Seventh Report of the Special Master

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Further Analysis of Length of Time Between Milestones

The data collected and used in the foregoing report permit an analysis of other lengths of stay between various milestones in the felony disposition process. Apart from the measurements discussed above, the available date required only simple manipulation to determine the following:

- Length of time between booking date and arraignment date;
- Length of time between booking date and disposition date;
- Length of time between booking date and sentencing date;
- Length of time between booking date and warrant to convey date;
- Length of time between booking date and transport date
- Length of time between indictment date and disposition date
- Length of time between indictment date and sentence date;
- Length of time between indictment date and warrant to convey date;
- Length of time between indictment date and transport date;
- Length of time between arraignment date and sentence date;
- Length of time between arraignment date and warrant to convey date;
- Length of time between arraignment date and transport date;
- Length of time between disposition date and warrant to convey date;

- Length of time between disposition date and transport date; and
- Length of time between sentence date and transport date.

This information, while perhaps not as useful as that in the body of this report, may be helpful to judges and other county officials in their evaluation of problems within the criminal justice system in Mahoning County. For this reason, this appendix presents these data, albeit in the shortened form of the following table. The full set of results is presented in Tables 7 – 21 in Appendix B.

Table-Appendix A

Points of Measurement	**Number of Cases[1]**	**Mean Number of Days + (Standard Deviation)**	**Median Number of Days + (Range)**	**Mean Length of Stay in Jail in Days + (Standard Deviation)**	**Median Length of Stay in Jail in Days + (Range)**
Booking Date to Arraignment Date	116	40.21 (30.32)	44 (0-229)	196.08 (162.44)	164.00 (10-785)
Booking Date to Disposition Date	138	180.61 (167.07)	122.50 (0-856)	192.45 (158.14)	164.00 (6-785)
Booking Date to Sentencing Date	156	215.38 (194.49)	161.50 (0-856)	180.01 (159.34)	153.00 (6-785)
Booking Date to Warrant to Convey Date	104	229.85 (195.10)	183.00 (6-862)	202.92 (173.57)	164.00 (10-785)
Booking Date to Transport Date	100	262.55 (185.27)	224.00 (25-892)	201.34 (165.72)	164.50 (10-785)
Indictment Date to Disposition Date	161	201.41 (182.42)	146.00 (0-981)	169.08 (156.41)	139 (6-785)
Indictment Date and Sentence Date	160	285.19 (200.42)	252.50 (27-1044)	171.51 (159.74)	140.50 (6-785)
Indictment Date and Warrant to Convey Date	109	329.17 (217.08)	284.00 (36-1057)	195.06 (173.34)	154.00 (8-785)
Indictment Date and Transport Date	104	358.61 (206.63)	319.00 (58-1092)	194.50 (166.07)	162.50 (8-785)
Arraignment Date and Sentence Date	164	262.34 (213.96)	210.50 (4-1183)	161.53 (156.01)	126.00 (6-785)
Arraignment Date and Warrant to Convey Date	102	312.93 (219.10)	271.00 (24-1044)	193.26 (172.86)	157.50 (8-785)

[1] This number reflects 187 days (the size of total sample) less the number of days ineligible for inclusion in a particular calculation.

Arraignment Date and Transport Date	98	338.61 (207.63)	301.50 (46-1079)	190.76 (165.13)	162.50 (8-785)
Disposition Date and Warrant to Convey Date	108	119.66 (159.50)	72 (1-738)	191.53 (170.20)	153.50 (8-785)
Disposition Date and Transport Date	104	144.16 (152.79)	104 (0-784)	189.11 (162.67)	157.50 (8-785)
Sentence Date to Transport Date	105	67.64 (98.27)	39 (0-729)	192.78 (166.21)	161.00 (8-785)

Appendix B – Tables

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Booking Date to Indictment Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 10	5	5	5
11 to 20	1	1	6
21 to 30	29	30	37
31 to 40	38	40	77
41 to 50	8	8	85
51 to 60	6	6	92
61 to 70	3	3	95
71 to 80	2	2	97
81 and above	3	3	100

*Note that the t*otal number of valid cases was 95. Because of a missing indictment date or because the booking date came after the indictment date, 92 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Indictment Date to Arraignment Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 10	8	5	5
11 to 20	128	80	84
21 to 30	6	4	88
31 to 40	4	2	91
41 to 50	3	2	92
51 to 60	4	2	95
61 to 70	2	1	96
71 and above	6	4	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 161. Because of a missing arraignment date, missing indictment date, or because the arraignment date came before the indictment date, 26 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Arraignment Date to Disposition Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 25	20	12	12
26 to 50	31	19	30
51 to 75	12	7	38
76 to 100	11	7	44
101 to 125	11	7	51
126 to 150	9	5	56
151 to 175	4	2	59
176 to 200	10	6	65
201 to 225	11	7	71
226 to 250	3	2	73
251 to 275	7	4	77
276 to 300	7	4	81
301 and above	31	19	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 167. Because of a missing disposition or arraignment date, 20 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Disposition Date to Sentencing Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 20	55	32	32
21 to 40	8	5	37
41 to 60	33	19	56
61 to 80	36	21	77
81 to 100	14	8	85
101 to 120	7	4	89
121 to 140	2	1	90
141 to 160	1	1	91
161 to 180	2	1	92
181 to 200	1	1	92
201 and above	13	8	100

Note that the *t*otal number of valid cases was 172. Because of a missing disposition or sentencing date, 15 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 5

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Sentence Date to Warrant to Convey Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 5	36	33	33
6 to 10	20	18	51
11 to 15	26	24	75
16 to 20	8	7	83
21 to 25	2	2	84
26 to 30	4	4	88
31 or above	13	12	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 109. Because of a missing sentence or warrant to convey date, 78 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 6

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Warrant to Convey Date to Transport Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 10	10	10	10
11 to 20	26	25	35
21 to 30	25	24	59
31 to 40	12	12	70
41 to 50	10	10	80
51 to 60	3	3	83
61 to 70	8	8	90
71 and above	10	10	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 104. Because of a missing warrant to convey or transport date, 83 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Booking Date to Arraignment Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 10	28	24	24
11 to 20	4	4	28
21 to 30	1	1	29
31 to 40	4	4	32
41 to 50	52	45	77
51 to 60	10	9	86
61 to 70	7	6	92
71 to 80	3	3	95
81 and above	6	5	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 115. Because of a missing arraignment date, 72 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Booking Date to Disposition Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 30	14	10	10
31 to 60	14	10	20
61 to 90	28	20	41
91 to 120	12	9	50
121 to 150	11	8	58
151 to 180	8	6	64
181 to 210	7	5	69
211 to 240	7	5	74
241 to 270	11	8	82
271 to 300	5	4	85
301 and above	20	15	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 137. Because of a missing disposition date, 50 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 9

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Booking Date to Sentence Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 30	22	14	14
31 to 60	8	5	19
61 to 90	16	10	29
91 to 120	14	9	38
121 to 150	13	8	47
151 to 180	14	9	56
181 to 210	9	6	62
211 to 240	8	5	67
241 to 270	6	4	70
271 to 300	6	4	74
301 to 330	12	8	82
331 to 360	0	0	82
361 to 390	5	3	85
391 and above	23	15	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 137. Because of a missing disposition date, 50 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 10

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Booking Date to Warrant to Convey Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 40	14	14	14
41 to 80	9	9	22
81 to 120	12	12	34
121 to 160	14	14	47
161 to 200	8	8	55
201 to 240	11	11	65
241 to 280	8	8	73
281 to 320	4	4	77
321 to 360	4	4	81
361 to 400	4	4	85
401 to 440	3	3	88
441 and above	13	12	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 104. Because of a missing warrant to convey date, 83 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 11

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Booking Date to Transport Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 50	9	9	9
51 to 100	10	10	19
101 to 150	10	10	29
151 to 200	16	16	46
201 to 250	11	11	57
251 to 300	14	14	71
301 to 350	4	4	75
351 to 400	5	5	80
401 to 450	7	7	87
451 to 500	3	3	90
501 and above	10	10	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 99. Because of a missing transport date, 88 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 12

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Indictment Date to Disposition Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 40	20	12	12
41 to 80	35	22	34
81 to 120	15	9	44
121 to 160	15	9	53
161 to 200	9	6	58
201 to 240	18	11	70
241 to 280	8	5	74
281 to 320	12	8	82
321 to 360	4	2	84
361 to 400	3	2	86
401 to 440	4	2	88
441 and above	18	11	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 161. Because of a missing indictment or disposition date, 26 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 13

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Indictment Date to Sentence Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 40	3	2	2
41 to 80	17	11	12
81 to 120	17	11	23
121 to 160	15	9	32
161 to 200	14	9	41
201 to 240	9	6	47
241 to 280	16	10	57
281 to 320	17	11	68
321 to 360	9	6	73
361 to 400	7	4	78
401 to 440	4	2	80
441 to 480	3	2	82
481 to 520	6	4	86
521 and above	23	14	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 160. Because of a missing indictment or sentence date, 27 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 14

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Indictment Date to Warrant to Convey Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 40	1	1	1
41 to 80	10	9	10
81 to 120	3	3	13
121 to 160	15	14	27
161 to 200	13	12	38
201 to 240	4	4	42
241 to 280	7	6	49
281 to 320	11	10	59
321 to 360	8	7	66
361 to 400	4	4	70
401 to 440	4	4	73
441 to 480	1	1	74
481 to 520	6	6	80
521 and above	22	20	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 109. Because of a missing indictment or warrant to convey date, 78 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 15

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Indictment Date to Transport Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 50	0	0	0
51 to 100	4	4	4
101 to 150	11	11	14
151 to 200	13	12	27
201 to 250	12	12	38
251 to 300	6	6	44
301 to 350	12	12	56
351 to 400	10	10	65
401 to 450	4	4	69
451 to 500	5	5	74
500 to 550	8	8	82
551 to 600	7	7	88
601 to 650	2	2	90
651 and above	10	10	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 104. Because of a missing indictment or transport date, 83 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 16

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Arraignment Date to Sentence Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 50	22	13	13
51 to 100	16	10	23
101 to 150	24	15	38
151 to 200	17	10	48
201 to 250	12	7	56
251 to 300	21	13	68
301 to 350	11	7	75
351 to 400	6	4	79
401 to 450	6	4	82
451 to 500	6	4	86
500 to 550	7	4	90
551 to 600	3	2	92
601 to 650	2	1	93
651 and above	11	7	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 164. Because of a missing arraignment or sentence date, 23 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 17

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Arraignment Date to Warrant to Convey Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 50	5	5	5
51 to 100	8	8	13
101 to 150	16	16	28
151 to 200	12	12	40
201 to 250	6	6	46
251 to 300	10	10	56
301 to 350	10	10	66
351 to 400	6	6	72
401 to 450	3	3	74
451 to 500	6	6	80
500 to 550	6	6	86
551 to 600	3	3	89
601 to 650	1	1	90
651 and above	10	10	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 102. Because of a missing arraignment or warrant to convey date, 85 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 18

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Arraignment Date to Transport Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 50	1	1	1
51 to 100	7	7	8
101 to 150	13	13	21
151 to 200	10	10	32
201 to 250	10	10	42
251 to 300	7	7	49
301 to 350	11	11	60
351 to 400	6	6	66
401 to 450	6	6	72
451 to 500	5	5	78
500 to 550	9	9	87
551 to 600	3	3	90
601 to 650	2	2	92
651 and above	8	8	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 98. Because of a missing arraignment or transport date, 89 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 19

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Disposition Date to Warrant to Convey Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 40	33	31	31
41 to 80	31	29	59
81 to 120	20	18	78
121 to 160	5	5	82
161 to 200	3	3	85
201 to 240	1	1	86
241 to 280	2	2	88
281 to 320	2	2	90
321 to 360	0	0	0
361 to 400	1	1	91
401 to 440	0	0	0
441 and above	10	9	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 108. Because of a missing disposition or warrant to convey date, 79 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 20

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Disposition Date to Transport Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 40	16	15	15
41 to 80	23	22	38
81 to 120	28	27	64
121 to 160	15	14	79
161 to 200	6	6	85
201 to 240	3	3	87
241 to 280	1	1	88
281 to 320	1	1	89
321 to 360	0	0	89
361 to 400	1	1	90
401 to 440	1	1	91
441 and above	9	9	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 104. Because of a missing disposition or transport date, 83 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 21

Frequency Distribution of the Length of Time From Sentence Date to Transport Date

Number of Days	Frequency (Number of Cases)	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 to 10	2	2	2
11 to 20	7	7	9
21 to 30	28	27	35
31 to 40	17	16	51
41 to 50	14	13	65
51 to 60	5	5	70
61 to 70	8	8	77
71 to 80	5	5	82
81 to 90	4	4	86
91 to 100	3	3	89
101 and above	12	11	100

Note that the total number of valid cases was 105. Because of a missing disposition or transport date, 82 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 22

Summary of the Findings

Points in Process	Time Period between Major Points in Case						Time Spent in Jail between Major Points in Case						
	n	Median	Mean	SD	Low	High	n	Median	Mean	SD	Low	High	Average cost
Booking to Indictment	95	33	37.79	24.30	0	217	95	161	192.06	154.47	10	785	$10,948
Indictment to Arraignment	161	14	21.65	30.90	5	251	161	135	168.34	158.74	6	785	$9,180
Arraignment to Disposition	167	122	186.38	195.82	0	1183	167	134	163.50	155.59	6	785	$9,112
Disposition to Sentencing	172	57	76.95	115.84	0	693	172	134.5	163.72	154.50	6	785	$9,146
Sentencing to Warrant to Convey	109	10	33.96	99.38	0	683	109	154	195.05	173.34	8	785	$10,472
Warrant to Convey to Transport	104	27	37.46	35.35	3	200	104	162.5	194.50	166.07	8	785	$11,050

Note that "n" refers to the number of valid cases from the randomly selected sub-sample of 187 felons who spent more than 10 days in jail in 2003. Median represents the 50th percentile where half of the case values fall below the median value and the other half of the case values fall above the median value. As noted earlier in this report, the median value often is used because it is not influenced by extreme values or outliers. "Mean" refers to the arithmetic mean. It is calculated by summing up all the values of the cases for the variable and dividing by the total number of cases. The arithmetic means is commonly referred to as the average or mean. "SD" refers to standard deviation. The standard deviation represents the average spread of values/scores of the cases around the mean. The standard deviation is used to tell how accurate the mean is as the typical value for all the cases on a particular measure. The smaller the standard deviation as compared to the mean, the more tightly the cases are around the mean are packed. This implies that the mean is a good representative single value for the data. The larger the standard deviation value as compared to the mean value, the more the scores are spread out from the mean. This implies that the mean may not be a good representative single value for the data and maybe influenced by extreme scores/values.