

Classifying Offenders For Lower Security:  
A Follow-Up Study of Correctional  
Decision Making

Prepared By:

Linda K. Holt  
Program Manager I-Research

Lawrence T. Williams  
Program Manager I-Research

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Michael V. Fair  
Commissioner

August 1982

PUBLICATION #12903 - 70-250 - 8-82 - CR

Approved By: John J. Manton, State Purchasing Agent

The length of the classification process was found to be greater than expected: a two-week median for Central Office to decide upon Area Board recommendations; two weeks from the decision to a transfer; and a four to five week median time period overall for classification to be completed (from hearing to transfer).

The outcome analysis of Area Board recommendations demonstrated a fairly high degree of consistency between the security level of the original placement recommended by the Board, those approved by Central Office, and the actual placements following the hearings. These latter two were slightly more conservative than the original recommendations. Finally, examination of six-month placements evidenced a substantial degree of movement through the various security levels of the corrections system. A large proportion (36.5 percent) were residents of a community-based program or on parole.

No definitive conclusions are offered, since little empirical support could be gleaned from the available data. The second study draws a sample of these cases and employs a more in-depth analysis utilizing additional variables. These include a continuous institutional movement tracking, the rationales upon which decisions are premised, and incarceration experience data. Thus, questions regarding the bases for the decisions, and the accuracy of the placements, will be addressed. Implications of the present study did note the need for more training and communication, and an upgrading in the efficiency of the decision-making.

Abstract

This report is the third and final part of an evaluation of the Area Board Classification System formerly used in the Massachusetts Department of Correction. This study reports on a six-month follow-up of those offenders recommended for and placed in a lower security setting. Overall, 75 percent of these placements were determined to be successful. An analysis found eight variables that distinguished successful and unsuccessful placements: minimum sentence length, time to serve before parole eligibility, maximum sentence length, area board seen, committing institution, age at first arrest, number of charges for drug offenses, and age at incarceration. An analysis was also done that compared offenders recommended for no placement change with successful lower security placements. In general offenders recommended for no change in current placement were younger, had problems during their present incarceration and were rated as having motivational and attitudinal problems. Half of the group recommended to remain at current status were moved to a lower security setting during the six-month follow-up period and 82 percent of those placements were successful. This group of individuals recommended to remain at current was more like the successful lower security placements than the unsuccessful in terms of those variables that seemed to determine success. In general the classification system had a high success rate in its lower security placements. There was a large group of offenders not recommended for lower security placements who were successful as well.

Acknowledgements

This report is the last phase in a series of three reports on the Area Board Classification process. The original design for the study was completed by Ellen Chayet, who also completed the earlier volumes in this series. Her work greatly facilitated our ability to finish this report. Major responsibility for data collection and timely consultations during the preparation of this report were provided by Paul Jones. We would like to thank them both for their efforts. Many thanks also to Cheryl Chase whose efforts in typing made this joint effort possible.

The research was funded in part by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Committee on Criminal Justice Model Evaluation Program, and in part through a grant from the National Institute of Corrections, Grant Number AZ-5.

Points of view of opinions expressed in this report are those of the researchers and do not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Committee on Criminal Justice or the National Institute of Corrections.

## Table of Contents

Title	Page Number
Abstract	1
Acknowledgements	2
Funding Information	3
Introduction	6
Highlights of the Area Board Classification System	9
Methodology	12
Research Objectives	12
The Sample	13
Definitions	13
Analytic Methods	14
Findings - Lower Security Transfer Outcomes	16
Client Profile	16
Completers and Non-Completers, A Comparison	17
Findings - Current Status Recommendations	21
Client Profile	22
Completers & Current Status, a Comparison	24
Effectiveness of the Area Board Process	26
Discussion	33
Appendix I Client Profile: Completers, Non-Completers & Current Status	35

## Table of Contents

Title	Page Number
Appendix II Completers & Non-Completers: Statistically Significant Variables	60
Appendix III Current Status and Completers, Statistically Significant Variables	63

## Introduction

The widespread diversification of correctional systems has necessitated a mechanism for the differential handling and placement of offenders. Recognizing that a heterogeneous prison population will require varied programming and differing security levels and finding that movement of offenders into lower security settings increases the likelihood of future success in the community, the administration created system-wide classification capabilities and used them to assist decisions effecting individual placements within the system.

These classification mechanisms operate within a framework of conflicting goals of the correctional system. The system must achieve the dual, and sometimes contradictory, goals of maximizing the benefits derived by offenders from the incarceration experience (rehabilitation) and maintaining secure and smoothly functioning facilities (security and custody). Effective classification processes must carefully balance the goals of security and rehabilitation, by allowing maximum utilization of rehabilitative opportunities by offenders and simultaneously not jeopardizing the



security of the community or facilities through excessive failure rates.

It is important that such classification procedures be carefully reviewed. Analysis of the types of offenders recommended for various placements and assessment of the rates of success of those placement decisions, is likely to provide critical information for those people making classification decisions. It may also be possible to identify factors in an offender's background that are particularly useful in making placement decisions.

This report is the third in a series of an evaluation of the Area Board Classification System of the Massachusetts Department of Correction (DOC). These three studies provide an in-depth documentation of procedures utilized by the DOC to review cases for inter-institutional transfer following initial classification. Although the DOC has restructured its approach to classification and no longer uses the Area Board concept, the findings of this study should still be useful to the extent that factors associated with successful classification placements are identified.

The first study presented a description of the Area Board classification process and a statistical description of the population seen by the area boards during the time period under consideration. The second study developed profiles of cases most likely to be recommended for various types of placements by the Area Boards and explored the rationales given for these various decisions. The

present study incorporates the findings of reports one and two in an outcome analysis. The effectiveness of the classification process will be assessed by looking at successes and failures of placement decisions and measuring the utilization of either the rehabilitative or security ideology in the classification process.

In the first part of this report the Area Board classification process will be reviewed. Second, the methodology used in conducting the evaluation will be given. In the evaluation, the first discussion considers successful and non-successful lower security transfers in an attempt to identify those characteristics that distinguish the two groups. Next, those individuals who were not recommended for lower security placement will be compared with successful lower security placements in order to identify characteristics that distinguish those two groups. Finally, those factors that distinguish successful and non-successful lower security placements will be applied to the group that was not recommended for movement to determine what proportion of that group might be likely to succeed in a lower security setting.

### Highlights of the Area Board Classification System

A brief overview of the Area Board Classification process that formerly was used in Massachusetts is important in order to understand the forthcoming analysis. Under this classification scheme, four types of classification capabilities were integrated into the system: intake reception/diagnostic centers; institution-based program review boards; inter-institutional classification (Area Boards); and special types of boards.

Two reception/diagnostic centers were designed to initially classify all court commitments to a state-level correctional facility. This process resulted in a determination of an appropriate security level, corresponding facility, and a fairly comprehensive assessment of needs and recommended programs to address these concerns.

Institutional boards were convened at each facility. Their role was multifaceted, including intake planning when the offender first arrived at the particular institution, periodic program and adjustment reviews, and initial transfer screening to determine referrals to Area Boards.

Area Boards convened primarily to review cases for inter-institutional transfers. A variety of recommendations resulted from an appearance before one of these Boards; for example, for the inmate to remain in his current facility (remain at current status), to transfer to higher security, lower security, to make a lateral move. Area Boards were not based at specific facilities; rather,

membership was drawn from one of the three separate DOC areas, and Boards saw inmates currently housed in that area only.

Finally, the special boards encompassed those classification hearings not included above, such as a massive endeavor to review all DOC residents for pre-release, or to assess the classification of inmates housed in the Departmental Segregation Unit (DSU).

All final decisions on classification recommendations were made by Central Office administrative staff, who acted on behalf of the Commissioner of Correction. Decisions may be in accordance with the recommendations, or central office may deny (overturn) a Board assessment and approve the case to another facility. Conditions with which the individual must comply may also be specified at this point, in lieu of, or in addition to those that the classification boards had deemed appropriate.

As mentioned in Interim Report I, this structure had some very real problems. While this structure was originally designed to induce improved effectiveness by upgrading the quality of decisions, one consequence was reduced efficiency. Final decisions were often delayed, which caused problems for individuals awaiting placements and institutional staff who felt that their recommendations were not given adequate consideration.

In 1980 this classification organization was altered. Basically the decentralized organization, whereby the state was divided into three geographical areas, was abandoned in favor of

centralized functions and classification procedures. One reception diagnostic center was used instead of two and Area Boards were no longer used. Inter-institutional transfers are now done by Classification Review Boards which make recommendations to Central Office. While the structure of the classification process changed, its purpose remained the same: to review offender cases for appropriate placement into one of the Department's varied institutions.

## Methodology

The analysis presented in this report is based on the research design and data collection efforts done during the first two phases of this study. Detailed description of the overall design, data sources and methodology are found in Interim Reports I and II. Aspects of methodology that are particularly relevant to analyses of this report are presented here.

### The Research Objectives

The research objectives of this paper can best be understood by reviewing the overall goals of the evaluation. Simply, these are: 1) to describe the operation of the Area Board System; 2) to develop profiles for cases recommended and approved/denied for the various placement options; 3) to document the rationales underlying recommendations and decisions, and the correlates of these decisions; and 4) to assess the effectiveness of the classification process.

Interim Report I addressed the first of these; Interim Report II addressed the second and third; the present study responds to the fourth objective by investigating the following set of derivative questions:

- a) What proportion of lower security placements are successful and what characteristics distinguish completers from non-completers?
- b) What are the characteristics of those remaining at their current status and how do they differ from successful lower security placements?
- c) What proportion of those remaining at their current status have characteristics similar to successful lower security placements?

### Sample

The original population consisted of a random sample of cases appearing before Area Boards from July 1977 through January 1978 (N=590). From these 590 cases, three groups were selected for further study. The three groups are: those recommended for lower security and who successfully completed that placement, those who failed to complete their lower security placement and were returned to higher security, and those for whom no movement was recommended.

### Definitions

Case: A case is an appearance before the Area Board. An inmate appearing more than once during the period under study would be counted as a separate case for each appearance. There are 590 cases in the sample.

Completers: Completers are those individuals who were recommended for transfer to lower security by the Area Board and the Central Office,

who had their initial placement as a result of the Area Board decision, and who remained at that lower level of security or were at an even lower level six months after the Area Board made the recommendation. It is important to note that transfers to lower security include transfers from any security level to a lower one. Thus a transfer from a maximum security institution to a medium security institution as well as a transfer from a medium security institution to a pre-release center would be considered in the analysis. There were 106 completers in the sample.

Non-Completers: A non-completer is an individual who was recommended for transfer to lower security by the Area Board and the Central Office, whose first move was a result of this decision, and who was returned to a higher security facility during the six months following the Area Board decision. There were 36 non-completers in the sample.

Current Status: A current status individual is a person who was recommended to remain in their current placement by the Area Board and the Central Office and whose first move was not the result of the Area Board decision. There are 114 current status individuals in the sample.

### Analytic Methods

From all data collected, 77 variables were selected for analysis in this segment of the study. These variables deal with background characteristics, criminal history, current offense, current incarceration and Area Board history. Details about sources of these



variables appears in Interim Report II.

Descriptions of the three-sub-groups being analyzed here were carried out by using frequency distributions. Where appropriate modes, means and medians are used to summarize these frequencies.

Comparisons between the sub-groups were accomplished using one of three distinct methods. In comparing completers and non-completers the chi-square technique was used. This technique dichotomizes variables at that point which maximizes the chi-square statistic and indicates that split which shows the largest difference between the two groups. In comparing current status and completers, the difference-of-means test evaluated with the t statistic was applied to interval level variables and the chi-square test was applied to nominal and ordinal level variables.

A simple scale was created in order to perform a multi-variate comparison of the current status and completer group. The scale is a simple additive device which assigns points for the presence or absence of different characteristics. Comparison of scale scores indicates the similarity between groups on a number of variables simultaneously.

Test statistics were evaluated at the .05 level of significance. Cases where data were missing were not included in making comparisons between groups.

Findings - Lower Security Transfer Outcomes

Client Profile

At the beginning of the study period most of these clients were in a maximum security setting. Of the 142 clients transferred to lower security as a result of the Area Board 83 (58%) began in maximum security, 30 (21%) began in medium security, 8 (6%) began in medium/minimum security and 21 (15%) began in minimum security. As a result of the Area Board Classification process 51% were transferred from a walled to an unwalled facility, 32% were transferred from one walled institution to another and 15% were transferred from one unwalled institution to another.

A description can be given for the clients who formed the successful and unsuccessful completer sample. The majority of the residents had committed person offenses, were Walpole commitments, were white, single, with no prior military service, no prior drug use mentioned, no prior charges for sex offenses, no prior charges for drug offenses, no prior charges for drunkenness offenses, and no prior charges for escape offenses. The majority of the population also had no prior juvenile incarcerations, no prior county incarcerations, no prior state or federal incarcerations, no juvenile paroles or parole violations, no adult paroles or parole violations, and had not received any furloughs. The majority were from Area III, had not received any minor or major disciplinary reports, had not had any prior pre-release placements, no prior returns to higher security from minimum or medium security, no prior parole revocations, were from the greater Boston SMSA, and had not any prior paroles or parole violations. The median maximum sentence was 5 years and the median amount of time on most skilled position and on job of longest duration was between 1 and 2 years, and ninth grade was the last

grade completed. The median number of prior court appearances was between 12 and 15, three prior person offenses, 5 prior property offenses; individuals were 25 at incarceration, 16 at first court appearance, and had between 2 and 3 years until their parole eligibility date.

A statistical profile of the sample broken down into program completers and non-completers is included in Appendix I.

#### Completers and Non-Completers: A Comparison

A comparison of the differences between program completers and non-completers for the sample resulted in eight variables that produced statistically significant differences. The eight variables were as follows:

- 1) Time until original parole eligibility date
- 2) Maximum sentence
- 3) Area
- 4) Committing Institution
- 5) Age at First Court Appearance
- 6) Number of Court Appearances for Drug Offenses
- 7) Age at Incarceration
- 8) Minimum Sentence

A brief discussion of each variable follows:

1) Time Until Original Parole Eligibility Date

When examining this variable, it was discovered that significantly more of the non-completers (at their commitment) had a shorter time to wait until their original parole eligibility date. Specifically, 77% of the non-completers had two years or less until their parole eligibility compared to only 43% for the successful completers. In terms of completion rates, 61% of those individuals who had two years or less until their original parole eligibility date were completers whereas 88% of those with more than two years until their original parole eligibility date were considered to be completers.

2) Maximum Sentence

All of the individuals who had a maximum sentence of more than twenty years were completers in the sample. Of those who had maximum sentences of less than twenty years, 70% were completers. This difference was found to be significant.

3) Area

Those individuals in Area II or III had a higher probability of being completers than did those from Area I. Specifically, 60% of those individuals in Area I were completers, 85% of those from Area II and 82% of those from Area III. For the combined group of individuals in Area II and III, 82% were completers.

4) Committing Institution

The majority of the non-completers were Concord commitments, whereas the vast majority of successful completers were Walpole commitments. Sixty-three percent of the individuals who were Concord commitments were successful completers, but 82% of the Walpole commitments were successful.

5) Age at First Court Appearance

Significantly more of the non-completers were sixteen or younger at their age at first court appearance than were the successful completers. Half of the successful completers were sixteen or younger at their first court appearance while 69% of the unsuccessful completers were sixteen or younger at their first court appearance. Sixty-eight percent of the sample who were sixteen years of age or younger at their first court appearance were successful, while 84% of those who were older than sixteen years at their first court appearance were successful.

6) Number of Court Appearances for Drug Offenses

An analysis of this variable reveals that significantly more of the non-completers had one or more prior court appearances for a drug offense than did the successful completers. Also, 66% of those people in the sample with prior court appearances for drug

offenses were successful, while 82% of the sample who had never appeared in court for a drug offense was successful.

7) Age at Incarceration

The majority of the successful completers were age twenty-three or older when incarcerated. Sixty-five percent of the completion sample were 23 or older when committed compared to only 44% for the non-completers. Sixty-four percent of the sample who were twenty-two years or younger at their commitment were successful while 80% of the individuals who were older than twenty-two at their incarceration were successful.

8) Minimum Sentence

The results for this variable corresponded to the results found in Number 4 above; that is, a larger proportion of the Concord commitments were unsuccessful. Specifically, 57% of those individuals who received indeterminate minimum sentences (indicative of Concord commitments) were successful, while 85% of those who received a fixed minimum sentence (Walpole commitment) were successful.

A profile can be constructed of the typical completer as comparable to non-completer for the sample. The individuals who are less likely to be successful are young Concord commitments with early parole eligibility dates (at their commitment) from Area I.

The unsuccessful lower security placement was also likely to have a short sentence (maximum sentence of 19 years or less), have been younger at their first court appearance (16 years or younger) and have prior court appearances for drug offenses.

One limitation of this analysis is that different types of movements to lower security were treated in the same manner. For example, moves from maximum to medium or from medium to pre-release could both be considered successful lower security placements in this analysis. Further research should differentiate various types of lower security placements to test for differences in outcomes, particularly for differences in outcomes between transfers from walled institutions to unwalled in contrast to moves between walled institutions.

#### Findings - Current Status Recommendations

The purpose of this section of the study is to assess the validity of the Area Board decision-making process in identifying individuals likely to be successful in lower security settings. In order to do this, those individuals who were successful in a lower security setting will be compared with those individuals who were recommended by the Area Board and the Central Office to remain in their current status. This comparison will show in what ways these two populations are similar in their background characteristics and what proportion of the group remaining at current status could be expected to succeed in lower security. The validity of the Area Board decision-making process will be considered greater if this proportion is small, that is the Area Board has effectively distinguished between likely successes and failures.

There were 114 individuals who were recommended for remaining at their current status by the Area Board and the Central Office.

Any move made was not the result of the Area Board process. The first part of this section will describe this group of offenders. The second part will compare them with successful lower security placements. Finally, a multi-variate analysis will be attempted to distinguish the proportion of likely successes in this group.

### Client Profile

A complete description of the 114 individuals recommended for current status placement appears in Appendix I. Some of the major identifying characteristics of this population are highlighted here. At the beginning of the study period 66 (58%) of this group were in a maximum security setting, 23 (20%) were in a medium/minimum security setting, 21 (18%) were in a medium security setting and 4 (4%) were in a minimum security setting.

Most people are currently incarcerated for an offense committed against another person. Most are currently serving Walpole sentences. The median minimum sentence for Walpole commitments is 6 years. The median maximum sentence for Concord commitments is 10 years. The median age at the time of incarceration is 22 years.

Most offenders in this group are white, single, and were never in the military. The median length of time in job with most skill is 5 to 6 months. The median time in job of longest duration is also 5 to 6 months. Most have experience in manual or service occupations. The median educational level is eighth grade and most need their GED. Half of this group have no history of drug use, one-fourth have a history of heroin use. Alcohol use is not a problem for most people. Over half the sample comes from the Boston area



SMSA including Suffolk and Middlesex counties.

The median age of first court appearance is 15 for this group. The median number of prior court appearances is 10, including three prior charges for person offenses, four prior charges for property offenses, no prior sex, drug, drunkenness or escape charges. The median number of prior adult incarcerations is one, adult and juvenile incarcerations is two. Most people have no prior parole or parole violation history.

Regarding their present incarceration, only one-third of this group has ever been furloughed. Most of these furloughs ended with no problems. The median number of minor and major disciplinary reports is one. Inmate motivation is labelled lacking or negative for more than half of this group. Inmate attitude is rated as fair or poor for most of this group. Where information is available, family members are equally likely to visit frequently as to never visit.

Program participation was heaviest in counseling (N=40) and education (N=36). Fewer members of this group participated in vocational programs (N=22), work release (N=13), or education release (N=0).

Most of this group has no prior pre-release experience. One-quarter of the group has pre-release experience. Most of these experiences ended negatively and were of short duration. Fifteen people were previously returned from minimum security facilities and 15 people were previously returned from medium security facilities. The median time until parole eligibility is 2 to 3 years at the time of the Area Board's decision.

Most people in this sample appeared before the Area III Board. Most were recommended by the Area Board and the Central Office for maximum security placements. One third of the boards were called by inmate request; in other cases boards convened for periodic reviews and disciplinary action. Most of the board's decisions were made unanimously. The median number of prior area boards seen is two for this group. Most had no prior area board recommendations for higher or lower security placements.

#### Completers and Current Status: A Comparison

In this section a comparison will be made between the 114 individuals who were recommended to remain at their current status and the 106 individuals who were successful lower security placements. First, those variables that discriminate between the two groups will be discussed. Second, those variables that fail to discriminate between the two groups will be discussed.

There are 14 variables that showed statistically significant differences between these two groups of offenders. These variables fall into three basic categories: age of offender, problems in present incarceration and relationship with the Area Board.

Those offenders recommended for current status were significantly younger at their first court appearance and at the time of incarceration than those who were successful at lower security. Those offenders who were recommended to remain at their current status were more likely to come from Suffolk and Middlesex Counties and to have histories of hard drug usage.

The offenders who were recommended to remain at current status had significantly more disciplinary reports, both minor and major, than those who were successful at lower security. Their attitude was more likely to be described as fair or poor, while those who were successful in lower security were likely to have good or excellent attitudes. The motivation of those recommended for current status was described as "moderate" or "lacking" while for successful lower security placements attitude was usually "high" to "only moderate". Family and community ties were significantly weaker among the group of offenders recommended for current status than the successful lower security placements. Those with prior pre-release experience spent significantly fewer months in that setting than successful lower security placements.

Those recommended to remain at current status had seen significantly more Area Boards than those successful at lower security. The reason for appearing before the Area Board also differed between these two groups. Those successful at lower security were more likely to have initiated the Area Board process while those individuals who remained at their current status were less likely to have requested a meeting of the Area Board. Current status recommendations were more likely to have disciplinary boards and periodic reviews than the other group. The institution recommended by Central Office and the Area Board was likely to be maximum security for this current status group, while community-based was the most common for the successful lower security placements.

In general the persons recommended for current status are in a maximum security setting. They were younger offenders, having been in court and incarcerated at an earlier age. In their present incarceration they were viewed as high risks with disciplinary reports, motivational and attitudinal problems and a lack of community support. They had seen more Area Boards in the past and were likely to be seeing them on a disciplinary or periodic basis. Complete information regarding differences between these two groups can be found in Appendix III.

There were 63 variables that did not distinguish current status recommendations from successful lower security placements. On a wide variety of personal background characteristics, prior criminal history indicators, program participation variables, present offense characteristics and present incarceration variables, these two groups are very similar.

#### Effectiveness of the Area Board Process

It has been established that 75 percent of the offenders recommended for a lower security setting were successful in that placement six months later. This would seem to be a high rate of success in the decision-making process. In terms of evaluating the effectiveness of this decision making process, the question could be raised as to whether more individuals could successfully complete a lower security placement if given the chance.

Of the 114 offenders recommended to remain at current status, 57 moved within the six month period and 57 remained at their current placement. These moves resulted from some other decision making process. Of the 57 offenders who did move, 21 (37%) moved from a walled institution to the street, 15 (26%) moved from a walled to an unwalled institution and 11 (19%) moved from one walled institution to another. Of the 57 offenders who did move, after 6 months 47 were considered successful lower security placements and 10 can be considered unsuccessful, yielding a success rate of 82 percent. This compares favorably with the 75 percent success rate of the Area Board lower security recommendations.

In order to further assess the effectiveness of the Area Board decision-making process a scale was constructed based on those variables that were found to be related to success in lower security settings. There were 8 variables found to distinguish between successful and unsuccessful placements in lower security: time until parole eligibility date, Area Board seen, age at first arrest, committing institution, minimum and maximum sentence, prior drug charges, and age at first incarceration. One point was assigned for each item in the scale according to the dichotomies established in Appendix II. That half of the dichotomy most linked with success received one point; the half linked with failure received no points. Eight is the maximum score on the scale and would be associated with success at a lower security setting. Comparing the scores on this scale of the three groups under discussion (completers, non-completers and current status) should permit an assessment of the proportion of those recommended for current status who might

be expected to succeed in a lower security setting.

Table 1 shows the distribution of scores of all three groups on the scale. Table 2 shows the distribution of all three groups on each item of the scale. There is a large difference between the unsuccessful lower security group and the other two groups. There is very little difference on the total scale score between the current status and the successful lower security group. About 60 percent of the current status group have scores above the average of the successful group. On only two of the eight variables, age at first arrest and age at first incarceration was there any great difference between these groups.

In general, based on a multi-variate analysis of the variables that distinguish successful and unsuccessful lower security placements, there is little difference between the current status group and the successful lower security group. A large proportion of the current status group have characteristics similar to the lower security placements. There are other variables considered earlier that distinguish between these two groups that indicate other factors that Area Boards are taking into consideration. Based on the fact that such a large proportion of the current status group did succeed in a lower security setting it would seem that some of the variables on which the classification decision making process is done should be re-evaluated.

Further study comparing different types of classification decisions, in particular more specification of types of lower security placements may yield useful results.

Table 1

Scores on Scale Representing Variables Associated  
With Success in Lower Security

Lower Security Scale Score	Current Status		Successful Lower		Unsuccessful		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	6	( 6)	6	( 6)	6	( 18)	18	( 8)
1	11	( 10)	11	( 12)	7	( 21)	29	( 12)
2	9	( 8)	7	( 7)	4	( 12)	20	( 8)
3	9	( 8)	3	( 3)	5	( 15)	17	( 7)
4	14	( 13)	11	( 12)	6	( 18)	31	( 13)
5	16	( 15)	17	( 18)	4	( 12)	37	( 16)
6	25	( 24)	20	( 21)	1	( 3)	46	( 20)
7	12	( 11)	12	( 13)	1	( 3)	25	( 11)
8	4	( 4)	7	( 7)	0	( 0)	11	( 5)
TOTAL	106	(100)	94	(100)	34	(100)	234	(100)
Mean Score	4.3		4.5		2.6			
Standard Deviation	(2.2)		(2.4)		(2.0)			

Table 2

Scores on Individual Items in Lower Security  
Success Scale By Classification Group

Individual Scale Item	Remain At Current Status		Successful Lower Security		Unsuccessful Lower Security	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent

Minimum Sentence

Indeterminate	31	( 27)	31	( 29)	23	( 62)
Non-Indeterminate	83	( 73)	75	( 71)	13	( 38)
Total	114	(100)	106	(100)	36	(100)

Chi-Square = 16.6 with 2 degrees of freedom, p=.0002

Time From Commitment to  
Original Parole  
Eligibility

Two Years or Less	41	( 38)	42	( 43)	27	( 77)
More Than Two Years	67	( 62)	55	( 57)	8	( 23)
Total	108	(100)	97	(100)	35	(100)

Chi-Square = 16.8 with 2 degrees of freedom, p=.0002

Maximum Sentence

19 Years or Less	85	( 75)	83	( 78)	36	(100)
20 Years or More	29	( 25)	23	( 22)	0	( 0)
Total	114	(100)	106	(100)	36	(100)

Chi-Square = 11.4 with 2 degrees of freedom, p=.003





Table 2

Scores on Individual Items in Lower Security  
Success Scale By Classification Group

Individual Scale Item	Remain At Current Status		Successful Lower Security		Unsuccessful Lower Security	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Age at Incarceration</u>						
22 Years or Younger	64	( 57)	36	( 35)	20	( 56)
23 Years or Older	49	( 43)	66	( 65)	16	( 44)
Total	113	(100)	102	(100)	36	(100)

Chi-Square = 10.8 with 2 degrees of freedom, p=.004

### Discussion

The purpose of this report was to evaluate the effectiveness of the Area Board classification system. Effectiveness was measured in two ways. First, effectiveness was measured by the proportion of offenders recommended for lower security who were successful in those placements. Second, effectiveness was measured by the proportion of cases who were rejected for transfer who were likely candidates for a successful lower security placement.

This report found a high degree of success in the group of offenders recommended for lower security placements. Those who succeeded represented 75 percent of the group recommended for and eventually transferred to lower security. These individuals tended to be older, to have less extensive prior involvement in the criminal justice system and to be serving longer sentences than the 25 percent of the group who were unsuccessful at lower security. Generally this finding indicates that the classification system was successful in their placement decisions.

An analysis of those individuals recommended to remain at current status revealed that half of this group moved to a lower security setting during the follow-up period and were 82 percent successful in those placements. Generally this group of current status recommendations were younger, experienced more difficulties during this incarceration and had a longer history of dealings

with the Area Board system. When comparing the current status, successful lower security and unsuccessful lower security groups it was determined that the current status group more resembled the successful than the unsuccessful group with the exception of indicators of age.

In summary, the Area Board classification system was effective in selecting a group of offenders that would succeed in a lower security setting. However, there was a large group of offenders for whom no lower security placement was recommended who matched in many respects the group that was successful and who demonstrated that they could succeed in a lower security setting. A number of variables such as subjective indicators of attitude and motivation as well as institutional adjustment should be re-evaluated in terms of their utility for classification purposes. One variable that continuously appeared in the analysis was that of age. Younger offenders were less likely to be recommended for lower security and were less likely to succeed in those placements. This clearly indicates a need for programming and monitoring in order to include this group successfully in the reintegrative programming of the Department.

Appendix I

Client Profile: Completers, Non-Completers And Current Status

	Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Present Offense						
Person	70	( 66)	24	( 67)	81	( 71)
Sex	12	( 11)	3	( 8)	8	( 7)
Property	14	( 13)	4	( 11)	10	( 9)
Drug	7	( 7)	2	( 6)	7	( 6)
Other	3	( 3)	3	( 8)	8	( 7)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
2. Minimum Sentence in Years						
Indeterminate	31	( 29)	23	( 64)	31	( 27)
2 Years	2	( 1)	1	( 3)	4	( 4)
3 Years	6	( 6)	3	( 8)	7	( 6)
4 Years	4	( 4)	2	( 6)	8	( 7)
5 Years	13	( 12)	2	( 6)	15	( 13)
6 Years	8	( 8)	2	( 6)	9	( 8)
7 Years	8	( 8)	0	( 0)	6	( 5)
8 Years	7	( 7)	1	( 3)	3	( 3)
9 Years	4	( 4)	1	( 2)	1	( 1)
10 Years	5	( 5)	0	( 0)	4	( 4)
11 to 12 Years	1	( 0)	1	( 2)	4	( 4)
13 to 15 Years	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	5	( 4)
16 to 19 Years	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
Life	10	( 9)	0	( 0)	15	( 13)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
3. Maximum Sentence						
2 Years	3	( 3)	4	( 11)	3	( 3)
3 Years	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
4 Years	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
5 Years	6	( 6)	6	( 17)	10	( 9)
6 Years	4	( 4)	3	( 8)	10	( 9)
7 Years	11	( 10)	1	( 3)	12	( 10)
8 Years	2	( 2)	3	( 8)	2	( 2)
9 Years	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
10 Years	22	( 21)	8	( 22)	18	( 16)
11 to 12 Years	14	( 13)	5	( 14)	8	( 7)
13 to 15 Years	15	( 14)	4	( 11)	17	( 15)
16 to 19 Years	2	( 2)	2	( 6)	3	( 3)
20 to 24 Years	11	( 10)	0	( 0)	10	( 9)
25 or More Years	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	4	( 4)
Life	10	( 9)	0	( 0)	15	( 13)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
4.	Race						
	White	70	( 66)	21	( 58)	78	( 68)
	Black	34	( 32)	12	( 33)	34	( 30)
	Other	1	( 1)	3	( 9)	1	( 1)
	Unknown	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
5.	Marital Status						
	Married	30	( 28)	12	( 33)	22	( 19)
	Single	57	( 54)	18	( 50)	76	( 67)
	Divorced	10	( 9)	6	( 17)	10	( 9)
	Widowed	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	Separated	5	( 5)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	Unknown	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
6.	Military Discharge						
	No Service	80	( 76)	28	( 78)	89	( 78)
	Honorable	5	( 5)	2	( 6)	1	( 1)
	Bad Conduct	2	( 1)	1	( 2)	1	( 1)
	Medical	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	Discharge Unknown	14	( 13)	2	( 6)	11	( 10)
	Unknown	5	( 5)	3	( 8)	11	( 10)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
7.	Time at Most Skilled Position						
	Less Than 1 Month	8	( 8)	0	( 0)	7	( 6)
	1-2 Months	10	( 9)	3	( 8)	11	( 10)
	3-4 Months	17	( 16)	8	( 22)	24	( 21)
	5-6 Months	8	( 8)	0	( 0)	9	( 8)
	7-9 Months	3	( 3)	4	( 11)	5	( 4)
	10-12 Months	5	( 5)	3	( 8)	10	( 9)
	1-2 Years	15	( 14)	6	( 17)	16	( 14)
	2-5 Years	16	( 15)	6	( 17)	9	( 8)
	More Than 5 Years	10	( 9)	2	( 6)	5	( 4)
	Unknown	14	( 13)	4	( 11)	18	( 16)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

	Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
8. Time on Job of Longest Duration						
Less Than 1 Month	5	( 5)	0	( 0)	5	( 4)
1-2 Months	10	( 9)	3	( 8)	8	( 7)
3-4 Months	17	( 16)	6	( 17)	24	( 21)
5-6 Months	6	( 6)	2	( 6)	12	( 10)
7-9 Months	3	( 3)	3	( 8)	6	( 5)
10-12 Months	5	( 5)	3	( 8)	10	( 9)
1-2 Years	19	( 18)	7	( 19)	15	( 13)
2-5 Years	17	( 16)	6	( 17)	10	( 9)
More Than 5 Years	10	( 9)	2	( 6)	7	( 6)
Unknown	14	( 13)	4	( 11)	17	( 15)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
9. Last Grade Completed						
Third Grade or Less	1	( 0)	1	( 3)	1	( 1)
Fifth	2	( 2)	1	( 3)	0	( 0)
Sixth	6	( 6)	2	( 6)	7	( 6)
Seventh	9	( 9)	5	( 14)	14	( 12)
Eighth	18	( 17)	6	( 17)	16	( 14)
Ninth	13	( 13)	7	( 19)	20	( 18)
Tenth	19	( 18)	4	( 11)	24	( 21)
Eleventh	8	( 8)	1	( 2)	7	( 6)
High School Graduate	21	( 20)	9	( 25)	16	( 14)
Some College	2	( 1)	0	( 0)	4	( 4)
College Graduate	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
Unknown	6	( 6)	0	( 0)	5	( 4)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
10. Drug Use						
None	55	( 52)	15	( 42)	56	( 49)
Non-Specific	9	( 9)	3	( 8)	10	( 9)
Heroin	29	( 27)	13	( 36)	28	( 25)
Marijuana	5	( 5)	4	( 11)	9	( 8)
Other	6	( 6)	1	( 3)	8	( 7)
Unknown	2	( 1)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)



	Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
11. Total Number of Court Appearances						
First Offense	5	( 5)	1	( 3)	3	( 3)
Two	6	( 6)	1	( 3)	4	( 4)
Three	6	( 6)	2	( 6)	7	( 6)
Four	5	( 5)	1	( 3)	3	( 3)
Five	5	( 5)	1	( 3)	8	( 7)
Six to Eight	11	( 10)	5	( 14)	18	( 16)
Nine to Eleven	18	( 17)	4	( 11)	21	( 18)
Twelve to Fifteen	17	( 16)	6	( 17)	21	( 18)
Sixteen to Twenty	13	( 12)	5	( 14)	13	( 11)
More Than 20	18	( 17)	9	( 25)	16	( 14)
Unknown	2	( 1)	1	( 1)	0	( 0)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
12. Number of Charges for Person Offenses						
None	8	( 8)	2	( 6)	4	( 4)
One	16	( 15)	6	( 17)	13	( 11)
Two	20	( 19)	6	( 17)	20	( 18)
Three	16	( 15)	6	( 17)	19	( 17)
Four	8	( 8)	5	( 14)	9	( 8)
Five	15	( 14)	5	( 14)	8	( 7)
Six to Eight	13	( 12)	4	( 11)	26	( 23)
Over 8	10	( 9)	2	( 4)	15	( 13)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
13. Number of Charges for Property Offenses						
None	22	( 21)	5	( 14)	14	( 12)
One	6	( 6)	3	( 8)	9	( 8)
Two	10	( 9)	3	( 8)	3	( 3)
Three	9	( 9)	2	( 6)	13	( 11)
Four	6	( 6)	2	( 6)	11	( 10)
Five	3	( 2)	3	( 8)	9	( 8)
Six to Eight	16	( 15)	1	( 3)	20	( 18)
Over 8	34	( 32)	17	( 47)	35	( 31)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
14.	Number of Charges for Sex Offenses						
	None	85	( 80)	32	( 89)	94	( 82)
	One	16	( 15)	4	( 11)	10	( 9)
	Two	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	8	( 7)
	Three	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	Six to Eight	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	Over 8	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
15.	Number of Charges for Drug Offenses						
	None	63	( 59)	14	( 39)	66	( 58)
	One	14	( 13)	11	( 31)	24	( 21)
	Two	8	( 8)	3	( 8)	5	( 4)
	Three	4	( 4)	3	( 8)	4	( 4)
	Four	2	( 2)	2	( 6)	4	( 4)
	Five	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	Six to Eight	5	( 5)	1	( 2)	5	( 4)
	Over 8	9	( 9)	2	( 6)	5	( 4)
	TOTAL*	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
16.	Number of Charges for Drunkenness Offenses						
	None	67	( 63)	24	( 67)	74	( 65)
	One	14	( 13)	4	( 11)	18	( 16)
	Two	10	( 9)	2	( 6)	6	( 5)
	Three	2	( 2)	2	( 5)	4	( 4)
	Four	2	( 2)	4	( 11)	2	( 2)
	Five	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	4	( 4)
	Six to Eight	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	Over 8	6	( 6)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
17.	Number of Charges for Escape Offenses						
	None	89	( 84)	29	( 81)	94	( 82)
	One	8	( 8)	2	( 6)	16	( 14)
	Two	4	( 4)	4	( 11)	1	( 1)
	Three	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	Four	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	Six to Eight	1	( 0)	1	( 2)	0	( 0)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
18.	Number of Prior Juvenile Incarcerations						
	None	78	( 74)	19	( 53)	73	( 64)
	One	9	( 9)	9	( 25)	17	( 15)
	Two	10	( 9)	1	( 2)	9	( 8)
	Three	5	( 5)	3	( 8)	3	( 3)
	Four	3	( 3)	2	( 6)	9	( 8)
	Five	1	( 0)	2	( 6)	2	( 2)
	Six or More	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
19.	Number of County Incarcerations						
	None	58	( 55)	19	( 53)	71	( 62)
	One	23	( 22)	7	( 19)	19	( 17)
	Two	12	( 11)	5	( 14)	10	( 9)
	Three	3	( 3)	3	( 8)	10	( 9)
	Four	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	Five	5	( 5)	2	( 6)	0	( 0)
	Six or More	2	( 1)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
20.	Number of Prior State or Federal Incarcerations						
	None	70	( 66)	25	( 69)	74	( 65)
	One	16	( 15)	6	( 17)	28	( 25)
	Two	9	( 9)	1	( 2)	6	( 5)
	Three	8	( 8)	2	( 6)	3	( 3)
	Four	2	( 2)	2	( 6)	3	( 3)
	Six or More	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
21.	Number of Juvenile Paroles						
	None	85	( 80)	24	( 67)	90	( 79)
	One	8	( 8)	4	( 11)	8	( 7)
	Two	9	( 9)	3	( 8)	7	( 6)
	Three	1	( 0)	3	( 8)	2	( 2)
	Four or More	3	( 3)	2	( 6)	7	( 6)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
22.	Number of Juvenile Parole Violations						
	Never Paroled	85	( 80)	24	( 67)	90	( 79)
	None	11	( 10)	6	( 17)	9	( 8)
	One	6	( 6)	4	( 11)	8	( 7)
	Two	1	( 1)	2	( 5)	2	( 2)
	Three	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	Four or More	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
23.	Number of Adult Paroles						
	None	75	( 71)	28	( 78)	82	( 72)
	One	18	( 17)	4	( 11)	22	( 19)
	Two	6	( 6)	3	( 8)	9	( 8)
	Three	5	( 5)	1	( 3)	1	( 1)
	Four or More	2	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
24.	Number of Adult Parole Violations						
	Never Paroled	75	( 71)	28	( 78)	82	( 72)
	None	10	( 9)	2	( 6)	12	( 10)
	One	11	( 10)	2	( 5)	16	( 14)
	Two	9	( 9)	4	( 11)	4	( 4)
	Four or More	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
25.	Total Number of Furloughs						
	None	66	( 62)	27	( 75)	75	( 66)
	One	10	( 9)	3	( 8)	9	( 8)
	2 to 5	14	( 13)	5	( 14)	20	( 18)
	6 to 10	7	( 7)	1	( 3)	4	( 4)
	11 to 15	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	21 to 30	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	31 to 50	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
26.	Number of Successful Furloughs Outcomes						
	Never Furloughed	66	( 62)	27	( 75)	75	( 66)
	None	1	( 1)	2	( 6)	1	( 1)
	One	9	( 9)	2	( 6)	10	( 9)
	2 to 5	15	( 14)	4	( 11)	18	( 16)
	6 to 10	6	( 6)	1	( 2)	4	( 4)
	11 to 15	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	21 to 30	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	31 to 50	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
27.	Number of Late Under Furlough Outcomes						
	Never Furloughed	66	( 62)	27	( 75)	75	( 66)
	None	33	( 31)	8	( 22)	32	( 28)
	One	6	( 6)	1	( 3)	2	( 2)
	2 to 5	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	5	( 4)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
28.	Number of Late Over Furlough Outcomes						
	Never Furloughed	66	( 62)	27	( 75)	75	( 66)
	None	40	( 38)	9	( 25)	38	( 33)
	One	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
29.	Number of Escape Furlough Outcomes						
	Never Furloughed	66	( 62)	27	( 75)	75	( 66)
	None	39	( 37)	6	( 17)	36	( 32)
	One	1	( 1)	2	( 6)	3	( 3)
	2 to 5	0	( 0)	1	( 2)	0	( 0)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
30.	Area						
	I	28	( 26)	19	( 53)	29	( 25)
	II	11	( 10)	2	( 5)	11	( 10)
	III	67	( 64)	15	( 42)	74	( 65)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
31.	Institution Recommended by Board						
	Maximum	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	64	( 56)
	Medium	27	( 26)	10	( 28)	20	( 18)
	Minimum	20	( 19)	7	( 19)	5	( 4)
	Medium-Minimum	6	( 6)	1	( 3)	22	( 19)
	Community-Based	46	( 43)	18	( 50)	2	( 2)
	House of Correction	3	( 2)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	Other	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	Unknown	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
32.	Institution Recommended by Central Office						
	Maximum	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	65	( 57)
	Medium	26	( 25)	11	( 31)	20	( 18)
	Minimum	22	( 21)	7	( 19)	5	( 4)
	Medium-Minimum	6	( 6)	1	( 3)	23	( 20)
	Community-Based	45	( 43)	17	( 47)	1	( 1)
	House of Correction	3	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	Other	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
33.	Commitment Institution						
	Walpole	69	( 65)	15	( 42)	80	( 70)
	Concord	35	( 33)	21	( 58)	33	( 29)
	Unknown	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
34.	Reason for Board						
	Unknown	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	Periodic Review	16	( 15)	3	( 8)	27	( 24)
	Inmate Request	59	( 56)	21	( 58)	42	( 37)
	Reclassification Disc	14	( 13)	3	( 8)	23	( 20)
	Other	1	( 0)	2	( 6)	3	( 3)
	Recc. of ICC	4	( 4)	3	( 8)	9	( 8)
	Open Reserve	3	( 3)	2	( 6)	3	( 3)
	Superintendent	6	( 6)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	Reclassification Fail Cond.	0	( 0)	2	( 6)	1	( 1)
	Other Reclassification	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
35.	Board Vote Tally						
	Unanimous	91	( 86)	33	( 92)	95	( 83)
	Minority Dissent	11	( 10)	3	( 8)	18	( 16)
	Unknown	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
36.	Educational Needs						
	Unknown	14	( 13)	1	( 3)	10	( 9)
	G.E.D.	49	( 46)	25	( 69)	70	( 61)
	Adult Basic Education	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	Pre-College	16	( 15)	3	( 8)	17	( 15)
	Vocational	16	( 15)	6	( 17)	13	( 11)
	Other	8	( 8)	1	( 3)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
37.	Family and Community Ties						
	Unknown	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	5	( 4)
	Visit Frequently	31	( 29)	5	( 14)	21	( 18)
	Visit Seldom	16	( 15)	4	( 11)	16	( 14)
	Never Visit	8	( 8)	6	( 17)	21	( 18)
	Cannot Determine	50	( 47)	21	( 58)	51	( 45)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)



		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
38.	Drug Use						
	Inappropriate	50	( 47)	14	( 39)	44	( 39)
	Current Soft Usage	9	( 9)	1	( 2)	2	( 2)
	Current Hard Usage	13	( 12)	8	( 22)	22	( 19)
	Past Soft Use	7	( 6)	2	( 6)	6	( 5)
	Past Hard Use	27	( 26)	11	( 31)	40	( 35)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
39.	Alcohol Usage						
	No Use	60	( 57)	20	( 56)	61	( 54)
	Current Mild Use	7	( 7)	1	( 2)	4	( 4)
	Current Use a Problem	23	( 22)	8	( 22)	28	( 25)
	Past Mild Use	5	( 4)	2	( 6)	1	( 1)
	Past Problem	11	( 10)	5	( 14)	20	( 18)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
40.	Number of Minor D. Reports						
	None	62	( 59)	19	( 53)	81	( 57)
	One	23	( 22)	12	( 33)	35	( 25)
	Two	15	( 14)	2	( 6)	17	( 12)
	Three	5	( 5)	2	( 6)	7	( 5)
	Four	0	( 0)	1	( 2)	1	( 1)
	Five	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	11	( 10)
	Nine or More	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 0)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	142	(100)
41.	Number of Major D-Reports						
	None	65	( 61)	25	( 69)	41	( 36)
	One	21	( 20)	7	( 19)	22	( 19)
	Two	10	( 9)	1	( 3)	15	( 13)
	Three	1	( 1)	2	( 6)	10	( 9)
	Four	1	( 1)	1	( 3)	9	( 8)
	Five	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	Six	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	Seven	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	4	( 4)
	Eight	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	Nine or More	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	8	( 7)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
42.	Motivation						
	Unknown	1	( 1)	4	( 11)	8	( 7)
	Highly	29	( 27)	12	( 33)	6	( 5)
	Somewhat	59	( 56)	16	( 44)	35	( 31)
	Lacking	14	( 13)	2	( 6)	45	( 40)
	Negatively	3	( 3)	2	( 6)	20	( 18)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
43.	Attitude of Inmate						
	Excellent	25	( 24)	11	( 31)	5	( 4)
	Good	49	( 46)	15	( 42)	17	( 15)
	Fair	28	( 26)	8	( 22)	59	( 52)
	Poor	4	( 4)	2	( 5)	30	( 26)
	Unknown	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	142	(100)
44.	Education Program Participation						
	Yes	48	( 45)	12	( 33)	41	( 36)
	No	54	( 51)	24	( 67)	67	( 59)
	Waiting	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	6	( 5)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
45.	Education Program Termination Type						
	No Participation	58	( 55)	23	( 64)	73	( 64)
	Positive	23	( 22)	4	( 11)	15	( 13)
	Negative	4	( 4)	1	( 3)	6	( 5)
	Neutral	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	Currently Participating	13	( 12)	7	( 19)	15	( 13)
	Unknown	4	( 3)	1	( 3)	5	( 3)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
46.	Counseling Participation						
	Yes	44	( 41)	17	( 47)	45	( 40)
	No	56	( 53)	16	( 44)	58	( 51)
	Waiting	6	( 6)	3	( 9)	10	( 9)
	Unknown	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	142	(100)
47.	Counseling Termination Type						
	No Participation	61	( 58)	16	( 44)	69	( 60)
	Positive	4	( 4)	1	( 4)	2	( 2)
	Negative	7	( 7)	4	( 11)	9	( 8)
	Neutral	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	6	( 5)
	Currently Participating	27	( 26)	12	( 33)	25	( 22)
	Unknown	3	( 1)	3	( 8)	3	( 3)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
48.	Vocational Participation						
	Yes	29	( 27)	12	( 33)	22	( 19)
	No	75	( 71)	24	( 67)	90	( 79)
	Waiting	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
49.	Vocational Termination Type						
	No Participation	76	( 72)	23	( 64)	92	( 81)
	Positive	1	( 0)	2	( 6)	3	( 3)
	Negative	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	6	( 5)
	Neutral	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	Currently Participating	18	( 17)	8	( 22)	9	( 8)
	Unknown	4	( 4)	3	( 8)	3	( 3)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

	Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
50. Work Release Participation						
Yes	13	( 12)	2	( 6)	13	( 11)
No	87	( 82)	33	( 92)	96	( 84)
Waiting	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
Unknown	3	( 3)	1	( 2)	5	( 4)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
51. Work Release Termination Type						
Neutral	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	2	( 1)
No Participation	91	( 86)	33	( 92)	100	( 88)
Positive	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
Negative	12	( 11)	2	( 6)	11	( 10)
Currently Participating	2	( 2)	1	( 2)	0	( 0)
Unknown	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
52. Education Release Participation						
Yes	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
No	100	( 94)	35	( 98)	111	( 97)
Waiting	3	( 3)	1	( 2)	0	( 0)
Unknown	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
53. Education Release Termination Type						
No Participation	104	( 98)	35	( 97)	114	(100)
Positive	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
Negative	1	( 1)	1	( 3)	0	( 0)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
54.	Number of Pre-Release Placements						
	None	85	( 80)	27	( 75)	85	( 75)
	One	15	( 14)	7	( 19)	23	( 20)
	Two	6	( 6)	2	( 6)	5	( 4)
	Three	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
55.	Current Termination Type for First Pre-Release Placement						
	No Prior	85	( 80)	27	( 75)	86	( 75)
	Negative	18	( 17)	7	( 19)	24	( 21)
	Neutral	2	( 2)	2	( 6)	3	( 3)
	Unknown	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	Positive	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
56.	Months in Pre-Release Placement						
	None	87	( 82)	27	( 75)	86	( 75)
	One	5	( 5)	4	( 11)	11	( 10)
	Two	3	( 3)	2	( 6)	9	( 8)
	Three	2	( 2)	2	( 6)	5	( 4)
	Four	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	Five	2	( 2)	1	( 2)	1	( 1)
	Six	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	Seven	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
57.	Current Termination Type for Second Pre-Release Placement						
	No Prior	101	( 95)	34	( 94)	108	( 95)
	Negative	5	( 5)	2	( 6)	5	( 4)
	Neutral	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
58.	Months in Second Pre-Release Placement						
	None	101	( 95)	34	( 94)	108	( 95)
	One	3	( 3)	1	( 3)	5	( 4)
	Two	0	( 0)	1	( 3)	1	( 1)
	Five	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	Seven	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
59.	Current Number of Returns to Higher From Minimum						
	None	74	( 70)	25	( 69)	99	( 87)
	One	26	( 25)	11	( 31)	10	( 9)
	Two	5	( 5)	0	( 0)	5	( 4)
	Three	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
60.	Current Returns to Higher From Medium						
	None	85	( 80)	33	( 92)	99	( 87)
	One	19	( 18)	3	( 8)	10	( 9)
	Two	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	5	( 4)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
61.	Number of Area Board Recommendations to Lower Security						
	None	66	( 62)	24	( 67)	64	( 56)
	One	26	( 25)	11	( 31)	31	( 27)
	Two	9	( 9)	1	( 2)	15	( 13)
	Three	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	Four	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
62.	Number of Area Board Recommendations to Higher Security						
	None	95	( 90)	35	( 98)	97	( 85)
	One	11	( 10)	1	( 2)	12	( 10)
	Two	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	Three	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	Four	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
63.	Past Parole Recovations						
	None	82	( 77)	29	( 81)	87	( 76)
	One	16	( 15)	7	( 19)	21	( 18)
	Two	5	( 5)	0	( 0)	6	( 5)
	Three	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	Four	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
64.	Total Area Board Seen						
	One	47	( 44)	17	( 47)	36	( 32)
	Two	26	( 25)	10	( 28)	29	( 25)
	Three	15	( 14)	4	( 11)	28	( 25)
	Four	12	( 11)	2	( 6)	6	( 5)
	Five	3	( 3)	1	( 3)	5	( 4)
	Six	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
	Seven	0	( 0)	1	( 3)	2	( 2)
	Eight	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	Nine	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	Unknown	1	( 1)	1	( 2)	2	( 2)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

	Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
65. Prior Address - SMSA						
Boston	54	( 51)	18	( 50)	74	( 65)
Brockton	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
Fall River	2	( 2)	1	( 3)	2	( 2)
Leominster-Fitchburg	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
Haverhill	4	( 4)	2	( 6)	0	( 0)
Lawrence-Lowell	0	( 0)	1	( 3)	8	( 7)
New Bedford	2	( 2)	1	( 3)	2	( 2)
Pittsfield	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
Springfield	16	( 15)	6	( 17)	6	( 5)
Worcester	8	( 8)	5	( 14)	5	( 4)
Other Mass.	8	( 8)	0	( 0)	7	( 6)
Out of State	1	( 0)	1	( 2)	4	( 4)
Unknown	1	( 0)	1	( 2)	2	( 2)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
66. Prior Address - County						
Franklin	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
Worcester	14	( 13)	5	( 14)	8	( 7)
Middlesex	7	( 7)	4	( 11)	26	( 23)
Suffolk	37	( 35)	10	( 28)	50	( 44)
Norfolk	5	( 5)	2	( 6)	2	( 2)
Bristol	4	( 4)	2	( 6)	7	( 6)
Plymouth	6	( 6)	2	( 6)	3	( 3)
Essex	7	( 7)	3	( 8)	5	( 4)
Hampden	16	( 15)	6	( 17)	5	( 4)
Berkshire	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
Barnstable	2	( 1)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
Out of State	5	( 5)	1	( 2)	3	( 3)
Unknown	1	( 0)	1	( 2)	2	( 2)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)



	Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
67. Prior Address-Selected Towns						
Boston	33	( 31)	9	( 25)	47	( 41)
Brockton	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
Cambridge	1	( 1)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
Fall River	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
Framingham	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
Holyoke	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
Lawrence	3	( 3)	2	( 6)	0	( 0)
Lowell	0	( 0)	1	( 3)	6	( 5)
Lynn	2	( 2)	1	( 3)	2	( 2)
New Bedford	2	( 2)	1	( 3)	2	( 2)
Somerville	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	8	( 7)
Springfield	12	( 11)	4	( 11)	5	( 4)
Worcester	5	( 5)	5	( 14)	3	( 3)
Other Mass.	32	( 30)	9	( 25)	28	( 25)
Quincy	0	( 0)	2	( 6)	1	( 1)
Out of State	5	( 5)	1	( 2)	3	( 3)
Unknown	1	( 0)	1	( 2)	2	( 2)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
68. Occupation						
Professional	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
Business	6	( 6)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
Sales, Clerical	9	( 9)	2	( 6)	12	( 10)
Semi-Professional	0	( 0)	2	( 6)	2	( 2)
Manual	57	( 54)	21	( 58)	50	( 44)
Services	22	( 21)	8	( 22)	3	( 27)
Agriculture	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
Student	2	( 1)	0	( 0)	4	( 4)
Unemployed	4	( 4)	1	( 2)	7	( 6)
Unknown	5	( 5)	2	( 6)	4	( 4)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

		Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
69.	Total Number of Any Prior Incarcerations						
	None	38	( 36)	12	( 33)	34	( 30)
	One	18	( 18)	5	( 14)	22	( 19)
	Two	16	( 15)	5	( 14)	16	( 14)
	Three	8	( 8)	2	( 6)	12	( 10)
	Four	8	( 8)	4	( 11)	15	( 13)
	Five	3	( 1)	1	( 3)	6	( 5)
	Six or More	15	( 14)	7	( 19)	9	( 8)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
70.	Total Number of Prior Adult Incarcerations						
	None	47	( 44)	16	( 44)	49	( 43)
	One	19	( 18)	7	( 19)	30	( 26)
	Two	17	( 16)	4	( 11)	12	( 10)
	Three	5	( 5)	2	( 6)	10	( 9)
	Four	5	( 5)	2	( 6)	8	( 7)
	Five	2	( 2)	1	( 3)	1	( 1)
	Six or More	11	( 10)	4	( 11)	4	( 4)
	TOTAL*	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
71.	Total Number of Paroles						
	None	67	( 63)	20	( 56)	70	( 61)
	One	15	( 14)	6	( 17)	18	( 16)
	Two	10	( 9)	3	( 8)	10	( 9)
	Three	6	( 6)	4	( 11)	6	( 5)
	Four or More	8	( 8)	3	( 8)	10	( 9)
	TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

	Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
72. Total Number of Parole Violations						
Never Paroled	67	( 63)	20	( 56)	70	( 61)
None	14	( 13)	7	( 19)	13	( 11)
One	11	( 10)	3	( 8)	18	( 16)
Two	8	( 8)	4	( 11)	8	( 7)
Three	2	( 0)	1	( 3)	2	( 2)
Four or More	4	( 4)	1	( 3)	3	( 3)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
73. Age at Incarceration						
Fifteen	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
Sixteen	1	( 0)	1	( 3)	1	( 1)
Seventeen	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	9	( 8)
Eighteen	8	( 7)	2	( 6)	11	( 10)
Nineteen	7	( 7)	2	( 6)	9	( 8)
Twenty	4	( 4)	6	( 17)	12	( 10)
Twenty-One	12	( 11)	3	( 8)	10	( 9)
Twenty-two	4	( 4)	6	( 17)	11	( 10)
Twenty-three	6	( 6)	0	( 0)	4	( 4)
Twenty-four	5	( 5)	3	( 8)	5	( 4)
Twenty-five	8	( 7)	2	( 6)	5	( 4)
26 to 29	23	( 22)	9	( 25)	19	( 17)
30 to 39	18	( 17)	1	( 3)	13	( 11)
40 and Older	6	( 6)	1	( 1)	3	( 3)
Unknown	4	( 4)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
TOTAL .	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

	Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
74. Age at First Court Appearance						
Seven	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
Eight	0	( 0)	1	( 3)	0	( 0)
Nine	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	4	( 4)
Ten	4	( 4)	2	( 6)	4	( 4)
Eleven	5	( 5)	3	( 8)	7	( 6)
Twelve	4	( 4)	1	( 3)	9	( 8)
Thirteen	6	( 6)	6	( 17)	10	( 9)
Fourteen	15	( 14)	6	( 17)	11	( 10)
Fifteen	11	( 10)	2	( 6)	12	( 10)
Sixteen	6	( 6)	4	( 11)	20	( 18)
Seventeen	18	( 17)	3	( 8)	15	( 13)
Eighteen	7	( 7)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
Nineteen	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	5	( 4)
Twenty	3	( 3)	2	( 6)	0	( 0)
Twenty-one	3	( 3)	1	( 3)	2	( 2)
Twenty-two	3	( 3)	2	( 6)	2	( 2)
Twenty-three	6	( 6)	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
Twenty-four	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
Twenty-five	1	( 0)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
26 to 29	2	( 2)	2	( 6)	2	( 2)
30 to 39	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
40 and Older	2	( 2)	0	( 0)	0	( 0)
Unknown	2	( 1)	1	( 0)	1	( 1)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
75. Age at First Drunk Court Appearance						
Not Applicable	67	( 63)	23	( 64)	75	( 66)
8 to 14	1	( 0)	2	( 6)	1	( 1)
15 to 17	11	( 10)	4	( 11)	15	( 13)
18 to 19	8	( 8)	3	( 8)	8	( 7)
20 to 21	5	( 5)	1	( 3)	3	( 3)
22 to 24	8	( 8)	1	( 3)	8	( 7)
25 to 29	6	( 6)	1	( 3)	1	( 1)
30 to 34	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
Unknown	0	( 0)	1	( 2)	0	( 0)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

	Completions		Non-Completions		Current Status	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
76. Age at First Drug Court Appearance						
Not Applicable	64	( 60)	13	( 36)	68	( 60)
8 to 14	1	( 1)	2	( 6)	1	( 1)
15 to 17	13	( 12)	7	( 19)	16	( 14)
18 to 19	6	( 6)	5	( 14)	12	( 10)
20 to 21	7	( 7)	1	( 3)	6	( 5)
22 to 24	6	( 6)	5	( 14)	5	( 4)
25 to 29	7	( 7)	1	( 3)	3	( 3)
30 to 34	1	( 1)	1	( 3)	1	( 1)
40 or More	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
Unknown	1	( 0)	1	( 2)	1	( 1)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)
77. Time Until Parole Eligibility Date						
1 to 3 Months	0	( 0)	1	( 3)	0	( 0)
4 to 6 Months	0	( 0)	2	( 6)	3	( 3)
7 to 9 Months	2	( 2)	1	( 3)	3	( 3)
10 to 12 Months	10	( 9)	7	( 19)	17	( 15)
13 to 18 Months	16	( 15)	9	( 25)	10	( 9)
19 to 24 Months	14	( 13)	7	( 19)	8	( 7)
2 to 3 Years	11	( 10)	3	( 8)	15	( 13)
3 to 5 Years	21	( 20)	4	( 11)	21	( 18)
5 to 10 Years	11	( 10)	1	( 3)	16	( 14)
10 to 15 Years	9	( 9)	0	( 0)	6	( 5)
15 or More Years	0	( 0)	0	( 0)	1	( 1)
Life	3	( 3)	0	( 0)	8	( 7)
Unknown	9	( 9)	1	( 3)	6	( 5)
TOTAL	106	(100)	36	(100)	114	(100)

## Appendix II

Completers & Non-Completers: Statistically Significant Variables

Variables That Produced Statistically Significant Results

	Completion Rate	Completions Number	Percent	Non-Completions Number	Percent
1. Minimum Sentence					
Indeterminate	57%	31	( 29)	23	( 64)
Non-Indeterminate	85%	75	( 71)	13	( 36)
Total	75%	106	(100)	36	(100)
$(X^2=13.6857, 1df, p<.001)$					
2. Time Until Original Parole Eligibility Date (Unknowns Excluded)					
Less Than 2 Years	61%	42	( 43)	27	( 77)
More Than 2 Years	87%	55	( 57)	8	( 23)
Total	73%	97	(100)	35	(100)
$(X^2=11.81, 1df, p<.001)$					
3. Maximum Sentence					
19 Years or Less	70%	83	( 78)	36	(100)
20 Years or More	100%	23	( 22)	0	( 0)
Total	75%	106	(100)	36	(100)
$(X^2=9.32, 1df, p<.01)$					
4. Area					
I	60%	28	( 26)	19	( 53)
II or III	82%	78	( 74)	17	( 47)
Total	75%	106	(100)	36	(100)
$(X^2=8.43, 1df, p<.01)$					

Variables That Produced Statistically Significant Results

		Completion Rate	Completions Number	Percent	Non-Completions Number	Percent
<hr/>						
5.	Committing Institution (Unknowns Excluded)					
	Walpole	82%	69	( 66)	15	( 42)
	Concord	63%	35	( 34)	21	( 58)
	Total	74%	104	(100)	36	(100)
	$(\chi^2=6.79, 1df, p<.01)$					
6.	Age at First Arrest (Unknowns Excluded)					
	16 Years or Younger	68%	52	( 50)	25	( 69)
	17 Years or Older	84%	52	( 50)	10	( 31)
	Total	75%	104	(100)	35	(100)
	$(\chi^2=4.87, 1df, p<.05)$					
7.	Number of Charges for Drug Offenses					
	None	82%	63	( 59)	14	( 39)
	One or More	66%	43	( 41)	22	( 61)
	Total	75%	106	(100)	36	(100)
	$(\chi^2=4.57, 1df, p<.05)$					
8.	Age at Incarceration (Unknowns Excluded)					
	22 Years or Younger	64%	36	( 35)	20	( 56)
	23 Years or Older	80%	66	( 65)	16	( 44)
	Total	74%	102	(100)	36	(100)
	$(\chi^2=4.53, 1df, p<.05)$					



### Appendix III

Current Status & Completers, Statistically Significant Variables

		Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	Number of Minor D-Reports		
	Current Status	1.7	( 2.3)
	Successful Lower	.7	( 1.2)
	t=3.78 with 172 degrees of freedom, p=.001		
2.	Number of Major D-Reports		
	Current Status	2.1	( 2.6)
	Successful Lower	1.0	( 2.0)
	t=3.7 with 208 degrees of freedom, p=.001		

	Current Status		Successful Lower	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
3. Motivation				
Highly	6	( 6)	29	( 28)
Somewhat	35	( 33)	59	( 56)
Lacking	45	( 42)	14	( 13)
Negatively	20	( 19)	3	( 3)
TOTAL	106	(100)	105	(100)

$\chi^2=50.1$  with 3 degrees of freedom,  $p=.001$

4. Attitude of Inmate				
Excellent	5	( 4)	25	( 24)
Good	17	( 15)	49	( 46)
Fair	59	( 53)	28	( 26)
Poor	30	( 27)	4	( 4)
TOTAL	111	(100)	106	(100)

$\chi^2=59.7$  with 3 degrees of freedom,  $p=.001$

---

---

	Mean	Standard Deviation
5. Total Area Boards Seen		
Current Status	2.5	( 1.9)
Successful Lower	2.1	( 1.4)
t=2.10 with 206 degrees of freedom, p = .04		

		Current Status Number	Percent	Successful Lower Number	Percent
<hr/>					
6.	Prior Address - County				
	Worcester	8	( 7)	14	( 13)
	Franklin	1	( 1)	0	( 0)
	Middlesex	26	( 23)	7	( 7)
	Suffolk	50	( 45)	37	( 35)
	Norfolk	2	( 2)	5	( 5)
	Bristol	7	( 6)	4	( 4)
	Plymouth	3	( 3)	6	( 6)
	Essex	5	( 5)	7	( 7)
	Hampden	5	( 5)	16	( 15)
	Berkshire	0	( 0)	2	( 2)
	Barnstable	2	( 2)	2	( 2)
	Out of State	3	( 3)	5	( 5)
	TOTAL	112	(100)	105	(100)
	$\chi^2=27.0$ with 11 degrees of freedom, $p=.01$				
7.	Institution Recommended by Board				
	Maximum	64	( 57)	0	( 0)
	Medium	20	( 18)	27	( 26)
	Minimum	5	( 4)	20	( 19)
	Medium-Minimum	22	( 20)	6	( 6)
	Community-Based	2	( 2)	46	( 43)
	House of Correction	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	Other	0	( 0)	4	( 4)
	TOTAL	114	(100)	106	(100)
	$\chi^2=130.4$ with 6 degrees of freedom, $p=.001$				

		Current Status		Successful Lower	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
8.	Institution Recommended By Central Office				
	Maximum	65	( 57)	0	( 0)
	Medium	20	( 18)	26	( 24)
	Minimum	5	( 4)	22	( 21)
	Medium-Minimum	23	( 20)	6	( 6)
	Community-Based	1	( 1)	45	( 42)
	House of Correction	0	( 0)	3	( 3)
	Other	0	( 0)	4	( 4)
	TOTAL	114	(100)	106	(100)

$\chi^2=135.4$ , with 6 degrees of freedom,  $p=.001$

9.	Reason for Board				
	Periodic Review	27	( 24)	16	( 16)
	Inmate Request	42	( 38)	59	( 57)
	Reclass D-Board	23	( 21)	14	( 14)
	Reclass Fail Cond	1	( 1)	0	( 0)
	Open Reserve	3	( 3)	3	( 3)
	Superintendent	2	( 2)	6	( 6)
	Other	4	( 4)	1	( 1)
	TOTAL	111	(100)	103	(100)

$\chi^2=14.3$  with 7 degrees of freedom,  $p = .05$

	Current Status Number	Percent	Successful Lower Number	Percent
10. Family and Community Ties				
Visit Frequently	21	( 19)	31	( 30)
Visit Seldom	16	( 15)	16	( 15)
Never Visit	21	( 19)	8	( 8)
Cannot Determine	51	( 47)	50	( 48)
TOTAL	109	(100)	105	(100)

$\chi^2=7.7$  with 3 degrees of freedom,  $p = .05$

11. Drug Usage				
Inappropriate	44	( 39)	50	( 47)
Current Soft Usage	2	( 2)	9	( 9)
Current Hard Usage	22	( 19)	13	( 12)
Past Soft Usage	6	( 5)	7	( 7)
Past Hard Usage	40	( 35)	27	( 26)
TOTAL	114	(100)	106	(100)

$\chi^2=9.5$ , with 4 degrees of freedom,  $p = .05$

	Mean	Standard Deviation
12. Age at Incarceration		
Current Status	23.9	( 7.5)
Successful Lower	25.9	( 6.7)
t=2.12 with 213 degrees of freedom, p = .04		
13. Age at First Arrest		
Current Status	15.4	( 4.0)
Successful Lower	17.2	( 6.5)
t=2.40 with 171 degrees of freedom, p = .02		
14. Months in First Pre-Release Placement		
Current Status	2.1	( 1.3)
Successful Lower	3.4	( 2.0)
t=2.40 with 28 degrees of freedom, p = .02		