

IMPACT EVALUATION - VOLUME III

NEW LINE CLASSIFICATION DURING ITS FIRST YEAR OF OPERATION

Submitted by:

Ellen Chayet  
Evaluation Specialist

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Frank A. Hall  
Commissioner

May 1978

Publication #10,613-24-200-6-78-CR

11/1/77  
11/2/77  
11/3/77

11/4/77  
11/5/77  
11/6/77

11/7/77  
11/8/77  
11/9/77  
11/10/77  
11/11/77  
11/12/77  
11/13/77  
11/14/77  
11/15/77  
11/16/77  
11/17/77  
11/18/77  
11/19/77  
11/20/77  
11/21/77  
11/22/77  
11/23/77  
11/24/77  
11/25/77  
11/26/77  
11/27/77  
11/28/77  
11/29/77  
11/30/77

11/31/77  
12/1/77  
12/2/77  
12/3/77  
12/4/77  
12/5/77  
12/6/77  
12/7/77  
12/8/77  
12/9/77  
12/10/77  
12/11/77  
12/12/77  
12/13/77  
12/14/77  
12/15/77  
12/16/77  
12/17/77  
12/18/77  
12/19/77  
12/20/77  
12/21/77  
12/22/77  
12/23/77  
12/24/77  
12/25/77  
12/26/77  
12/27/77  
12/28/77  
12/29/77  
12/30/77

12/31/77  
1/1/78  
1/2/78  
1/3/78  
1/4/78  
1/5/78  
1/6/78  
1/7/78  
1/8/78  
1/9/78  
1/10/78  
1/11/78  
1/12/78  
1/13/78  
1/14/78  
1/15/78  
1/16/78  
1/17/78  
1/18/78  
1/19/78  
1/20/78  
1/21/78  
1/22/78  
1/23/78  
1/24/78  
1/25/78  
1/26/78  
1/27/78  
1/28/78  
1/29/78  
1/30/78  
1/31/78

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank three individuals for their assistance with this evaluation. Joe Spinale, of the Research Division, assisted in compiling and checking statistical tables. Terry Assael, Impact Deputy Director, contributed much of the data and necessary background material. Finally, Ellen Weiner of the Research Division, was as always competent and efficient in preparing both the draft and final reports.



FOREWORD

This study evaluates one program component funded under the "Special Impact-Corrections" grant (June, 1975 through May, 1976). Impact monies were targeted at MCI-Concord commitments providing for a variety of programs and services both unique and complementary to existing capabilities. The scope of these programs ranged from those serving the actual institutionalized Concord population, to street-based strategies. Briefly, these were:

1. New Line: a classification capability aimed at court commitments to MCI-Concord.
2. Lancaster: a pre-release/minimum security facility for returns to the Worcester area.
3. Pre-Release Training: training designed to reduce program non-completions at community-based facilities.
4. C.A.R.V.E.: employment project at the Fernald State School for the mentally retarded.
5. Supported Work: training and community work experience for pre-release clients and parolees.
6. Release Support: tri-phased program to facilitate transition for individuals released directly to the street.
7. Purchase of Services: funds for requests in such areas as education, medical costs, and vocational training.

Each of these components is analyzed in a separate study, since they differ in type of population served and objectives addressed. Hence, variables collected for each and desirable outcome measures will also differ. Each volume of the Impact studies should be incorporated as a segment of a comprehensive assessment of the Impact program.

The present study is an evaluation of the New Line component of the Impact grant.

NEW LINEABSTRACT

The New Line is an intake classification capability designed for court commitments to the Massachusetts Correctional Institution at Concord, a facility at that time housing the younger, relative newcomer to adult crime. Operationalized with LEAA discretionary funding from June, 1975 through May, 1976, the New Line was formulated in response to two salient and disturbing trends in Concord's population; one, that the facility was simply becoming increasingly overcrowded; and two, there was a disproportionately high rate of population turnover. Both observations implied that appropriate custody assessment and sound treatment planning would be difficult to effect.

In this context, New Line goals were to both conduct an intake classification assessment that was thorough and efficient, and would divert as many men as possible from residency at Concord; and to consolidate and utilize the varied institutional programs for offenders not suitable for transfer. A rate of ten percent diversion was projected as minimal by program planners.

This evaluation focuses on two areas: a description of the classification operations during its first year of funding; and an analysis and profile of the men diverted from the facility.

Client intake commenced in June, 1975; through the end of May, 1976, a total of 377 individuals were screened. Of these, 265 men (70.3 percent) were classified by New Line, with the remainder referred to more appropriate capabilities. On the average, the classification process lasted 12.5 weeks. If the individual was to be diverted, he remained at the New Line for just over two weeks. The staff recommended 42.2 percent of all clients seen for diversion; the actual rate of diversion was a bit lower (104 individuals, for a rate of 39.2 percent). Nearly seventy percent of these men who were diverted from maximum custody were transferred to a minimum security placement, community-based facility, or directly paroled.

The client profile yielded some interesting distinguishing characteristics of men diverted as compared to those designated to remain at Concord. Among these findings were that individuals who were transferred from the facility were significantly more likely to have been older when committed, to have been older when first arrested, to have evidenced a longer employment history, and to have been better educated. They were less likely to have been booked on a sex-related charge, to have previously been arrested, to have ever been arrested for a sex or property crime, and to have ever been incarcerated as an adult.

The study concludes that New Line met many of its original goals by sustaining a high rate of diversion, including a large percentage placed in lower custody or community-based facilities. Further, analysis of the client profile indicated that placement decisions appear to have been appropriate. The New Line activities seem to be consistent with a reintegrative philosophy of corrections, and a concern for individualized treatment needs.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction	1
Methodology	4
The Sample	4
Research Questions	6
Findings	
Section I	
Clients Accepted for New Line Classification	6
Speed of Classification	6
Purchase of Service Participation	7
Time Spent Awaiting Transfer	7
Diversion and Receiving Institution	8
Actual Rates of Diversion and Receiving Institution	8
Section II	
Current Incarceration	11
Criminal History	12
Personal Background Characteristics	12
Summary of Findings	14
Discussion	17

# TABLE OF TABLES

	<u>PAGE</u>
Table I: Transfers of Clients Screened by New Line	6
Table II: Time to Complete Classification	6
Table III: Time Spent Awaiting Transfer after Termination from New Line Program	7
Table IV: Facilities Recommended for New Line Clients	8
Table V: Facilities Receiving New Line Clients	8
Table VI: Facilities Receiving New Line Diversions	10
Table VII: Maximum Chi Square Splits	15



## Introduction

Classification, or the assessment of the incarcerated individuals most appropriate level of custody and program suitability, poses an ever-complex challenge for the correctional administrator. Although different jurisdictions assume varying approaches to the problem, the offender is generally afforded an intake evaluation which serves to guide the subsequent experience of incarceration. Classification may be integrated within further aspects of this experience, such as when there is indication that the original recommendations might not have been appropriate. The implementation and utilization of specific classification capabilities is entirely consistent with the ever-expanding field of correctional treatment components and program-matically distinct facilities.

Massachusetts adheres to the multi-level classification philosophy. Incoming court commitments are traditionally sentenced to one of two maximum security facilities; MCI-Concord, designed to serve the young, relative newcomer to crime, and MCI-Walpole, reserved for the older, recidivistic, and more serious offender.<sup>1</sup> Statutory constraints allow for little latitude in determining to which institution an offender will be sent. Thus, a decision must be made, upon commitment or shortly thereafter, regarding a carefully defined treatment program which will maximize the rehabilitative effect of the individual's term of incarceration. Intake assessments are often buttressed with additional appearances before classification boards to further plan the direction of the offender's term of imprisonment.<sup>2</sup>

The New Line was conceived as an innovative intake classification capability for court commitments to Concord.<sup>3</sup> The procedures documented here became operational with Impact discretionary funding during the period of June, 1975 through May, 1976. The mission of the New Line, as a supplemental facility to the existing classification process at Concord, was primarily twofold: one, to divert as many individuals as possible from residing at this institution; and, two, to recommend that varied treatment modalities be provided for offenders judged to remain at Concord.

- 
- 1 Since this evaluation, the distinction of where classification will occur is based upon the offender's age, with men 23 and older classified at the Reception Diagnostic Center (RDC), and those 22 and younger at the Northeast Reception Diagnostic Center (NRDC).
  - 2 The reader should be cautioned that this description of the classification process in Massachusetts is characteristic of the year being studied. Since that time, the system has undergone change, although the New Line remains operational as the NRDC. Future Research Division studies will detail the more current classification procedures.
  - 3 Since Impact funding, the New Line has become the Northeast Reception Diagnostic Center (NRDC) for all men 22 years of age and younger. The counterpart for men 23 and older is the RDC.

The New Line occupies primary importance at the foundation of Impact-related programs; thus, a short exposition is necessary. Clients who were diverted could be recommended for pre-release training, an Impact component aimed at reducing failure of Concord commitments at community-based facilities; or, a direct pre-release placement could be deemed suitable, in which case the Impact-funded Lancaster facility might be chosen. Individuals remaining at Concord could participate in Release Support, CARVE, or Supported Work. Upon release from maximum security, enrollment in another Impact component was, of course, possible. Finally, all Concord commitments were eligible for Purchase of Services funds.<sup>4</sup>

A variety of additional treatment options offered by Massachusetts Corrections were available to New Line staff. Diversion placements were limited only by the number of facilities and community-based programs in Massachusetts; an array of inside-the-walls services and programs were also possible. Thus, the crucial objective of New Line was to tailor a treatment plan to the resident's eligibility and suitability for each option. The specific operational goals of the capability, viewed in this context, were to conduct an efficient and qualitatively sound classification procedure; and related to this and perhaps more important, to divert as many men as possible, but at least ten percent of all clients, from serving their sentence at Concord. These goals stemmed from the linked observations that, one, the Concord facility was becoming increasingly over-crowded, and, two, an abnormally rapid rate of population turnover was evident at the institution. The New Line could have an important bearing on these problems by selecting people for whom the custody level of Concord is inappropriate, discerning this early in the resident's stay, and by carefully planning treatment programs which would minimize the likelihood of premature transfer of inmates remaining at the facility.

Court commitments (parole violators and transfers were handled by the existing classification team) were assigned to the New Line upon arrival at the facility. Housed in a separate section from population, the New Line team consisting of a Director, staff psychologist, assistant staff psychologist, correctional social workers, a rehabilitation counselor, and clerical support conducted an immediate intake screening procedure to assess suitability for New Line classification. If accepted, the individual was oriented to the classification process and to the intricacies of institutional life, and an exhaustive investigation into the offender's personal background, criminal history, and other factors relevant to the decision-making ensued. Ultimately, a consensus, which

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted, however, that all New Line clients did not participate in additional Impact components; neither was the reverse necessarily the case. See the Foreword for a brief description of these programs.

included input from the correctional resident, was reached which specifically recommended treatment. If the client was to remain at Concord, he was released to population. Divertees were generally held at New Line until the particular transfer could be arranged.

This study will examine the first year of operations of the New Line program as it was funded by the Impact grant. Although some questions will of necessity remain unanswered, the key issues of implementation will be addressed.

## Methodology

### The Sample

The original sample consisted of 377 individuals who were actually seen by New Line Staff during the specified funding period and for whom data was available. Of these, 112 were almost immediately transferred to either other correctional institutions (most frequently of these, houses of correction); to the Reception Diagnostic Center (a classification capability at MCI-Norfolk serving Walpole commitments primarily); or referred to another classification capability at Concord. The remaining 265 men were ultimately classified by the New Line, and this study concerns that group.<sup>5</sup>

Program-related data, provided by New Line Staff, was collected on every individual received by the New Line, including dates of residence at the facility, classification recommendation, and actual immediate outcome of the recommendation. Additionally, criminal history data, personal background characteristics, and information regarding the current offense were obtained for each individual from the data base maintained by the Corrections and Parole Management Information Systems.

### Research Questions

This paper will address two separate issues:

1. How did the classification procedure of the New Line function? This portion of the study is a basic description of New Line activities as it related to the population under observation, and will examine the attainment of the program's operational goals.
2. Are there any differences between the individuals actually diverted by the New Line, and those who are not? More specifically, an attempt will be made in this section to isolate characteristics of commitments who were transferred from MCI-Concord at the conclusion of the classification experience. We want to assess these characteristics against stated program goals of diverting as many eligible and suitable clients from being incarcerated at MCI-Concord.

---

<sup>5</sup> Any discrepancies between this figure and those documented in the Impact final report are due to unavailability of data for the research.

Section I will primarily utilize descriptive statistics (i.e., percentages) to evaluate the New Line operations. In Section II, however, a measure of association, the Chi Square test will be employed to determine the divergence in characteristics between the two groups of divertees (individuals placed outside of the institution) and non-divertees. In this case, the maximum Chi Square obtained will be the one reported. In other words, for each variable for which a statistically significant difference between the two groups was observed, the value of that variable at which the greatest difference occurred will be the one documented. It should be noted that the standard used throughout to assess significance will be at the .05 level or beyond; that is, the observed relationship could be expected to occur by chance only 5 times out of 100, or less.

## Findings

### Section I

#### Clients Accepted for New Line Classification

Since the New Line commenced client intake in July, 1975, a total of 377 individuals were screened. Of these, 112 were immediately transferred elsewhere (29.7 percent of all clients seen). Thus, 265 men (70.3 percent of all screened clients) were classified at the New Line. This is illustrated in Table I.

TABLE I: TRANSFERS OF CLIENTS SCREENED BY NEW LINE

Remain at New Line		Reception Diagnostic Center		House of Correction		Other		TOTAL	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
265	(70.3)	81	(21.5)	16	(4.2)	15	(4.0)	377	(100.0)

The bulk of this study will be devoted to those men actually classified by New Line.

#### Speed of Classification<sup>1</sup>

The period of time residents were involved in classification lasted from four weeks (one client for .4 percent of the sample) to 96 weeks (one individual). This latter figure (as well as one individual residing at New Line for 56 weeks) should be excluded from this portion of the analysis, since they were incarcerated at Concord for some time prior to program implementation. Adjusted in this manner, the longest period an individual awaited completion of classification was 36 weeks (one individual representing .4 percent of the sample). The average length of stay for New Line clients was 12.5 weeks.

TABLE II: TIME TO COMPLETE CLASSIFICATION

<u>Time Spent in the New Line</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 to 4 weeks	1	(.4)
5 to 8 weeks	66	(25.2)
9 to 12 weeks	71	(27.1)
13 to 16 weeks	75	(28.6)
17 to 20 weeks	29	(11.1)
21 to 24 weeks	14	(5.3)
25 weeks or longer	6	(2.3)
TOTAL	262*	(100.0)

\* Data was missing for one individual.

- 1 This refers to the length of time individuals had to wait to have a completed classification; i.e., from the time he was admitted to the New Line Program, to the time a classification decision was reached.

### Purchase of Services Participation

The Impact Grant made it possible for a Concord commitment to avail himself of funding for a particular need, as educational or medical expenses, without directing such requests through the traditional channels. Of the 265 men processed by New Line, only 30 (11.3 percent) made any requests of Purchase of Services while participants of the New Line. It should be noted, however, that many New Line participants were ineligible for Purchase of Services, due to their pre-classification status.

### Time Spent Awaiting Transfer from New Line

After classification is complete, the inmate designated for a transfer out of Concord to some other facility must remain at the institution until such a move can be accommodated. For the 97 cases for whom data was available, time awaiting transfer ranged from less than one week ( 16 individuals, or 16.5 percent) to nine weeks (two clients, or 2.1 percent of this sample). The average length of time awaiting transfer was 2.3 weeks. (This figure represents the mean; the median, or the point at which the sample is equally split above and below, is 1.7 weeks.)

TABLE III: TIME SPENT AWAITING TRANSFER AFTER TERMINATION FROM  
NEW LINE PROGRAM

<u>Number of Weeks</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 1 week	16	(16.5)
1 to 2 weeks	46	(47.4)
3 to 4 weeks	19	(19.6)
5 to 6 weeks	12	(12.4)
7 to 9 weeks	4	( 4.1)
TOTAL	97	(100.0)

### Diversion and Receiving Institution

#### Recommendations

Of the 263 men classified by the New Line and for whom data was available, 111 were recommended for a transfer, for a rate of 42.2 percent. The remainder, 152 individuals, were recommended to remain at Concord (57.8 percent). Institutions recommended for placement are summarized in Table IV:

TABLE IV: FACILITIES RECOMMENDED FOR NEW LINE CLIENTS (N=263)

<u>Facility</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Concord <sup>1</sup>	152	(57.8)
Framingham <sup>3</sup>	2	( 0.8)
Norfolk <sup>2</sup>	18	( 6.8)
Bridgewater <sup>5</sup>	5	( 1.9)
Forestry <sup>3</sup>	5	( 1.9)
Community Based Programs <sup>4</sup>	67	(25.5)
Houses of Correction <sup>5</sup>	14	( 5.3)
TOTAL	263	(100.0)

- 1 Maximum/medium security  
 2 Medium security  
 3 Minimum security

- 4 Includes pre-release centers  
 and halfway houses  
 5 Varied custody levels

Actual Rates of Diversion and Receiving Institutions

In classification decision-making, however, final approval must be secured from the Commissioner of Correction. At this level, several factors may cause a discrepancy between the placement that was originally recommended by a classification board, and the facility actually receiving the individual. In some cases, a recommended transfer to lower custody may be vetoed; rarely, a non-diversion recommendation may be overturned for another placement; and often, a designated facility may not be able to admit additional residents. For these reasons, the actual rates of diversion must be explored.

Of the 265 men in the sample, 161 remained at Concord (60.8 percent). The actual number of diversions accomplished by the New Line was 104 men, for a rate of 39.2 percent. Facilities receiving these men are depicted in Table V:

TABLE V: FACILITIES RECEIVING NEW LINE CLIENTS (N=265)

<u>Facility</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Walpole <sup>1</sup>	5	( 1.9)
Concord	161	(60.8)
Framingham	1	( 0.4)
Norfolk	15	( 5.6)
Bridgewater	4	( 1.5)
Forestry	7	( 2.6)
Community Based Programs	59	(22.3)
Houses of Correction	6	( 2.3)
Parole	4	( 1.5)
Do Not Know*	3	( 1.1)
TOTAL	265	(100.0)

\* These men were diverted, but their actual placement is unknown.

1 Maximum security (for other custody levels, see Table IV.)



A visual comparison between recommended and actual placements highlights some interesting discrepancies. First, five men were sent to Walpole, a recommendation not originally made by New Line. Three were paroled, another option not recommended by the New Line staff. Several facilities received fewer than the number of recommended diversions: Framingham, Norfolk, Bridgewater, community based programs, and houses of correction. Concord, on the other hand, received more than the recommended 152 men.

Those facilities evidencing a substantial difference between the number of recommended placements and the actual number received were examined:

Of the 161 men remaining at Concord, 145 had not been recommended for transfer, six had originally been slated for a house of correction, five for community based programs, four to Norfolk, and one to Bridgewater.

Individuals placed at Walpole were originally recommended to remain at Concord (three men) and one each designated for Norfolk and a community based program.

Fifty-seven out of a recommended 67 New Line clients were transferred to a community based program. Of those who did not actually receive this placement, five remained at Concord, one was a Walpole placement, and two were directly paroled.<sup>6</sup>

Houses of Correction were destined to receive fourteen men, although six actually transferred. Two of the remaining eight individuals were sent instead to community based facilities, and six continued as Concord residents.

---

<sup>6</sup> Data was unavailable for two cases.

TABLE VI: FACILITIES RECEIVING NEW LINE DIVERSIONS (N=104)

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Number of Diversions</u>	<u>Percent of Diversions (%)</u>
Walpole	5	( 4.8)
Framingham	1	( 1.0)
Norfolk	15	(14.4)
Bridgewater	4	( 3.8)
Forestry	7	( 6.8)
Community Based Program	59	(56.7)
House of Correction	6	( 5.8)
Parole	4	( 3.8)
Do Not Know	3	( 2.9)
TOTAL	104	(100.0)

As Table VI illustrates, the final distribution of correctional facilities receiving offenders diverted from Concord was quite diverse. It is striking that a majority (56.7 percent) of all diversions were directly transferred to a community based facility (pre-release centers and halfway houses). In fact, nearly seventy percent (67.3) of all men diverted from the maximum custody level were deemed suitable for a minimum security placement, either community based, forestry camps, or parole.

In summary, New Line performed a comprehensive classification on 265 individuals. On the average, this procedure lasted approximately twelve weeks. Of all men seen, 39.2 percent were diverted to institutions other than Concord, with a majority of those diverted being transferred to a minimum security facility, community based placement, or directly paroled. The implications of this set of findings will be discussed after a presentation of the characteristics of these offenders which contributed to this classificatory assessment.

## Section II

This section will attempt to isolate differences in characteristics between the offender group that was diverted (N=104) the one classified to remain at Concord (N=161). A profile of the typical New Line diversion should emerge from this analysis. The findings are logically categorized into three distinct areas: nature of the current offense and incarceration, criminal history, and personal background characteristics. Only variables demonstrating a significant association on the basis of the Chi Square test will be discussed, and further, only the maximum Chi Square splits observed will be presented. A breakdown of these splits, proportions of each group in each category, and significance levels are presented in Table VII on page 15.

### A. Current Incarceration

#### Age at Incarceration

Divertees were much more likely to have been older than non-divertees when incarcerated for the current offense. The maximum difference obtained occurred at age 24; whereas 20.2 percent of the diverttees were older than 24, only 5.6 percent of the non-divertees were in this category. This relationship can only be viewed with regard to Concord's orientation toward the youthful adult offender. Therefore, it is appropriate to divert older inmates from this institution.

#### Court of Commitment

Divertees were committed proportionally more often from Essex Court as compared to all other jurisdictions. Only two percent of non-divertees were committed from Essex, as compared to 9.6 percent of the diverttees.

#### Time Served Since Original Commitment

At the end of the classification process, diverttees had served considerably less time than non-divertees. Whereas 74.8 percent of all individuals transferred from Concord had been incarcerated at the facility for three months or less, only 62.8 percent of the group remaining at Concord had served this time. This finding may be explained by the administrative procedure that gave priority to processing diverted clients.

#### Primary Offense

The only offense category for which individuals were booked that significantly differentiated between the two groups was that of all sex offenses (including rape). Divertees were significantly less likely than non-divertees to be serving the current sentence for committing a sex offense (3.8 percent versus 12.4 percent respectively). This must be interpreted with caution, however, since normally, offenders booked on a sex-related charge

need departmental declaration that he or she is not a "sexually dangerous person" (SDP). This procedure may take months to assess, during which time the inmate may be ineligible for transfer. It is possible, then, that some non-divertees were not recommended to be transferred from Concord due to the influence of SDP clearance upon eligibility.

## B. Criminal History

### Total Number of Court Appearances

Divertees had appeared in court for any charge on significantly fewer occasions than did non-divertees. Of the former group, 60.5 percent accrued a total of eight or fewer total court appearances; whereas only 39.8 percent of the latter group fell within this range.

### Total Number of Property Offenses

Divertees were less apt to have been previously arrested for a property crime. The greatest difference obtained was at ten prior arrests; 93.3 percent of the diverttees had been arrested for this on ten or fewer occasions, compared to 82 percent of the non-divertees.

### Total Number of Sex Offenses

Divertees were less likely to have been previously charged with a sex-related offense. The vast majority (95.2 percent) had never been arrested on this type of charge, contrasted with 85.1 percent of clients remaining at Concord.

### Age at First Arrest

When arrested for the first time, diverttees were more likely to have been older than 17 (33.7 percent) compared to 21.1 percent of the non-divertees.

### Total Number of Adult Incarcerations

Divertees were found to have never been incarcerated as an adult (85.6 percent) more so than non-divertees (75.2 percent).

## Personal Background Characteristics

### Marital Status

A significant difference was evidenced between the two groups in terms of ever having been married versus never having

married. Divertees were more likely to have been married at some point (28.8 percent) than were non-divertees (17.2 percent).

#### Time at Most Skilled Position

Divertees were more likely to have been employed for a longer period of time at their most skilled position. A larger portion of this group (40.5 percent) worked for nine months or more, compared to 23.1 percent of the non-divertees.

#### Time on Job of Longest Duration

Divertees were more apt to have been employed at any job for nine months or more (41.3 percent) than were non-divertees (26.0 percent).

The above three characteristics seem to be logically connected to the previously stated finding that divertees tend to be older than individuals remaining at Concord. Thus, the age difference may account for divertees having married, and for having been eligible to work for more time than non-divertees.

#### Last Grade Completed

Divertees had completed the ninth grade or higher (62.5 percent) in greater proportion than non-divertees (39.7 percent).

Summary of Findings

In summation, individuals who were transferred to a placement other than Concord were significantly more likely than those not diverted:

- to have been older than 24 when incarcerated
- to have been committed from Essex Court
- to have resided in Concord for three months or less by the end of the classification process
- to have been older than 17 when arrested for the first time
- to have been married
- to have been employed for a longer period of time (nine months or more) at their most skilled position
- to have been employed at any job for nine months or more
- to have completed the ninth grade or more

On the other hand, diverted clients were significantly less likely:

- to have been booked on a sex-related charge
- to have previously appeared in court for any charge
- to have previously been arrested for committing a property offense
- to have ever been charged with a sex-related offense
- to have ever been incarcerated as an adult

TABLE VII: MAXIMUM CHI SQUARE ( $\chi^2$ ) SPLITS\*

VARIABLE	SPLIT	DIVERTEES		NON-DIVERTEES		$\chi^2$ (1df for all variables)
		N	(%)	N	(%)	
I. CURRENT INCARCERATION						
1. Age at Incarceration	24 or older	21	(20.2)	9	( 5.6)	13.420
	younger than 24	83	(79.8)	152	(94.4)	P < .001
2. Court of Commitment	Essex	10	( 9.6)	3	( 2.0)	7.407
	All other courts	94	(90.4)	148	(98.0)	P < .01
3. Time Served	3 months or less	77	(74.8)	98	(62.8)	4.033
	longer than 3 months	26	(25.2)	58	(37.2)	P < .05
4. Primary Offense	All sex offenses	4	( 3.8)	20	(12.4)	5.642
	other offenses	100	(96.2)	141	(87.6)	P < .01
II. CRIMINAL HISTORY						
1. Total Number of Court Appearances	8 or fewer	49	(60.5)	49	(39.8)	8.348
	more than 8	32	(39.5)	74	(60.2)	P < .01
2. Total Number of Property Offenses	10 or fewer	97	(93.3)	132	(82.0)	6.850
	more than ten	7	( 6.7)	29	(18.0)	P < .01
3. Total Number of Sex Offenses	None	99	(95.2)	137	(85.1)	6.612
	one or more	5	( 4.8)	24	(14.9)	P < .05
4. Age of First Arrest	17 or older	35	(33.7)	34	(21.1)	5.155
	younger than 17	69	(66.3)	127	(78.9)	P < .05
5. Total Number of Adult Incarcerations	None	89	(85.6)	121	(75.2)	4.172
	one or more	15	(14.4)	40	(24.8)	P < .05
III. PERSONAL BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS						
1. Marital Status	has been married	30	(28.8)	28	(17.7)	4.503
	never married	74	(71.2)	130	(82.3)	P < .05

TABLE VII: (Continued)

VARIABLE	SPLIT	DIVERTEES		NON-DIVERTEES		$\chi^2$
		N	(%)	N	(%)	(1df for all variables)
2. Time at Most Skilled Position	9 months or more	30	(40.5)	24	(23.1)	6.239
	less than 9 months	44	(59.5)	80	(76.9)	$P < .05$
3. Time on Job of Longest Duration	9 months or more	31	(41.3)	27	(26.0)	4.700
	less than 9 months	44	(58.7)	77	(74.0)	$P < .05$
4. Last Grade Completed	Ninth or higher	50	(62.5)	48	(39.7)	10.047
	less than ninth	30	(37.5)	73	(60.3)	$P < .01$

\* Although there were 104 divertees and 161 non-divertees in our sample, discrepancies in the individuals variables are due to missing information.



## Discussion

In order to assess the degree to which the New Line accomplished its original objectives, we must return to the two sets of questions posed at the outset of this study. Overall, however, it appears that this classification capability met many of its projected goals despite the problems of ever-increasing population at Concord during the year being investigated.<sup>8</sup>

Foremost among the set of questions addressing program implementation is the issue of diversion. Project planners estimated the goal of diversion to be ten percent; compared to this, the rate of nearly forty percent actual diversion obtained through New Line efforts far surpassed expectations. The range of facilities receiving divertees spanned corrections custody levels from maximum security to parole. Consistent with project philosophy, and acting with the flexibility inherent in indeterminate sentencing, a majority of the divertees (56.7 percent) were transferred to a community-based facility. All of these findings are indicative of an effort made by New Line to utilize varied types of treatment options for Concord commitments; and particularly, to expedite the process of graduated release via direct placements to community facilities.

Other implementation goals were not as fully met. Again, these should be regarded within the context of disproportionate population expansion. The most obvious was the administrative decision, made early during the project year, to restrict classification assessment to new court commitments to Concord. This was a direct result of population growth, and the inability to effectively and efficiently conduct sound classification for all men entering Concord. Second, the classification procedure was not found to be as efficient as originally conceptualized, despite the restriction of the pool of eligible clients mentioned above. Whereas a period of three to four weeks was planned as necessary to complete classification, less than one percent of all individuals seen by the New Line were completed classifications by four weeks. It was found that the average time of involvement with New Line was 12.5 weeks, which is well beyond the four week parameter.

The second portion of this study was devoted to developing a typology of individuals who were diverted from Concord. Analysis yielded a number of characteristics that significantly differentiated the two groups of divertees and men remaining at Concord. An examination of these characteristics of the typical divertree leads to the inference that New Line staff sustained a high level of effort to determine individual appropriateness for treatment

<sup>8</sup> For complete documentation of this, as well as other issues confronting New Line during its first year of operations, see: Barthe, Robert and Terry Assael, Corrections Impact Program Final Report, 75-ED-01-0002.

planning. For example, men recommended for a transfer were likely to have been serving their first adult incarceration, and to have aggregated much less of a criminal history than clients remaining at Concord. The recommendation that this type of individual not be required to reside in a maximum custody level, therefore, seems to be appropriate. It is also consistent with a "reintegrative" ideology, which would assert that prevention of further criminal involvement may be contingent upon non-immersion into the deviant subculture that flourishes in a maximum security correctional setting.

The finding that divertees were apt to be older than 24 when incarcerated is linked with the administrative policy of maintaining Concord for a more youthful offender. Finally, several additional findings, commented upon previously, are logically interconnected. For example, it was found that divertees, who were older than non-divertees would have had more time to have been both married and employed. This type of constellation of characteristics is also evident of other components of the divertree profile, such as criminal history.

No outcome analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which New Line divertees were successful at their placements. Although this type of investigation constitutes an important indicator of New Line effectiveness, it was beyond the scope of the present study. However, we can tentatively suggest that in its first year of operations, this classification capability achieved many of its planned goals of implementation, and exercised seemingly logical judgments when referring clients to the range of treatment options at its disposal.