

C5700.8 M478v 1985 c. 3



Analysis of Oklahoma Department of Corrections
Victim-Offender Mediation Program
March 1984 - August 1985

November 8, 1985

Bud Clark
Steven Davis, Ph.D.
Planning and Research



A15306495043

OKLAHOMA PUBLICATIONS CLEARINGHOUSE
OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF LIBRARIES
200 N. E. 13th ST.
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Planning and Research Staff

Bill Chown, Statistical Analyst II
*Bud Clark, Statistical Analyst III
*Steve Davis, Administrator of Planning and Research
Bob Faulkner, Senior Correctional Case Manager
Ellen Fox, Statistical Analyst II
Claudia Johnson, Senior Correctional Case Manager
Thadd Johnson, Senior Correctional Case Manager
Ruthie Steele, Secretary I
Sue Tunnicliff, Data Entry Operator II

*Denotes authors of the report

INTRODUCTION

In 1983 the Oklahoma State Legislature passed the Non-violent Intermediate Offender and 120 Day Judicial Review acts that required the Oklahoma Department of Corrections to develop treatment plans for specified categories of offenders. One aspect of the Specialized Offender Accountability Plans developed in response to the measures was a victim-offender mediation program. The present report summarizes the results of mediated case plans occurring since implementation of the mediation process in March 1984 through August 1985. Data for the study included information for each Probation and Parole District plus the Lexington Assessment and Reception Center. Only those plans to which the court had responded are included in this summary. That is, plans still pending were not considered.

It is important to note that on NIO plans the Department of Corrections must revise the plan in some cases to be acceptable to the court. For purposes of the present report, mediated plans for NIOs which were not approved by the court as detailed in the initial victim-offender mediation agreement are considered rejected plans. For 120 Day JRs, the plan is either approved or rejected; no revisions are made. Therefore, those plans accepted by the court reflect the initial mediated agreement and are categorized as approved.

METHOD

POPULATION

The population for the study consisted of 365 completed mediation plans, of which 206 (56.44 percent) were for 120 Day JRs and 159 (44.56 percent) for NIOs. As mentioned, only those plans upon which the court had ruled were included in the study.

PROCEDURE

Data for the study was submitted by the mediation facilitators to Dave Mesaros, Mediation Coordinator for the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. The following variables were requested by the Planning and Research unit to be collected for the study: (a) Department of Corrections number; (b) offender name; (c) offense name, which was converted into a Department of Corrections offense code; (d) case type, NIO or 120 Day JR; (e) initial sentence imposed by the court; (f) mediated sentence; and (g) the court's action on the mediated plan.

The majority of the initial court assigned sentences for NIOs were either indeterminate periods of incarceration or probation. To obtain an estimate of time sentenced, all indeterminate sentences were assigned the modal sentence for the crime specified. The modal values, which represent the most frequent sentence imposed by the courts for the specified crime, were provided by Planning and Research through summarization of the sentence file maintained on the Department of Corrections Data General equipment. The same modal value was assigned whether the initial sentence was incarceration or probation. That is, the modal value for incarceration was assigned to indeterminate probation sentences. Also, for some NIO cases, the mediated plan specified that the sentence be imposed until age 22. Since date of birth and effective date on the sentence were not provided, it was necessary to estimate the time involved. For cases where the mediated sentence was until age 22, the sentence was estimated to be 24 months.

Estimates were also made for the cost of the initial sentence. Information from the Oklahoma Department of Corrections Finance and Accounting Unit revealed that the average cost per year to house an inmate within an institution during Fiscal Year 1985 was \$11,428.19; to house an inmate in community treatment centers, the yearly cost was \$8,999.51; and to provide supervision on probation for the year, the cost was \$513.88. For the incarceration cost estimates, the community treatment center cost for Fiscal Year 1985 was utilized and converted into a cost per month, which was \$749.96. The cost of community treatment centers was selected as a conservative estimate. For probation costs, the monthly figure employed was \$42.82.

To estimate the cost per mediated plan, the annual salary for mediation facilitators was used. Mediation facilitators are Administrative Officers I with an annual salary, according to the Human Resources Unit, of \$22,488. There are seven facilitators in the system, so the estimated cost of mediation for a year was set at \$157,416. Since the time period for the study includes five months beyond one year, the additional months raised the estimated cost of mediation to \$216,006. This estimate does ignore the cost of the SOAP case managers and the clerical services in preparing the plan, and other costs attached to the process, such as transportation of certain offenders. However, using the facilitators' salaries as the basis for the cost estimate does incorporate the primary staff members devoted full-time to mediation. In addition, there are several plans in progress and plans pending before the court that are not included in the present study. The time spent by facilitators on plans not completed should, at least in part, offset the costs for other factors and make the facilitators' salaries a more representative cost estimate.

RESULTS

The frequency and percentage distributions of mediated cases by offense categories are presented in Table I for 120 Day JRs and in Table II for NIOs. The most frequently mediated offense categories on 120 Day JRs were Driving While Intoxicated (DUI) and Burglary II. District II had the smallest percentage of Burglary II cases and the largest percentage DUI cases. LARC submitted plans on the violent offenses (manslaughter, rape, robbery and assault). Plans submitted on NIOs were primarily on larceny (25.7 percent) and burglary offenses (40.2 percent), with only 3.1 percent for DUI.

When compared to all 120 Day JR plans filed in the study, offense categories on the approved plans (Table III) included a lower percentage of DUI offenses (17.7 percent) and a higher percentage of Burglary II crimes. Percentages for the approved NIO plans (Table IV) closely resembled the distribution among all NIO plans (Table II). Information concerning the sentence outcomes on the plans follows, first for 120 Day JRs then for NIOs.

120 Day JR

A total of 206 mediated plans for 120 day JRs had been reviewed by the courts, of which 45 (21.8 percent) were approved (Table V). Percent approved ranged from a low of 2.0 percent in District II to a high of 36.0 percent for the Lexington Assessment and Reception Center. Note that plans from Lexington were submitted to several judicial districts while plans from District II were submitted to one judicial district. The initial court imposed sentences for the 45 approved plans included 33 (73.3 percent) that involved incarceration only and 12 (26.7 percent) with an initial sentence of incarceration and probation periods.

The average initial sentence for the 33 with incarceration only was 33 months. After the mediated plan was approved, the average incarcerated time decreased to 17 months and probation was assigned for an average of 16 months. For the twelve cases with initial sentences that included both incarceration and probation, the average time to be incarcerated was 20 months and the average probation time was 35 months. The approved mediated plans decreased the incarcerated period to an average of 7 months and increased the average probation period to 49 months. Overall the average initial incarceration time assigned by the courts was 29 months and the average initial probation period was 35 months. The average sentence following approval of the mediated plan included 14 months incarceration and 24 months probation.

Applying the cost estimates presented earlier, the average sentence imposed by the court would have cost the taxpayers \$21,748.84 for incarceration and \$1,498.70 for probation. However, the cost of the average mediated sentence approved was \$10,499.44 for incarceration and \$1,027.68 for probation. The overall cost savings over the court imposed sentences was \$527,418.90. Additional cost for the mediation process included 54.6 percent of the facilitators' salaries (206 of the 365 plans prepared during the time period), which was \$179,939.28. Subtracted from the cost savings leaves a net savings of \$347,749.62 for the mediated 120 Day JR plans.

NIO

The percentage of approved plans for mediated NIO cases was substantially better than for the 120 Day JR plans. For NIOs, 89.3 percent of the 159 plans reviewed by the courts were approved (Table VI). Of the approved plans, 86 (60.56 percent) received initial sentences of incarceration only, 54 (38.03 percent) were sentenced to probation, and two (1.41 percent) received both incarceration and probation time. Average sentence for those with initial sentences of incarceration only was 29 months in prison; after approval of the mediated plan, the incarcerated portion was reduced to an average of 8 months with an average of 21 months on probation. As mentioned earlier, court imposed sentences for NIOs were generally indeterminate sentences and were converted to determinate sentences by assigning the modal sentence of current inmates with the same offense.

On those plans where the initial sentence was probation only, the average court imposed sentence was 32 months, which was reduced to an average of 24 months by the approved mediated plan. For the two plans where the court imposed incarceration and probation, the initial average sentence was 21 months incarcerated and 45 months probation. The averages following approval of the mediated plans were six months incarcerated and 48 months probation.

Overall, the average incarceration period imposed initially by the court was 29 months and the average probation period was 32 months. Approval of mediated plans reduced incarceration to eight months and probation to 22 months. Total cost for the initial court imposed sentence was \$23,119.08 while mediation reduced the total cost to \$6,941.72, for a cost difference of \$16,177.36 per case. With 142 approved plans, the overall cost savings was \$2,297,185.12. NIO plans comprised 43.56 percent of the total mediated plans reviewed by the court, so the cost of mediation on NIO plans was estimated to be \$94,092.84. Net savings as a result of mediated NIO plans was \$2,203,092.28.

DISCUSSION

The mediation process appears to have provided a substantial cost savings to the taxpayers of Oklahoma through the reduction in time to be served in prison, with an estimated total cost savings of \$2,550,841.90. However, before one may state that the mediation program was cost-effective, it would be necessary to compare the results of the present study with the results of non-mediated SOAP plans for the same time period. It seems probable that the process for mediated plans may cost more than the process for non-mediated plans, as additional staff and travel are required by the mediation process. If the mediation process is more expensive than the non-mediated SOAP process, then mediation must have a higher approval rate with the courts to be labeled cost-effective. The data necessary for a comparison of mediated versus non-mediated SOAP plans is not currently available.

Additionally, the present study does not assess whether or not mediation is cost-effective in the long term. To assess the long term cost-effectiveness of mediation, it would be necessary to track the individuals with approved mediated plans to determine whether they remain crime free for the length of their sentence. For individuals that return to crime during their probation period, additional costs would be involved for the victim and for additional criminal justice involvement, both of which would reduce the net cost savings.

The resulting cost savings on the initial sentence could be increased if a larger percentage of the 120 Day JR plans were approved. The legislation requires that the Department of Corrections submit a plan after the court has specified a sentence. Discussions with employees involved in the mediation program indicated that the courts are reluctant to approve 120 Day JR plans since the offender has already appeared before the court and completed the due process. Certainly with only 1 of 49 plans receiving approval in District II and only 45 of 206 plans statewide being approved, the law is not being implemented effectively. Modification of the legislation or development of a different implementation process would serve to improve the cost-effectiveness of the mediation program and the SOAP process in general. Pre-sentence plan development is one approach to this problem that promises to improve results. For instance, in July and August 1985, 23 pre-sentence mediations were conducted and 22 of those agreements (96 percent) were subsequently approved by the sentencing court.

Estimates employed in the present study could be improved to generate better cost estimates and better estimates of sentence length on indeterminate sentences. For the cost estimates, a time study of the SOAP case managers while preparing plans would allow the case manager cost to be included in the estimated cost of mediation. The same is true for the clerical services involved. Estimates of sentence length may be improved by more closely matching the crime and demographic characteristics of the individuals with receptions into the inmate and probation systems.

852660

TABLE I
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION ON CRIME BY DISTRICT FOR MEDIATED 120 DAY JR CASES

	I		II		III		IV		V		VI		LARC		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
BURGLARY I	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4
BURGLARY II	12	36.3	6	12.2	4	36.3	6	33.3	6	20.6	3	7.3	6	24.0	43	20.8
LARCENY	5	15.1	1	2.0	1	9.0	3	16.6	1	3.4	3	7.3	2	8.0	16	7.7
BOGUS CHECK	1	3.0	0	0.0	1	9.0	2	11.1	1	3.4	1	2.4	0	0.0	6	2.9
FORGERY	0	0.0	2	4.0	1	9.0	0	0.0	4	13.7	2	4.8	2	8.0	11	5.3
FRAUD	0	0.0	3	6.1	0	0.0	1	5.5	0	0.0	1	2.4	0	0.0	5	2.4
EMBEZZLEMENT	3	9.0	2	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.9	2	4.8	0	0.0	9	4.3
UNLV	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.0	2	11.1	0	0.0	1	2.4	0	0.0	4	1.9
DUI	5	15.1	31	63.2	2	18.1	3	16.6	11	37.9	20	48.7	3	12.0	75	36.4
POSS. OB. DRUGS	2	6.0	2	4.0	1	9.0	0	0.0	1	3.4	5	12.2	1	4.0	12	5.8
DIST. DRUGS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.0	2	0.9
ESCAPE	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
MISC. NON-VIOLENT	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	10.3	2	4.8	0	0.0	5	2.4
MANSLAUGHTER	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.0	2	0.9
RAPE	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.0	1	0.4
ROBBERY	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	16.0	4	1.9
ASSAULT	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.0	2	0.9
ARSON	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
SEX OFFENSE	3	9.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	1.9
WEAPONS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
MISC. VIOLENT	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
UNKNOWN	2	6.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.5	0	0.0	1	2.4	0	0.0	4	1.9
TOTAL	33	100.0	49	100.0	11	100.0	18	100.0	29	100.0	41	100.0	25	100.0	206	100.0

TABLE II

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION ON CRIME BY DISTRICT FOR MEDIATED NIO CASES

	I		II		III		IV		V		VI		LARC		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
BURGLARY I	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
BURGLARY II	8	40.0	9	33.3	12	46.1	14	42.4	13	41.9	5	50.0	3	25.0	64	40.2
LARCENY	8	40.0	8	29.6	9	34.6	7	21.2	4	12.9	3	30.0	2	16.6	41	25.7
BOGUS CHECK	1	5.0	2	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.8
FORGERY	0	0.0	1	3.7	3	11.5	2	6.0	5	16.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	6.9
FRAUD	1	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.0	2	6.4	1	10.0	0	0.0	5	3.1
EMBEZZLEMENT	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
UJMV	1	5.0	2	7.4	0	0.0	3	9.0	1	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	4.4
DUI	0	0.0	1	3.7	1	3.8	3	9.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.1
POSS. OBT. DRUGS	0	0.0	2	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	9.6	0	0.0	1	8.3	6	3.7
DIST. DRUGS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.2	0	0.0	2	16.6	3	1.8
ESCAPE	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	0.6
MISC. NON-VIOLENT	1	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	3	1.8
MANSLAUGHTER	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
RAPE	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ROBBERY	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ASSAULT	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ARSON	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	0.6
SEX OFFENSE	0	0.0	2	7.4	0	0.0	1	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	4	2.5
WEAPONS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.2
MISC. VIOLENT	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6
UNKNOWN	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	2	1.2
TOTAL	20	100.0	27	100.0	26	100.0	33	100.0	31	100.0	10	100.0	12	100.0	159	100.0

TABLE III
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION ON CRIME BY DISTRICT FOR MEDIATED 120 DAY JR CASES THAT WERE APPROVED

	I		II		III		IV		V		VI		LARC		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
BURGLARY I	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
BURGLARY II	4	44.4	0	0.0	3	50.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	9.0	3	33.3	12	26.6
LARCENY	1	11.1	0	0.0	1	16.6	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	4	8.8
BOGUS CHECK	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	40.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.8
FORGERY	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.6	0	0.0	2	50.0	1	9.0	0	0.0	4	8.8
FRAUD	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.4
EMBEZZLEMENT	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
LUMP	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.6	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	9.0	0	0.0	3	6.6
DUI	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	45.4	2	22.2	8	17.7
POSS. OBT. DRUGS	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.0	0	0.0	2	4.4
DIST. DRUGS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ESCAPE	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
MISC. NON-VIOLENT	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.0	0	0.0	1	2.2
MANSLAUGHTER	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	22.2	2	4.4
RAPE	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ROBBERY	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ASSAULT	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	11.1	1	2.2
ARSON	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
SEX OFFENSE	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
WEAPONS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
MISC. VIOLENT	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
UNKNOWN	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.0	0	0.0	2	4.4
TOTAL	9	100.0	1	100.0	6	100.0	5	100.0	4	100.0	11	100.0	9	100.0	45	100.0

TABLE IV
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION ON CRIME BY DISTRICT FOR MEDIATED MIO CASES THAT WERE APPROVED

	I		II		III		IV		V		VI		LARC		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
BURGLARY I	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
BURGLARY II	7	38.8	7	31.8	12	46.1	13	43.3	12	46.1	5	50.0	1	10.0	57	40.1
LARCENY	8	44.4	7	31.8	9	34.6	7	23.3	4	15.3	3	30.0	2	20.0	40	28.1
BOGUS CHECK	1	5.5	2	9.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.1
FORGERY	0	0.0	1	4.5	3	11.5	2	6.6	3	11.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	6.3
FRAUD	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.6	1	10.0	0	0.0	3	2.1
EMBEZZLEMENT	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
UNRV	1	5.5	1	4.5	0	0.0	3	10.0	1	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	4.2
DUI	0	0.0	1	4.5	1	3.8	3	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.5
POSS. OBT. DRUGS	0	0.0	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	11.5	0	0.0	1	10.0	5	3.5
DIST. DRUGS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.8	0	0.0	2	20.0	3	2.1
ESCAPE	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	1	0.7
MISC. NON-VIOLENT	1	5.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	3	2.1
MANSLAUGHTER	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
RAPE	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ROBBERY	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ASSAULT	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
ARSON	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	1	0.7
SEX OFFENSE	0	0.0	2	9.0	0	0.0	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	4	2.8
WEAPONS	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
MISC. VIOLENT	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
UNKNOWN	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	1	0.7
TOTAL	18	100.0	22	100.0	26	100.0	30	100.0	26	100.0	10	100.0	10	100.0	142	100.0

TABLE V
SUMMARY OF COURT RESPONSES TO MEDIATED 120 JR PLANS

	DISTRICT							TOTAL
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	LARC	
TOTAL MEDIATED*	33	49	11	18	29	41	25	206
1. NUMBER APPROVED	9	1	6	5	4	11	9	45
2. PERCENT APPROVED	27.2	2.0	54.5	27.7	13.7	26.8	36.0	21.8
SENTENCE CHANGES								
1. INITIAL SENT. INCARCERATION ONLY								
a. NUMBER	9	1	4	3	3	5	8	33
b. AVERAGE INITIAL SENTENCE	27	24	21	28	36	24	52	33
c. APPROVED SENT. AFTER MEDIATION								
1. INCARCERATION	9	5	6	5	5	13	44	17
2. PROBATION	17	19	17	23	31	11	7	16
2. INITIAL SENT. INCARCERATION AND PROBATION								
a. NUMBER	0	0	2	2	1	6	1	12
b. AVERAGE INITIAL SENTENCE								
1. INCARCERATION	0	0	21	30	36	13	24	20
2. PROBATION	0	0	33	54	24	35	12	35
c. APPROVED SENT. AFTER MEDIATION								
1. INCARCERATION	0	0	4	5	5	10	1	7
2. PROBATION	0	0	55	79	56	38	35	49
3. TOTAL								
a. NUMBER	9	1	6	5	4	11	9	45
b. AVERAGE INITIAL SENTENCE								
1. INCARCERATION	27	24	21	29	36	18	49	29
2. PROBATION	0	0	33	54	24	35	12	35
c. APPROVED SENT. AFTER MEDIATION								
1. INCARCERATION	9	5	6	5	5	11	39	14
2. PROBATION	17	19	30	45	37	26	10	24
COST ESTIMATES								
1. INITIAL								
a. INCAR.	20248.92	17999.04	15749.16	21748.84	26998.56	13499.28	36748.04	21748.84
b. PROBATION	0.00	0.00	1413.06	2312.28	1027.68	1498.70	513.84	1498.70
c. TOTAL COST	20248.92	17999.04	17162.22	24061.12	28026.24	14997.98	37261.88	23247.54
2. MEDIATED								
a. INCARCERATION	6749.64	3749.80	4499.76	3749.80	3749.80	8249.56	29248.44	10499.44
b. PROBATION	727.94	813.58	1284.60	1926.90	1584.34	1113.32	426.20	1027.68
c. TOTAL COST	7477.58	4563.38	5784.36	5676.70	5334.14	9362.88	29676.64	11527.12
3. COST DIFF.								
	12771.34	13435.66	11377.86	18384.42	22692.10	5635.10	7585.24	11720.42

TABLE VI
SUMMARY OF COURT RESPONSES TO MEDIATED NJO PLANS

	DISTRICT							TOTAL
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	LARC	
TOTAL MEDIATED*	20	27	26	33	31	10	12	159
1. NUMBER APPROVED	18	22	26	30	26	10	10	142
2. PERCENT APPROVED	90.0	81.4	100.0	90.9	83.8	100.0	83.3	89.3
SENTENCE CHANGES								
1. INITIAL SENT.								
INCARCERATION ONLY								
a. NUMBER	9	16	18	19	14	0	10	86
b. AVERAGE INITIAL SENTENCE	27	30	31	29	27	0	31	29
c. APPROVED SENT. AFTER MEDIATION								
1. INCARCERATION	3	13	6	6	5	0	15	8
2. PROBATION	28	15	21	71	24	0	18	21
2. INITIAL SENT. PROBATION ONLY								
a. NUMBER	9	6	7	11	11	10	0	54
b. AVERAGE INITIAL SENTENCE	28	26	41	33	33	30	0	32
c. APPROVED SENT. AFTER MEDIATION	21	23	24	23	26	26	0	24
3. INITIAL SENT. INCARCERATION AND PROBATION								
a. NUMBER	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
b. AVERAGE INITIAL SENTENCE								
1. INCARCERATION	0	0	18	0	24	0	0	21
2. PROBATION	0	0	54	0	36	0	0	45
c. APPROVED SENT. AFTER MEDIATION								
1. INCARCERATION	0	0	5	0	8	0	0	6
2. PROBATION	0	0	43	0	52	0	0	48
4. TOTAL								
a. NUMBER	18	22	26	30	26	10	10	142
b. AVERAGE INITIAL SENTENCE								
1. INCARCERATION	27	30	31	29	27	0	31	29
2. PROBATION	28	26	43	33	33	30	0	32
c. APPROVED SENT. AFTER MEDIATION								
1. INCARCERATION	3	13	6	6	5	0	15	8
2. PROBATION	25	17	23	54	26	26	18	22
C. COST ESTIMATES								
1. INITIAL								
a. INCAR.	20248.92	22498.80	23248.76	21748.84	20248.92	0.00	23248.76	21748.84
b. PROBATION	1198.96	1113.32	1841.26	1413.06	1413.06	1284.60	0.00	1370.24
c. TOTAL COST	21447.88	23612.12	25090.02	23161.90	21661.98	1284.60	23248.76	23119.08
2. MEDIATED								
a. INCARCERATION	2249.88	9749.48	4499.76	4499.76	3749.80	0.00	11249.40	5999.68
b. PROBATION	1070.50	727.94	984.86	2312.28	1113.32	1113.32	770.76	942.04
c. TOTAL COST	3320.38	10477.42	5484.62	6812.04	4863.12	1113.32	12020.16	6941.72
3. COST DIFF.								
	18127.50	13134.70	19605.40	16349.86	16796.86	171.28	11228.60	16177.36