on furlough. Of the 3,080 furloughed residents in this study, 137 were cited for a breach of the furlough privilege for one of the above-specified reasons.

This group of residents was also compared to the successful population to determine if any significant differences between the two groups exist. No statistically significant differences however could be found in regard and to the six variables considered: offense, minimum sentence, age, race, marital status and military service. It is highly possible that the number of cases was too small to allow any tendencies to emerge statistically. For the actual results of this comparison, see Tables I to VI in the Appendix.



APPENDIX

TABLE 1

Individual Furlough Experience By Offense

	Individuals Furloughed Successfully		Individuals Declared Escape		Individuals Experiencing Difficulty on Escape		Total Residents Furloughed	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>OFFENSES vs. PERSON</u>								
Murder 1	59	(2.4)	7	(2.6)	1	(.8)	67	(2.4)
Murder 2	119	(4.9)	10	(3.7)	4	(3.1)	133	(4.7)
Manslaughter	166	(6.8)	16	(6.0)	11	(8.5)	193	(6.8)
Armed Robbery	684	(28.1)	74	(27.6)	33	(25.4)	791	(28.0)
Other	355	(14.6)	56	(20.9)	28	(21.5)	439	(15.5)
TOTAL	1,383	(56.9)	163	(60.8)	77	(59.2)	1,623	(57.4)
<u>OFFENSES vs. PROPERTY</u>								
Burglary	252	(10.4)	18	(6.7)	10	(7.7)	280	(9.9)
Larceny of Motor Vehicle	22	(.9)	6	(2.2)	2	(1.5)	30	(1.1)
Other	174	(7.2)	26	(9.7)	8	(6.2)	208	(7.4)
TOTAL	448	(18.4)	50	(18.7)	20	(15.4)	518	(18.3)
<u>SEX OFFENSES</u>								
Rape	82	(3.4)	3	(1.1)	3	(2.3)	88	(3.1)
Other	74	(3.0)	4	(1.5)	1	(.8)	79	(2.8)
TOTAL	156	(6.4)	7	(2.6)	4	(3.1)	167	(5.9)

TABLE 1

Individual Furlough Experience By Offense  
(continued)

	Individuals Furloughed Successfully		Individuals Declared Escape		Individuals Experiencing Difficulty on Escape		Total Residents Furloughed	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
OTHER OFFENSES	368	(15.1)	36	(13.4)	26	(20.0)	430	(15.2)
	15	(.6)	5	(1.9)	1	(.8)	21	(.7)
	61	(2.5)	7	(2.6)	2	(1.5)	70	(2.5)
TOTAL	444	(18.3)	48	(17.9)	29	(22.3)	521	(18.4)
GRAND TOTAL	2,431	(100.0)	268	(100.0)	130	(100.0)	2,829	(100.0)
Data Unavailable	225		19		7		251	
TOTAL # Cases	2,656		287		137		3,080	

TABLE 2

Individual Furlough Experience By Minimum Sentence

<u>Minimum Sentence</u>	<u>Individuals Furloughed Successfully</u>		<u>Individuals Declared Escape</u>		<u>Individuals Experiencing Difficulty on Escape</u>		<u>Total Residents Furloughed</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Indeterminate	899	(40.4)	110	(44.2)	50	(40.3)	1,059	(40.8)
1-3 years	284	(12.8)	24	(9.6)	12	(9.7)	320	(12.3)
4-6 years	412	(18.5)	40	(16.1)	33	(26.6)	485	(18.7)
7-9 years	212	(9.5)	21	(8.4)	9	(7.3)	242	(9.3)
10-14 years	139	(6.2)	26	(10.4)	11	(8.9)	176	(6.8)
15-19 years	69	(3.1)	8	(3.2)	3	(2.4)	80	(3.1)
20-29 years	18	(.8)	3	(1.2)	1	(.8)	22	(.8)
30 or more	7	(.3)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	7	(.3)
Life	182	(8.2)	17	(6.8)	5	(4.0)	204	(7.9)
Death	3	(.1)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	3	(.1)
TOTAL	2,225	(100.0)	249	(100.0)	124	(100.0)	2,598	(100.0)
Data Unavailable	431		38		13		482	
TOTAL # CASES	2,656		287		137		3,080	

TABLE 3

Individual Furlough Experience by Race

<u>Race</u>	<u>Individuals Furloughed Successfully</u>		<u>Individuals Declared Escape</u>		<u>Individuals Experiencing Difficulty in Furlough</u>		<u>Total Residents Furloughed</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White								
Black	1,594	(65.9)	151	(56.6)	84	(65.6)	1,829	(65.0)
Other	805	(33.3)	114	(42.7)	44	(34.4)	963	(34.2)
TOTAL	19	(.8)	2	(.7)	0	(00.0)	21	(.8)
Data Unavailable	2,418	(100.0)	267	(100.0)	128	(100.0)	2,813	(100.0)
TOTAL # CASES	238		20		9		267	
	2,656		287		137		3,080	

TABLE 4

Individual Furlough Experience By Age\*

Age	Individuals Furloughed Successfully		Individuals Declared Escape		Individuals Experiencing Difficulty on Furlough		Total Residents Furloughed	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
16-19 Years	203	(8.4)	26	(9.7)	10	(7.7)	239	(8.5)
20-24 Years	818	(33.8)	101	(37.7)	42	(32.3)	961	(34.1)
25-29 Years	605	(25.0)	69	(25.7)	27	(20.8)	701	(24.9)
30-34 Years	365	(15.1)	38	(14.2)	25	(19.2)	428	(15.2)
35-39 Years	178	(7.4)	16	(6.0)	8	(6.2)	202	(7.2)
40-44 Years	109	(4.5)	9	(3.4)	9	(6.9)	127	(4.5)
45-49 Years	68	(2.8)	7	(2.6)	3	(2.3)	78	(2.8)
50 or Older	73	(3.0)	2	(.7)	6	(4.6)	81	(2.9)
TOTAL	2,419	(100.0)	268	(100.0)	130	(100.0)	2,817	(100.0)
Data Unavailable	237		19		7		263	
TOTAL # CASES	2,656		287		137		3,080	

\*Age was calculated for residents as of January 1, 1974.

TABLE 5

Individual Furlough Experience by Marital Status

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Individuals Furloughed Successfully</u>		<u>Individuals Declared Escape</u>		<u>Individuals Experiencing Difficulty in Furlough</u>		<u>Total Residents Furloughed</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single	1,315	(54.6)	139	(52.5)	63	(49.6)	1,517	(54.2)
Married	658	(27.3)	78	(29.4)	34	(26.8)	770	(27.5)
Divorced	249	(10.3)	34	(12.8)	18	(14.2)	301	(10.8)
Widowed	46	(1.9)	0	(0.0)	2	(1.6)	48	(1.7)
Separated	139	(5.8)	14	(5.3)	10	(7.9)	163	(5.8)
TOTAL	2,407	(100.0)	265	(100.0)	127	(100.0)	2,799	(100.0)
Data Unavailable	249		22		10		281	
TOTAL # CASES	2,656		287		137		3,080	

TABLE 6

Individual Furlough Experience By Military Service Discharge

<u>Type of Discharge</u>	<u>Individuals Furloughed Successfully</u>		<u>Individuals Declared Escape</u>		<u>Individuals Experiencing Difficulty in Furlough</u>		<u>Total Residents Furloughed</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Military Service	1,795	(75.2)	210	(80.5)	92	(72.4)	2,097	(75.6)
Honorable Discharge	103	(4.3)	5	(1.9)	4	(3.1)	112	(4. )
Dishonorable Discharge	7	(.3)	0	(0.0)	0	(0.0)	7	(.3)
Bad Conduct/ General Discharge	47	(2.0)	5	(1.9)	5	(3.9)	57	(2.1)
Discharge Unknown	435	(18.2)	41	(15.7)	26	(20.5)	502	(18.1)
TOTAL	2,387	(100.0)	261	(100.0)	127	(100.0)	2,775	(100.0)
Data Unavailable	269		26		10		305	
<u>TOTAL # CASES</u>	2,656		287		137		3,080	