

ASCA Survey

Follow-up Questions and Certification of Survey Numbers

Respondent's name: Minnesota Department of Corrections
Shari Burt, Communications Director

CERTIFICATION OF SURVEY NUMBERS

I have reviewed the numbers on the attached spreadsheet submitted by my state in the ASCA survey and certify them as accurate.

Please (X)

Thank you for completing the Pew/ASCA survey on state recidivism rates. These follow-up questions focus on four pairs of survey questions related to admissions, releases, and returns to prison from 1999 and 2004. Our goal is to ensure transparency about how the numbers were collected, what they are measuring and how they may vary to one degree or another, since differences in each state's laws, sentencing practices, and tracking systems make it likely the data will not perfectly align.

We hope to 'jog' your memory about these differences that now go back 11 years or more. Please simply **type in your answers at the end of each question** using as much space as needed. Include in your answers any other factors that explain how your state's data may have changed from 1999 to 2004 or is different or unique in any way. Also, especially if parole and probation are managed separately from corrections in your state, we strongly suggest collaboration with those officials to ensure all changes and differences are reported.

The more precise and thorough your response, the better use we can make of these data in the final report. We anticipate releasing our analysis in the late autumn and are convinced that you will find the insight your responses provide as to the national landscape of recidivism very helpful in your daily work.

Please e-mail completed surveys to jppprevost@yahoo.com by August 15th.

- A) Between 1999 and 2004, were there any changes in criminal or sentencing law that had any impact on your state's correctional population, admissions, or releases? For example, many states have made significant changes in laws regarding sex offenders. One state passed a law banning misdemeanants from its prison system. Other changes could have affected where inmates were housed for counting purposes. Perhaps your state experienced smaller changes whose individual effects may have been minor but collectively had significant impact on your prison population. **Yes, see attached document that reflects some of the changes that have occurred in Minnesota.**
- B) Survey Questions 3 and 4: *Number of sentenced inmates released to the community during CY 1999 and CY 2004.*
- Was your reporting period a time-frame that was not Jan – Dec? **No**
- Are any of these offender groups included in your release totals:
1. Temporary releases (e.g. inmates furloughed). **No**
 2. Offenders considered inmates but released to 'home confinement' or other population reducing strategies. **Yes, work release and challenge incarceration (boot camp) program**
 3. Offenders who died while inmates **No**

4. Inmates paroled to detainers (Ex: sent to another state to answer charges or to serve a prison sentence for a previous conviction) **No**
5. Inmates released more than one time during the year and; therefore, counted more than one time. **Yes**

Did your release totals represent:

1. First releases from prison **No**
2. All releases from prison **Yes**

C) Survey Questions 5 and 6: *Recidivism - Number of sentenced inmates released from the DOC during CY 1999 and 2004 who returned to the DOC prison system for a new conviction or technical violation within 36 months of release. Count an offender who is returned to prison for a new conviction and a technical violation as a new conviction.*

- i. Please explain how you determined the time period for counting releases returned to prison within three years. Was it:
 1. Three years from the day of release **Yes**
 2. Anytime during the third year after release (i.e. 1999 releases who returned during 2002) **No**
 3. Some other way (please explain) **No**
- ii. Were you able to calculate the three year return rate for both the 1999 and 2004 release groups using the same time period method? **Yes**
- iii. Were you able to count as new conviction returns to prison, those whose return reason was legally technical violation(s) but who also had a new conviction? **Yes**
- iv. If any offenders were returned to prison within three years for technical violations, and then, while incarcerated were later convicted of a crime that occurred prior to the return to prison, did you count these offenders as technical violations or new convictions? **New convictions.**
- v. Do you have the capacity to count offenders returned to prison on technical violations but who had pending charges? **No**

D) Between 1999 and 2004, did your state implement any new strategies for reducing the return to prison rate or add significant capacity to these strategies that has had an effect on your return to prison rate. For example, these could include: brief stays in jail or longer stays that do not require revocation; increasing availability of treatment programs; adoption of screening instruments that lessened the likelihood of revocation; changes in how supervision was conducted; etc. **No**

E) Survey Questions 7 and 8: *Community Supervision: Number of sentenced inmates released during CY 1999 and 2004 under some type of community supervision and without some type of community supervision.*

Between 1999 and 2004 were there any changes in types of offenders counted among those supervised in the community (new crimes created, crimes elevated from misdemeanor to felony, law changes abolishing parole for certain crimes, etc.)? **Yes**

Between 1999 and 2004 were there any changes in the length of time to serve before release that made a difference in the total number released to community supervision or released to no supervision (this would include measures to reduce prison population)? **Yes**

Does the total released to community supervision include releases to unsupervised probation or parole supervision? **No**

- F) Survey questions 9 and 10: *Crime type among sentenced inmates released to the community during 1999 and 2004.*

Were you able to separate your 1999 and 2004 releases such that the same crimes were included under the same type for both years? **No, we did not have the necessary data available for 1999 releases and did not report for that year.**

Did your data system allow you to separate your 1999 and 2004 releases such that the crimes in each type match those indicated in the ASCA definitions list? **Yes, only for 2004 releases.**

Final questions related to your data and how it compares nationally

- G) Your state was among those that saw a 30% or greater increase in prison releases to the community between 1999 and 2004. Looking back, does this increase reflect any change in policy or practice that should be noted in the survey report? **No**
- H) Your state was among those that had a recidivism rate at least 5% higher than the national average for inmates released in 2004. We are most interested in your thoughts on what factors may have contributed to this difference. **The higher rate of recidivism could be due to any number of reasons, but there are two, in particular, that come to mind. First, compared to other states, Minnesota may have more accurate recidivism data. For example, improvements made in the past in how we track recidivism have inevitably led to increases in recidivism detected. Second, Minnesota has historically reserved prison beds for only the most serious offenders (severe offense and/or long criminal history). Although Minnesota is generally in the middle of the pack, relative to the other 49 states, with respect to population size and crime rate, it has the second lowest incarceration rate. The offenders released from Minnesota prisons may recidivate at a higher rate because, compared to prisoners from other states, they have a greater risk of recidivism. Ultimately, however, it is difficult to provide an adequate response to this question without knowing what measure of recidivism is referred to above. Is it any return to prison, reconviction, reincarceration for a new offense, an average of these? This piece of information would have been helpful.**
- I) Your state was among those that had a 30% or greater increase in the percent of inmates released to supervision between 1999 and 2004. Looking back, does this increase reflect any change in policy or practice that should be noted in the survey report? **No**

E-mail completed surveys to jppprevost@yahoo.com by August 15th

ASCA and the Pew Public Safety Performance Project gratefully
thank you for your time and expertise.

ASCA/Pew State Recidivism and Prison Profiles Study

[Exit this survey >>](#)

Recidivism will be computed as the number of sentenced inmates released from the DOC to the community during the calendar year (CY) who returned to the DOC prison system for a new conviction or technical violation of the community supervision requirements within 36 months of release divided by the number of sentenced inmates released to the community during that calendar year. Data for two calendar year release cohorts (2004 and 1999) are collected to provide information on recidivism and release trends.

3. Number of Sentenced Inmates Released to the community during CY 1999?

Males:

Females:

4. Number of Sentenced Inmates Released to the community during CY 2004?

Males:

Females:

5. Recidivism -- Number of sentenced inmates released from the DOC during CY 1999 who returned to the DOC prison system for a new conviction or technical violation within 36 months of release. Count an offender who is returned to prison for a new conviction and a technical violation as a new conviction.

Males Returned for New Conviction within 36 months:

Males Returned for Technical Violation within 36 months:

Females Returned for New Conviction within 36 months:

Females Returned for Technical Violation within 36 months:

6. Recidivism -- Number of sentenced inmates released from the DOC during CY 2004 who returned to the DOC prison system for a new conviction or technical violation within 36 months of release. Count an offender who is returned to prison for a new conviction and a technical violation as a new conviction.

Males Returned for New Conviction within 36 months:

Males Returned for Technical Violation within 36 months:

Females Returned for New Conviction within 36 months:

Females Returned for Technical Violation within 36 months:

7. Community Supervision: Number of sentenced inmates released during CY 1999 under some type of community supervision and number without some type of community supervision.

Males released without

8. Community Supervision: Number of sentenced inmates released during CY 2004 under some type of community supervision and number without some type of community supervision.

Males released without

Q6 Recidivism among CY 2004 Release Cohort

Type of Return - Males and Females									
State	New Crime-Return		Technical-Return		Total Return		Released		N
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
MN	1,853	35.7%	1,325	25.5%	3,178	61.2%			5,189
Total Rpt	1,853	35.7%	1,325	25.5%	3,178	61.2%			5,189
2004 N	1	1	1	1	1	1			1