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Over the past three decades, as the United States has experienced explosive prison growth, women have been hard hit. Although women have the dubious distinction of being the fastest growing segment of the prison population, scant attention has been paid to their involvement in the criminal justice system. Indeed, even most official sources of criminal justice data do not distinguish between men and women in their analyses, leaving it only to speculation on whether there are any distinctions between the two groups that make a difference.

HARD HIT: The Growth in the Imprisonment of Women, 1977 – 2004 is the first study of its kind, analyzing the striking growth in the numbers of women in prison, state-by-state over nearly three decades. The report provides context to the alarming growth trends and reviews what is understood about the phenomena by researchers who study women in the criminal justice system.

Anchored by the research of Dr. Natasha A. Frost and accompanied by the analysis of Justice Strategies, HARD HIT is the first in a series of reports to be put out by the Institute on Women & Criminal Justice that will examine the states’ treatment of women in the criminal justice system. The aim of these reports is to shed light on the phenomenon of punitiveness – its pervasiveness, its roots, its consequences, and possible responses.

The Women’s Prison Association is the nation’s oldest and largest service organization working with women in the criminal justice system. WPA’s work has a dual focus on direct services and systems change. WPA operates a full range of program services to address women’s need for livelihood, housing, family, health and well-being, and criminal justice compliance. WPA’s newest division, the Institute on Women & Criminal Justice, is a national center for dialogue, research, and information about criminal justice-involved women, their families and communities. By fostering a national conversation on women and criminal justice, the Institute seeks to create breakthroughs in the ways in which our public systems address the issue of women and crime, and to promote innovative solutions and highlight what works.

KEY FINDINGS

Hard Hit: The Growth in the Imprisonment of Women, 1977 – 2004 points to some alarming trends in our nation’s incarceration of women. These findings raise crucial questions for further study.

Across the board, the growth has been dramatic. In 1977, the U.S. imprisoned 11,212 women; by 2004, that number had ballooned to 96,125, a 757% increase. In 1977, the United States imprisoned 10 women per 100,000 female residents; in 2004, the rate had grown to 64 per 100,000.

Tremendous state and regional variances exist. While imprisonment rates have soared from coast to coast, there is a remarkable level of variation among states and regions. For example, in 2004, Oklahoma imprisoned 129 of every 100,000 female residents. In contrast, that same year, Massachusetts and Rhode Island imprisoned 11 women per 100,000 female residents. Unless we are to believe that Oklahoma women are more than 10 times more “criminal” than their Massachusetts and Rhode Island counterparts, we have to assume that criminal justice policy and practice are pivotal. From a regional perspective, the Mountain and Southern states stand out as particularly punitive in the imprisonment of women. In fact, the South has historically incarcerated women and men at relatively high rates. In contrast, the Mountain states are showing a growth rate for women that is startling both in its size and in comparison to men.

At the beginning of this century, interesting shifts occur. The last five years covered by this report (1999 – 2004) reflect a period in which our reliance on incarceration was being reconsidered. Many states engaged in sentencing reform and in creating treatment and other alternatives to imprisonment. During this time, some states continued to increase the numbers of women they imprisoned (Florida’s prison population, for instance, increased by 1,840 women or 48%), and other states made modest increases (like Alabama’s growth of 3%). Significantly, nine states actually experienced a decrease in their female population during this five-year period. Among them are some of the states with the largest prison populations: New York was down by 831 or 23% and New Jersey was down by 392 women or 21%.

Women, families, and communities are devastated by imprisonment. As discussed in Justice Strategies’ review of the recent research, millions of women...
and families in this country have been affected by our nation’s heavy reliance on incarceration. The U.S. disproportionately imprisons women of color with few economic resources and many familial responsibilities. This has compounded the hardship experienced in already impoverished communities.

THE NEED FOR MORE RESEARCH – 
AND ACTION

Women are a small portion of the prison population – roughly 7% nationally, in 2004. So, why should we care? Of course, imprisonment is not “worse” for women than it is for men. However, the incarceration of women creates some different effects that have historically been largely unaddressed in conversations focusing primarily on men.

The cycling of women through the criminal justice system has a destabilizing effect not only on the women’s immediate families, but on the social networks of their communities. They are, more often than not, primary caretakers of young children and other family members.

From the taxpayer’s perspective, the price of incarcerating women is not limited to the cost of the prison cell and three meals a day. Locking up women also means paying the tab for putting their children in foster care, treating health and mental health conditions that have worsened during incarceration, and providing public assistance and shelter for those who are homeless and destitute upon release. For most women who are sent to prison, the more economical and humane response of providing community-based substance abuse and mental health treatment, coupled with increased economic and social supports, would produce a better result. WPA has long maintained that criminal justice and social policy that better served women would also produce better outcomes for men.

If, as HARD HIT suggests, women are especially sensitive to shifting trends in imprisonment, we should be looking to the patterns of their involvement in the criminal justice system for clues to improving the system overall. The causes of the trends revealed in this report are not self-evident and warrant additional inquiry. In our next report in the Punitiveness series, the Institute on Women & Criminal Justice will go deeper into the reasons for the growth in female imprisonment, again state-by-state, examining how offense type, risk of imprisonment, and length of stay in prison contribute to the increase.

We hope that this report will contribute to an evolving national conversation about women, communities, and justice.

Ann Jacobs, Institute Director
Sarah From, Deputy Director
May 2006
INTRODUCTION

The Institute on Women and Criminal Justice of the Women’s Prison Association is releasing the first volume of *The Punitiveness Report*, a national study by Dr. Natasha Frost, assistant professor at Northeastern University College of Criminal Justice. Her report presents the first state-by-state compendium of data charting the dramatic increase in the incarceration of women over the past 27 years in the United States. A second volume will look more deeply at factors that increased the risk of imprisonment for women arrested for felony offenses and increased the amount of time spent behind bars.

While women comprise just a small segment of all the people serving prison terms in the U.S., their number is rising at a far faster rate than that of men. Incarceration of women has profound impacts on the families and communities left behind. Dr. Frost’s findings should spark a national dialogue about how women are affected by incarceration. Her findings should also motivate policymakers to examine the trends and prospects for reform in their states.

*Growth Trends and Recent Research Findings* is presented as a companion to Dr. Frost’s exhaustive study. It provides a brief overview of recent research that provides context for her findings regarding the increased incarceration of women, and discusses the multitude of problems incarceration presents for women and their children. This report also takes a closer look at growth patterns, regional trends, and how states rank on various measures of female imprisonment.

Over the final quarter of the 20th century, U.S. criminal justice policies underwent a period of intense politicization and harsh transformation. Draconian sentencing laws and get-tough correctional policies led to an unprecedented increase in jail and prison populations, driving the United States’ rate of incarceration head and shoulders above that of other developed nations.

The imprisonment boom that began in the late 1970s has swelled the state and federal prison system to more than 1.4 million prisoners. Adding those held in local jails and other lockups (juvenile facilities, immigrant detention, etc.) the total number of people behind bars rises to almost 2.3 million – of which seven percent are women.1 At the end of 2004, 96,125 women were serving state or federal sentences – almost nine times the number in prison in 1977.2

NATIONAL PRISON POPULATION GROWTH TRENDS

Female state prison population growth has far outpaced male growth in the past quarter-century. The number of women serving sentences of more than a year grew by 757 percent between 1977 and 2004 – nearly twice the 388 percent increase in the male prison population. Although the size of the gap varies, female prison populations have risen more quickly than male populations in all 50 states. The trend has also been persistent, with median annual growth rates for women exceeding growth rates for men in 22 of the last 27 years, including each of the past 11 years.3

In part, this is due to the small number of women who were incarcerated at the beginning of the boom relative to the number of men, so that increases show up as larger proportional growth against smaller base figures.

Women’s higher growth rate is also due to an increase in the number of women arrested, but changes

---


2 All prison population and imprisonment rates which are not separately footnoted come from data files compiled by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and available on the BJS website (http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/). For purposes of this analysis, only prisoners serving sentences of more than a year are included in order to facilitate state comparisons. As a result, prison population figures reported here may differ slightly from figures reported elsewhere.

3 In general, national and regional trends in state prison population growth rates and imprisonment rates are reported in terms of median rates rather than the overall rate for the group in question. The purpose of reporting median rates (and proportions where the female share of the prison population is at issue) is to give equal weight to developments in all 50 states rather than presenting results that primarily reflect trends in the most populous states. For example, a chart of overall growth rates for the female prison population of the Pacific states would be virtually identical to a chart of California growth rates, since the state accounts for 82 percent of the region’s female prison population. Where rates and proportions are based on total regional populations rather than the median for states in the region, they are described as “overall” or “total” rates and proportions in order to avoid confusion.
in prosecutorial and judicial decision-making have also played a major role. For example, between 1995 and 2004, arrests of women were up 13 percent while the number of women behind prison bars rose by 53 percent. Female imprisonment rates jumped 36 percent over the same period, compared to an increase of 17 percent for men. Women’s share of the prison population rose from 6.3 percent to 7.2 percent.

While the number of women prisoners has soared, the proportion of women convicted of violent offenses has declined since 1979, when they comprised 49 percent of the women in the state prison system.4 One-third of the women serving state prison sentences in 2002 were incarcerated for violent offenses, compared to more than half of the men. Drug offenses now account for nearly one-third of women (up from one in 10 in 1979), compared with just one-fifth of men.

Male prison populations catch cold while women get pneumonia

The rise of the female state prison population has been constant but uneven over the past quarter-century, punctuated by growth spurts in the early and late 1980s and mid-1990s. Median annual growth rates fell after 1995 and have remained in the single digits since then. Nonetheless, many states continue to see significant population growth, including nine where numbers shot up by over 10 percent in 2004. (See Figure 1.)

The pattern of growth in female prison populations generally tracks changes in male prison populations, which also underwent periods of rapid expansion in the early and late 1980s. But women have been hit much harder, experiencing growth spikes that reached higher, lasted longer and often began earlier than those affecting men.

For example, while the growth rate for male prisoners shot up a little more than twofold between 1980 and 1981, from 5.4 percent to 14 percent, the growth rate for female prisoners increased four-fold, from 3.8 percent to 17 percent. The following year, the male growth rate fell below 12 percent while the female growth rate kept climbing to more than 18 percent.

An even more remarkable growth spurt took place between 1987 and 1990. Both the men’s and women’s prison populations began and ended the four-year period with annual growth rates hovering around seven to eight percent. In between, however, annual growth in the women’s prison population hit record levels, topping 25 percent, compared to a peak rate of less than 14 percent for males. To paraphrase the old saying, when the male prison population caught cold, women came down with pneumonia.

The gap between male and female prison population growth rates has widened recently, producing an annual rate of increase for women that roughly doubled the rate for men in six of the last seven years. The number of women added to the state prison populations each year remains high despite lower growth rates. In fact, the expansion that has taken place since 1999 (11,689 new female prisoners) exceeds the total female state prison population in 1980 (11,113 women). (See Figure 2.)

REGIONAL PRISON POPULATION GROWTH TRENDS

National trends play a significant role in patterns of state prison population expansion, as evidenced by the simultaneous growth spurts that took place at the beginning and end of the 1980s. Three in five states saw female prison population growth rates reach a 25-year
high-water mark in 1981 (six states), 1982 (six states) or 1989 (14 states). The latter year was an extraordinarily punitive one for women: 43 states saw population increases in the double digits while half saw their numbers jump by more than 25 percent. But growth in women’s prison populations also varies by geographic region.5

The Northeast: Turning the corner on female prison population growth?

Northeastern states logged extraordinarily rapid growth during the 1980s followed by below-average growth during the 1990s.6 The region saw record growth in 1989 when most states saw their female prison population jump by more than a third. Between 1999 and 2004, however, the total number of women housed in Northeastern state prisons fell by 11 percent (976 prisoners), driven by prison population declines in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut. (See Figures 3 and 4.)

The Pacific states: From boom to bust and back

Pacific states also saw unusually high rates of growth during the 1980s, including nine years with median growth rates in the double-digits.7 The pattern in the years that followed have been erratic. The region’s female prison population actually fell slightly in 1991 but resumed its climb the following year. The turn of the century ushered in a more substantial 1,347-person decrease in the region’s female prison population, reflected in every Pacific state but Oregon. But by the end of 2004, the decline had been erased by the addition of 2,003 women to prisons in Pacific states. (See Figures 5 and 6.)

The Midwest and South: Setting the national growth trend

Depending on how one looks at it, women’s prison populations in the Midwest and South either set the na-
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Figure 5.

Pacific: Median annual change in state prison populations

![Graph showing annual change in state prison populations in the Pacific region and the U.S.](image)
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Figure 6.

Pacific states: Annual change in number of female state prisoners

![Graph showing annual change in number of female state prisoners in Pacific states](image)

SOURCE: Bureau of Justice Statistics
tional trend or tracked it closely, rising rapidly in the early and late 1980s and mid-1990s. Southern states (excluding Texas) were more likely to see below-average growth rates during the 1980s, but the region has nearly matched national median rates since then. (See Figure 8.) Midwestern states’ median growth rates have hovered at or below those of the nation as a whole since 1999 with the exception of 2004, when the region’s annual growth rate shot to more than 8 percent. (See Figures 7 and 9.)

The number of women added to Southern prisons each year remains substantial. The region recorded its second-largest annual increase in 1999 (2,007 women), and its fourth-largest increase took place in 2002 (1,853 women). Almost a quarter (23 percent) of Southern female prison population growth since 1979 took place in the last five years. (See Figure 10.)

8 The Southern region encompasses Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia. In this section, however, the median annual growth rates and net growth in Southern female prison populations are presented without data from Texas because anomalies in the state’s prisoner count would distort the regional picture. BJS statistics show that Texas’ female prison population grew by 188 percent a single year (1993), which represents close to half of all growth in the state’s female prison population over a 25-year period. Rather than a tripling of the state’s female prison population in the course of a single year, it is likely that the apparent jump is a result of years of undercounting – possibly of state prisoners housed in local jails due to a shortage of state prison beds.
The Mountain states: Speeding ahead

Every region has seen women’s prison populations increase by leaps and bounds. But the pace and persistence of growth in the Mountain states set the region apart from the rest of the country. Over the past 27 years, the total female prison population of the Mountain states has risen by 1,600 percent — twice the national population growth rate of 757 percent.

The explosion of women’s prison populations in the Mountain states began in the 1980s and has continued in recent years. The region’s total female prison population has increased by 56 percent since 1999 — four times the 13 percent increase felt nationally. Fully 38 percent of the growth in the Mountain states’ female prison population over the past quarter-century occurred during the last five years. (See Figures 11 and 12.)

Tough, tougher, toughest: Mountain and Southern states lead the rise in female imprisonment rates

Analysis of median incarceration rates for the various regions shows similar patterns with some critical differences. Southern states experienced the smallest proportional growth in female imprisonment rates. But because the South began the 27-year period with much higher rates than the rest of the country — a me-
median of 11 per 100,000 residents compared to a median of five per 100,000 residents elsewhere – increased use of incarceration had a greater impact there.

While the typical Midwest state added 40 female prisoners for every 100,000 residents between 1979 and 2004, and the typical Pacific state added 46 per 100,000, the median incarceration rate for Southern states grew by 57 per 100,000 – second only to a Mountain state increase of 77 per 100,000. As for the Northeastern states, it took a decade of breakneck growth to reach the place where Southern states started in 1977. (See Figure 13.)

STATE VARIANCE IN THE USE OF IMPRISONMENT FOR WOMEN

The use of imprisonment for women varies enormously by state as well as by region. 129 of every 100,000 women in Oklahoma are serving a state prison sentence while Massachusetts imprisons 11 women for every 100,000 female state residents. Women make up over 12 percent of state prisoners in Montana – nearly four times their 3.2 percent share of Rhode Island’s prison population. A handful of states – including Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire and North Dakota – have
seen a greater than 20-fold increase in their female prison populations since 1977. Michigan and North Carolina, by contrast, experienced comparatively “modest” four-fold growth over the same period.

The measures employed in the following comparative analysis of states – the female imprisonment rate, the female proportion of the prison population, and female prison population growth – help us identify patterns and trends that can guide future research exploring how and why the extent of female imprisonment varies so greatly among states. Each of these measures captures a different facet of the extent of female imprisonment and how it has changed over time. Used together, the measures pinpoint states where sentencing and correctional policies and trends appear to have fallen harder, or less hard, on women. Ultimately, they help to highlight both positive trends as well as unmet opportunities to reduce costs and improve outcomes.

**How states stack up**

States stack up differently based on the measure used to compare them. Louisiana has the nation’s third-highest female imprisonment rate (103 per 100,000 residents) but women’s share of the state’s prison population (6.5 percent) falls below the national median (7 percent). New Hampshire ranks third in female prison population growth (up 5,850 percent since 1977) yet the state’s female imprisonment rate (18 per 100,000) remains the fourth-lowest in the nation. The chart at the end of this section presents state statistics and ranks across all three measures (including measures of population growth over two different time periods).

A handful of states, however, stand among the nation’s “toughest” on multiple measures of female imprisonment. Trends in these states should be of particular interest to researchers, policymakers and advocates who are concerned about the damage that imprisonment can cause to women, their families and their communities.

Heading the list is Montana, which devotes by far the largest share of its prison beds to women. Montana’s female prison population has grown at the fastest rate in the nation since 1977 and its female imprisonment rate (102 per 100,000) ranks fourth nationwide.

Several other Mountain states also appear to be particularly tough on women. Idaho and Colorado rank
## Measures of state use of imprisonment for women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>645%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>729%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>1261%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>900%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1522%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>2539%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1010%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>424%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>551%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>596%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>3029%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>2211%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>893%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>1347%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>801%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>597%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>949%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1000%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>757%</td>
<td>114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>353%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>382%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>293%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>625%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>2711%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1484%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>23550%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>377%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1251%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>585%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>717%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>930%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>445%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>282%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>6350%</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>452%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1237%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>776%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>763%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>362%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>417%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1511%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>721%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1141%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1573%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>789%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>978%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>477%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>909%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>863%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>1213%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>503%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Average</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>757%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics
among the top 10 on every scale of female imprisonment, including population growth over the last five years. Wyoming devotes the second-largest share of prison space to women and imprisons them at the ninth-highest rate in the nation. Arizona boasts the nation’s seventh-leading female imprisonment rate and has seen its female prison population jump by more than 60 percent since 1999.

Among Southern states, Oklahoma and Mississippi merit special attention. Not only do they imprison women at the highest rates in the nation, but Oklahoma is also one of seven states where women make up at least 10 percent of the prison population, and Mississippi’s population has grown 28 times larger since 1977.

Three Midwestern states and one Pacific state demand also deserve notice, each for a different set of reasons. Women are heavily overrepresented in South Dakota prisons compared to rest of the nation, and the state’s incarceration and growth rates are well above-average. Missouri imprisons women at the eighth-highest rate in the nation and also ranks poorly on the other scales of female imprisonment.

North Dakota has a comparatively low female imprisonment rate but devotes over 10 percent of its prison beds to women – a population whose numbers have shot up 6,350 percent since 1977 and doubled over the past five years. Women also comprise over 10 percent of prisoners in Hawaii and, despite an 8 percent drop in its female prison population since 1999, the Pacific state ranks third in population growth over the past 27 years.

On the other end of the spectrum are several states that have made much less extensive use of prisons for women. Rhode Island lands at the bottom by nearly every measure. Women comprise just over three percent of Rhode Island’s prison population and are imprisoned at a rate of 11 per 100,000 residents despite more than four-fold growth in the number of female prisoners since 1977. Neighboring Massachusetts is also remarkable for its equally low incarceration rate; the small share of prison beds the state devotes to women (4.3 percent); and a 9-percent reduction in the female prison population that has taken place in the last half-decade.

New York and Michigan follow Rhode Island and Massachusetts, devoting a slightly higher proportion of prison beds to women and imprisoning women at significantly higher but still below-average rates. The growth rate of Michigan’s female prison population over the past 27 years was the second-lowest in the nation (five percent per year on average) and not far above the growth rate for men. New York claimed the ninth-slowest growth rate as well as the most significant drop in its female prison population since the turn of the century.

Several other Northeastern states, including New Hampshire, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, fall near the bottom of most female imprisonment scales. The Garden State recorded the second-largest female prison population reduction over the last five years. New Hampshire, as previously mentioned, has maintained a low female imprisonment rate despite huge proportional growth in its women’s prison population.

Maryland and North Carolina deserve mention for another reason. Both states have experienced unusually slow growth in their female prison populations since 1977, bringing imprisonment rates that were once among the nation’s highest into the bottom ranks. (See Table 1.)

New century finds women leading opposing incarceration trends

Women’s prison population growth outstripped growth in the men’s population in every state during the past 27 years. A different trend has emerged since the end of 1999. Women continue to be disproportionately impacted in states where overall growth rates remain high. But among states that experienced little or no prison population growth, a large majority saw growth rates for female prisoners fall below rates for males.

Women led the growth trend in 29 of 30 states where the total prison population (male and female) rose by 10 percent or more over the last half-decade. The opposite was true of states that experienced slower growth or a net decline in their total prison population – 13 of 20 saw their male prison population rise more quickly, or decline more slowly, than their female population.

The differences could not be starker. In North Dakota, West Virginia and Oregon – states where the total prison population has jumped by more than a third since 1999 – the female prison population is growing at twice the rate of the male population. On the other hand, New York and New Jersey have watched prison populations fall by more than 10 percent, led by even sharper drops in the number of women behind prison bars (23 percent and 21 percent, respectively).10

Women’s imprisonment is not driving growth

---

10 The most striking exception to this trend is Ohio, where a 5.4 percent drop in the men’s prison population has been partially offset by 12-percent growth in the women’s population.
Figure 14. Change in state prison populations: 1999 to 2004
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trends in most states, since their share of the total population, while growing, remains relatively small. Instead, the data suggest that women’s prison populations may be especially sensitive to the factors that drive rapid growth in the overall prison population. (See Figure 14.)

**WHAT CAN RESEARCH TELL US ABOUT THE PROBLEM?**

The question of whether the increased involvement of women in the criminal justice system reflects actual changes in their involvement in an expanding range of activities considered criminal or changes in law enforcement and sentencing policies and practices has received some attention. The 1970s saw a great deal of debate in the media over whether the women’s movement for equal rights would produce an era of “liberated” women criminals who would venture into serious, violent criminal activities.

Some academics claimed that increased arrests of women were evidence that the feminist movement was driving new trends in women’s involvement in crime. Others countered that close analysis of arrest data indicated that increased arrests of women were largely occurring in categories conceived as traditionally female such as shoplifting, prostitution and passing bad checks.

Debate about women’s involvement in violent crime was freshened in the early 1990s with the charge that women in New York City were becoming more involved in violent street crime. It was argued that the high incidence of homicides and imprisonment among young men in these neighborhoods had increased opportunities for young women to enter the “informal drug economy” as dealers. Women were described as responding to the same social and economic dynamics that drove increased levels of violence among men, making gender a “less salient factor.” Controversy over the role of women in New York’s epidemic of violent street crime faded as reports of violent crime in the City plummeted over the next decade.

Meda Chesney-Lind, a prominent scholar and outspoken advocate for the needs of girls and women in the criminal justice system, contends that pro-arrest policies for police handling of domestic violence incidents have contributed to an unwarranted rise in arrests of women for violent offenses. She cites large increases in domestic violence arrests of women during the 1990s in Maryland and California, and points out that increases in arrests of women for assault during this period did not track arrests of women for murder—an arrest category that could be presumed to increase if women were becoming more assaultive. In fact, arrests of women for murder have steadily declined.

In the federal criminal justice system, draconian mandatory minimum sentencing laws and rigid sentencing guidelines have increased the proportion of women who receive prison sentences and the length of time women spend behind bars. The federal sentencing reforms of the mid-1980s have resulted in higher rates of incarceration of women for economic offenses, and have drastically increased the length of incarceration for drug offenses.

Myrna Raeder charges that these reforms have “subverted the earlier non-incarcerative model of female sentencing,” where women tended to receive probation or shorter prison terms. She argues that a defendant’s primary responsibilities for care of children should be taken into account by judges at sentencing out of concern that imprisonment rests enormous hardships on them. Raeder contends that while such a policy might benefit more women than men (because women more often fill this familial role) no true affront to gender equity would stem from this accommodation.

Most recent research literature devoted to analysis of women in the criminal justice system presents four distinct themes to describe the etiology of women’s criminal behaviors and their personal and social problems. First, most women in the criminal justice system come from neighborhoods that are entrenched in poverty and largely lacking in viable systems of social support. Second, alarming large numbers of these

---

women have experienced very serious physical and/or sexual abuse, often commencing when they were young children. Third, as adults, most of these women are plagued with high levels of physical and mental health problems as well as substance abuse issues. Often these problems are combined and compounded. Fourth, the great majority of the women who have suffered from these deprivations, histories of trauma and abuse, and health deficits are mothers – and they are far more likely than men in the criminal justice system to be the sole support and caregivers for their children.

The relationship between violent physical and sexual abuse and women’s incarceration has been traced by Angela Browne in her research on the high rates of women in prison with histories of abuse.16 She reports strong associations between histories of childhood sexual abuse and violence against women in intimate relationships, and women’s participation in illegal activities. She argues that “gender entrapment” of African American women – violence from intimate partners resulting in “acute injuries, chronic pain, sexual degradation, and emotional trauma” – can lead them to commit crimes.

Most women of color entering the criminal justice system come from economically distressed communities lacking in social supports. Much of the drug abuse that characterizes these women’s involvement in criminal behavior is understood as “self medication” used to ease the pain and suffering brought about by the circumstances of their life histories. The flood of crack cocaine that hit urban areas such as New York City in the late 1980s served to increase women’s involvement in street-level prostitution, a mainstay survival strategy for women addicts along with low-level drug dealing and petty property crimes.18

---

The war on drugs and other drivers of female prison population growth

Other efforts to explain the sharp increase in women’s imprisonment have focused on the “war on drugs,” with its emphasis on street-level sweeps of those engaged in the drug trade and harsh mandatory sentencing. The crackdown on drug crime was sold to the American public as the answer to an escalating epidemic of male violence. Yet despite their roles as relatively minor players in the drug trade, women – disproportionate numbers of them African American and Latina – have been “caught in the net” of increasingly punitive policing, prosecutorial, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense charges</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index offenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter</td>
<td>9,326</td>
<td>6,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible rape</td>
<td>16,418</td>
<td>13,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>55,997</td>
<td>46,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>231,184</td>
<td>193,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>128,610</td>
<td>111,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny-theft</td>
<td>423,744</td>
<td>340,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>61,561</td>
<td>56,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>4,789</td>
<td>3,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>312,925</td>
<td>260,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crime</td>
<td>618,703</td>
<td>512,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Index Offenses</td>
<td>931,628</td>
<td>773,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assaults</td>
<td>557,206</td>
<td>486,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery and counterfeiting</td>
<td>41,867</td>
<td>41,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>125,511</td>
<td>96,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>4,666</td>
<td>4,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen property; buying, receiving, possessing</td>
<td>61,583</td>
<td>51,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>97,358</td>
<td>86,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons; carrying, possessing, etc.</td>
<td>107,938</td>
<td>79,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution and commercialized vice</td>
<td>24,636</td>
<td>17,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offenses (except forcible rape and prostitution)</td>
<td>45,717</td>
<td>42,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse violations</td>
<td>625,692</td>
<td>771,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>6,577</td>
<td>4,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses against family and children</td>
<td>70,160</td>
<td>53,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving under the influence</td>
<td>747,918</td>
<td>677,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor laws</td>
<td>203,835</td>
<td>218,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness</td>
<td>424,612</td>
<td>295,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly conduct</td>
<td>295,955</td>
<td>223,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagrancy</td>
<td>11,388</td>
<td>16,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other offenses (except traffic)</td>
<td>1,513,629</td>
<td>1,666,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicion</td>
<td>3,388</td>
<td>1,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for other offenses</td>
<td>4,969,636</td>
<td>4,837,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for all offenses</td>
<td>5,901,264</td>
<td>5,610,577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sentencing policies.¹⁹ Once in the system, women often have little choice but to accept plea bargains and then face mandatory minimum sentencing laws that restrict judges from mitigating the impact of their sentencing decisions in consideration of their family situations or their obvious need for substance abuse treatment.

Analysis of national and state corrections data provide support for this explanation. The proportion of female state prisoners convicted of drug offenses has risen from just 11 percent in 1979 to 32 percent at the end of 2002.²⁰ By contrast, 21 percent of male prisoners were serving time for drug offenses in 2002. (See Table 2.)

The burden of increased incarceration for drug sales has fallen more heavily on women of color than on white women. An overall increase of 433 percent in the female drug prisoner population between 1986 and 1991 was comprised of a 241 percent increase for white women, a 328 percent increase for Latina women, and a staggering 828 percent increase for African American women.²¹

Barbara Bloom maintains that the intersection of race, class and gender puts low-income women of color, especially African American women, in “triple jeopardy” and contributes to their disproportionate incarceration. Cultural stereotypes limit their access to programs and services that could help them improve their economic circumstances, strengthen their family units, and avoid criminal involvement.²²

Natalie Sokoloff contends that since African American women – who comprise 12 percent of the female population in the U.S. – now comprise more than 50 percent of women in prison, the “war on drugs” has become a “war on poor black women.”²³

The impact of drug enforcement on women’s incarceration appears to vary among different state sentencing regimes. In New York, a state characterized by Marc Mauer as operating a “drug-driven criminal justice system,” drug offenses accounted for 91 percent of the increase in the number of women sentenced to prison from 1986 to 1995. In Minnesota, where a structured sentencing guidelines system affords judges more discretion than is provided New York’s judges under the inflexible Rockefeller Drug Laws, drug offenses accounted for just 26 percent of the increase in women’s imprisonment.²⁴
Women arrested for involvement in the drug trade tend to play peripheral or minimal roles, selling small amounts to support a habit, or simply living with intimates who engage in drug sales. Once arrested under mandatory minimum drug laws, women face intense pressure to plea bargain but are likely to have little or no information about larger drug market operations to use as bargaining chips. Mandatory minimum drug laws remove the discretion that judges might otherwise use to take account of mitigating factors such as a woman’s role giving primary support and care to children or to elder relatives.

The escalating “war on drugs” has often been stoked with inflamed portrayals of drug-involved women in the popular media. In the mid-1980s, pregnant addicts giving birth to ailing “crack babies” became drug-enforcement icons. Twenty years later there is scant evidence to substantiate the dire predictions of permanent and severe damage to their children due to their drug use. Neither hysteria about “crack babies” nor increased resources for drug court programs has produced a significant effort to increase access to effective drug treatment for pregnant women. Yet current media depictions of women addicted to methamphetamine are fueling the same hysteria with respect to pregnant women’s drug use. (See Table 3.)

The drug war has been a major driver of female prison population growth but not the only one. Between 1995 and 2004, arrests of adult women for drug offenses rose by 48 percent compared to 23 percent growth for men. But arrests of women for violent offenses were also up by 6.3 percent in contrast to a nearly 17 percent decline for men.

While arrests of adult women between 1995 and 2004 have increased by 13 percent overall, their arrests for the more serious “index” offenses (murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft and arson) have declined by 3 percent. The main share of increase in arrests of women for violent index crime was in the category of aggravated assaults. Arrests of women for murder during the period actually declined by 12 percent.

In terms of women’s share of overall arrests, the pattern appears relatively stable over the decade, increasing from 20 percent to 23 percent. For more serious index crime, women’s share rose from 24 percent to 27 percent. The vast majority of women’s arrests are for lower-level offenses, with 82 percent of women’s arrests falling into the less serious “non-index” category. This includes a large number of arrests for drug violations, as well as minor offenses typically thought to be “women’s crimes,” such as shoplifting and welfare fraud.

While the FBI arrest data displayed above show a 6 percent increase in arrests of women for violent index offenses between 1995 and 2004, data available from the National Crime Victimization Survey show no significant increase in actual violent victimizations by women for the period. (See Table 4.)

The social costs of women’s incarceration

This profile of women in the criminal justice system clearly illustrates their multiple needs. Joanne Belknap reports that as prisoners, women are disadvantaged in terms of access to educational, vocational, and recreational opportunities. Women are disproportionately women of color, in their early to mid-30s, most likely to have been convicted of a drug-related offense, from fragmented families that include other family members who also have been involved with the criminal justice system, survivors of physical and/or sexual abuse as children and adults, individuals with significant substance abuse problems, individuals with multiple physical and mental health problems, unmarried mothers of minor children, and individuals with a high school or general equivalency diploma (GED) but limited vocational training and sporadic work histories.

SOURCE: NIC: “Gender-Responsive Strategies”
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26 Ibid.
28 NVCS data are not yet available for 2004.
A paucity of services and programs for women in prison has been justified by the high cost, given women’s small numbers relative to men behind bars. Her research documents inadequate access to healthcare and program services. She found differences among women’s programming needs according to their level of substance abuse, their race, and the length of their prison term. African American women had much higher rates of participation in education and drug programs, and were far more likely to request access to vocational training. Bellknapp also identified a need for more programs to help women deal with histories of sexual and physical abuse.

Added to the many issues, problems and barriers women share with men at reentry from prison, women must struggle with reunification of their families. More than 70 percent of women in prison have children. Even before a mother’s arrest and separation from the family unit, many children will have experienced emotional hardship associated with parental substance abuse and economic instability. While she is incarcerated they suffer additional trauma, anxiety, guilt, shame and fear.

More than half of mothers in prison have no visits with their children for the duration of their time behind bars. Children are generally subject to instability and uncertainly while their mothers are imprisoned. On average, the children of incarcerated mothers will live with at least two different caregivers during the period of their incarceration. More than half will experience separation from their siblings.

More than 80 percent of mothers in prison plan to reunify their families upon release, but accomplishing this goal is often very difficult. Prior to a mother’s arrest and incarceration, the typical family unit survived on an income of less than $500 per month. Generally lacking adequate job skills and an acceptable record of past employment, most women are ill-prepared to support a family upon their release from prison. Moreover, the communities to which they return are ill-prepared to receive them.

Dina Rose and Todd Clear’s groundbreaking research has documented that the removal of women from their neighborhoods through incarceration has a disproportionate affect on the community because of the multiple roles they play. Rose and Clear’s research also documents the disproportionate concentration of people returning from prison to a relatively small number of urban neighborhoods within large cities. These neighborhoods are stressed by a lack of economic and social capital. Most residents are beleaguered with the challenges of daily survival and are not prepared to stretch their meager resources to accommodate the needs of their returning friends and relatives.

Natalie Sokoloff has examined the broad impact of mass incarceration on African American women – women in prison; those left behind in communities when their loved-ones and friends are sent to prisons; and women who leave prison to reenter the communities they left behind. Incarceration of both women and men from poor communities removes the contributions they were making – income, childcare, elder care and emotional support – from the families they leave behind.

The Legal Action Center has cataloged the many ways that a women’s criminal record may restrict access to vital resources when she returns from prison: denial of public housing; denial of welfare benefits and food stamps; denial of financial assistance for education; and barriers to employment. These post-conviction penalties constitute an additional layer of punishment that endures far beyond the prison sentence handed down by a judge. (See Figure 15.)

### POLICIES THAT MAKE A DIFFERENCE

Many advocates for rational criminal justice policies worried that the “prison boom” and its attendant spiral into harsh punitiveness would never abate. Six years into the new century, we see that crime rates have plummeted, and public attitudes about criminal justice issues have experienced a remarkable shift. Over the past few years most states in the U.S. have struggled with a se-

---

33 Ibid.
In the face of declining revenues, policymakers – both Republicans and Democrats – have been re-thinking many of the costly correctional policies they had embraced when revenues were booming.

A clear majority of states have embraced one or more constructive measures to roll back harsh laws and policies. Most are experiencing a far more moderate rate of prison population growth. In 31 states policymakers have introduced major reforms in their effort to cut costs while improving the effectiveness of their sentencing and correctional systems. At least 20 states have rolled back mandatory minimum sentences or re-structured other harsh penalties enacted in preceding years to get tough on low-level drug offenders or non-violent lawbreakers. Legislators in at least 24 states have eased prison population pressures with mechanisms to shorten time served in prison, speed the release of prisoners who pose little risk to public safety, and penalize those who violate release conditions without returning them to prison.

State revenue performance improved somewhat in 2004 but many state officials are continuing on a trajectory of reform. While some states, as well as the federal criminal justice system, still remain on the same old “get tough” course, a handful of states have turned the corner and begun to significantly downsize their prison systems.

Given that the majority of women in the prison system are sentenced for nonviolent crimes that stem from drug abuse and economic marginalization, women should be a key focus for policymakers as they craft more humane and cost effective alternatives to incarceration. The prevalence of nonviolent conviction offenses and the lower recidivism rates experienced by women after release from prison indicate that de-carceration efforts targeting women would present few risks to public safety. And the status of many women as primary caregivers to their children should weigh heavily in favor of diverting them to community-based programs designed to enhance their ability to lead self-sufficient, successful lives in the community.

Indeed, efforts in a few states to reduce reliance on incarceration suggests that just as the get-tough excesses of the 1980s and 1990s have had greater impact on women, strategies that reverse their effects should bring greater relief for women. For example, enactment of Proposition 36 in 2000 by voters in California has diverted tens of thousands of people arrested for pos-
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57 Greene, Judith A. Positive Trends in State-Level Sentencing and Corrections Policy. Available online at http://www.justicestrategies.net/Publications.htm (Updates from the author)
session of drugs. By 2001 the number of women sentenced to prison had dropped by 10 percent, and correctional managers attributed Proposition 36 as the largest factor driving the decline. Early in 2003 the Department of Corrections was able to close the Northern California Women’s Facility at Stockton, with savings expected to total $31.6 million by July 2006.

In New York, reduced levels of crime and arrests – combined with a series of measures such as increased “merit time” for drug prisoners and “presumptive release” for many prisoners serving time in prison for nonviolent crimes – have contributed to six straight years of downsizing in the state prison system. The prison population dropped from almost 73,000 in 1999 to about 63,000 today. New York’s downsizing appears to be impacting women – whose numbers fell by 23 percent between 1999 and 2004 – at higher rates than men, who saw a 12 percent decline.

Supervision conditions set by probation and parole authorities can scuttle a woman’s best efforts to comply with an overload of rigid rules and requirements. Policy changes designed to reduce technical violation rates, such as the use of intermediate sanctions, should have favorable results for women, since many are revoked to prison for violations of community supervision requirements related to substance abuse or conflicts between reporting requirements and family responsibilities.

Efforts to break the cycle of crime and incarceration for women should be focused on helping them to learn more effective ways to cope with the stresses they face, strengthening their social and familial support networks, and enhancing their access to education and employment opportunities. Substance abuse treatment and other program interventions for women must be gender-responsive. Confrontational therapeutic techniques designed to break down the denial and defenses of men are likely to be counterproductive for women with histories of extreme psychological, physical and sexual trauma.

Alternative programs for women must take account of the family responsibilities women bear. Women are typically required to separate from their children when they enter residential treatment. Intervention programs designed for women should be designed with the understanding that they and their families are often burdened with pressures from conflicting and inflexible requirements of multiple agencies. Criminal justice, welfare and child welfare agencies may set competing or conflicting goals and conditions for women, while limiting or denying access to essential services needed to stabilize and maintain the family unit.

The problems have become particularly acute since the mid-1990s federal legislative “reforms” imposed a thicket of barriers to family preservation and women’s recovery. These include the Adoption and Safe Families Act, which accelerates termination of parental rights to children in foster care; and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, which permanently bars anyone with a drug-related felony conviction from receiving federal cash assistance and food stamps. Federal law further restricts Temporary Aid to Needy Families and Supplemental Social Security Income to people who violate conditions of probation or parole.

When women are released from prison they face the same barriers to reentry as men – social stigmatization; lack of adequate housing; few or no employment opportunities; and denial of public benefits and services. Social reintegration is difficult enough when people return from prison to the high-poverty neighborhoods they left behind when they entered prison. Caught in a “catch-22,” many women cannot obtain government aid to secure adequate housing because they do not have custody of their children – and they cannot secure custody of their children because they do not have adequate housing.

41 Prisoners serving a mandatory sentence under the Rockefeller Drug Laws can receive a “merit time” reduction of their sentence in the amount of one-third of the minimum imposed by the court, provided they have a good behavior record and participate in work or treatment programs to prepare themselves for release.
42 New York’s “earned eligibility” program allows certain prisoners that complete work and/or treatment program assignments to earn a “certificate” that sets a presumption that they will be released at their first parole hearing unless the parole board decides otherwise.
43 These data were obtained from the online “Criminal Justice Data Sheet” of the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services.
45 Allard, Patricia. Life Sentences: Denying Welfare Benefits To Women Convicted Of Drug Offences. (Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project. February 2002) States may choose to “opt out” of these restrictions but many have not done so.
Ann Jacobs maintains reentry services should be coordinated to address the multiple challenges that women face.47 Reentry planning must not prioritize one or two dimensions (e.g., substance abuse treatment and/or employment) over other dimensions (e.g., housing needs, family reunification and/or problems of past sexual abuse) that, if left unaddressed, can lead to relapse and recidivism. WPA has devised a reentry “matrix” to illustrate how planning for successful reentry must incorporate strategies that simultaneously address at least five domains, or basic life areas, key to moving a women forward through three phases of reintegration. (See Table 5.)

The matrix makes it clear that no single agency in government or the community service sector can fill all of a woman’s reentry needs; a coordinated effort is needed. Further, to the extent that we create these coordinated community supports, we will also be preventing women from coming into contact with the criminal justice and child welfare systems in the first place.

CONCLUSION

During the past quarter-century, we have witnessed a truly extraordinary rise in the number of women behind bars – at a rate of growth that far exceeds an already staggering increase in the male prison population. The burden of the expanding female prison population has not been borne equally. Women in Oklahoma are over ten times more likely to be serving a state prison sentence than counterparts in Massachusetts or Rhode Island. While the number of women imprisoned in other parts of the country shot up 800 percent, the number in Mountain states’ prisons leapt 1,600 percent.

The majority of women in the U.S. prison system are serving sentences for nonviolent drug and property offenses. Many are incarcerated as a result of the overly harsh laws and policies adopted at the height of the “war on drugs.” Yet recent national research on public preferences about crime and corrections indicates strong support – by a two to one margin – for measures that address the causes of crime over strict sentencing. Most Americans favor mandatory drug treatment and community service rather than prison – even for those who sell small amounts of drugs.48 From both an economic and public safety standpoint, the advantages of employing substance-abuse treatment and gender-responsive services instead of prison for such women are clear.

Incarcerating women does not solve the problems that underlie their involvement in the criminal justice system. Their imprisonment creates enormous turmoil and suffering for their children. What makes far more sense is sensible sentencing reforms and public investment in effective drug treatment and gender-responsive services to aid women who seek to live law-abiding lives and provide a healthy and stable home for their children.

WPA’s “matrix” approach to reentry can serve just as well as a model for assisting women who might otherwise face incarceration to stabilize themselves and their families, and to attain self-sufficiency and successful lives in their communities. Supporting such a process requires understanding how poverty, trauma and victimization (past and present) and bad choices can combine to propel women into substance abuse and criminal involvement. Assisting them effectively means providing access to coordinated services that address these multiple issues simultaneously.

The experience of the last five years demonstrates that continued female prison population growth is not inevitable, and also that measures to reign in prison population growth may be especially beneficial to women. Policymakers and practitioners are in dire need of better information on the causes and consequences of, and alternatives to, this rapid growth in the number of women behind bars.

More research is needed to tell us how prisons are being used for women: what kinds of offenses are driving increases in the number of women in prison, and how the mix of female prisoners serving short and long sentences is affecting population levels. Further study is needed to determine to what extent variations in incarceration rates are driven by differences in criminal behavior, and to what extent they are driven by differences in law enforcement, sentencing, correctional practice.

Despite efforts by a handful of excellent researchers, the unique issues facing women in the criminal justice system remain poorly understood, in part because they comprise a small – if growing – share of the nation’s prison population. A better understanding of this population is critical for several reasons.

First, while the impact of incarcerating women is not necessarily greater than the impact of incarcerating men, it is certainly different. Women prisoners were more likely to have been primary caretakers of children prior

---

to incarceration, and their absence can place unique strains on families. Women also respond differently to incarceration. It is often observed that correctional facilities fail to provide prisoners with the tools needed to succeed on the outside. This may be especially true for women with a history of trauma or past abuse.

Second, existing research also suggests that women’s pathways to prison may differ from those of men. As a consequence, strategies for improving criminal justice outcomes and reducing use of imprisonment are unlikely to succeed if these differences are not addressed.

Third, examination of trends in the incarceration of women can shed light on the larger issue of steadily rising incarceration rates. Analysis of recent prison population trends presented in this brief suggests that female prison populations are particularly sensitive to the factors that drive overall levels of imprisonment. Not only could further research help generate strategies that produce better outcomes for women, but some of the same strategies could be deployed to improve outcomes for men.

But more research on these issues is just the starting point. Action is needed to address the multitude of policies and practices that ensnare women in systems that cannot recognize and accommodate their needs as individuals and as parents. More and more incarceration should not be our response to the ways in which poverty, trauma, and addiction surface in women. Women should be supported – at the individual, family, and community level – in their efforts to create self-sufficient, successful lives for themselves and their families.
Part II: State by State Analysis

By Dr. Natasha A. Frost, Northeastern University

National Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. IMPRISONMENT AT A GLANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment Rate 1977: 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Imprisonment Rate 1977: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment Rate 2004: 486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Imprisonment Rate 2004: 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Sentenced Prisoners 1977: 11,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Sentenced Prisoners 2004: 96,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase 1977-2004: 757 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Percent Increase 1977-2004: 8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase 1999-2004: 17 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Imprisonment in the United States

At year-end 2004, United States state and federal prisons housed 1,433,793 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 1,337,668 were male and 96,125 were female.

In 1977, United States prisons housed 11,212 female inmates: by 2004, the female prison population had increased almost nine-fold, reaching 96,125. The number of female inmates grew every year except for 2001 when the number of female inmates dropped slightly before resuming its upward trend. Between 1977 and 2004, the female imprisonment rate in the United States grew by 757% (with an average annual change of 8% per year).

Female Imprisonment Rates

Between 1977 and 2004, the United States female imprisonment rate (including the federal prison system and the prison populations of all fifty states) grew from 10 to 64 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents.

Correctional Facilities

The source for all correctional facility data in this report is the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities (Stephan and Karberg, 2003). According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, the United States has 1,668 state and federal correctional facilities. Of the 1,668 correctional facilities, 1,287 house male prisoners only, 156 house female prisoners only, and 225 house both male and female prisoners.
Male to Female imprisonment ratio

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace than the number of male prisoners. In 1977, the United States imprisoned 24 male prisoners for every female prisoner – by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 14 male prisoners for every female prisoner (including all 50 states and the federal system).

State-level variation

As is always the case, viewing the United States as a whole masks substantial state-level variations in imprisonment practices. Some states are significantly more punitive in female imprisonment rates than others. Although imprisonment rates have grown in all states between 1977 and 2004, that growth has taken different shapes, with some experiencing rapid growth and others demonstrating a surprising stability (particularly relative to other states) long after the beginning of unprecedented growth in the use of imprisonment across the country as a whole.

The color-coded map that follows visually depicts state-level variations in female imprisonment rates.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT 1977-2004

Sentenced Female Prisoners

At yearend 1977, U.S. prisons housed a total of 11,212 sentenced female prisoners. At that time, only the federal prison system housed over 1,000 women. Fully half of the states (25) had female prison populations of less than 100 and four states housed less than 10 prisoners (Montana, North Dakota, New Hampshire and Vermont).
Although no state had a prison population of over 1,000 women in 1977, by year-end 2004, twenty-six states housed more than 1,000 female prisoners. Only two states (Rhode Island and Vermont) maintained female prison populations of under 100 women at year-end 2004 (recall that in 1977 half of the states housed less than 100 female prisoners). Moreover, two of the states that had female prison populations of under 100 in 1977 had far exceeded the 1,000 female prisoner mark by 2004. Colorado, which housed only 72 female prisoners in 1977, had 1,900 female prisoners in 2004. Mississippi’s 57 female prisoners in 1977 grew to 1,602 in 2004.

Table 1 presents the actual female prison populations in each state in 2004 and in 1977. The states are sorted based on the total female prisoners in 2004 (from highest to lowest).

**Female Imprisonment Rates**

In 1977, the median imprisonment rate across the states was 7 female prisoners for every 100,000 female residents. At that time, no state had a female imprisonment rate of over 20 sentenced female prisoners per 100,000 females in the population. By 2004, the median imprisonment rate of 55 female prisoners for every 100,000 female residents was more than five times higher than it had been in 1977. Five states had female imprisonment rates of over 100 female prisoners per 100,000 (Oklahoma, Mississippi, Louisiana, Montana, and Texas), and only four states maintained female imprisonment rates of under 20 per 100,000 (Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island).
### TABLE A. TOTAL FEMALE PRISONERS BY STATE, 2004 and 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>96,125</td>
<td>11,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>11,408</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>10,882</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>10,207</td>
<td>1,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2,789</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE B. FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATES BY STATE, 2004 and 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over the five year period between 1999-2004, the number of sentenced female prisoners in the United States increased from 82,402 (in 1999) to 96,125 (in 2004) – a growth of 17% in just five years. Nine states experienced decreases in the female prison population with New York and New Jersey experiencing the largest declines in female prisoners over the period (New York’s female prison population fell from 3,620 female prisoners in 1999 to 2,789 in 2004, a decrease of 23% and New Jersey’s female prison population fell from 1,862 female prisoners in 1999 to 1,470 in 2004 – a decrease of 21%). The remaining 41 states and the

| LARGEST INCREASES IN FEMALE PRISONERS AND LARGEST GROWTH (% CHANGE), 1999-2004 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Increase in Number of Female Prisoners, 1999-2004            | % Change 1999-2004 |
| Federal                                                      | Maine           |
| 2,151                                                        | 114%            |
| Florida                                                      | North Dakota    |
| 1,840                                                        | 102%            |
| Texas                                                        | Vermont         |
| 1,093                                                        | 95%             |
| Arizona                                                      | West Virginia   |
| 975                                                          | 86%             |
| Georgia                                                      | New Mexico      |
| 836                                                          | 81%             |
| Virginia                                                     | Montana         |
| 803                                                          | 80%             |
| Colorado                                                     | Oregon          |
| 687                                                          | 68%             |
| Indiana                                                      | Idaho           |
| 662                                                          | 62%             |
| Missouri                                                     | Arizona         |
| 616                                                          | 62%             |
| Tennessee                                                    | Colorado        |
| 537                                                          | 57%             |

| SMALLEST INCREASES IN FEMALE PRISONERS AND SMALLEST GROWTH (% CHANGE), 1999-2004 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Increase in Number of Female Prisoners, 1999-2004              | % Change 1999-2004 |
| New Hampshire                                                 | California      |
| 2                                                              | 1%              |
| Rhode Island                                                  | New Hampshire   |
| 3                                                              | 2%              |
| Vermont                                                       | Alabama         |
| 39                                                             | 3%              |
| Alaska                                                        | Michigan        |
| 41                                                             | 4%              |
| Kansas                                                        | Louisiana       |
| 50                                                             | 5%              |
| Alabama                                                       | Rhode Island    |
| 53                                                             | 5%              |
| California                                                    | Kansas          |
| 56                                                             | 9%              |
| Maine                                                        | South Carolina  |
| 64                                                             | 9%              |
| North Dakota                                                  | Texas           |
| 65                                                             | 11%             |
| Wyoming                                                       | Ohio            |
| 71                                                             | 12%             |

| DECREASES IN FEMALE PRISONERS AND NEGATIVE GROWTH (% CHANGE), 1999-2004 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Decrease in Number of Female Prisoners, 1999-2004                      | % Change 1999-2004 |
| New York                                                                | New York        |
| -831                                                                     | -23%            |
| New Jersey                                                              | New Jersey      |
| -392                                                                     | -21%            |
| Wisconsin                                                               | Massachusetts   |
| -55                                                                      | -9%             |
| Illinois                                                                | Hawaii          |
| -52                                                                      | -8%             |
| Massachusetts                                                           | Wisconsin       |
| -38                                                                      | -4%             |
| Hawaii                                                                  | Connecticut     |
| -36                                                                      | -3%             |
| Connecticut                                                             | Illinois        |
| -25                                                                      | -2%             |
| Oklahoma                                                                | Oklahoma        |
| -16                                                                      | -1%             |
| Delaware                                                                | *Delaware        |
| -1                                                                       | 0%              |

*Though DE experienced a 1-person decrease from 1999-2004, this constitutes less than a 1%.
federal prison system saw increases in their female prison populations. The tables below list the ten states with the largest increase in actual female prisoners and the ten states with the largest % change in the female prison population between yearend 1999 and yearend 2004. The prison population data are year-end data, so the growth actually represents growth from the end of 1999 through the end of 2004.
IMPRISONMENT IN ALABAMA

At year-end 2004, Alabama prisons housed 25,257 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 23,596 were male and 1,661 were female. Alabama’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 71 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents is the 15th highest in the country. Alabama’s 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 556 prisoners per 100,000 residents is the 6th highest overall imprisonment rate in the country.

In 1977, Alabama prisons housed 223 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,661. Alabama’s female prison population was at its lowest with 223 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 1,917 female inmates in 2003.
GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Alabama’s female prison population grew by 645% with an average annual percent change of 8.15% per year.

Alabama’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 71 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents was the 15th highest female imprisonment rate in the country. Although Alabama’s female imprisonment growth trend tracks the average growth in female imprisonment across the states, at no point was Alabama’s female imprisonment rate at or below that average. In other words, in terms of female imprisonment, between 1977 and 2004, Alabama’s female imprisonment rate has always exceeded the average across states. In that regard, Alabama could be considered over-punitive in its imprisonment of female offenders. Alabama is among the 10 most punitive states in its overall imprisonment rate.

MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner – by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In Alabama’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 24 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Alabama’s male to female imprisonment ratio (14:1) was roughly equivalent to the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Alabama has 36 correctional facilities. Of Alabama’s 36 correctional facilities, 31 house male prisoners only, 3 house female prisoners only, and 2 house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Alaska prisons housed 2,632 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 2,458 were male and 174 were female. Alaska’s female imprisonment rate of 55 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents is 25th highest in the country. Alaska’s 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 398 prisoners per 100,000 residents is 24th highest overall imprisonment rate in the country.

In 1977, Alaska’s prisons housed 21 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 174. Alaska’s female prison population was at its lowest with 9 female prisoners in 1980 and peaked at 174 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Alaska’s female prison population grew by 729% with an average annual percent change of 14.9% per year.

Alaska’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 55 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents ranked 25th among the states. Alaska’s female imprisonment growth trend appears to be far more erratic than the average growth trend of the other states. This could be in part because Alaska has a combined prison/jail population and its imprisonment figures are therefore sometimes conflated with its jail figures. Over the period, Alaska’s imprisonment rate was at times higher and at times lower than the average across states. With
a rank of 25th overall in terms of its female imprisonment rate, Alaska can be considered average in its punitiveness toward female offenders.

**MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO**

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Alaska’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 24 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Alaska’s male to female imprisonment ratio (14:1) was roughly equivalent to the average across states.

**CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES**

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Alaska has 24 correctional facilities. Of Alaska’s 24 correctional facilities, 19 house male prisoners only and 5 house both male and female prisoners. None of Alaska’s 24 correctional facilities house only female inmates.
At year-end 2004, Arizona prisons housed 31,106 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 28,561 were male and 2,545 were female. Arizona’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 89 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents is the 7th highest in the country. Arizona’s 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 534 prisoners per 100,000 residents is the 9th highest overall imprisonment rate in the country.

In 1977, Arizona prisons housed 187 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 2,545. Arizona’s female prison population was at its lowest with 176 female prisoners in 1979 and peaked at 2,545 female inmates in 2004.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Arizona’s female prison population grew by 1,261% with an average annual percent change of 10.4% per year.

Arizona’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 89 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents was the 7th highest female imprisonment rate in the country. Although Arizona’s female imprisonment rate growth trend tracks the average growth in female imprisonment
rates across the states, at no point was Arizona’s female imprisonment rate at or below that average. In other words, in terms of female imprisonment, between 1978 and 2004, Arizona’s female imprisonment rate always exceeded the average across states. Arizona is among the 10 most punitive states both in its imprisonment rate overall and in its female imprisonment rate.

### CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Arizona has 18 correctional facilities. Of Arizona’s 18 correctional facilities, 10 house male prisoners only and 8 house both male and female prisoners. None of Arizona’s 18 correctional facilities house only female inmates.

### MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Arizona’s 1977 ratio was substantially lower than average with 16 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Arizona’s male to female imprisonment ratio (11:1) remained lower than the average across states.
At year-end 2004, Arkansas prisons housed 13,668 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 12,758 were male and 910 were female. Arkansas’ 2004 female imprisonment rate of 65 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents is the 19th highest in the country. Arkansas’ 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 495 prisoners per 100,000 residents is the 10th highest overall imprisonment rate in the country.

In 1977, Arkansas prisons housed 91 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 910. Arkansas’ female prison population was at its lowest with 91 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 910 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Arkansas’ female prison population grew by 900% with an average annual percent change of 9.5% per year.

Arkansas' 2004 female imprisonment rate of 65 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents was the 19th highest female imprisonment rate in the country. As shown in the Figure, although Arkansas’ female imprisonment rate growth trend tracks the average growth in female imprisonment across the states, Arkansas’ rate fluctuates more erratically – occasionally matching the average, but usually rising above. At no point was Arkansas’ female imprisonment rate notably below average. In other words, in terms of female im-
prisonment, between 1978 and 2004, Arkansas’ female imprisonment rate typically exceeded the average across states. That said, relative to other states, Arkansas is more punitive in its overall imprisonment rate (ranked 10th) than it is in its female imprisonment rate (ranked 19th).

MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Arkansas’ 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 25 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Arkansas’ male to female imprisonment ratio (14:1) was roughly equivalent to the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Arkansas has 15 correctional facilities. Of Arkansas’ 15 correctional facilities, 13 house male prisoners only, 2 house both male and female prisoners, and no facility houses only female prisoners.
In 1977, California prisons housed 671 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 10,882. California’s female prison population was at its lowest with 671 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 10,905 female inmates in 1998.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, California’s female prison population grew by 1,522% with an average annual percent change of 11.3% per year. California’s female imprisonment rate growth trend was actually below the average imprisonment rate across states in 1977. Through the late 1970s and early 1980s, California’s female imprisonment rate growth...
increased and peaked substantially above average in 1998. After 1998, California’s female imprisonment rate began to drop annually, while the average imprisonment rate across the states continued to increase. By 2004, California’s female imprisonment rate was slightly higher than (but closer to) the average across states.

**CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES**

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, California has 92 correctional facilities. Of California’s 92 correctional facilities, 62 house male prisoners only, 14 house female prisoners only, and 16 house both male and female prisoners.

**MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO**

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. California’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 25 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, California’s male to female imprisonment ratio (14:1) was slightly higher than the average across states.
At year-end 2004, Colorado prisons housed 20,293 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 18,393 were male and 1,900 were female. Colorado’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 83 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents is the 10th highest in the country. Colorado’s 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 438 prisoners per 100,000 residents is the 18th highest overall imprisonment rate in the country.

In 1977, Colorado prisons housed 72 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,900. Colorado’s female prison population was at its lowest with 66 female prisoners in 1978 and peaked at 1,900 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Colorado’s female prison population grew by 2,539% with an average annual percent change of 13.6% per year. Colorado’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 83 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents was the 10th highest female imprisonment rate in the country. From 1977 until the early 1990s, Colorado’s female imprisonment rate was below the average across states. In the mid-1990s, Colorado’s female imprisonment rate began to grow at a pace faster than average. Within a few years, Colorado’s female imprisonment rate was notably higher than the average across states. By 2004, Colorado was among the 10 most punitive states.
states in its female imprisonment rate. Colorado is interesting in that its female imprisonment rate ranking changed substantially between 1977 (ranked 33rd) and 2004 (ranked 10th) and in that its overall imprisonment rate is closer to the average than is its female imprisonment rate. Colorado appears to be particularly punitive in its imprisonment of female offenders relative to other states.

MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Colorado’s 1977 ratio was higher than average with 31 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Colorado’s male to female imprisonment ratio (10:1) had fallen below the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Colorado has 48 correctional facilities. Of Colorado’s 48 correctional facilities, 29 house male prisoners only, seven house female prisoners only, and 12 house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Connecticut prisons housed 13,240 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 12,452 were male and 788 were female. Connecticut’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 44 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents is the 33rd highest in the country. Connecticut’s 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 377 prisoners per 100,000 residents is the 29th highest overall imprisonment rate in the country.

In 1977, Connecticut prisons housed 71 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 788. Connecticut’s female prison population was at its lowest with 64 female prisoners in 1979 and peaked at 925 female inmates in 2002.

Between 1977 and 2004, Connecticut’s female prison population grew by 1,010% with an average annual percent change of 11.2% per year.

Although Connecticut’s female imprisonment rate has typically fallen below the average across states, it rose slightly above the average in the early 1990s and again in the late 1990s. Connecticut’s imprisonment rate growth has been fairly erratic, particularly through the 1990s. By 2004, Connecticut’s female imprisonment rate was substantially below average (as it had been through the 1970s and 1980s).
INSTITUTE ON WOMEN & CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Connecticut’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 24 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Connecticut’s male to female imprisonment ratio (16:1) was slightly higher than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Connecticut has 20 correctional facilities. Of Connecticut’s 20 correctional facilities, 19 house male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and none house both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT IN DELAWARE

At year-end 2004, Delaware prisons housed 4,087 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 3,872 were male and 215 were female. Delaware’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 51 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents is the 28th highest in the country. Delaware’s 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 488 prisoners per 100,000 residents is the 11th highest overall imprisonment rate in the country.

In 1977, Delaware’s prisons housed 41 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 215. Delaware’s female prison population was at its lowest with 33 female prisoners in 1980 and peaked at 255 female inmates in 2001.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Delaware’s female prison population grew by 424% with an average annual percent change of 7.4% per year.

Delaware’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 51 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents was the 28th highest female imprisonment rate and was below the average across all states. For most of the period between 1977 and 2004, Delaware’s female imprisonment rate was higher than average. Delaware’s impris-
The imprisonment rate fluctuated over the period dropping below the average in 1997, rising again through 2001 and then falling quite substantially. Like Alaska, Delaware has a combined prison/jail population, and therefore, some prisoners serving sentences of less than one year may be included in the imprisonment rate. Delaware is the 11th most punitive state with regard to imprisonment overall, but is far more average in its imprisonment of females.

**MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO**

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Delaware’s 1977 ratio was substantially lower than average with 19 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Delaware’s male to female imprisonment ratio (18:1) was higher than the average across states.

**CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES**

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Delaware has nine correctional facilities. Of Delaware’s correctional facilities, five house male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and three house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Florida prisons housed 85,530 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 79,870 were male and 5,660 were female. Florida ranks 20th overall with a 2004 female imprisonment rate of 64 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents. Florida’s 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 486 prisoners per 100,000 residents is the 12th highest overall imprisonment rate in the country.

In 1977, Florida prisons housed 870 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 5,660. Florida’s female prison population was at its lowest with 807 female prisoners in 1980 and peaked at 5,660 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Florida’s female prison population grew by 551% with an average annual percent change of 7.6% per year.

Florida’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 64 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents was slightly higher than the average state imprisonment rate. However, Florida has become far less punitive in terms of its female imprisonment rate over time. In 1977, Florida’s female imprisonment rate of 19 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents ranked 2nd highest in the country. In fact, for much of the period between 1977 and 1995 Florida’s imprisonment rate was substantially above average. In the mid-1990s,
Florida’s female imprisonment rate dropped as imprisonment rates continued to grow across other states. As a result, for the latter part of the 1990s through 2001, Florida’s female imprisonment rate was just above average before beginning to climb once more.

**MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO**

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Florida’s 1977 ratio was lower than average with 22 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Florida’s male to female imprisonment ratio (14:1) was roughly equivalent to the average across states.

**CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES**

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Florida has 106 correctional facilities. Of Florida’s 106 correctional facilities, 87 house male prisoners only, 11 house female prisoners only, and eight house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Georgia prisons housed 51,089 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 47,656 were male and 3,433 were female. Georgia’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 77 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents is the 11th highest overall imprisonment rate in the country. Georgia’s 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 574 prisoners per 100,000 residents is the 5th highest.

In 1977, Georgia prisons housed 493 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 3,433. Georgia’s female prison population was at its lowest with 493 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 3,433 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Georgia’s female prison population grew by 596% with an average annual percent change of 7.6% per year.

Between 1977 and 2004, Georgia’s female imprisonment rate was consistently higher than average. However, its rank relative to other states has fallen quite substantially. In 1977, Georgia’s imprisonment rate of 18 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents was the 3rd highest in the country. While still substantially above average in 2004, Georgia has dropped to a rank of 11th. Although no longer among the 10 most punitive states in terms of female imprisonment, Georgia remains more punitive than other states on average.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner – by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Georgia’s 1977 ratio was lower than average with 23 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Georgia’s male to female imprisonment ratio (14:1) was roughly equivalent to the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Georgia has 84 correctional facilities. Of Georgia’s 84 correctional facilities, 69 house male prisoners only, seven house female prisoners only, and eight house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Hawaii prisons housed 4,174 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 3,736 were male and 438 were female. With a female imprisonment rate of 69 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents in 2004, Hawaii ranks 16th highest in its female imprisonment rate. With a 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 329 prisoners per 100,000 residents, Hawaii ranks 36th overall.

In 1977, Hawaii prisons housed 14 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 438. Hawaii’s female prison population was at its lowest with 14 female prisoners in 1977 (and again in 1980) and peaked at 474 female inmates in 1999.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Female Sentenced Prisoners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPRISONMENT GROWTH AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imprisonment Rate</th>
<th>Female Imprisonment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>44 (49th)</td>
<td>3 (45th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>329 (36th)</td>
<td>69 (16th)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Increase 1977-2004: 3,029%
Average Annual Percent Increase 1977-2004: 15%
Percent Increase 1999-2004: -8%

Between 1977 and 2004, Hawaii’s female prison population grew by 3,029% with an average annual percent change of 15.2% per year.

Through the late 1970s and entire 1980s, Hawaii’s female imprisonment rate was consistently at or below average, relative to other states. In the mid to late 1990s, however, Hawaii’s female imprisonment rate began to increase quite dramatically, so that by 2004 its rate was substantially higher than the average across states. In 1977, Hawaii was one of the least punitive states in terms of female imprisonment (ranked 45th); by 2004, Hawaii had climbed to a rank of 16th.
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Hawaii’s 1977 ratio was slightly higher than average with 28 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Hawaii’s male to female imprisonment ratio (9:1) remained substantially lower the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Hawaii has 10 correctional facilities. Of Hawaii’s 10 correctional facilities, 3 house male prisoners only, 3 house female prisoners only, and 4 house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Idaho prisons housed 6,375 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 5,728 were male and 647 were female. Idaho’s 2004 female imprisonment rate of 93 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents is the 6th highest in the country. Idaho’s 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 454 prisoners per 100,000 residents is the 17th highest overall imprisonment rate.

In 1977, Idaho prisons housed 28 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 647. Idaho’s female prison population was at its lowest with 25 female prisoners in both 1980 and 1981 and peaked at 647 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Idaho’s female prison population grew by 2,211% with an average annual percent change of 13.2% per year.

From 1977 through the mid 1990s, Idaho’s female imprisonment rate hovered slightly below the average across states. In the mid 1990s, Idaho’s female prison population began to grow quite rapidly. By 2004, Idaho’s female imprisonment rate of 93 female prisoners per 100,000 was exceptionally high relative to other states. Although quite average in its overall imprisonment rate (ranked 17th), Idaho currently ranks as the 6th most punitive state with reference to female imprisonment rates.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Idaho’s 1977 ratio was equal to the average across states with 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Idaho’s male to female imprisonment ratio (9:1) was substantially lower than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Idaho has 13 correctional facilities. Of Idaho’s 13 correctional facilities, 11 house male prisoners only and two house female prisoners only. No facilities house both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT IN ILLINOIS

At year-end 2004, Illinois prisons housed 44,054 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 41,304 were male and 2,750 were female. With a female imprisonment rate of 43 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents Illinois ranked 34th in 2004. With an overall imprisonment rate of 346 prisoners per 100,000 residents in 2004, Illinois ranks 32nd in its imprisonment rate.

In 1977, Illinois prisons housed 277 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 2,750. Illinois’ female prison population was at its lowest with 236 female prisoners in 1978 and peaked at 2,849 female inmates in 2000.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Illinois’ female prison population grew by 893% with an average annual percent change of 10.6% per year.

MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Illinois’ 1977 ratio was substantially higher than average with 40 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Illinois’ male to female imprisonment ratio (15:1) was just slightly higher than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Illinois has 48 correctional facilities. Of Illinois’ 48 correctional facilities, 39 house male prisoners only, four house female prisoners only, and five house both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT IN INDIANA

At year-end 2004 Indiana prisons housed 23,939 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 22,058 were male and 1,881 were female. With a female imprisonment rate of 383 prisoners per 100,000 residents, Indiana ranks 23rd. Indiana ranks 28th with an overall imprisonment rate of 383 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Indiana prisons housed 130 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,881. Indiana’s female prison population was at its lowest with 121 female prisoners in 1978 and peaked at 1,881 female inmates in 2004.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Indiana’s female prison population grew by 1,347% with an average annual percent change of 10.9% per year.

Throughout the period between 1977 and 2004, Indiana’s female imprisonment rate hovered at or below the average across states. From 1985 through 2002, Indiana’s imprisonment rate was below average. Due to more substantial increases in female prisoners in the late 1990s, by 2004 Indiana’s female imprisonment rate of 59 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents exceeded the average across states. In terms of both overall imprisonment and imprisonment of females, Indiana has been average in its puni-
tiveness and quite consistently ranks in the middle third of the states.

MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Indiana’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 32 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Indiana’s male to female imprisonment ratio (12:1) remained slightly lower the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Indiana has 25 correctional facilities. Of Indiana’s 25 correctional facilities, 20 house male prisoners only, four house female prisoners only, and one houses both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT IN IOWA

At year-end 2004, Iowa prisons housed 8,525 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 7,768 were male and 757 were female. With its 2004 female imprisonment rate of 50 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Iowa ranks 29th. With an overall imprisonment rate of 288 prisoners per 100,000 residents, Iowa is 39th in the overall imprisonment rate rankings.

In 1977, Iowa prisons housed 84 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 757. Iowa’s female prison population was at its lowest with 71 female prisoners in 1978 and peaked at 757 female inmates in 2004.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Iowa’s female prison population grew by 801% with an average annual percent change of 9.2% per year.

Iowa’s female imprisonment rate has consistently fallen below the average across states. Although below average in its female imprisonment rate, Iowa is not among the least punitive states in this regard, and is ranked notably higher (29th) in its punitiveness toward female offenders than it is in its punitiveness overall (39th).
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Iowa’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 24 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Iowa’s male to female imprisonment ratio (10:1) remained lower than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Iowa has 30 correctional facilities. Of Iowa’s 30 correctional facilities, 15 house male prisoners only, two house female prisoners only, and 13 house both male and female prisoners.
Institute on Women & Criminal Justice

At year-end 2004, Kansas prisons housed 8,966 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 8,346 were male and 620 were female. Kansas ranks 32nd in female imprisonment with a rate of 45 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents. Kansas' 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 327 prisoners per 100,000 residents is the 36th highest overall imprisonment rate.

In 1977, Kansas prisons housed 89 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 620. Kansas female prison population was at its lowest with 82 female prisoners in 1979 and peaked at 629 female inmates in 2003.

Growth in Female Imprisonment Rate

Between 1977 and 2004, Kansas’ female prison population grew by 597% with an average annual percent change of 8.3% per year.

The female imprisonment rate in Kansas fluctuated somewhat erratically between 1977 and 2004. Through the mid to late 1980s, Kansas’ female imprisonment rate was above average. Kansas female imprisonment rate fell below average in 1989 and remained so through 2004.
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Kansas’ 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 24 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Kansas’ male to female imprisonment ratio (13:1) was equal to the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Kansas has 11 correctional facilities. Of Kansas’ 11 correctional facilities, eight house male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and two house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Kentucky prisons housed 17,140 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 15,693 were male and 1,447 were female. With a female imprisonment rate of 69 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Kentucky ranked 17th in 2004. With an overall imprisonment rate of 412 prisoners per 100,000 residents, Kentucky ranked 21st relative to other states in 2004.

In 1977, Kentucky prisons housed 138 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,447. Kentucky’s female prison population was at its lowest with 111 female prisoners in 1978 and peaked at 1,447 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Kentucky’s female prison population grew by 949% with an average annual percent change of 9.8% per year.

For most of the period between 1977 and 2004, Kentucky’s female imprisonment rate hovered at or below average. In the late 1990s, Kentucky’s female imprisonment rate jumped quite suddenly and then fell just as quickly before resuming a more stable upward trend. In 2004, Kentucky’s female imprisonment rate of 69 female inmates per 100,000 female residents was above the average across states.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Kentucky’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 25 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Kentucky’s male to female imprisonment ratio (11:1) remained lower than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Kentucky has 25 correctional facilities. Of Kentucky’s 25 correctional facilities, 18 house male prisoners only, three house female prisoners only, and four house both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT IN LOUISIANA

At year-end 2004, Louisiana prisons housed 36,939 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 34,553 were male and 2,386 were female. With 103 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Louisiana has the third highest female imprisonment rate. Louisiana’s 2004 overall imprisonment rate of 816 prisoners per 100,000 residents is the highest overall imprisonment rate in the country.

In 1977, Louisiana prisons housed 217 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 2,386. Louisiana’s female prison population was at its lowest with 208 female prisoners in 1978 and peaked at 2,405 female inmates in 2003.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Louisiana’s female prison population grew by 1,000% with an average annual percent change of 9.6% per year.

While Louisiana’s female imprisonment rate has been above average for the entire period between 1977 and 2004, its rate of increase in female imprisonment picked up substantially in the 1990s. By the late 1990s, Louisiana was almost twice as punitive as the average state in its female imprisonment rate.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Louisiana’s 1977 ratio was higher than average with 30 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Louisiana’s male to female imprisonment ratio (14:1) was roughly equivalent to the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Louisiana has 17 correctional facilities. Of Louisiana’s 17 correctional facilities, 14 house male prisoners only and three house female prisoners only. No facilities house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Maine prisons housed 1,961 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 1,841 were male and 120 were female. With an imprisonment rate of 18 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Maine ranks 48th in its imprisonment rate for women. Maine’s overall imprisonment rate is similarly low; at 148 prisoners per 100,000 residents, it had the lowest imprisonment rate in the country in 2004.

In 1977, Maine prisons housed 14 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 120. Maine’s female prison population was at its lowest with 10 female prisoners in 1978 and peaked at 120 females inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Maine’s female prison population grew by 757% with an average annual percent change of 11.7% per year.

Throughout the period between 1977 and 2004, Maine’s female imprisonment rate has been substantially below average. In fact, the average female imprisonment rate across the states has typically been two to three times higher than the female imprisonment rate in Maine. In 2004, Maine had the lowest overall imprisonment rate and, with a female imprisonment rate of 18 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Maine is also among the 10 least punitive states (ranked 48th) toward female offenders.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner – by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Maine’s 1977 ratio was substantially higher than average with 43 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Maine’s male to female imprisonment ratio (16:1) was only slightly higher than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Maine has eight correctional facilities. Of Maine’s eight correctional facilities, six house male prisoners only and two house both male and female prisoners. No facilities house only female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Maryland prisons housed 22,696 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 21,572 were male and 1,124 were female. In 2004, Maryland ranked 41st in female imprisonment rate with 39 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents and ranked 22nd in overall imprisonment with 406 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Maryland prisons housed 248 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,124. Maryland’s female prison population was at its lowest with 222 female prisoners in 1979 and peaked at 1,191 female inmates in 2003.

Between 1977 and 2004, Maryland’s female prison population grew by 353% with an average annual percent change of 6.1% per year.

As depicted in the Figure, Maryland’s female imprisonment rate growth tracked average growth across states fairly closely until the early to mid-1990s. At that point, most states’ female imprisonment rates continued to grow, but Maryland’s stabilized. As a result, Maryland’s female imprisonment rate in 2004 was substantially lower than the average across states.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Maryland’s 1977 ratio was higher than average with 32 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Maryland’s male to female imprisonment ratio (19:1) remained higher than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Maryland has 26 correctional facilities. Of Maryland’s 26 correctional facilities, 22 house male prisoners only, two house female prisoners only, and two house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Massachusetts’ prisons housed 8,688 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 8,312 were male and 376 were female. Massachusetts ranked 49th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 11 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 44th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 232 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Massachusetts’ prisons housed 78 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 376. Massachusetts’ female prison population was at its lowest with 47 female prisoners in 1979 and peaked at 461 female inmates in 1996.

Between 1977 and 2004, Massachusetts’ female prison population grew by 382% with an average annual percent change of 8.7% per year.

Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, Massachusetts’ overall and female imprisonment rates were substantially lower than the average imprisonment rates across the states. With a female imprisonment rate of 11 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Massachusetts is among the 10 least punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders (ranked 49th).
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there was an average of 36 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Massachusetts’ 1977 ratio was notably higher than average with 35 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Massachusetts’ male to female imprisonment ratio (22:1) remained notably higher than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Massachusetts has 25 correctional facilities. Of Massachusetts’ 25 correctional facilities, 19 house male prisoners only, four house female prisoners only, and two house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Michigan prisons housed 48,883 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 46,770 were male and 2,113 were female. Michigan ranked 37th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 41 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 13th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 483 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Michigan prisons housed 538 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 2,113. Michigan’s female prison population was at its lowest with 538 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 2,267 female inmates in 2002.

Between 1977 and 2004, Michigan’s female prison population grew by 293% with an average annual percent change of 5.5% per year (a much slower rate of growth than in most other states).

From 1977 until the mid-1990s, Michigan’s female imprisonment rate was typically higher than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. In the mid-1990s, growth in female imprisonment in Michigan slowed relative to growth in other states, and its imprisonment fell below average. With a female imprisonment rate of 41 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Michigan ranked 37th in its imprisonment of female offenders in 2004.
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Although Michigan’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 25 male prisoners for every female prisoner, Michigan’s male to female ratio remained remarkably stable over a period where most states experienced decreases in that ratio. Therefore, by 2004, Michigan’s male to female imprisonment ratio (22:1) was substantially higher than the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Michigan has 70 correctional facilities. Of Michigan’s 70 correctional facilities, 56 house male prisoners only, three house female prisoners only, and 11 house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Minnesota prisons housed 8,758 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 8,214 were male and 544 were female. Minnesota ranked 46th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 21 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 49th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 171 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Minnesota prisons housed 75 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 544. Minnesota’s female prison population was at its lowest with 67 female prisoners in 1982 and peaked at 544 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Minnesota’s female prison population grew by 625% with an average annual percent change of 8.3% per year. Minnesota has always been among the least punitive states in terms of overall imprisonment (ranked 49th in both 1977 and 2004). Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, Minnesota’s female imprisonment rate was also substantially lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states, and its rate of growth was much slower. With a female imprisonment rate of 21 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents in 2004, Minnesota is among the 10 least punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders (ranked 46th).
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Minnesota’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 24 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Minnesota’s male to female imprisonment ratio (15:1) was slightly higher than the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Minnesota has 9 correctional facilities. Of Minnesota’s nine correctional facilities, seven house male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and one houses both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT GROWTH AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imprisonment Rate</th>
<th>Female Imprisonment Rate</th>
<th>Total Female Sentenced Prisoners</th>
<th>Average Annual Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>67 (40th)</td>
<td>4 (39th)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>669 (3rd)</td>
<td>107 (2nd)</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Increase 1977-2004: 2,711%
Percent Increase 1999-2004: 25%

IMPRISONMENT IN MISSISSIPPI

At year-end 2004, Mississippi’s prisons housed 19,469 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 17,867 were male and 1,602 were female. With 107 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Mississippi’s female imprisonment rate was among the highest in the country in 2004 (ranked 2nd). With 669 prisoners per 100,000 residents, Mississippi had the third highest overall imprisonment rate in the country in 2004.

In 1977, Mississippi prisons housed 57 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,602. Mississippi’s female prison population was at its lowest with 57 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 1,875 female inmates in 2002.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Mississippi’s female prison population grew by 2,711% with an average annual percent change of 14.0% per year.

From the late 1970s through the early 1980s, Mississippi’s female imprisonment rate hovered at or just below average. Through the 1980s, Mississippi’s female imprisonment rate increased gradually and maintained its slightly higher than average rate. Beginning in the early to mid 1990s, Mississippi’s female prison population began to grow a rate that was quite substantially greater than average, so that by the end of the 1990s and through 2004, Mississippi’s female imprisonment rate was double the average across the states. In 2004, Mississippi’s female imprisonment
rate was the second highest in the country. In terms of imprisonment of women offenders, Mississippi is among the most punitive.

**MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO**

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Mississippi’s 1977 ratio was substantially higher than average with 45 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Due to rapid growth in female imprisonment through the 1990s, by 2004, Mississippi’s male to female imprisonment ratio (11:1) was lower than the average across states.

**CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES**

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Mississippi has 28 correctional facilities. Of Mississippi’s 28 correctional facilities, 25 house male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and two house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Missouri prisons housed 31,061 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 28,558 were male and 2,503 were female. Missouri ranked 8th highest in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 85 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 8th highest in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 538 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Missouri prisons housed 158 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 2,503. Missouri’s female prison population was at its lowest with 158 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 2,503 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Missouri’s female prison population grew by 1,484% with an average annual percent change of 11.5% per year.

From 1977 through the mid-1990s, Missouri’s female imprisonment rate growth tracked average growth across the states. In the mid-1990’s growth in Missouri’s female imprisonment rate accelerated quite rapidly, so that by 2004, Missouri’s female imprisonment rate was substantially higher than average. With an imprisonment rate of 85 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Missouri ranked 8th most punitive in 2004.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Missouri’s 1977 ratio was quite a bit higher than average with 33 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Missouri’s male to female imprisonment ratio (11:1) had declined to the point where it was lower than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Missouri has 28 correctional facilities. Of Missouri’s 28 correctional facilities, 23 house male prisoners only, three house female prisoners only, and two house both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT IN MONTANA

At year-end 2004, Montana prisons housed 3,877 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 3,404 were male and 473 were female. Montana ranked 4th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 102 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 20th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 416 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Montana prisons housed 2 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 473. Montana’s female prison population was at its lowest with 2 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 473 female inmates in 2004.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Montana’s female prison population grew by 23,550% with an average annual percent change of 39.1% per year. Much of this increase can be attributed to quite dramatic growth in the number of female prisoners throughout the late 1990s.

Throughout the period from 1977 until the late 1990s, Montana’s female imprisonment rate was substantially lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. Beginning in the late 1990s, Montana’s female imprisonment rate began to increase quite dramatically, so that by 2004, Montana had the 4th highest female imprisonment rate in the country (with 102 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents). To put this growth in perspective, Montana –
one of the ten most punitive states in terms of female imprisonment in 2004 – was the least punitive state in that regard in 1977.

**MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO**

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Montana’s 1977 ratio was substantially higher than average with 44 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Montana’s male to female imprisonment ratio (7:1) was half that of the average across states.

**CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES**

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Montana has eight correctional facilities. Of Montana’s eight correctional facilities, one houses male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and six house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Nebraska prisons housed 4,038 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 3,690 were male and 348 were female. With 39 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Nebraska ranked 40th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate. With 230 prisoners per 100,000 residents, Nebraska ranked 45th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate.

In 1977, Nebraska prisons housed 73 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 348. Nebraska’s female prison population was at its lowest with 49 female prisoners in 1979 and peaked at 348 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Nebraska’s female prison population grew by 377% with an average annual percent change of 7.0% per year.

With the exception of 1977, when Nebraska’s female imprisonment rate was slightly higher than average, its imprisonment rate was below average throughout the entire period from 1978 to 2004. Nebraska’s female imprisonment rate of 39 female prisoners per 100,000 females in 2004 was substantially lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner – by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Nebraska’s 1977 ratio was substantially lower than average with 17 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Nebraska’s male to female imprisonment ratio (11:1) remained lower than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Nebraska has nine correctional facilities. Of Nebraska’s nine correctional facilities, six house male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and two house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Nevada prisons housed 11,280 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 10,402 were male and 878 were female. Nevada ranked 12th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 77 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 14th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 474 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Nevada prisons housed 65 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 878. Nevada’s female prison population was at its lowest with 65 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 880 female inmates in 2003.

Between 1977 and 2004, Nevada’s female prison population grew by 1,251% with an average annual percent change of 11.1% per year. Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, Nevada’s female imprisonment rate was substantially higher than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. With a female imprisonment rate of 77 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Nevada ranks 12th most punitive in its imprisonment of female offenders. Nevada has consistently had one of the highest female imprisonment rates in the country – in 1977, it ranked as the most punitive state.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Nevada’s 1977 ratio was substantially lower than average with 17 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Nevada’s male to female imprisonment ratio (12:1) remained slightly lower than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Nevada has 20 correctional facilities. Of Nevada’s 20 correctional facilities, 16 house male prisoners only, two house female prisoners only, and two house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, New Hampshire prisons housed 2,448 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 2,329 were male and 119 were female. New Hampshire ranked 47th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 18 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 47th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 119 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, New Hampshire prisons housed only 2 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 119. New Hampshire’s female prison population was at its lowest with 2 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 144 female inmates in 2002.

Between 1977 and 2004, New Hampshire’s female prison population grew by 5,850% with an average annual percent change of 21.1% per year.

Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, New Hampshire’s female imprisonment rate was substantially lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. With a female imprisonment rate of 18 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, New Hampshire is among the 10 least punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders in 2004 (ranked 47th).
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. New Hampshire’s 1977 ratio was substantially higher than average with 46 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, New Hampshire’s male to female imprisonment ratio (20:1) remained higher than the average across states (though less dramatically so).

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, New Hampshire has eight correctional facilities. Of New Hampshire’s eight correctional facilities, three house male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and three house both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT IN NEW JERSEY

At year-end 2004, New Jersey prisons housed 26,757 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 25,287 were male and 1,470 were female. New Jersey ranked 42nd in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 33 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents and 38th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 306 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, New Jersey prisons housed 180 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,470. New Jersey’s female prison population was at its lowest with 176 female prisoners in 1978 and peaked at 1,862 female inmates in 1999.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, New Jersey’s female prison population grew by 717% with an average annual percent change of 8.8% per year.

Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, New Jersey’s female imprisonment rate was somewhat lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. With a female imprisonment rate of 33 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, New Jersey was among the 10 least punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders in 2004 (ranked 42nd).
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. New Jersey’s 1977 ratio was higher than average with 29 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, New Jersey’s male to female imprisonment ratio (17:1) remained higher than the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, New Jersey has 43 correctional facilities. Of New Jersey’s 43 correctional facilities, 35 house male prisoners only, four house female prisoners only, and four house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, New Mexico’s prisons housed 6,111 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 5,565 were male and 546 were female. New Mexico ranked 24th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 56 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 37th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 318 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, New Mexico prisons housed 53 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 546. New Mexico’s female prison population was at its lowest with 40 female prisoners in 1979 and peaked at 546 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, New Mexico’s female prison population grew by 930% with an average annual percent change of 12.0% per year.

Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, New Mexico’s female imprisonment rate was at or below the average female imprisonment rate across the states. While many states experienced consistent and steady growth in female imprisonment, New Mexico’s female imprisonment rate varied quite erratically (particularly through the 1990s). With a female imprisonment rate of 56, New Mexico’s female imprisonment rate in 2004 was average.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. New Mexico’s 1977 ratio was equivalent to the average across states with 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, New Mexico’s male to female imprisonment ratio (10:1) was substantially lower than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, New Mexico has 10 correctional facilities. Of New Mexico’s 10 correctional facilities, nine house male prisoners only and one houses female prisoners only. No facilities house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, New York prisons housed 63,751 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 60,962 were male and 2,789 were female. New York ranked 44th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 28 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents and 33rd in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 331 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, New York prisons housed 512 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 2,789. New York’s female prison population was at its lowest with 512 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 3,728 female inmates in 1996.

**GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE**

Between 1977 and 2004, New York’s female prison population grew by 445% with an average annual percent change of 7.1% per year.

New York’s female imprisonment rate was slightly lower than the average across states from 1977 until the late 1980s. New York’s female imprisonment rate growth increased quite substantially in the late 1980s and through the early 1990s before stabilizing. As female imprisonment rates grew in other states throughout the 1990s, in New York the female imprisonment rate stabilized and then fell, so that by 2004, New York was among the 10 least punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders (ranked 44th).

---

**IMPRISONMENT IN NEW YORK**

**IMPRISONMENT GROWTH AT A GLANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imprisonment Rate</th>
<th>Female Imprisonment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>108 (22nd)</td>
<td>5 (32nd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>331 (33rd)</td>
<td>28 (44th)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total Female Sentenced Prisoners 1977: 512
- Total Female Sentenced Prisoners 2004: 2,789
- Percent Increase 1977-2004: 445%
- Average Annual Percent Increase 1977-2004: 7%
- Percent Decrease 1999-2004: -23%
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. New York’s 1977 ratio was substantially higher than the average across states with 37 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, New York’s male to female imprisonment ratio (22:1) remained notably higher than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, New York has 72 correctional facilities. Of New York’s 72 correctional facilities, 62 house male prisoners only, five house female prisoners only, and five house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, North Carolina prisons housed 30,583 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 28,925 were male and 1,758 were female. North Carolina ranked 39th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 40 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 31st in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 357 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, North Carolina prisons housed 460 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,758. North Carolina’s female prison population was at its lowest with 446 female prisoners in 1978 and peaked at 1,758 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, North Carolina’s female imprisonment rate grew by 282% with an average annual percent change of 5.6% per year.

Through the mid-to-late 1980s, North Carolina was quite punitive in both its overall imprisonment rate and its female imprisonment rate. In 1977, for example, North Carolina’s overall imprisonment rate was the 5th highest in the country, and its female imprisonment rate the second highest (at 16 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, North Carolina’s female imprisonment rate was twice the average across states). Over time, as most states grew progressively more punitive, North Carolina experienced a much slower rate of growth. By the late 1980s North Car-
olina was average in its imprisonment rates. In the mid-1990s, as many states experienced an acceleration in imprisonment rate, North Carolina began to reverse its path. By 2004, with a female imprisonment rate of 40 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, North Carolina was among the 15 least punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders (ranked 39th).

**CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES**

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, North Carolina has 80 correctional facilities. Of North Carolina’s 80 correctional facilities, 72 house male prisoners only, seven house female prisoners only, and one houses both male and female prisoners.

**MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO**

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. North Carolina’s 1977 ratio was slightly higher than average with 27 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, North Carolina’s male to female imprisonment ratio (16:1) remained slightly higher than the average across states.
At year-end 2004, North Dakota prisons housed 1,238 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 1,109 were male and 129 were female. North Dakota ranked 38th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 41 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 46th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 195 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, North Dakota prisons housed only two female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 129. North Dakota’s female prison population was at its lowest with two female prisoners in 1977, 1978, 1979, and 1980 and peaked at 129 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, North Dakota’s female prison population grew by 6,350% with an average annual percent change of 28.4% per year. The excessively high percent change can be explained by the very low beginning count (in 1977, North Dakota had only two female prisoners).

Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, North Dakota’s female imprisonment rate was substantially lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. With a female imprisonment rate of 41 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, North Dakota is among the 15 least punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders (ranked 38th). While still somewhat less punitive relative to other
states, North Dakota became increasingly punitive in its imprisonment of female offenders through the 1990s. The trend toward a higher imprisonment rate in North Dakota is more pronounced in its imprisonment of females than it is in its overall imprisonment.

MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner – by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. North Dakota’s male to female ratio appears quite erratic, largely because of the low base number of female prisoners. North Dakota’s 1977 ratio was substantially higher than average with 80 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, North Dakota’s male to female imprisonment ratio (9:1) was lower than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, North Dakota has three correctional facilities. Of North Dakota’s three correctional facilities, one houses male prisoners only and two house both male and female prisoners. No facility houses only female inmates.
IMPRISONMENT IN OHIO

At year-end 2004, Ohio prisons housed 44,806 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 41,621 were male and 3,185 were female. Ohio ranked 27th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 54 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 25th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 391 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Ohio prisons housed 577 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 3,185. Ohio’s female prison population was at its lowest with 538 female prisoners in 1978 and peaked at 3,185 female inmates in 2004.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Ohio’s female prison population grew by 452% with an average annual percent change of 6.8% per year.

From 1977 until the late 1990s, Ohio’s female imprisonment rate was typically quite a bit higher than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. In the late 1990s, as the average across states continued to grow, Ohio’s female imprisonment rate stabilized. With a 2004 female imprisonment rate of 54 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Ohio was ranked 27th.
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner – by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Ohio’s 1977 ratio was lower than average with 21 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Ohio’s male to female imprisonment ratio (13:1) was equal to the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Ohio has 34 correctional facilities. Of Ohio’s 34 correctional facilities, 29 house male prisoners only, three house female prisoners only, and two house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Oklahoma prisons housed 22,913 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 20,613 were male and 2,300 were female. Oklahoma ranked 1st in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 129 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 4th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 649 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Oklahoma prisons housed 172 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 2,300. Oklahoma’s female prison population was at its lowest with 172 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 2,394 female inmates in 2000.

Between 1977 and 2004, Oklahoma’s female prison population grew by 1,237% with an average annual percent change of 10.7% per year. Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, Oklahoma’s female imprisonment rate was markedly higher than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. Although Oklahoma has always been among the most punitive in terms of its imprisonment rates, both Oklahoma’s overall imprisonment rate and female imprisonment rate began to grow substantially faster than average beginning in the mid-to-late 1980s. With a female imprisonment rate of 129 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents in 2004, Oklahoma is the most punitive state in its imprisonment of female offenders.
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Oklahoma’s 1977 ratio was lower than average with 23 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Oklahoma’s male to female imprisonment ratio (9:1) remained notably lower than the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Oklahoma has 52 correctional facilities. Of Oklahoma’s 52 correctional facilities, 40 house male prisoners only, eight house female prisoners only, and four house both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT IN OREGON

At year-end 2004, Oregon prisons housed 13,167 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 12,186 were male and 981 were female. Oregon ranked 26th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 54 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 30th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 365 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Oregon prisons housed 112 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 981. Oregon’s female prison population was at its lowest with 100 female prisoners in 1980 and peaked at 981 female inmates in 2004.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Oregon’s female prison population grew by 776% with an average annual percent change of 9.4% per year.

From 1977 through the early 1990s, Oregon’s female imprisonment rate closely tracked the average trend (sometimes Oregon had a slightly higher than average female imprisonment rate and sometimes slightly lower). Beginning in the early 1990s, Oregon experienced a trend-bucking and fairly substantial dip in its female imprisonment rate. Although Oregon’s female imprisonment rate resumed its upward trend in the mid-1990s, Oregon remains below average in terms of its female imprisonment rate. With a female imprisonment rate of 54 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Oregon ranks 26th among states in 2004.
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Oregon’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 25 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Oregon’s male to female imprisonment ratio (12:1) remained slightly lower than the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Oregon has 13 correctional facilities. Of Oregon’s 13 correctional facilities, nine house male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and three house both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT IN PENNSYLVANIA

At year-end 2004, Pennsylvania prisons housed 40,931 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 39,111 were male and 1,820 were female. Pennsylvania ranked 43rd in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 28 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 35th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 329 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Pennsylvania prisons housed 211 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,820. Pennsylvania’s female prison population was at its lowest with 211 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 1821 female inmates in 2003.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Pennsylvania’s female prison population grew by 763% with an average annual percent change of 8.6% per year.

Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, Pennsylvania’s female imprisonment rate was substantially lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. With a female imprisonment rate of 28 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Pennsylvania is among the 10 least punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders (ranked 43rd).
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Pennsylvania’s 1977 ratio was notably higher than the average, with 34 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Pennsylvania’s male to female imprisonment ratio (21:1) remained considerably higher than the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Pennsylvania has 44 correctional facilities. Of Pennsylvania’s 44 correctional facilities, 37 house male prisoners only, 4 house female prisoners only, and 3 house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Rhode Island prisons housed 1,894 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 1,834 were male and 60 were female. Rhode Island ranked 50th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 11 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 48th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 175 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Rhode Island prisons housed 13 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 60. Rhode Island’s female prison population was at its lowest with 8 female prisoners in 1981 and peaked at 91 female inmates in 1998.

Between 1977 and 2004, Rhode Island’s female prison population grew by 362% with an average annual percent change of 9.2% per year.

Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, Rhode Island’s female imprisonment rate was substantially lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. In fact, Rhode Island experienced far less growth in female imprisonment than any other state. With a female imprisonment rate of 11 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Rhode Island was the least punitive state in its imprisonment of female offenders in 2004.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Rhode Island’s 1977 ratio was substantially higher than average with 40 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Rhode Island’s male to female imprisonment ratio (31:1) remained markedly higher than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Rhode Island has seven correctional facilities. Of Rhode Island’s seven correctional facilities, six house male prisoners only and one houses female prisoners only. No facilities house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, South Carolina’s prisons housed 22,730 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 21,302 were male and 1,428 were female. South Carolina ranked 18th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 66 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 7th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 539 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, South Carolina prisons housed 276 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,428. South Carolina’s female prison population was at its lowest with 276 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 1,506 female inmates in 2002.

Between 1977 and 2004, South Carolina’s female prison population grew by 417% with an average annual percent change of 6.6% per year.

Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, South Carolina’s female imprisonment rate was substantially higher than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. With a female imprisonment rate of 66 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, South Carolina ranked 18th in female imprisonment in 2004.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. South Carolina’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 24 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, South Carolina’s male to female imprisonment ratio (15:1) was roughly equivalent to the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, South Carolina has four correctional facilities. Of South Carolina’s four correctional facilities, two house male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and one houses both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, South Dakota prisons housed 3,088 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 2,798 were male and 290 were female. South Dakota ranked 13th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 75 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 23rd in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 399 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, South Dakota prisons housed 18 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 290. South Dakota female prison population was at its lowest with 15 female prisoners in 1978 and 1980 and peaked at 290 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, South Dakota’s female prison population grew by 1,511% with an average annual percent change of 13.3% per year.

Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, South Dakota’s female imprisonment rate tracked the average female imprisonment rate across the states fairly closely. From 1977 through 1997, South Dakota’s female imprisonment rate was slightly below average. After 1997, its rate climbed above the average. With a female imprisonment rate of 75 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, South Dakota ranked among the 13 most punitive states in 2004.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. South Dakota’s 1977 ratio was slightly higher than average with 27 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, South Dakota’s male to female imprisonment ratio (10:1) was lower than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, South Dakota has 34 correctional facilities. Of South Dakota’s 34 correctional facilities, 29 house male prisoners only, three house female prisoners only, and two house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Tennessee prisons housed 25,884 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 23,979 were male and 1,905 were female. Tennessee ranked 21st in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 63 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 19th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 437 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Tennessee prisons housed 232 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,905. Tennessee ranked 21st in its female imprisonment rate in 1977 with 10 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 18th in its imprisonment rate in 2004 with 63 female prisoners per 100,000 residents.

The female prison population in Tennessee has seen a growth of 721% between 1977 and 2004, with an average annual percent change of 9.1% per year. Tennessee began the period of 1977 through 2004 with a female imprisonment rate that was slightly higher than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. In the mid-1980s, female imprisonment rates typically continued to grow, Tennessee’s rate stabilized with minimal annual growth. Toward the end of the 1990s, Tennessee’s female imprisonment rate was once again higher than the average across states. With a female imprisonment rate of 63 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Tennessee ranked 21st in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Tennessee’s female prison population grew by 721% with an average annual percent change of 9.1% per year.

Tennessee began the period of 1977 through 2004 with a female imprisonment rate that was slightly higher than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. In the mid-1980s, as female imprisonment rates typically continued to grow, Tennessee’s rate stabilized with minimal annual growth. Toward the end of the 1990s, Tennessee’s female imprisonment rate began to grow quite substantially, so that by 2004, Tennessee’s imprisonment rate was once again higher than the average across states. With a female imprisonment rate of 63 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Tennessee ranked 21st in 2004.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Tennessee’s 1977 ratio was lower than average with 23 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Tennessee’s male to female imprisonment ratio (13:1) was equal to the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Tennessee has 15 correctional facilities. Of Tennessee’s 15 correctional facilities, 12 house male prisoners only, two house female prisoners only, and one houses both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Texas prisons housed 157,617 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 146,209 were male and 11,408 were female. Texas ranked 5th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 101 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 2nd in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 694 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Texas prisons housed 919 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 11,408. Texas’ female prison population was at its lowest with 919 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 11,634 female inmates in 2000.

### IMPRISONMENT GROWTH AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imprisonment Rate</th>
<th>Female Imprisonment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>176 (8th)</td>
<td>14 (7th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>694 (2nd)</td>
<td>101 (5th)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Female Sentenced Prisoners</th>
<th>Percent Increase 1977-2004</th>
<th>Average Annual Percent Increase 1977-2004</th>
<th>Percent Increase 1999-2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11,408</td>
<td>1,141%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Texas' female prison population grew by 1,141% with an average annual percent change of 13.3% per year.

For most of the period from 1977 to 2004, Texas’ female imprisonment rate was higher than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. However, the most notable trend in the figure below is the spike in Texas’ female imprisonment rate in 1993. Between 1992 and 1993, Texas’ female imprisonment rate more than doubled. It remained high throughout the rest of the 1990s, and through 2004. With a female imprisonment rate of 101 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents in 2004, Texas is among the 10 most punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders (ranked 5th).
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Texas’ 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 23 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Texas’ male to female imprisonment ratio (13:1) was equal to the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Texas has 136 correctional facilities. Of Texas’ 136 correctional facilities, 107 house male prisoners only, 10 house female prisoners only, and 19 house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Utah prisons housed 5,916 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 5,414 were male and 502 were female. Utah ranked 35th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 42 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 42nd in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 246 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Utah prisons housed 30 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 502. Utah’s female prison population was at its lowest with 27 female prisoners in 1980 and peaked at 502 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, Utah’s female prison population grew by 1,573% with an average annual percent change of 12.2% per year.

Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, Utah’s female imprisonment rate was consistently and substantially lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. With a female imprisonment rate of 42 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Utah was among the 15 least punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders in 2004 (ranked 45th).
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Utah’s 1977 ratio was equivalent to average across states with 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Utah’s male to female imprisonment ratio (11:1) was lower than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Utah has nine correctional facilities. Of Utah’s nine correctional facilities, five house male prisoners only and four house both male and female prisoners. No facility houses only female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, Vermont prisons housed 1,451 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 1,371 were male and 80 were female. Vermont is among the ten least punitive states both in overall imprisonment and female imprisonment. Vermont ranked 45th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 25 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 43rd in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 233 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Vermont prisons housed nine female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 80. Vermont’s female prison population was at its lowest with four female prisoners in 1986 and peaked at 84 female inmates in 2003.

Between 1977 and 2004, Vermont’s female prison population grew by 789% with an average annual percent change of 16.8% per year. Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, Vermont’s female imprisonment rate was substantially lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. With a female imprisonment rate of 25 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Vermont is among the 10 least punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders in 2004 (ranked 45th).
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Vermont’s 1977 ratio was substantially higher than average with 41 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Vermont’s male to female imprisonment ratio (17:1) remained somewhat higher – though less dramatically so – than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Vermont has nine correctional facilities. Of Vermont’s nine correctional facilities, seven house male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and one houses both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT IN VIRGINIA

At year-end 2004, Virginia prisons housed 35,564 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 32,858 were male and 2,706 were female. Virginia ranked 14th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 71 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 15th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 473 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Virginia prisons housed 251 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 2,706. Virginia’s female prison population was at its lowest with 251 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 2,706 female inmates in 2004.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Virginia’s female prison population grew by 978% with an average annual percent change of 9.7% per year.

For much of the period from 1977 to 1990, Virginia’s female imprisonment rate closely tracked the average female imprisonment rate across the states. Beginning in the early 1990s, Virginia’s female imprisonment growth accelerated more rapidly. By 2004, with a female imprisonment rate of 71 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Virginia was among the 15 most punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders (ranked 14th).
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Virginia’s 1977 ratio was slightly higher than average with 27 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Virginia’s male to female imprisonment ratio (12:1) was slightly lower than the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Virginia has 61 correctional facilities. Of Virginia’s 61 correctional facilities, 54 house male prisoners only and seven house female prisoners. No facilities house both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT IN WASHINGTON

At year-end 2004, Washington prisons housed 16,503 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 15,200 were male and 1,303 were female. Washington ranked 36th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 42 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 41st in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 264 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Washington prisons housed 226 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,303. Washington’s female prison population was at its lowest with 190 female prisoners in 1980 and peaked at 1,303 female inmates in 2004.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Washington’s female prison population grew by 477% with an average annual percent change of 7.3% per year.

Washington began the period with a female imprisonment rate that was substantially higher than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. However, as growth continued across most states through the 1980s, in Washington the prison population remained stable. As a result, even after Washington’s female imprisonment rate began to climb, Washington remained less punitive than other states in its imprisonment of females. With a female imprisonment rate of 42 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Washington was among the 15 least punitive states in 2004 (ranked 36th).
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Washington’s 1977 ratio was substantially lower than average with 17 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Washington’s male to female imprisonment ratio (12:1) was only slightly lower than the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Washington has 30 correctional facilities. Of Washington’s 30 correctional facilities, 15 house male prisoners only, three house female prisoners only, and 12 house both male and female prisoners.
At year-end 2004, West Virginia prisons housed 5,026 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 4,582 were male and 444 were female. West Virginia ranked 30th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 48 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 40th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 277 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, West Virginia prisons housed 44 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 444. West Virginia’s female prison population was at its lowest with 29 female prisoners in 1978 and peaked at 444 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, West Virginia’s female prison population grew by 909% with an average annual percent change of 10.1% per year.

Throughout the period from 1977 to 2004, West Virginia’s female imprisonment rate was substantially lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states. In fact, between 1977 and the mid-1990s West Virginia experienced very little growth in female imprisonment. West Virginia’s female imprisonment rate began to grow more rapidly through the 1990s so that, with a female imprisonment rate of 48 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, West Virginia ranked 30th in 2004.
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. West Virginia’s 1977 ratio was the same as the average across states with 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner. After some fluctuation, West Virginia’s male to female imprisonment ratio (10:1) was lower than the average across states in 2004.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, West Virginia has 11 correctional facilities. Of West Virginia’s 11 correctional facilities, five house male prisoners only, one house female prisoners only, and five house both male and female prisoners.
IMPRISONMENT GROWTH AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imprisonment Rate</th>
<th>Female Imprisonment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>72 (37th)</td>
<td>6 (30th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>390 (26th)</td>
<td>47 (31st)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total Female Sentenced Prisoners 1977: 136
- Total Female Sentenced Prisoners 2004: 1,310
- Percent Increase 1977-2004: 863%
- Average Annual Percent Increase 1977-2004: 9%
- Percent Decrease 1999-2004: 4%

IMPRISONMENT IN WISCONSIN

At year-end 2004, Wisconsin prisons housed 21,540 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 20,230 were male and 1,310 were female. Wisconsin ranked 31st in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 47 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 26th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 390 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Wisconsin prisons housed 136 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 1,310. Wisconsin’s female prison population was at its lowest with 136 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 1,365 female inmates in 1999.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Wisconsin’s female prison population grew by 863% with an average annual percent change of 9.4% per year.

Throughout much of the period from 1977 to 2004, Wisconsin’s female imprisonment rate was substantially lower than the average female imprisonment rate across the states; however, in the 1990s, Wisconsin’s female imprisonment rate began to increase rather quickly and drastically. By 1998, Wisconsin’s female imprisonment rate exceeded the average across states before stabilizing. With a female imprisonment rate of 47 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Wisconsin ranked 31st in 2004.
The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Wisconsin’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 24 male prisoners for every female prisoner. By 2004, Wisconsin’s male to female imprisonment ratio (15:1) was slightly higher than the average across states.

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Wisconsin has 30 correctional facilities. Of Wisconsin’s 30 correctional facilities, 26 house male prisoners only, three house female prisoners only, and one houses both male and female prisoners.
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IMPRISONMENT IN WYOMING

At year-end 2004, Wyoming prisons housed 1,980 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 1,770 were male and 210 were female. Wyoming ranked 9th in its 2004 female imprisonment rate with 84 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, and 27th in its 2004 overall imprisonment rate with 389 prisoners per 100,000 residents.

In 1977, Wyoming prisons housed 16 female inmates; by 2004, the female prison population had reached 210. Wyoming’s female prison population was at its lowest with 16 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 210 female inmates in 2004.

GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE

Between 1977 and 2004, Wyoming’s female prison population grew by 1,213% with an average annual percent change of 11.6% per year.

Wyoming’s female imprisonment rate grew more erratically than in other states through the period from 1977 to 2004. Its female imprisonment rate tended to rise and fall, sometimes quite substantially, from year to year. By the mid-1990s, Wyoming female imprisonment rate was above average. With a female imprisonment rate of 84 female prisoners per 100,000 female residents, Wyoming was among the 10 most punitive states in its imprisonment of female offenders in 2004 (ranked 9th).

IMPRISONMENT GROWTH AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment Rate</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Imprisonment Rate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Sentenced</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase 1977-2004</td>
<td>1,213%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Percent</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase 1977-2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase 1999-2004</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. Wyoming’s 1977 ratio was slightly lower than average with 24 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, Wyoming’s male to female imprisonment ratio (8:1) was substantially lower than the average across states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, Wyoming has nine correctional facilities. Of Wyoming’s nine correctional facilities, four house male prisoners only, one houses female prisoners only, and four house both male and female prisoners.
Imprisonment data for the District of Columbia are included only through 1997. In 1997, the Revitalization Act initiated the transfer of all sentenced DC prisoners to the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. The transfer process, which was gradual, began in 1998 and was fully complete at the end of 2001.1

At year-end 1997, District of Columbia prisons housed 9,353 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 8,946 were male and 407 were female. In 1977, DC prisons housed 42 female inmates; by 1997, the female prison population had reached 407. The District of Columbia’s female prison population was at its lowest with 42 female prisoners in 1977 and peaked at 537 female inmates in 1994.

**GROWTH IN FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATE**

Between 1977 and 1997, the District of Columbia’s female prison population grew by 869% with an average annual percent change of 18.4% per year.

Throughout the period from 1977 to 1997, the District of Columbia’s female imprisonment rate was exceeded the average female imprisonment rate across the states. In the late 1980s, DC’s female imprisonment rate increased dramatically (as did its overall imprisonment rate), so that by the early 1990s, the female imprisonment rate in DC was more than twice as high as the average across the states. The District of Columbia’s imprisonment rate remained high through the beginning of the transition of sentenced DC inmates to federal custody.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. DC’s 1977 ratio was substantially higher than average with 52 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 1997, DC’s male to female imprisonment ratio (22:1) remained higher than the average across states.
At year-end 2004, Federal prisons housed 159,137 inmates serving sentences of more than one year. Of these inmates, 148,930 were male and 10,207 were female. In 2004, the female imprisonment rate 7 federal prisoners per 100,000 female residents and the overall federal imprisonment rate was 54 federal prisoners per 100,000 residents. Ranking the federal imprisonment rate relative to the states is not particularly useful because the population base is so large.

In 1977, federal prisons housed 1,694 female inmates; by 2004, the federal female prison population had reached 10,207. The federal female prison population was at its lowest with 1173 female prisoners in 1980 and peaked at 10,207 female inmates in 2004.

Between 1977 and 2004, the federal system’s female prison population grew by 503% with an average annual percent change of 7.3% per year.
MALE TO FEMALE IMPRISONMENT RATIO

The male to female imprisonment ratio indicates the number of male inmates for every female inmate. Although both female and male imprisonment rates have increased over the period of study, a shrinking ratio suggests that the number of female prisoners has increased at a faster pace. In 1977, across the states, there were an average of 26 male prisoners for every female prisoner; by 2004, this ratio had fallen to 13 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In the federal system, the 1977 ratio was substantially lower than the state average with 16 male prisoners for every female prisoner. In 2004, the federal system’s male to female imprisonment ratio (15:1) was slightly higher the average across the states.

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

According to the 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, the Federal Bureau of Prisons operates 84 correctional facilities. Of these 84 correctional facilities, 73 house male prisoners only, 4 house female prisoners only, and 7 house both male and female prisoners.
NOTES

All averages across the states in this report are medians. For the purposes of this initial report, only prison data for inmates sentenced to more than one year were included. The exclusion of data covering those not sentenced (or those sentenced to less than one year) allows for the inclusion of the six states that have mixed prison and jail populations. The six states with mixed prison/jail populations include: Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

All imprisonment data were drawn from Bureau of Justice Statistics datasets and spreadsheets that rely on National Prisoner Statistics (NPS) and National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP) data. For a description of the NPS and NCRP methodologies and state by state explanatory notes see: [http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/p03.pdf](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/p03.pdf)

The gender specific data for 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002 were compiled for the author by Paige M. Harrison of the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The author would like to thank Paige Harrison for providing the gender specific data tables.
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About Women’s Prison Association

Founded in 1844, WPA is the nation’s oldest service and advocacy organization committed to helping women with criminal justice histories live self-sufficient, rewarding lives and realize their potential to contribute to society. We take a dual approach to our work, combining a commitment to helping women change the circumstances of their lives one-by-one with a commitment to changing the systems that create opportunities and barriers for criminal justice-involved women.

**WPA Client Services** assist women to obtain work, housing, and health care; rebuild their families; and participate fully in civic life. WPA offers an integrated continuum of services to over 2500 women a year in the New York City jail, several state prisons, and in the community through our residential and non-residential programs.

**Institute on Women & Criminal Justice** is a national center for dialogue, research, and information about criminal justice-involved women, their families and communities. By fostering a national conversation on women and criminal justice, the Institute is working to create a breakthrough in the ways in which our public systems deal with women and crime. The Institute actively promotes innovative solutions and highlights what works.

---
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www.wpaonline.org
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