

SUMMARY EVALUATIONS OF WORK RELEASE PROGRAMS IN THE  
UNITED STATES

Daniel P. Le Clair, Research Analyst

The Massachusetts Department of Correction

John O. Boone,  
Commissioner

May, 1972

Publication of this Document Approved by  
Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent  
No. 6221

## I. Work Release Evaluations

### A. Work Release: General Studies of Success/Failure

Minnesota. Corrections Department. Work Release for Misdemeanants by Carole L. Bartholomew, St. Paul, 1970.

During 1967, 18,068 individuals were sentenced to county jails, work-houses, and lock-ups in Minnesota. Of these, 1,896 or 10.5 percent served all or part of their sentences in the Work Release Program for misdemeanants. Most, 82 percent, retained their pre-sentence jobs while on the work release program, and another 9 percent found new jobs themselves. Most of the work releasees, 53 percent, served ten to twenty-nine days of their sentences in the work release program. Half of the individuals were terminated from the program at the completion of their sentences; only 7 percent were terminated because of violation of work release rules and 6 percent absconded. After termination from the program, 82 percent of the work releasees continued with the same job, and custody personnel in the jails and work-houses felt the program was beneficial to the offenders in 82 percent of the cases.

Minnesota. Division of Research and Planning. Minnesota State Department of Correction. "Analysis of Work Release for Felons in Minnesota," March, 1971.

During 1970, a total of 154 felony offenders participated in the Work Release Program. Of these, 126 reached termination during that year, of whom 74 (59 percent) were defined as successes. Most of the failures were for absconding or for violation of work release: drinking, not returning to the facility after work, missing work, etc. Only 8 were charged with or convicted for a new offense.

District of Columbia. Correction Department. Office of Planning and Research. Characteristics Associated with Success on Work Release in a State Correctional Institution (Research Report No. 32), September, 1970.

#### Purpose and Method

In-program successes and failures in the Work-Release program of an eastern Department of Corrections were studied to ascertain what personal-social characteristics were associated with these two performance categories.

The subject included 200 successes and 200 failures. Failure was defined as removal for rule or law violation or for defection from the program. The 200 successes were a random selection from 400 successful program completions. The 200 failures were randomly drawn from 233 in-program failures.

#### Findings

The 400 subjects were predominantly Black (81.5 percent). The

successes showed an overrepresentation of whites (27 percent) and an underrepresentation of Blacks (73 percent).

The overall in-program failure rate during the period of the study (July 1, 1969, through April 30, 1970) was 37 percent. Single men were overrepresented among the failures (59 percent vs 48 percent expected). Married men were underrepresented (20 percent vs 28 percent expected), and separated men were underrepresented (13 percent vs 17 percent expected) among the failures.

Failures were slightly overrepresented among the 20-25 and the 26-30 age groups. They were slightly underrepresented in the 31-40, the 41-50 and the over 50 age groups.

Failures were underrepresented among the men with 7th grade and lower education, overrepresented in men with education to the 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th grades, and underrepresented among men with 12th grade education. The relationship between failure and educational level appears, in effect, to be slightly curvilinear, with failure most likely in the middle range of educational attainment.

Officially stated reasons for failure included 1) drinking or intoxication, 30 percent; 2) escape, 22 percent; 3) rule infraction, 13 percent; 4) unauthorized leave and return, 11 percent; and 5) other, including "dismissed from job," "trouble-maker," "medical," and "failure to turn in paycheck" 24 percent.

Failures showed some tendency to be in prison for crimes against property rather than crimes against persons.

Failures showed a marked tendency to reflect size of company and number of Work Releasees employed by the company. Forty-eight employers accounted for 33 percent (66) of the subjects. The failure rate in this group was 12 percent. The five largest employers accounted for 27 percent of the jobs; the 54 subjects employed by these five companies showed a failure rate of 40 percent.

B. Work Release: Studies of Recidivism

4.

California. Corrections Department. Parole and Community Service Division. Work Furlough Programs. Sacramento, 1968.

The Parole and Community Services Division of the California Department of Corrections reports that the program results after a one year follow-up are considerably lower prison return rate of work releasees (12.3 percent) as compared with the California state-wide felon return rate of 21 percent.

District of Columbia. Correction Department. "In-program and post-release performance of work-release inmates: a preliminary assessment of the Work Release Program," Stuart Adams and Joseph B. Dellinger, Washington, D. C., 1969 (Research Report No. 13).

An effort to assess the effectiveness of the work release program of the District of Columbia was made in 1969. In order to obtain information on in-program and post-release performance of work release "graduates," the 281 cases who moved into and out of the work release program between its start in April, 1966, and the end of July 1967, were identified and their records were traced. The study group was separated into 156 felony offenders and 125 misdemeanants. Of the 156 felony offenders, a total of 50 (32.2 percent) absconded or were revoked during their stay in the work release unit. The absconds and revokees were then separated for periods that averaged 4.9 months and then released to the community. A post-release follow-up of the graduates from work-release and from re-incarceration showed that at twelve months out, about 26 percent of the 156 felony offenders had been detained in the D. C. Jail. The remaining 74 percent may be defined as "successes" at the end of the twelve-month follow-up period.

Of the 125 misdemeanants, a total of 36 (28.8 percent) absconded or were revoked during their stay in the work release unit. The absconds and revokees were re-incarcerated for an average of three months and then released to the community. A post-release follow-up of the 125 misdemeanants showed that after an exposure time of twelve months, about 24 percent of the group had been detained at the D. C. Jail. The remaining 76 percent may be regarded as successes at the end of one year of community exposure.

The 125 misdemeanants included a group of 51 who had been ordered to work release by the adjudicating courts. This group showed no absconds during the stay in the unit; it also showed a revocation rate of only about 14 percent, which was about one-half of the revocation and abscond rate (28.8 percent) for all misdemeanants and about one-third of the revoke and abscond rate of the non-court ordered misdemeanants (40 percent).

C. Newman & T. Bielen, "Work Release: An Alternative in Correction Handling," MSS, Pennsylvania State University, 1968.

Comparative analysis of the recidivism rate of ninety individuals who participated in a work release program with a randomly selected group of 69 prisoners who did not, showed an 8 percent rate 18 months after release for the work release participants as compared with 14 percent recidivism for those not in the program, on the basis of known date. Those selected for the work release program were possibly better risks because more were older, more largely non-white, more married, and more were skilled workers.

One useful conclusion is that with selected offenders, at least, work release can be an economical and theoretically desirable procedure that poses no increase in risk to the community.

Although administrative selection of inmates for work release seemed to reflect good judgement, the basis for selection was subjective and, therefore, not suitable for the development of a predictive instrument to aid selection of subjects for work release.

### C. Work Release: Cost-Benefit Evaluations

California. Santa Clara County Sheriff's Department: San Jose State College, Center for Interdisciplinary Studies. Work Furlough Study. San Jose, California, 1968. Various pagings.

In February of 1957, the Santa Clara County (California) Sheriff's Department initiated a work-release program, patterned after the Huber Plan of 1914, which is in effect in Wisconsin. Inmate eligibility for participation is determined by: the nature of the present offense; past arrest record; type of employment; and degree of need of the offender's dependents. A room and board and administrative charge is levied against each man's earnings, and his remaining funds used as he indicates. If court orders exist pertaining to any non-support charges, restitution, or other collections, an attempt is made to satisfy all claims, commensurate with the participant's income. Inmate violations have ranged from escapes to such minor violations as unauthorized phone calls. The most frequent violation is the use of alcoholic beverages; a policy of strict enforcement of regulations is maintained. Since its inception, the program's success rate averages 85 percent. However, since participants are removed for any violation, and sometimes even where there is suspicion of infraction, the 85 percent success group becomes increasingly important. The program has been fruitful economically, but its effect on recidivism is still largely unknown. Research is planned, directed at finding what effect the program might have in this regard.

California Taxpayers' Association. Work Furlough Program in California Counties, 1967-68: A Workload Study, 1968.

A survey was made of the work-release program in California counties during 1967-1968. From the statistical data which were compiled it appeared that there are some valid economic gains in the programs. Estimates of the savings to a county ranged from \$20,000 to \$40,000 per year in some of the larger counties to \$2,000 in a small county. The savings varied from about 10 percent of total earnings to 58 percent with the median at 28.5 percent. In a report to the Los Angeles county probation department it was found that 22.1 percent of the work releasees' families would have applied for assistance at a cost of \$55,000. Thirty percent of the Work Releasees' total earnings is returned to the county. Communities were generally reported as co-operative in providing job opportunities for the inmates.

Though the program was found to be fruitful economically, its effects on recidivism had not been studied.

California. San Joaquin County Work Furlough Financial Statement. Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency. Model Community Correctional Program. San Joaquin County, California, Summary Report, 1969.

Cost-Benefit Analysis reveals:

	<u>1965-1966</u>	<u>1967-1968</u>
Total inmate earnings	\$ 600,207	\$ 706,682
Room and board payments	207,552	269,820
Support payments to families	35,000	40,212
Net inmate earnings	251,000	247,356
Man days in program	48,511	65,366

(Inmates pay only for days worked so the room and board payments are not a 5 x multiple of the man days in the program.)

District of Columbia. Department of Corrections. Cost Analysis of the D. C. Work Release Program (Research Report No. 24) June, 1970.

The D. C. Department of Corrections Work Release program for men was studied to provide information on the extent to which the program has been cost-beneficial. The study covers the first 39 months of Work Release operation, during which more than 1,000 men were in the program. The data used were obtained from Work Release records and reports and from the Department's Budget Office. Because of a change in the budget status of the program, the study period was divided into two parts; Phase I, April 1966, through December 1967, and Phase II, January 1968, through June 1969.

Cost Reduction: The Phase I Work Release program had two parts--a felon program which ran the full 21 months, and a separate misdemeanor program, running the last 10 months of the period. Both parts of the program were housed in prisons and had small staffs. Although records are not complete for this Phase of the program, the reduction in cost of maintaining these men is estimated at \$104,209 for an average population of 54 felons and 44 misdemeanants over the period, or an annual saving of \$59,548 to the Department. During Phase II, the program was housed in the Jail with a larger, but still relatively small staff for the average program population of 106. The records for this period show a cost reduction of \$109,342, or \$136,894 on an annual basis.

Data were not available on any savings that may have been produced by reductions in recidivism attributable to the program.

Benefits from Earnings: During Phase I the Work Releasees returned \$94,006 to the government through taxes and lodging payment out of total earnings of \$387,376. In Phase I the Work Releasees also paid \$74,104 to dependents and creditors in the community and retained \$219,265 for their own use in the program and after release. The average return to the government from these earnings was \$769 per felon Work Releasee-year and \$580 per misdemeanor Work Releasee-year. The return to the government and community (dependents and creditors)

together per participant-year totals \$1,363 for felons and \$1,071 for misdemeanants. Adding to these figures the cost reduction divided by the average number of participants in the program, total benefits from Work Release to the Department of Corrections, the D. C. and Federal Governments, and the community come to \$2,315 per felon Work Releasee-year, and \$2,023 per misdemeanor Work Releasee-year. These figures do not include the benefits to the economy or to the individual from money retained by Work Releasees.

During Phase II, the Work Releasees earned a total of \$370,524, of which \$125,559 went to the government, \$59,873 went to creditors and dependents, and \$185,091 was retained for personal use. The average return to the government alone per man-year in the program was \$789 in Phase II. The average return from earnings to the government and community was \$1166 per man-year. Adding to this amount the per-man reduction to the Department in maintenance costs, the benefits from Work Release to people other than the participants come to \$2363 per program man-year. The cost to society of maintaining an inmate in the Department of Corrections is thus reduced by about half by placing a man on Work Release rather than in an institution.

G. Godby, "Four Years of Work Release in Oregon," An Evaluative Report to the State of Oregon Corrections Administrator," John S. Galvin, April 1970.

A brief, essentially non-statistical, report on the work-release program in Oregon, April 1966 - March 1970, during which time 1142 persons participated in a work, education, or training release period. Of these 257 (23 percent) failed to satisfactorily complete the program and 885 (77 percent) were returned to society having a job and some available money on the day of release.

Work releasees paid approximately \$273,880 in taxes; \$300,352 to the state for board and room; \$71,420 for the support of dependents; \$11,198 gate money returned to the institution. Additionally, out of total earnings of \$1,369.00 the sum of \$314,768 was returned to Oregon's economy through purchases and \$343,880 became available to individuals on release from prison.

Data on post-release careers is not available.

Zalba, Serapio R. "Work Release - a Two Pronged Effort." Crime and Delinquency, 13(4):506-512, 1967.

Zalba analyzed 4 programs in Wisconsin and three California counties. Escape rates varied from less than one percent (Orange and Marin counties) to 12 percent (Milwaukee County, Wis.). In Wisconsin, work releasees earned a total of \$2,800,000 during the years 1955 to 1960; the sum in 1960 was \$633,000. In Marin County, California, the annual average for the years 1962 to 1964 was \$122,000. In Santa Clara County the total earned by persons in the program in eight years (1957 to 1965) came to over \$1,375,000, averaging \$486 for each work releasee; the total earned in 1965 alone was \$243,000.



## II. Evaluations of Community-Based Corrections Programs

District of Columbia. Department of Corrections. A Comparison of the Community Performance of Community Correctional Center and Institutional Releases: Some Preliminary Findings. Judith A. Hecht, March 15, 1971.

Community correctional center releasees show a lower recidivism rate than a comparable risk group of institution releasees:

\*81.7 of community correctional center releasees did not recidivate within eight months compared with 69.8% of institution releasees;

\*71.7 of center releasees had no further legal difficulties of any sort compared with 55.5% of institution releasees;

\*the recidivism rate for new convictions from the community centers, 11.7%, is one-half that of the institution's 22.7%.

Community correctional centers are rehabilitating and assisting men without histories of drug, alcohol, or other serious problems significantly more than traditional institutions. The recidivism rate from the centers for these men is 5.6%, one-third the institution's rate of 16.7%.

In short, results to date indicate that the community correctional centers are sound investments.

### Findings

In line with national priorities for community - based corrections, the D. C. Department of Corrections has been expanding its Community Correctional Center Program. On an average day in February, 1970, the year in which the Department of Corrections opened its first community correctional center for adults, approximately 230 men or 18% of all convicted men in Department facilities were center residents. This fiscal year, the centers' average daily population of approximately 620 men represents 22% of all convicted men in Department facilities and the Department projects that by the conclusion of February, 1972, the centers' daily population will increase to 1,195 or 30% of the total. Within three short years, the Department plans to increase its center population more than 300%, and place twice the percentage of all its convicted institutionalized men within these facilities.

This increasing commitment to community centers rightfully raises questions as to their effectiveness. The most obvious measure is recidivism: how many men return to the correctional system after release.

In an attempt to answer this question, the Department has collected data on a sample of 120 men released from centers (CCCs) and on a sample of 119 men released from the Department's more traditional type institutions. As the Department opened its first houses in September through November 1969, men who have been released from the centers have not experienced community life for a prolonged period of time. The

recidivism data presented here cover the intital eight months of community exposure for men released January through April of 1970. This time, though short, is the most critical period of post-release adjustment. These data should not be considered as conclusive or as providing more than a very tentative answer to center effectiveness.

District of Columbia. U. S. Department of Justice. A Descriptive and Comparative Study of Recidivism in Pre-release Guidance Center Releasees. Hall, Reis H., Milazzo, Mildred, and Posner, Judy. Bureau of Prisons, December 28, 1966.

A study was conducted to test an hypothesis that prerelease guidance centers may have differential impacts on various types of offenders. Federal prisoners, totaling 285 released during 1964 from four pre-release centers were followed up after a minimum of two years parole supervision. "Failure" was defined as commitment to an institution of any kind for one or more days, or issuance of a parole warrant; "success" means no arrests, as well as arrest without conviction and even conviction without commitment.

Excluding the 54 men returned to institutions for "in-program" failure at the centers, 57.6% of the 231 men released to the free community on parole were judged "successes," while 42.4% were considered "failures." The anticipated overall failure rate for the groups had been estimated at 52.3%. The difference between actual and expected failure rate according to the federal researchers was "an index of increased program effectiveness attributable to the pre-release guidance centers."

Performance of prisoners in the community upon release from pre-release centers also involves their ability to survive the three to four month stay in the center. In the course of a little over a year and a half, of 456 men who had spent time in one of the four centers, 361 (80%) were released to the community, 41 (9%) were returned to institutions prior to parole; and 52 (11%) absconded.

In terms of differential impact, car thieves with previous records did much better than the anticipated high failure rate would indicate.

### III. Furlough Evaluations

California Correction Department. California's Pre-release furlough program for State Prisoners. Norman Holt. Sacramento, 1969. 26 p. (Research Report No. 39)

Inmates in the California State Prison system have, since January, 1969, been eligible for release on 72-hour furloughs within the period beginning 90 days prior to their release dates. The California Corrections Department conducted an evaluation of this program for participants during the first half of 1969. A majority of eligible inmates requested furloughs, and about 90 percent of those requested were granted. One hundred and sixty-five inmates received 198 furloughs. Almost all (92 percent) of the furloughees planned to secure or confirm employment. Of the 85 who had no offers on file, 40 inmates returned with firm jobs while 27 others showed evidence of at least seeking work. Although the furloughees represent a cross section of state prisoners, most having alcohol or drug problems, only two failed to return, two returned intoxicated, and one was arrested for drunk driving. No one in the community is known to have suffered any physical hardship or to have lost any property as a result of those 198 furloughs. Nor did the program require any additional funds or capital outlay. The institution actually realized a savings on clothing and food. On the other hand, all the data gathered indicate that the pre-release furloughs have substantial benefits on preparing inmates for their return to the community. Some possible reasons for the success of the furlough program are suggested. First, the inmate is required to take the initiative in developing his own plan. Second is the plan itself; the inmate is encouraged to concentrate his efforts on a few selected activities. Third, interviewing the inmate when he returns and asking the family's reaction provide some external controls. Fourth, a climate of competition appears to have developed among the inmates to see how much they can do in three days.

District of Columbia. A Report on the D. C. Halfway House and Furlough Programs. December 10, 1971. By the D. C. Citizens Council for Criminal Justice.

Under the furlough program minimum custody men may leave the prison for school programs, vocational training and work programs, and escorted visits in the community. In a sixteen month period, over 1,000 furloughs had been granted. Only 21 men (or .05%) absconded, giving the program a 98% success rate.

At Thanksgiving and again at Christmas, 1970, an experimental "evaluative furlough" program was inaugurated. Again the minimum custody men were eligible and the furloughs provided residents an opportunity to demonstrate that they were worthy of assuming additional responsibility. Six hour visits were granted to 171 men at Thanksgiving and 171 men returned. At Christmas 6 to 12 hour furloughs were granted to 268 men and 1 failed to return. The men were given tests for alcohol, a uranalysis to check for drug use, and searched for contraband. The results were so successful that an official "evaluative furlough" program was established in June, 1971. Residents were granted unescorted family visits of limited duration, usually 12 to 48 hours, as a means of building and strengthening

those ties with family and community thought so important to the prisoners' successful rehabilitation.

During the two month operating period, 426 men were granted furloughs of which only 6 men absconded. The percentage of those failing to return from furloughs is 1.5%; the success rate of the program is approximately 98%.

#### IV. Summaries of Evaluations of Programs already Existing in Massachusetts

Evaluations of four programs currently in operation in Massachusetts that approach a community-based correctional model have been carried out. They include the following programs:

(1) Massachusetts Correctional Institution, Concord, Day Work Program: Fifteen men at that institution live in the former deputy superintendent's house just outside the walls. They are employed by the day in private industry and return to the residence after work.

(2) Massachusetts Correctional Institution, Concord, Walter E. Fernald School Program: About fifteen men live on the MCI-Concord Farm and travel daily to the Fernald School to work as attendants caring for severely retarded males.

(3) Massachusetts Correctional Forestry Camps: Three camps exist whereby assigned prisoners are employed in "reforestation, maintenance and development of state forests." Camp men follow a rugged work schedule in reforestation under the custody of correctional officers and the guidance of men from the Department of Natural Resources. They clear forests, build and repair roads, cut and haul timber, fight forest fires, aid in the search for missing persons and aircraft, etc.

(4) Brooke House, a private correctional halfway house operated by Massachusetts Half-way Houses, Inc., opened in Boston in November, 1965. The 25 resident population is drawn from the Massachusetts Correctional Institutions at Walpole, Norfolk and Concord; from the Suffolk County House of Correction at Deer Island and from Federal institutions. Residents apply for the program as a way of obtaining parole or discharge earlier than would normally be the case. The intended length of stay for a resident is approximately three months; during this time he works at a regular job and participates in House programs.

The following evaluations of the effectiveness of these programs are broken down into two groups: (1) findings from the program evaluations by the research staff of the Massachusetts Department of Corrections, and (2) findings from evaluations of the Brooke House staff.

- A. Studies Conducted by Research Staff of Massachusetts Department of Corrections. Evaluation of the Concord Day Work Program, Daniel P. LeClair, Research Analyst. Forthcoming Massachusetts Department of Correction publication.

In January, 1972, the research staff of the Massachusetts Department of Corrections undertook a research evaluation of the Concord Day Work program. For the purpose of this evaluation a sample was drawn consisting of all offenders whose incarceration at Concord terminated successfully between August, 1968, and December 31, 1970, and who participated in the Day Work program prior to release.

The basic questions the study sought to answer were: To what extent did the 97 ex-Day Work releasees remain law abiding, and what variables were associated with subsequent lawful and lawless behavior, respectively? The general procedure followed in answering these questions was to use the rates of recidivism. Two samples were derived for comparison. The first was obtained from the list of Concord Day Work participants which contained all those who were in the program at some point from its inception through December, 1971. From this list, 94 members fit the criteria necessary for a recidivism follow-up period of one year; i.e., they were released to the community before December 31, 1970. Of the 94 selected, 16 had to be dropped as in-program failures or as part of an "other" category (poor health, outstanding warrants, etc.). Both categories were dropped from the study in that these participants did not complete the program. The final sample, therefore, consisted of 78 participants.

The second sample, the non-Day Work control group, was obtained by using the 1966 Concord Base Expectancy Data. This sample consisted of the 306 former inmates of MCI-Concord who were released to the community in 1966. This sample of 306 was reduced to 152 by eliminating those offenders who would have been ineligible for entry into Day Work (i.e., excluding those whose then present incarceration was a result of a person or sex offense).

At the present time, all data has been collected and the analysis process has been begun. However, since analysis is yet to be completed, what follows must be considered as tentative summary of findings. This cannot be overstressed! Preliminary results often become less pronounced or may even change after a more detailed examination of the multiple relationships that occur.

#### Overall Impact of the Day Work Program

##### Actual Recidivism Rate (for Day Work releasees)

30.76%

##### Control Group Recidivism Rate (for the types of men in Day Work but not in program)

32.23%

The difference is not a large one for the 12 month follow-up period. However, when a breakdown of various follow-up periods is made, more pronounced differences occur.

<u>Follow-up Period</u>	<u>Day Work</u>		<u>Concord Control Group</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Recidivism Rate</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Recidivism Rate</u>
1 month	78	2.56%	152	1.97%
3 months	78	8.97	152	5.26
6 months	78	15.38	152	17.10
9 months	78	24.35	152	26.31
12 months	78	30.76	152	32.23
15 months	63	31.74	152	38.81
18 months	57	28.07	152	42.76
21 months	47	31.91	152	44.73
More than 21 months	42	30.95	152	48.68

From this table it can be seen that while the reduction of recidivism for the Day Work group is very slight for the 12-month follow-up period, as the follow-up period is increased the difference becomes more pronounced. One could conclude from this that Day Work has a positive impact on recidivism although such does not become evident during the first year after release. A basic problem, however, is that evaluation past the 12 month period involves only a portion of the total Day Work sample since some subjects had not been released long enough to be included in a follow-up period beyond 12 months.

In terms of the differential impact of Day Work on recidivism, the analysis clearly indicated a negative impact group: inmates with either serious disciplinary records (some good conduct days withheld prior to entry into Day Work), or who were young with long records (25 years or younger at time of the then present incarceration with 13 or more prior arrests).

<u>Negative Impact Group</u>	<u>Day Work</u>	<u>Concord Control Group</u>
Men with either of two characteristics		
(1) Serious Disciplinary Records	N=11	N=47
(2) Young with Long Records	Recidivism=64%	Recidivism=21%

(note: these two groups are mutually exclusive)

The above differences between samples was statistically significant at the .05 significance level. Such can be interpreted as indicating that not only are inmates with either of these characteristics not helped by Day Work, but in addition that they are actually hurt by it.

A Cost-Benefit of the Concord Day Work Program is Summarized in Charts I and II below:

Chart I

MASSACHUSETTS CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, CONCORD  
DAY WORK PROGRAM

	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>
Number of men in program	45	65

FINANCES

August 1968 to June 1969

Gross earnings	\$50,023.23
Federal tax	4,719.82
State tax	602.82
F.I.C.A.	2,349.09
Other	3,036.92
Net earnings	39,324.58
Food and lodging	14,341.00

January 1, 1970 to December 31, 1970

Gross earnings	\$65,004.86
Federal tax	4,719.82
State tax	907.37
F.I.C.A.	3,119.98
Other	4,115.11
Net earnings	51,048.43
Food and lodging	17,598.50

	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>
Number of men taken out of program	4	22
Average number of men in program	12	15

Places of employment for 1969 and 1970:

Continental Wool Company  
Concord Foundry, Inc.  
Concord Woodworking Co.  
Polaroid (Seiler's Servend-kitchen)  
Grason Stadler Co. (electrical)  
Walden Nursing Home, Concord

Salary levels for both years:

Minimum gross about \$71.25 per week in Nursing Home.  
Maximum gross about \$150.00 per week in Foundry.  
Average - \$120.00 per week.



## Chart II

\$ 24.50	Rent paid weekly (Individual)
+ 3.50	Wages no longer paid by State weekly (Individual)
28.00	Subtotal
- 4.42	Weekly meals (Individual)
23.58	
- 8.25	Weekly per man differential for supervision
15.33	Net gain
x 15	Number of inmates in program each week
229.95	
x 52	Weeks in year
11,957.40	Subtotal yearly income from program
- 74.30	6 month expenses
11,883.10	Net Day Work Program Gain
In addition, if you include wall cost per man if not in Day Work:	
\$ 5,800.00	Wall cost per man per year
x 15	Number in work release at one time
87,000.00	
+11,883.10	Net Total Day Work Gain
98,883.10	Employee non accounted for cost
-33,343.96	
\$65,539.14	State Net Gain from Day Work Program

In terms of these financial breakdowns several important points should be made. First, from the taxpayers' point of view, the cost of retraining in detention is considerably less for those placed in the program. Although no specific funds are allocated to run the Day Work program, MCI-Concord institutional facilities, including guards, are used. However, as Chart II shows, when various assets and liabilities are weighed the result is a State Net Gain of \$65,539.14 yearly. Added to this, as seen in Chart I, the Day Work participants in 1970, for example, contributed \$4,719.62 in Federal taxes; \$907.37 in State taxes; and \$3,119.98 in F.I.C.A. payments. Finally, money is often sent home to the inmates' dependents and the inmate has a cash reserve when released to the community.

### Conclusion

Analysis has revealed, thus far, that the Day Work program has not had a significant impact on the reduction of recidivism for a 12 month follow-up period. However, as the follow-up period is increased statistically significant differences in favor of Day Work begin to

appear. Certain types of inmates were found to be hurt by participation in Day Work though no clear positive group could be determined. The financial breakdown of program costs and gains are impressive from the taxpayers' point of view. From a security point of view, there have been no disturbances in the Day Work house and there has been only one runaway in the 3½ year history of the program.

#### Rate of Escape

One person escaped in the 3½ year history of the program, i.e., one person out of approximately 200 participants (0.5%). This represents probably the lowest rate of escape of any work release program in the U. S.

- B. Evaluation of the Concord Achievement Rehabilitation Volunteer Experiment at the Walter C. Fernald School. Ed Callahan, Research Analyst, forthcoming Massachusetts Department of Corrections publication.

Definition of Recidivism: Commitment to a state or federal prison or a house of correction for a period of 30 days or more within one year of release.

#### Samples

Fernald Sample--Consists of all men who successfully completed the Fernald program and were released between February of 1968 and March 1, 1970. February of 1968 represents the date of inception of the program. March 1, 1970, was used as a cut-off date because, at the time data collection ended for this study, this date allowed enough time to follow up all men in the Fernald sample for one year after their release. A total of 53 men successfully completed the program and were released between these two dates.

The phrase "successfully completed" means that men who did not successfully complete the program (i.e., men who escaped or who were removed as disciplinary problems) were not included in the Fernald Sample. They were not included because the purpose of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in terms of reducing recidivism among its participants. In-program failures, by definition, have not been "helped" by participation in the program and in actuality have not completed the program.

Control Sample--The Control Sample was made up of all men released from MCI-Concord in 1966 but who did not participate in the Fernald Sample, a total of 306 men.

#### Findings

Overall Impact of Program on Recidivism--Within one year of release, 24.5% of the Fernald Program men were re-incarcerated as opposed to 29.7% of the control (non-participant) men.

Differential Impact on Recidivism--Two select characteristics were found to be related to a significant reduction in recidivism. The first indicated that Fernald Program participants with an eighth grade education or more had a significantly lower recidivism rate (10.5%) than their counterparts in the Control Sample (29.5%). The second variable was the length of time spent in the program. It was discovered that those who spent a moderate amount of time in the program (i.e., 2 through 5 months) had a significantly lower recidivism rate (10.5%) than those who were in the program for either a short period of time or a long period of time (i.e., less than 2 months or 6 months or more (60.0%).

Rate of Escape--Of the first 85 men who were placed on the program, 7 escaped. This represents an escape rate of 8.2%. All seven of these men were later captured and re-incarcerated.

- C. Massachusetts Department of Corrections. Evaluation of Massachusetts Forestry Camps, M. Hyler, Research Analyst, forthcoming publication.

### Recidivism

Forestry camp releasees have consistently had a lower recidivism rate than institutional releasees in Massachusetts. Controlled for selective factors, the camp recidivist rate was 35.3% as compared to an institutional rate of 45.0% for a two year follow-up period. The camp placement is most beneficial to those men with stable work backgrounds. The forestry program is physically taxing and may, therefore, present a challenge to those inmates.

The forestry camps present a unique setting for certain types of vocational programing. Motor vehicles are an integral part of camp work, as well as independent assignments to teams of men. Customary security problems are not a consideration. Officers are able to work on a co-operative basis with the campmen.

### Cost-Benefit

The camp operation is less costly than institutional placement. In 1969, the per capita cost per inmate was \$4,637.12 at Walpole, \$4,194.32 at Norfolk, and \$5,580.60 at Concord. For the camps it was \$4,424.87. Though somewhat lower cost per capita, the tremendous savings the forestry camps present does not show up until a consideration of the work accomplished for the state is presented. The Department of Natural Resources figures for 1970, as noted in the table below, clearly illustrates this point:

Work Accomplished for Natural Resources - Summaries OnlyMCI-Monroe

Workshop Projects	\$ 21,540.
Recreation Projects	55,760.
Forestry Projects	31,525.
Equipment Work	<u>38,760.</u>
Total	\$147,585.

MCI-Warwick

Workshop Projects	\$ 34,965.
Recreation Projects	68,880.
Forestry Projects	12,030.
Equipment Work	<u>39,500.</u>
Total	\$155,375.

MCI-Plymouth

Manufacturing fire places & grates	\$ 9,480.	
Charge Pond - Cleaning Area	4,350.	
Cutting roadside brush	690.	
Planation: Pruning, thinning, weeding	13,120.	(52 acres)
Workshop Maintenance and Wood Pile	6,520.	
Maintenance of Recreation Areas	1,650.	
Sweeping and Grading Roads	<u>1,620.</u>	
Total	\$ 37,430.	

Grand Total \$340,390.

The total cost of operating the three prison camps for fiscal 1970 was \$616,834.00. The daily average inmate count was 142 men. This results in a per capita cost of \$4,330.00 for the year after deducting income of \$1,976.00 from the sale of meal tickets to employees. When we take the \$614,858.00 cost of operation and subtract work done for Natural Resources (\$340,390.00) our cost of operating becomes \$274,468.00. Our per capita cost, then, becomes \$1,932.87. It is at this point that the tremendous savings becomes apparent.

Security\*:

Although the camps operate on a minimum security basis and work outside camp grounds, less than 3% have absconded in over 18 years (70 of the 2,300 appx. camp inmates from May 1952 to August 1970).

\* An Analysis of Massachusetts Forestry Camp Escapees. Massachusetts Department of Correction. M. Hyler and J. Labbe, Research Analysts. December, 1970.

There are no weapons on camp grounds and only 3 officers are on duty at any one time. The combined yearly rate of the three camps is just 5.6 escapees per year. Most escapees are simple walkaways and 54% are apprehended within 48 hours. It is interesting to note that anxiety over wife and family was a contributing factor in many escape histories. Better community-family contacts might have prevented these incidents.

- D. The Effectiveness of a Correctional Halfway House. Peck, Joseph H., Simon, Steven I., and Riley, J. Brian. Massachusetts Half-way Houses, Inc., June, 1969.

The first 92 residents who were assigned to the Brooke House program, who arrived between November, 1965, and November, 1967, were followed up to determine whether they had been incarcerated in Massachusetts state and county correctional institutions for thirty days or more after discharge from the Brooke House program.

Base Expectancy Recidivist Rates were calculated for a percentage of residents from MCI-Concord, Walpole, and Norfolk; for residents from the Suffolk County House of Corrections; and for a comparison of residents of Deer Island and Federal Institutions. In other words, Base Expectancy Recidivist Rates were calculated for various institutions in proportion to the percentage of participants in the Brooke House program who are drawn from these institutions.

The expected rate of recidivism for the types of men in Brooke House was calculated to be 67.1%. The actual rate of recidivism for the Brooke House group was found to be 51.8%. This represents a statistically significant difference in favor of the Brooke House participants. This finding can be interpreted as indicating that the Brooke House program contributes significantly to the reduction of recidivism for its participants.

Further analysis revealed that Brooke House has the most impact on those residents who stay an intermediate length of time in the program. Residents who stay for a short time do not benefit appreciably. They either never intended to stay or impulsively absconded. Residents who stay for excessively long periods probably do so because they have failed to establish a place for themselves to go in the community and have become dependent on the program. They leave reluctantly and do not do well.

Evaluation of a Correctional Halfway House. William McKinley Runyan, 1970.

The purpose of the study was to assess the effectiveness of the Brooke House program as measured by recidivism rates during a one year follow-up period. Base Expectancy Recidivism rates are compared with the actual recidivism rates for a sample of 66 residents. To maximize the validity of the results, the same sources of information and the same procedures for data gathering are used in determining actual recidivism as were used in the calculation of Base Expectancy Recidivism Rates. The halfway house was found to reduce recidivism rates from 35.8% to 24.2% over the one year follow-up period.