
DEVELOPMENT OF AN OBJECTIVE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

**FINAL REPORT
(Grant No. 91P01GHL7)**

Submitted to:

National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20534

Submitted by:

Dr. Michael W. Forcier
Project Director
Dougherty Management Associates, Inc
9 Meriam Street, Suite 4
Lexington, MA 02173-5312

June 14, 1992

INTRODUCTION

This final report for the project titled, “Development of an Objective Classification System”, presents the results of a one-year effort to design an objective, point-based system of initial inmate classification for the Massachusetts Department of Correction (MDOC). At the inception of this project, there existed a twelve-item scale of initial inmate custody classification (See Appendix A) which had been developed by an internal MDOC Classification Task Force consisting of the Deputy Commissioner, Associate Commissioner for Programs and Treatment, four institutional superintendents, Director of Classification, and Deputy Director of Research. That scale was developed through: a review of the literature as to what variables should be included on objective classification scales; a review of other state classification systems as well as the NIC Model Systems Approach and Federal Bureau of Prisons Systems; and, a consensus process that reflected the professional judgement of Task Force members as to what variables should be included on a classification scale and the manner in which they should be defined.

This draft initial scale which emanated from Task Force deliberations consisted of twelve items, eight of which pertained to criminal history and four of which pertained to social history. For each factor, a risk scale was defined by categories for low, low-moderate, moderate, high-moderate, high or no risk behaviors (some factors had fewer categories). Definitions for each risk category are given in the Appendix. The eight criminal history variables were:

- Severity of current offense
- Prior assaultive offense history
- Escape history
- Legal issues
- Prior institutional violence and/or major disciplinary history
- Returns to higher custody
- Identifiable criminal patterns due to substance abuse
- Overall criminal history

These items were to be summed to arrive at a Total History Score.

The four Social History variables were:

- Family relationships
- Educational history
- Vocational history
- Work history

The four Social History variables were also added for a Total Social History score. A Total Overall security rating was obtained by combining the Total Criminal History and Total Social History Scores. This Overall Rating resulted in a particular security level designation.

Modifications to Scale Based on NIC Training

In September 1989, Massachusetts was one of 13 states selected by the National Institute of Corrections to attend a new NIC National Academy of Corrections training session titled, "Evaluating Objective Classification Systems." That training, attended by the MDOC Director of Programs and Classification and Deputy Director of Research resulted in the refinement of a draft initial inmate classification scale. The objective of the Massachusetts project at the NIC training seminar was to learn about processes for developing, implementing, and evaluating an objective classification system based on the experiences of NIC trainers and the other states that attended the training. Unlike some of the other states that attended the training which had fully operating objective classification systems, the MDOC was only at the initial stages of system development. For example, the draft scale described above had neither variable weights nor security level cut-off scores associated with it. While the draft initial scale was very well received by both NIC training staff and representatives from other states, some minor "fine-tuning" was suggested for individual variable categories. It was also suggested that the variable Age, be added to the scale.

The major tasks which remained after the training were the derivation of weights or points to be assigned to each variable in the initial classification scale and the establishment of "cut-off" points or ranges to designate various security level placements based on scale scores. These were the tasks which motivated the request for NIC long-term technical assistance. In the next section, the methodology for the development of this project is described.

METHODS

The sample for this study was selected from the 2,409 commitments to the Department of Correction in 1985. A systematic random sample of 506 inmates, or 21% of the total commitments, was selected. Data for the study were collected from the records of 506 court commitments to the DOC who had initial classifications conducted between January 1985 and October 1986. It was originally intended to select the sample from 1987 commitments. This changed when it was discovered that the dependent or criterion variable in the study, disciplinary reports, was only automated through 1987. In effect, this meant that there would be no opportunity to observe post-commitment institutional adjustment for most of the sample over a sufficient period of time. Therefore, it was decided to use an earlier commitment sample whose adjustment could be assessed from the date of commitment in 1985 through the period of follow-up.

The criterion variable used to design the scoring system, institutional adjustment, was measured by the number of major disciplinary reports resulting in guilty findings between the initial classification date and December 31, 1987. Computerized records of all disciplinary reports were available for this time period.

There are 31 different offenses for which inmates can receive disciplinary reports. The types of major misconduct included in this report were the following major disciplinary reports:

- Disobeying/Lying or Insolence
- Violating Rules
- Failure to Keep Quarters
- Out of Place
- Failure to Perform Assignment
- Counterfeiting/Forgery
- Tampering with Exit
- Disrupting Order
- Escape
- Alcohol/Other Drug
- Misuse Medication
- Refusing Drug Test
- Gambling
- Rioting
- Possession of Weapon
- Killing/Attempted Killing
- Self Mutilation
- Fighting/Assaulting/Threatening
- Abusive Language
- Engaging in Sex Acts
- Setting a Fire
- Destroying Property
- Possession of Others Property
- Possession of Unauthorized Items
- Exchanging Money
- Stealing
- Bribing Staff
- Bribing Staff with Services
- Extortion
- Violating Massachusetts Laws
- Attempting to Commit Infraction

From examination of the list above, it is obvious that disciplinary offenses vary substantially in terms of severity although the Massachusetts prison system classifies reports into only three types: major, minor, and referred to District Attorney (D.A). Thus, it is possible for the same disciplinary offense to be classified as major by one officer and minor by another although this usually only happens with less severe offenses such as “being out of place” which are usually only classified as major where there is history of this offense by the inmate. More serious offenses such as “rioting” will typically always be classified as major or where a crime is involved (e.g., killing), referred to the District Attorney. In other words, the classification of the disciplinary report is partly independent of the event or offense itself and is a function of the staff member’s writing the report determination that it should be a major or minor offense. For 1987, the last year for which automated disciplinary report data were available, 75% of the 20,321 disciplinary reports issued were classified as major, 25% were classified as minor, and less than 1% were initially referred to the D.A. (Holt, 1986).

Moreover, in any single disciplinary report, an inmate can be cited for more than one offense so that the number of offenses committed is greater than the number of disciplinary reports issued. Frequently, multiple offenses in the same report are consolidated by a Disciplinary Hearing Board

making it difficult to specify which of the multiple offense the inmate was actually guilty of. The researchers thus chose the strategy of counting only disciplinary reports and those referred to the D.A. the inmate was found to have been guilty of by a Disciplinary Hearing Board. guilty of.

Two patterns were evident in the disciplinary report data. First, the length of the follow-up period varied as a function of the initial classification date, ranging from 17 to 36 months. Second, there was a severe positive skew in the distribution of major disciplinary reports. More than 40% of the sample had no disciplinary reports, while a few inmates accumulated more than 80 each. The data were adjusted for these patterns by computing the average number of reports per 12 months of follow-up for each inmate and then taking the natural logarithm of this average (plus one) to reduce skewness. The natural log of major reports per year then served as the measure of institutional adjustment in the analysis.

The classification scoring system was developed from a multiple regression analysis of the log of annual disciplinary reports. Explanatory variables in the regression model included the eight criminal history factors, the four social history items, and a binary variable designating inmates 29 years of age or younger. The individual risk categories for the criminal and social history variables were each coded from 0 for no risk to 5 for the high risk category. Previous research has demonstrated that prison misconduct can be influenced by the security level to which inmates are initially assigned (Berrocochea and Gibbs, 1991). For example, one would expect more disciplinary reports to be issued in a higher security facility than a lower security facility because of the tighter levels of control and custody exercised in the former. This is certainly true of the Massachusetts prison system where many more disciplinary reports are written annually in higher security facilities compared to lower security facilities of comparable size. As a result, binary variables identifying those assigned to a maximum security prison or to minimum security prison and pre-release facilities were added to the regression model.

For individual risk factor variables, there were instances of missing data ranging from a low of 6 cases on the variable "educational history" to a high of 141 cases on "returns to higher custody on prior incarcerations." The existence of missing data is reflective of trying to work with criminal records data where information is either missing, ambiguous, or not recorded in the form desired by the researchers. In fact, the classification scale developed by the Task Force for this project was developed after the information was recorded in the prison folders between 1985 and 1987. This meant that information did not (always) appear in the form desired by the researchers. Also, for most of the social history variables, the variable definitions were predicated on the development of an intensified diagnostic and assessment process not fully available at the time the study sample was committed to the Department of Correction. The study scale was pilot-tested with caseworkers who actually had an easier time determining appropriate risk categories for each variable since they administered it with actual inmates as opposed to a retrospective sample of prison inmate records.

A backward elimination procedure was used to select the set of risk factors that affected institutional adjustment in this sample of inmates. During each step of the procedure, the variable with the smallest effect on disciplinary reports was eliminated from the model. This process continued until only risk factors with important non-zero effects remained. Regression diagnostics (using Cook's *d* as an influence measure) and residuals were examined to identify any cases that might distort the regression estimates. One outlier was detected and removed from the analysis.

Once the final regression model was identified, a classification scoring system was developed by deriving weights for the categories of each risk factor. These weights or values were based on the relative magnitudes of the coefficients in the regression equation. An overall classification score for an inmate was calculated by adding the point values for all risk factors.

In the final phase of the analysis, classification score ranges were defined to divide inmates into three risk groups. These ranges were determined by regressing the log of annual disciplinary reports on classification scores and using the resulting equation to predict the appropriate score cutpoints. These cutpoints divide the inmate population into low risk (fewer than .5 expected disciplinary reports per year), moderate risk (.5 to 1.5 reports per year), and high risk (more than 1.5 annual reports) groups.

RESULTS

Offense Severity

Five categories of offense severity were specified in this scale ranging from low severity offenses (e.g., receiving stolen goods) to high severity offenses (e.g., murder). A listing of offenses by severity category is attached as the Appendix. In the study sample, 35% (167) were in the high severity offense category, 25% (118) were moderate high, 18% (87) were moderate, 17% (80) were low moderate, and 5% (25) were in the low severity offense category.

Prior Assaultive Offense History

The same offense severity scale was also used to assess prior assaultive offenses. Fifty-five percent (267) of the sample had no prior assaultive offenses while 45% (218) did have at least one prior assaultive offense in their criminal history.

Escape History

Three categories of escape history were specified for the scale. A low category escape was defined as a failure to appear in court, a violation of personal recognizance, or bail jumping within the last (5) years. A moderate category escape was defined as an escape from any facility more than five years ago. A high category escape was defined as an escape from any facility within the last five years. Other provisions for scoring escapes were specified depending on circumstances surrounding the escape. These are described in the Appendix.

Twenty-nine percent (140) of the sample had an escape history with 16.8% (81) in the low category, 6% (29) in the moderate category, and 6% (30) in the high category. Seventy-one percent (341) of the sample had no escape history.

Legal Issues

Five categories of pending legal issues were defined ranging from low (e.g., requests to notify probation) to high (e.g., felony warrants). Sixty-one percent (304) of the sample had some type of legal issue with 34% (167) having outstanding felony warrants.

Prior Institutional Violence and/or Major Disciplinary History

Five categories of institutional violence were specified using combinations of disciplinary infractions that were rated along three categories of severity by the American Correctional Association in their Guidelines for the Development of Policies and Procedures for Adult Correctional Institutions. Twenty percent (74) had a history of prior institutional violence or other major disciplinary infractions (e.g., drugs).

Returns to Higher Custody

There were four categories of returns to higher custody on prior incarcerations which varied in terms of the nature of the return. For example, a low category on this variable pertained to returns from minimum or pre-release which were of a non-violent nature while high category returns were those from minimum or pre-release which were due to a new crime or were of a violent nature. Only 11% (40) of the sample had experienced returns to higher custody on prior incarcerations and only 3% (9) were due to new crimes or of a violent, assaultive nature.

Identifiable Criminal Patterns Due to Substance Abuse

Three categories of substance abuse related criminal patterns were defined and ranged in severity from one OUI arrest to a history of violent offenses while under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Seventy-five percent (372) had some type of criminal pattern due to substance abuse.

Overall Criminal History

A five category overall criminal history variable ranked offenders based on the number and types of criminal convictions. Only 11% (53) of the sample had no prior arrests or incarcerations. while two-thirds (324) had multiple arrests and incarcerations.

Family Relationships

The family relationships variable was meant to assess the strength of the relationship between inmates and family members. This variable was generally very difficult to score from information contained in inmate folders given the general absence of verifiable information. Reports of visits received by family members were usually mentioned in classification reports and served as the primary measure of relationships despite its shortcomings. Approximately half (49%) of the sample appeared to have relatively stable relationships with family while 47% (227) came from either disorganized family backgrounds with moderate to no support or who had family members involved in criminal activities.

Educational History

Only 11% (55) of the sample had a high school or post-high school education while 70% (348) had some high school or trade school education.

Vocational History

Nearly half (46% or 227) of the sample possessed limited vocational skills while 40% (199) could be characterized as having semi-skilled training. Only 11% (56) had a documented professional, technical, or skilled trade.

Work History

The work history of the sample was quite varied. Thirty-one percent (135) of the sample had two years or more of consistent employment or full-time attendance in school, 7% (31) had a consistent employment history between one to two years, 16% (69) had a consistent employment history between 6 months to one year, 27% (120) had an employment history that was sporadic (i.e., not holding any job for more than six (6) months), and 19% (83) had no consistent employment or no employment.

Age

The mean age of the sample was 29 and ranged from 17 to 69.

Disciplinary Reports

Table 1 below shows the distribution of major disciplinary reports per year for the sample. Forty-two percent of the sample received no disciplinary reports. For over half of the sample, the misconduct rate was one report of less every two years. At the other extreme, 8.5% of the sample had 5 or more disciplinary reports per year.

Table 1. Distribution of Major Disciplinary Reports Per Year

<u>Reports Per Year</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	41.7
.34 - .50	13.6
.51 - 1.00	10.9
1.01 - 1.50	8.5
1.51 - 2.00	4.9
2.01 - 2.50	4.0
2.51 - 3.00	2.8
3.01 - 4.00	3.0
4.01 - 5.00	2.2
5.01 - 7.00	2.8
7.01 or more	5.7
	<hr/>
	100%
	(N=506)

Table 2 shows the estimates from the final regression model. This model retained all risk factors for which the difference between the highest and lowest risk categories produced at least a one unit difference in the log of annual disciplinary reports (regression coefficients of .025 or greater). Four of the original twelve risk factors (severity of current offense, escape history, prior institutional violence/major disciplinary history, and overall criminal history) had important effects on misconduct. The youngest inmates, those aged 29 years or younger, incurred more disciplinary reports than older inmates after controlling for the other factors. Initial security level also influenced subsequent adjustment patterns. Compared to those assigned to medium security institutions, inmates placed in maximum security had higher rates of major disciplinary reports, and those entering minimum security or pre-release centers had significantly fewer disciplinary reports.

Table 2. Institutional Adjustment Regression Model

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Unstandardized Coefficient</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>	<u>p value</u>
Constant	.1530	.1285	.23
Offense severity	.0282	.0276	.31
Escape history	.0483	.0259	.06
Violence/disciplinary history	.0574	.0279	.04
Overall criminal history	.0277	.0383	.47
Inmate aged 17-29 years	.3961	.0683	<.001
Maximum security	.5926	.1158	<.001
Minimum/pre-release security	-.3122	.1077	<.01

N = 444

Adjusted R² = .172

Standard error of estimate = .684

The classification scale derived from the regression model is shown in Table 3. Point values for this scale were determined by setting the category values to 0,1,2,3, and 4 points for the factor with the smallest effect (overall criminal history) and scaling the other values proportionately to the regression coefficient for this factor. Classification score totals in this sample ranged from 0 to 39 points; the mean was 15 points and the median score was 17 points.

Table 3. DOC Classification Score Point Values

Severity of Current Offense		<input type="checkbox"/>
Low	0 pts.	
Low-Moderate	1 pt.	
Moderate	2 pts.	
High-Moderate	3 pts.	
High	4 pts.	

Escape History		<input type="checkbox"/>
None	0 pts.	
Low	2 pts.	
Moderate	5 pts.	
High	9 pts.	

Prior Institutional Violence/ Major Disciplinary History		<input type="checkbox"/>
None	0 pts.	
Low	2 pts.	
Low-Moderate	4 pts.	
Moderate	6 pts.	
High-Moderate	8 pts.	
High	10 pts.	

Overall Criminal History		<input type="checkbox"/>
LOW	0 pts.	
Low-Moderate	1 pt.	
Moderate	2 pts.	
High-Moderate	3 pts.	
High	4 pts.	

Inmate's Age		<input type="checkbox"/>
30 years or older	0 pts.	
29 years or younger	14 pts.	

TOTAL CLASSIFICATION SCORE

Misconduct Risk Groups:
 Low Risk = 0-8 points
 Moderate Risk = 9-24 points
 High risk = 25 or more points

Risk groups for institutional adjustment were defined by the relationship between classification scores and logged values of annual disciplinary reports. The correlation between these two measures was .33. Inmates predicted to have less than .5 reports each year were assigned to the low risk group (classification scores of 0 to 8 points), those predicted to receive .5 to 1.5 reports per year were considered moderate risk (9 to 24 classification points), and the highest risk group consisted of those expected to incur more than 1.5 reports per year (classification scores of 25 points or more). Thirty-two percent of the sample fell in the low-risk group, 58% in the moderate risk group, and 10% in the high risk group.

Table 4 shows the relationship between the classification risk groups and the actual number of disciplinary reports per year for 445 inmates with complete data. The classification scores placed 43% of these inmate in the appropriate group. Classification groups and security level assignments are compared in Table 5. Using the proposed scoring system placed half of the inmates in the system to which they were actually assigned. However, considerably more inmates were considered to be at low risk of institutional misconduct (32%) than were actually assigned to minimum security facilities or pre-release centers (10.6%). While the proportion of high risk inmates was nearly identical to the proportion assigned to Massachusetts’ maximum security prison (10.1% vs. 9.4%), only 8 of the 42 maximum security inmates were predicted to be at high risk for misconduct.

Table 4. Disciplinary Reports Per Year by Classification Risk Group

<u>Disciplinary Reports Per Year</u>	<u>Classification Risk Group</u>			<u>Row Total</u>
	<u>High (25+ pts)</u>	<u>Moderate (9-24 pts)</u>	<u>Low (0-8 pts)</u>	
1.50/year+	21	84	13	118 (26.5%)
.5-1.50/year	8	58	19	85 (19.1%)
<.5/year	16	114	112	242 (54.4%)
Column Total	45 (10.1%)	256 (57.5%)	144 (32.4%)	445 (100%)

Table 5. Security Level Assignments by Classification Risk Group

<u>Actual Security Level</u>	<u>Classification Risk Group</u>			<u>Row Total</u>
	High (25+ pts)	Moderate (9-24 pts)	Low (0-8 pts)	
Maximum	8	23	11	42 (9.4%)
Medium	35	202	119	356 (80.0%)
Minimum/Pre	2	31	14	47 (10.6%)
Column Total	45 (10.1%)	256 (57.5%)	144 (32.4%)	445 (100%)

DISCUSSION

One caveat should be kept in mind when ‘interpreting the results of this project. In the classification literature, the distinction is frequently made between “custody level” and “security level.” As defined by the National Institute of Corrections (1983), custody level refers to the degree of staff supervision exercised over inmate within a facility. Security level refers to the type of physical (both architectural and environment) constraints that characterize a facility. This distinction is a crucial one from a classification perspective for as Brennan (1987) notes classification factors for custody are related to institutional misconduct (e.g., disciplinary records) while security classification changes the focus from institutional risk to public risk and street behavior including escape, recidivism, and habitual criminality. As a result, the factors used in custody classification may be different (or weighted differently) than those used in security classification. In particular security classifications place greater emphasis on legal variables, criminal history, escape history, and the severity of current offense than do custody classifications.

The National Institution of Corrections (1983:27) has found that many states:

- do not distinguish or have operative definitions of custody and security;
- do not have system-wide custody and security criteria but rather use a different set of definitions for each facility;
- base their definitions on factors having no demonstrated validity in custody and security level assignment such as length of sentence;
- base supervision on facility placement. Thus, inmates are said to require maximum custody supervision because they are in a maximum security institution making the terms custody and security synonymous.

In fact, the Massachusetts Department of Correction: does not have operative definitions nor criteria custody and security; has typically assessed custody/security needs based primarily on length of sentence; and, uses the terms custody and security interchangeably.

The results of this study are generally similar to other analyses of misconduct risk (Berrocochea and Gibbs, 1992; Brennan, 1987, 1980). Like other research, the present study found age to be a strong correlate of institutional misconduct with younger inmates have significantly higher rates of disciplinary reports than older inmates. This is reflected in the weights assigned to the age variable with those 29 and younger receiving 14 points and those 30 and older receiving zero points. This is generally consistent with research documenting a decline in misconduct rates with age and eventual leveling off after the age of 35 (Petersilia and Honig, 1980). One important effect of this proposed scoring system would be to place all inmates 29 and younger into medium security (and some in maximum) at initial classification while only “older” inmates (i.e., 30 and over) would be eligible for a minimum security placement at initial classification.

A second major finding of this study is that the current DOC classification system results in overclassification of inmates with respect to the groups defined by the analysis. Thirty-four percent (153) of the inmates were placed in a higher security level than the classification scale would assign them given their misconduct risk. Specifically, 23 were actually assigned to maximum security that the scale would assign to medium, 11 were assigned to maximum that the scale would assign to minimum, and most problematic, 119 were assigned to medium that the scale would assign to minimum (see Table 5). Although not as severe, this result is consistent with an earlier study by Forcier (1989), which reclassified 205 inmate cases using NIC Model Systems Approach classification criteria and found that 50% of DOC inmates were overclassified at initial classification. The result of this overclassification is a misuse of high security bed space. One major advantage of the classification scale developed in this project is that the scale security/custody cutpoints can be modified to reflect changes in bed space capacity across the different security levels.

The results indicated that eight of the original variables suggested by the DOC Classification Task Force for the scale were not associated with institutional misconduct as measured by major disciplinary reports. Some of those variables, such as prior assaultive offense history, have been found by other research to also have weak or inconsistent correlations with prison misconduct (Brennan, 1987). By contrast, some variables found by other research to be correlated with lower rates of

misconduct (e.g., employment stability) were not found to be so in the present project. Still others which have had mixed relationships with institutional misconduct (e.g., substance abuse), were unrelated in the current project. Overall, it should be noted that the relationship between the classification scores and actual disciplinary reports per year was found to be comparatively weak ($r=.33$). This is partly due to the fact that the classification scores do not take account of the subsequent effects of security level assignment on misconduct. That is, one's initial security/custody designation is predictive of their future misconduct with inmates assigned to higher security levels receiving more disciplinary reports than those assigned to lower security levels.

There are two possibilities for improving the validity of the classification scores developed here. The first way would be to improve the measurement of institutional misconduct. The current study used a count of major guilty disciplinary findings as an outcome measure but did not differentiate these in terms of their severity. As Brennan (1987) notes, this can be misleading because it lumps together diverse behaviors which are really very different in terms of their seriousness even though all may be treated as "major." One method for measuring the severity of inmate misconduct would be to use correctional officer assessments of individual inmates to define the weights for different types of major and minor infractions. Another method suggested by Brennan would be to develop and separate general dimensions of misconduct such as violence toward other inmates, drug use, or sexual pressuring.

Another strategy for improving the validity of the classification scores would be to improve the measurement of the predictor variables and incorporate new variables found by other research to be related to institutional misconduct. As mentioned previously, the predictor variables for this draft scale were developed through a consensus process of Classification Task Force members as to which variables were important in classification decision-making. Some of the variables, particularly the social history variables, were suggested with the assumption that improved assessment would occur at intake to the system. Nonetheless, the subjective nature by which the variable categories were defined (e.g., low to high) could be made more objective through reassessment of the variable category definitions. Moreover, it may be desirable to improve the specificity of certain variables by identifying certain components, such as whether weapons were used in current or prior offenses, whether the offender was under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of the offense, etc. Still other variables not tested in the current project, such as psychological functioning, could be incorporated into further scale development. These are issues which the researchers will discuss with Executive and Classification Staff from the Massachusetts Department of Correction.

REFERENCES

- Berecochea, John E. and Joel B. Gibbs. 1991. "Inmate Classification: A Correctional Program that Works?" Evaluation Review, 15 (3): 333-363.
- Brennan, Tim. 1987. "Classification for Control in Jails and Prisons." Pp. 323-366 in Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision-Making, Don M. Gottfredson and Michael Tonry (editors). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Forcier, Michael W. 1989. "Testing the Implementation of a Point-Based Classification System: A Comparison of DOC Initial Classifications with the NIC Model Systems Approach." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Reno, Nevada, November 8-12, 1989.
- Holt, Linda K. 1988. Disciplinary Reports Issued in the Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1986. (Report #332). Boston: Massachusetts Department of Correction.
- National Institute of Corrections. 1983. Prison Classification: A Model System Approach. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Petersilia, Joan and P. Honig. 1980. The Prison Experience of Career Criminals. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

APPENDIX A

OBJECTIVE SCALE
INITIAL INMATE CLASSIFICATION

CRIMINAL HISTORY

1. Severity of Current Offense

Discussion:

The current offense can be now categorized by reference to the attached Table A which breaks down all offenses within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and places them under a category which is now scored by objective scale which ranges from non violent crimes at a low to very violent to a high. It should also be noted that in case a person is sentenced on multiple offenses you should chose for scoring purposes in this category the most serious of all the offenses, that is, the offense that scores the highest on the table, which is attached to this report.

2. Prior Assaultive Offense History

Discussion:

In this area one needs to reference Table A when looking at the overall history of the inmate. When reviewing his criminal record and the types of offenses, evaluate as to what crimes fall under what categories and then make a general opinion on trends, (i.e., a person who has gone from nonviolent behavior and has increased in violent convictions up to and including the very most assaultive. Crimes which are always around armed or unarmed robbery, those crimes which are consistently very violent, those crimes that consistently deal with drugs.) If you see an overall pattern *score* as to most *severe*. An overall pattern would again consider those offenses which predominately fall under one of the categories in Category A. If in fact there is only *one* or two offenses and no significant pattern of offense can take place, then you should *score* his criminal history section depending upon that pattern. If the offenses reflect a singular offense, that is, normally under the category of current offense it would show as highly assaultive but there is *only one* in his past, then you should down score that as a singular, again this is a criminal history and we are now looking at the overall pattern and we are looking for repetition. If there were two violent offenses then most definitely score him high. An example here might be as follows: Inmate A was committed for a rape that was a violent rape one time and his current offense is B&E, although that is a singular offense that rape would be considered high rate and high risk now and we would actually down grade it to a moderate or a high moderate because it is a singular offense and it is not a history. Another example might be an individual who had a violent rape, as discussed in Inmate A, and has had two of those, now there is a pattern and a history of that rape even though the pattern is only two it is really a history of assaultive behavior that should be scored high. You also have to look at the type of rape, if it is a statutory rape that is, by consenting adults and one

happened to be under the age of sixteen (16), and he was eighteen (18) or twenty-one (21), that might and should be viewed much more differently than the case of rape where it was rape, kidnaping and assault charges. Always if there is an objective scale or not there is a degree of subjectiveness in where you need to make a determination and in this particular aspect as the' overall degree of assaultive history here and degree of violence involved in the history, and then score accordingly on the attached scale.

3. Escape History

Discussion:

Low:

A failure to appear in court, a violation of personal recognizances, bail jumping, within the last five (5) years.

Moderate:

An escape from any facility more than five (5) years ago.

High:

An escape from any facility five (5) or less.

Also an escape from the custody of transportation officers or court officers where the individual is in handcuffs and restraints should also, if within the last five (5) years, be scored as high. If it happened more than five (5) years ago then it should be scored as moderate.

Additionally, as a general rule, any escape involving the commission of a new crime, any violence or threat thereof, shall be scored one category higher for walled escapes and escapes from custody, and two categories higher for any nonwalled escape, The other general rule is any voluntary return from escape within forty-eight (48) hours shall be scored two categories lower and any voluntary return within ten (10) days shall be scored one category lower unless there is any new crime committed, act of violence or threat thereof, in which there is no reduction given in a category.

4. Legal Issues

Discussion:

Low:

This would include requests to notify probation, warrants if From and After sentences which have been Henschelled, request to notify an individual or an agency which is not a criminal justice agency i.e., welfare.

Low-Moderate:

Immigration and naturalization detainer if it is a request to notify only. Any civil court cases, divorce, request to notify any individual and/or agency which is law enforcement and/or criminal justice.

Moderate:

Parole violation warrants, U.S. Marshall and federal detainers which gear toward notification depending upon the type of detainer would need to be individually reviewed. further, any outstanding litigation by the inmate against someone else should be reviewed under the moderate category as to whether or not application should apply.

High-Moderate:

Misdemeanor warrants where, if convicted, County or Concord time could be given to the inmate. Immigration and naturalization warrants if deportation hearing is pending and has been decided to be held.

High:

From and After sentences not Henschelled, felony warrants which if convicted could result in additional state time, immigration and naturalization if deportation has been decided in the affirmative. All outstanding warrants including rendition, governors, and felony and federal warrants which are for From and After or concurrent time to assure that in fact we have an individual in this particular category who is doing concurrent or From and After federal, we may want to place him in minimum or pre release, however the feds would never go along with it due to their calculations the person should be in a walled facility.

5. Prior Institutional Violence and/or Major Disciplinary History

Discussion:

Low:

One (1) Category III infraction in last year.

Low-Moderate:

Two (2) or three (3) Category XII offenses last year. One (1) Category B offense one (1) to three (3) years ago.

Moderate:

One (1) Category II offense in last year. More than three (3) Category III offenses in last year. History of Category II offenses more than three (3) years ago.

High-Moderate:

One (1) to three (3) Category II offenses in last year. More than ten (10) Category III offenses in last year.

High:

One (1) Category I offense and more than three (3) Category II offenses in last year.

6. Returns to Higher Custody

Discussion:

Low:

From minimum or Pre-Release security of a non-violent, non-assaultive nature.

Low-Moderate:

Each subsequent return of any nature from minimum or Pre-Release security. From Medium security of a non-violent or non-assaultive nature.

Moderate:

From Minimum or Pre-Release security of a violent or assaultive nature.

High:

From Minimum or Pre-Release security resulting in a new crime(s) and conviction. From Medium security of a violent or assaultive nature. Each subsequent return of any nature from medium or close custody. From Medium security resulting in a new crime(s) conviction. Each return to higher custody resulting in DSU Commitment.

7. Identifiable Criminal Pattern Due to Substance Abuse

Discussion:

Low:

One misdemeanor offense related to drinking. Self admission to Substance Abuse Program Pattern of arrest involving drinking. One (1) OUI arrest.

Moderate:

Arrests for possession of cocaine, heroin. More than one (1) arrest for OUI, has participated in alcohol/drug treatment program Prior substance abuse while on parole. Arrests related to illegal use of drugs, or under the influence. Sales of cocaine, heroin. Prior substance abuse while incarcerated.

High:

Pattern of violent offenses while under the influence of drugs or alcohol. All criminal activity related to drug and alcohol abuse. A pattern of substance abuse and sales while incarcerated.

8. Overall Criminal History

Discussion:

Low:

No prior arrest history, first incarceration.

Low-Moderate:

Has prior arrests and conviction for misdemeanors, no prior incarcerations or probations.

Moderate:

Prior felony or misdemeanor resulting in one (1) incarceration or multiple House of Correction sentences.

High-Moderate:

Has had convictions increasing in severity and frequency which have resulted in more than one (1) incarceration in the state system or Federal system

High:

Has a pattern of criminal activity which has escalated to the present offense. Numerous offenses and felony convictions up to the current offense. Career criminal.

SOCIAL HISTORY

1. Family Relationships

Low:

Relationships and support are exceptionally strong and positive.

Low-Moderate:

Relatively stable relationship.

Moderate:

Some disorganization in the family, moderate support.

High-Moderate:

Disruptive family patterns. No family support.

High:

Victim or victims of current offense are family member(s), or family is also involved in criminal activities.

2. Educational History

Low:

College or other post High School Education. High School or higher education.

Low-Moderate:

Has some High School or Trade School.

Moderate:

Sixth to eight grade level. Limited knowledge of English. Can understand English but does not speak it.

High-Moderate:

Third to fifth grade level. Functionally illiterate. No ability to speak or understand English.

High:

Documented illiteracy. Illiterate and borderline retardation or lower.

3. Vocational History

Low:

Has a documented profession, technical or skilled trade or will be able to resume prior work upon release.

Low-Moderate:

Has a semi-skilled training, may have some difficulty returning to previous job.

Moderate:

Limited skills.

High-Moderate:

No skills, ability to be trained.

High:

No skills. Has no ability to be trained.

4. Work History

Low:

Two (2) years or more of consistent employment or full time attendance in school.

Low-Moderate:

Consistent employment history between one (1) to two (2) years.

Moderate:

Consistent employment history between six (6) months to one (1) year.

High-Moderate:

Employment history is sporadic or does not hold any one job for more than six (6) months.

High:

No consistent employment or no employment.

**INITIAL INMATE CLASSIFICATION
CUSTODY**

NAME: _____
 last first middle

NUMBER: _____

CASEWORKER: _____

DATE: _____

CRIMINAL HISTORY

<p>1. Severity of Current Offense (Score the most serious offense if more than one.)</p> <p> Low Low-Moderate Moderate High-Moderate High</p>	<p>Category Total</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>
<p>2. Prior Assaultive Offense History</p> <p> Low Low-Moderate Moderate High-Moderate High</p>	<p>Category Total</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>
<p>3. Escape History</p> <p> Low Moderate High</p>	<p>Category Total</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>
<p>4. Legal Issues</p> <p> Low Low-Moderate Moderate High-Moderate High</p>	<p>Category Total</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>
<p>5. Prior Institutional Violence and/or Major Disciplinary History</p> <p> Low Low-Moderate Moderate High-Moderate High</p>	<p>Category Total</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>
<p>6. Returns to Higher Custody</p> <p> Low-Moderate Moderate High</p>	<p>Category Total</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>

Criminal History (Continued)

**7. Identifiable Criminal Patterns
Due to Substance Abuse**

Low
Mderate
Hi gh

Category Total

8. Overall Criminal History

Low-Mderate
Mderate
Hi gh-Mderate
Hi gh

Category Total

TOTAL CRIMINAL HISTORY

SOCIAL HISTORY

1. Family Relationships

Low
Low-Mderate
Mderate
Hi gh-Mderate
Hi gh

Category Total

2. Educational History

Low-Mderate
Mderate
Hi gh-Mderate
Hi gh

Category Total

3. Vocational History

Low
Low-Mderate
Mderate
Hi gh-Mderate
Hi gh

Category Total

4. Work History

Low
Low-Mderate
Mderate
Hi gh-Mderate
Hi gh

Category Total

Social History (continued)

TOTAL SOCIAL HISTORY

TOTAL OVERALL RATING
(Criminal & Social History)

Comments:

C a s e m a n a g e r: _____

Date: _____

TABLE A

LOW

B&E M/V
 Bribery
 Common Night Walker
 Contempt
 Cruelty to Animals
 Der Sup Fr Prostitution
 Disturbing Peace
 Drunk
 False Alarm Fire
 Firearm
 Forgery & Uttering
 Fraud
 Gaming
 Heroin 28-29 Gms
 Illegitimacy
 Larceny
 Leaving Scene
 Loansharking
 Mail Fraud
 Minor Pss. Alcohol
 Non-Support
 Polygamy
 Prostitution
 Rec. Stolen Goods
 Rec. Stolen Goods Com
 Stealing
 Stubborn Child
 Theft M.V.
 Trespassing
 Unlaw. Poss Alcohol
 Use W/O Authority
 Vagrancy (loitering]
 Viol. Constit. Rights
 Viol. M.V.
 Viol. of Court Order
 Violation of Rights

LOW MODERATE

Burglary
 Burglary Implements
 Drug Cont. Subs.
 Drugs Stealing
 Grand Theft
 Incest
 Indecent ExpoSUrE
 Induc/Viol Narc Law
 Larceny fromP e r s o n
 Mal Want Inj Prop
 Oper Und Infl Narc
 Oper Under Influence
 Poss Class D
 Poss Class E
 Poss Danger Weapon
 Pres Wh Narc Illeg
 Resisting Arrest
 Sodomy & Buggery
 Unarmed Robbery

MODERATE

A&B

Access A/Fact Arm Rob
 Accessory After Fact
 Armed Robbery
 Aslt W/Int Rob Unarm
 Asslt. Other
 Asslt. W/D.W.
 Burglary Armed
 Cocaine 100-199 GMS
 Extortion
 Heroin 100-199 GMS
 Intimidation Witness
 Lascivious Act
 Marijuana 50-99 lbs.
 Porn CH
 Pornography
 Poss Cla B 1st Off

Poss C1 A
 Poss Class B
 Poss Class C
 Poss Heroin
 Poss Narcotics
 Unnatural Act <16

MODERATE HIGH

A&B w/DW
 Acc to Murder
 Aggrevated Rape
 Arson
 Arson of a Bldg
 Aslt w/Int Rob Armed
 Attempted Kidnapping
 Cocaine > 200 GMS
 Consp. to Trafficking
 Escape
 Heroin > 199 GMS
 Manslaughter
 Mariju. 100 lbs. - 1 ton
 Pos Cla A rep <18
 Poss Cla B Rep Off
 Pos Cla B Rep off <18
 Pos Cla C 1st Off
 Pos Cla C Rep Off
 POSS Cla C Rep Off <18
 Poss Clas A 1st Off
 POS Clas A Rp Off
 Poss Narc w/Int Sell
 POSS. Infernal Mchne
 Veh Homicide
 Weapons (If Distribution &
 Illegal Sale- Otherwise
 MOD)

HIGH

A/Aslt W/Int Com. Mur
 Armed Aslt Dwell Hse
 Aslt F<16 w/I Rape
 Asslt W/Int Murder
 Asslt W/Int Rape
 Attempted Murder
 Concealing Explosive
 Conf/Fear/Stealing
 Explosives
 Indecent A&B <14
 Indecent A&B >13
 Kidnapping
 Marij. 1 ton - 5 Ton
 Marijuana >5 tons
 Mayhem
 Murder 1
 Murder 2
 Rape
 Rape <16
 Rape of Child
 Sale Narcotics
 Sale of Heroin
 Trafficking Drugs

TABLE B
DISCIPLINARY SEVERITY SCALE*

Category 1 Offenses (High):

- 1-1 Murder or attempted murder
- 1-2 Assault with weapon
- 1-3 Extortion, blackmail for protection
- 1-4 Rape
- 1-5 Escape
- 1-6 Escape attempted or planned
- 1-7 Arson
- 1-8 Possession of explosives or ammunition
- 1-9 Possession of a gun, firearm, knife, or unauthorized sharpened instrument
- 1-10 Possession Of drugs or drug paraphernalia not authorized by medical staff
- 1-11 Assault to commit sex acts
- 1-12 Participation in riots, work strikes, or mutinous disturbance
- 1-13 Inciting to riot (conveying any inflammatory or mutinous communication by voice, written word, sign, symbol or gesture)
- 1-14 Possession of escape paraphernalia
- 1-15 Trafficking in drugs
- 1-16 Possession of stolen property with value over \$100
- 1-17 Bribery or attempted bribery of an official
- 1-19 Theft of property with a value over \$100
- 1-19 Wearing of a disguise or mask
- 1-20 Locking devices tampering
- 1-21 Violation of condition of furlough
- 1-22 Violation of condition of work release
- 1-23 Counterfeit of any government document, money, or official paper
- 1-24 Flagrant failure to follow safety or sanitation regulations
- 1-25 Attempt to commit any of the above offenses or assist others to commit any of the above acts

Category II Offenses (Medium):

- 2-1 Fighting
- 2-2 Threat to another person
- 2-3 Engagement in sexual acts not involving threat or force
- 2-4 Indecent exposure
- 2-5 Misuse of authorized medication
- 2-6 Possession of unauthorized money
- 2-7 Loan of property to others for profit
- 2-8 Possession of unauthorized state property
- 2-9 Possession or manufacture of unauthorized beverages
- 2-10 Possession of stolen property with value below \$100
- 2-11 Theft of property with value below \$100
- 2-12 Possession of unauthorized negotiables such as canteen tickets, credit cards or checks
- 2-13 Possession of unauthorized drivers licenses or social security cards
- 2-14 Unauthorized absence from work or assignment not related to attempted escape
- 2-15 Presence in an unauthorized area
- 2-16 Court absence

* From: Guidelines for the Development of Policies and Procedures for Adult Correctional Institutions, Hay, 1981, American Correctional Association.

- 2-17 Failure to comply with disciplinary procedures
- 2-18 Disposal of written order from staff
- 2-19 Willful destruction of state property valued over \$100
- 2-20 Breaking and entering another inmate's room, locker or storage bin
- 2-21 Intoxication Or consumption of intoxicants
- 2-22 Violation of visiting regulations
- 2-23 Refusal to work
- 2-24 Disorderly conduct
- 2-25 False testimony presented to staff
- 2-26 Violation of mail regulations
- 2-27 Attempt to commit any of the above acts or assist others to commit any of the above acts

Category III Offenses (Low):

- 3-1 Possession of unauthorized clothing
- 3-2 Defacing of state property
- 3-3 Misuse of state property
- 3-4 Food waste
- 3-5 Failure to maintain personal hygiene
- 3-6 Failure to maintain sanitary and orderly housing conditions
- 3-7 Use of obscene language
- 3-8 Disobeyal of verbal order from staff
- 3-9 Destruction of state property below \$100
- 3-10 Bartering
- 3-11 Tattoo activities
- 3-12 Malingering
- 3-13 Gambling
- 3-14 Failure to perform assigned tasks
- 3-15 Disorderly conduct