

MF-1

REPORT NUMBER 61

Feasibility of an Earlier
Drug Free Discharge From Outpatient
Status (Parole) for California's
Civil Addicts

GERALD E. BECKETT

84882



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS — RESEARCH UNIT

APRIL 1980

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

California Department of
Corrections

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EDMUND G. BROWN, JR.
GOVERNOR



YOUTH AND ADULT CORRECTIONAL AGENCY
HOWARD WAY
SECRETARY

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

RUTH L. RUSHEN
DIRECTOR



SAMUEL D. YOCKEY
CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

RONALD SHINN, PH. D.
CHIEF OF RESEARCH

FEASIBILITY OF AN EARLIER DRUG FREE DISCHARGE
FROM OUTPATIENT STATUS (PAROLE) FOR
CALIFORNIA'S CIVIL ADDICTS

NCJRS

AUG 20 1982

ACQUISITIONS

Administrative Abstract

Currently, California civil addicts may receive an early discharge from their commitment if they remain free from the use of narcotics and other crime for at least two consecutive years after release from the California Rehabilitation Center (CRC).^{*} This study, a month-by-month follow up of all 7202 persons released from CRC during 1972 and 1974, concluded that the required period could safely be *reduced* to one year. Only about 14 of every 100 releases were still arrest and narcotic free 12½ months after release, but of these, 10 or 75% were still clean a year later at 24½ months. Of the four who failed about half (58%) committed technical violations only, primarily use of drugs, and of the four about three (or 64%) were allowed to remain in the community by the Narcotic Addict Evaluation Authority. The results are similar to those used to begin discharging felon parolees after one year of arrest free adjustment, which was proved to be safe in a subsequent evaluation.

It is recommended that legislation be initiated to reduce the time required for an early discharge to one year from the current two years.

The advantages are:

- Minimal risks because of the relatively small numbers involved and the low rate of reinvolverment with drugs or crime;
- Large gain of time and fiscal resources for use elsewhere-- discharging a year early the 448 of the 1974 release cohort who were clean at 12½ months would have saved \$582,400 in parole costs;
- The Civil Addict Program would be more comparable with state prison as a dispositional choice for narcotic addicts who are now choosing the latter because of the determinate sentencing law.

^{*}Section 3200, *Welfare and Institutions Code*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Administrative Abstract.....	i
List of Tables.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
California Civil Addict Program, 1	
California Parole Experience, 3	
Procedure.....	4
General, 4	
Criteria for Selecting an Earlier Month, 5	
Reason for Violation, 6	
Results.....	6
All Releases, 6	
How They Violated and What Happened to Them, 10	
First Compared to Rereleases, 12	
Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations.....	15
Conclusion, 17	
Recommendations, 17	
References.....	24

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Number</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status: All Releases, 1972, N = 3671.....	8
2	Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status: All Releases, 1974, N = 3451.....	9
3	Reason for Violation and Disposition of Outpatients Who Were Clean at 12½ Months but Not at 24½ Months.....	11
4	First Releases Compared to Rereleases: Percent Clean at Three Month Intervals after Release.....	13
5	First Releases Compared to Rereleases: Percent Clean at Three Month Follow Up Intervals Who Remained Clean Through 24½ Months after Release.....	14
6	Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status: First Release, 1972, N = 1969.....	20
7	Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status: Re-Released, 1972, N = 1972.....	21
8	Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status: First Release, 1974, N = 1561.....	22
9	Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status: Re-Released, 1974, N = 1890.....	23

FEASIBILITY OF AN EARLIER DRUG FREE DISCHARGE
FROM OUTPATIENT STATUS (PAROLE) FOR
CALIFORNIA'S CIVIL ADDICTS

Several articles (Holt, 1976; Adams, 1975; Bennett, 1973) have stressed the benefits to be gained from what seems at first to be risks in correctional procedures. This has been particularly true in terms of reducing the length of parole supervision to the minimum necessary for adequate protection of the public and reintegration of the parolee. The direct benefit of such a change is freeing resources for use elsewhere while the indirect benefit is establishing a more attainable behavioral goal for the offender.

California reports considerable success from an experiment making a one year reduction in the time required for felons to be discharged from parole due to remaining arrest free in their first year of parole (Jaman, Bennett, Berecochea, 1974). The purpose of this study is to determine whether it is similarly feasible to reduce the time necessary for civil addicts to remain drug and crime free before granting an early discharge from the Civil Addict Program (CAP).

California Civil Addict Program

Persons admitted to the CAP have typically been convicted of a felony crime (92%) in superior court, and then in civil court have been found to be addicted to narcotics or in imminent danger thereof and

committed to a seven year term. Sentencing on the criminal conviction has been set aside until the civil commitment is over.

A CAP commitment usually consists of alternating inpatient stays at the California Rehabilitation Center (CRC) and outpatient trials. The first inpatient stay is for about eight months while subsequent stays average five months. Outpatient status (OPS) is a form of supervised parole which requires routine anti-narcotics testing, cooperation with the parole agent, regular employment, no illegal narcotic or drug use, and no other crime. Violations of these conditions of release must be reported by the parole agent to the Narcotic Addict Evaluation Authority (NAEA), a board which makes the parole release and revocation decision.

Relevant to this study is the provision for an early discharge from outpatient status contained in Section 3200 of the *Welfare and Institutions Code* (W&IC). The person must have "abstained from the use of narcotics for at least two consecutive years" (three if approved for methadone maintenance) and have "otherwise complied with the conditions of his release..." before the NAEA can return the person to civil court for early discharge from the program. Upon discharge from civil court the person is returned to criminal court for sentencing which usually results in a dismissal of criminal charges. A follow-up of these 3200 W&IC discharges found that criminal charges were dismissed for 93% and probation granted for the rest (Beckett and Thomas, 1976).

The administrative procedure is for the NAEA to require the parole agent to identify the eligible case and to administer a surprise anti-

narcotic test during the twenty-fifth drug and arrest free month. A report which recommends whether discharge proceedings should be initiated in civil court is then submitted to the NAEA. From 1975 through 1977, early discharges pursuant to Section 3200 W&IC totaled 1392.

California Parole Experience

Before the Determinate Sentence Law was implemented in California, felons paroled from state prison were required to complete 24 consecutive favorable months before they could be granted an early discharge.¹ Department of Corrections' researchers, in searching for characteristics which would correctly predict being in favorable status at 24 months, found the best predictor by far was being arrest free twelve months after release (Jaman, Bennett, and Berecochea, 1974). Of 2427 parolees released from prison during 1967 and arrest free at twelve months after release, 85% were eligible for discharge after 24 months for having remained under continuous favorable parole supervision. This finding was translated into policy during 1971 as Adult Authority Resolution Number 284 which made it possible to gain a parole discharge after one year of arrest free parole providing the person was legally eligible.

To determine whether a "safe" decision had been made, a sample of one year discharges (AA 284) was tracked for one year after discharge. Their post-discharge behavior was more favorable than that of similar samples of parolees discharged after two arrest free years and at the

¹Section 2943, *California Penal Code*.

expiration of their term: 96.7%, 94.7%, and 93.7% made favorable adjustments, respectively. In addition, it was found that the post discharge behavior of the AA 284 sample was not influenced by whether they had a prior history of violence or, most relevant herein, narcotics abuse. It was estimated that the one year discharge policy (AA 284) may have saved about \$2.2 million during fiscal year 1971-72 (Jaman, Bennett, and Berecochea, 1974).

PROCEDURE

Each person released from CRC to outpatient status during the years 1972 and 1974 was tracked for 24½ months or until the first reported violation if that occurred sooner. This was accomplished by accessing a routinely maintained computer file derived from official reports and documents.² The date of behavior leading to a violation report, as well as date of release from CRC, were recorded. In this report "violation" refers to the date the delinquency occurred and not the date a subsequent disposition of the case was made by the NAEA. The NAEA requires a report on all behavior more serious than common drunk or traffic violations, so this violation subsumes a wide range of delinquent activity, including use of narcotics or drugs, petty theft, robbery and other serious felonies.

²This file is maintained by the Management Information Section, Policy and Planning Division, California Department of Corrections.

From the above dates it was possible to develop frequency distributions of the number violated and the number clean (not violated) at the end of each month after release. This was done separately for each year's release cohort and within them for both first and re-releases. Two percentages were calculated from these frequencies: the percent remaining clean at the end of each monthly interval and the percent remaining clean from each interval after release through the 24½ month point. These probabilities were used to identify a month during which earlier discharge would be feasible.

Criteria for Selecting an Earlier Month

The analytical strategy used herein is to select (a) the interval after release at which violations occur at a noticeably lower frequency before the 24½ month point is reached and (b) a rate comparable to that used to justify the felon parole one year discharge policy. Establishing a comparable rate is complicated by the use of a less stringent outcome criterion at 24 months in the felon study than is available for this civil addict study. The felon project used percent "favorable" rather than percent "clean" which is being used for civil addicts. "Favorable" includes not only the clean group but also those arrested by the agent for technical violations including drug abuse, arrest and release only, parolee-at-large less than six months, jail sentence under 90 days or all suspended, misdemeanor probation, fine or bail forfeited, and NTCU placement. Actual percent clean figures are not available for the felon study, but experience indicates that about 62% of the favorable category are "clean" in a sense identical to the civil

addict criterion (Jaman, 1977). Therefore, if in the felon study 85% of those clean at 12 months were favorable at 24 months, then one would estimate that 53% were clean at 24 months ($.62 \times 85\% = 53\%$), and the 53% rate will be used as the indicator of comparable outcome for the civil addicts studied herein.

Reason for Violation

A second level of analysis was undertaken to more clearly describe the risk of shortening the period required for early discharge. This was limited to those released during 1974 whose first violation occurred after the 12½ month, which was identified as a possible early discharge point. Information on the nature of the violating behavior and response of the NAEA was coded from official parole reports, and Criminal Identification and Information reports used earlier.

RESULTS

All Releases

Table 1 displays the result of the month-to-month follow up for the total of 3671 men and women released from CRC during 1972. Column 1 contains the number violated each month, while Column 2 shows the declining number who remained clean from month-to-month. Column 3 shows the percent of the total number released who were still clean each month after release, and that only 11.5% remained clean for the entire 24½ months. Inspecting the column reveals that the 12½ month point is where the decline in percent clean from month-to-month is noticeably

more gradual, in less than 1% increments. The overall drop from 12½ months is only 3.7% or 137 persons.

Column 4 contains the percent who were clean at each follow up interval who remained clean through the 24½ month point. Scrutinizing this column reveals that changes after 13½ months are relatively small, suggesting that outpatient behavior may be stabilizing here. Of the 559 who were clean at 12½ months 423 or 75.7% made it clean to 24½ months, while for the 13½ month group the figure is 80.1%. The point of comparability with the 85% "favorable" outcome (or 53% clean) of the felon study was reached at 8½ months after release.

Repeating the procedure for the cohort released during 1974 yields similar results (Table 2). At 24½ months 9.2% of the 3421 releases remained clean, which is a drop of 3.8% or 132 cases from the 13% who were clean at 12½ months. Of the 448 persons clean at 12½ months 316 or 70.5% remained clean through 24½ months. Comparability with the felon outcome is reached at 9½ months.

Table 1

Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center
Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status:
All Releases, 1972, N = 3671

Months After Release	Number		Percent	
	Violated ¹	Clean ²	Clean of All Released ³	Clean at 24½ mos. ⁴
At release	-	3671	100.0	11.5
.5	644	3027	82.5	14.0
1.5	630	2397	65.3	17.6
2.5	473	1924	52.4	22.0
3.5	378	1546	42.1	27.4
4.5	255	1291	35.2	32.8
5.5	172	1119	30.5	37.8
6.5	155	964	26.3	43.9
7.5	121	843	23.0	50.2
8.5	63	780	21.2	54.2
9.5	75	705	19.2	60.0
10.5	59	646	17.6	65.5
11.5	48	598	16.3	70.7
12.5	39	559	15.2	75.7
13.5	31	528	14.4	80.1
14.5	14	514	14.0	82.3
15.5	14	500	13.6	84.6
16.5	15	485	13.2	87.2
17.5	8	477	13.0	88.7
18.5	13	464	12.6	91.2
19.5	11	453	12.3	93.4
20.5	12	441	12.0	95.9
21.5	7	434	11.8	97.5
22.5	8	426	11.6	99.3
23.5	2	424	11.5	99.8
24.5	1	423	11.5	100.0

¹Violated: A delinquent act reported to the NAEA resulting in suspension of outpatient status.

²Clean: Not violated since release.

³% Clean = Number clean/number released X 100.

⁴% Clean at 24½ months = Number clean/number clean at 24½ mos. X 100.

Table 2

Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center
Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status:
All Releases, 1974, N = 3451

Months After Release	Number		Percent	
	Violated ¹	Clean ²	Clean of All Released ³	Clean at ⁴ 24½ mos.
At release	--	3451	100.0	9.2
.5	599	2852	82.6	11.1
1.5	705	2147	62.6	14.7
2.5	464	1683	48.8	18.8
3.5	376	1307	37.9	24.2
4.5	214	1093	31.7	28.9
5.5	168	925	26.8	34.2
6.5	122	803	23.3	39.4
7.5	81	722	20.9	43.8
8.5	71	651	18.9	48.5
9.5	74	577	16.7	54.8
10.5	47	530	15.4	59.6
11.5	45	485	14.1	65.2
12.5	37	448	13.0	70.5
13.5	20	428	12.4	73.8
14.5	20	408	11.8	77.5
15.5	16	392	11.4	80.6
16.5	13	379	11.0	83.4
17.5	13	366	10.6	86.3
18.5	12	354	10.3	89.3
19.5	13	341	9.9	92.7
20.5	5	336	9.7	94.0
21.5	5	331	9.6	95.5
22.5	5	326	9.4	96.9
23.5	4	322	9.3	98.1
24.5	6	316	9.2	100.0

¹Violated: A delinquent act reported to the NAEA resulting in suspension of outpatient status.

²Clean: Not violated since release.

³% Clean = Number clean/number released X 100.

⁴% Clean at 24½ months = Number clean/number clean at 24½ mos. X 100.

How They Violated and What Happened to Them

For the following analysis 12½ months was selected for its practicality as a feasible time at which an earlier discharge could be made, although comparability with the felon study was reached three-four months sooner. As revealed above 132 civil addict outpatients released in 1974 violated the conditions of their release and lost their clean designation between 12½ and 24½ months. Their violations fell into the following categories:

• Drug use only	74	56.1%
• Other technical	3	2.3
• Absconded supervision	20	15.2
• Arrested and/or convicted for a crime	35	26.5

The dispositions of each type of violation are categorized in Table 3, and it is readily apparent that the least serious violations received the least serious dispositions. Most of the 74 persons violated for drug use only were reinstated and therefore allowed to remain in the community (59 or 79.7%). In contrast only 16 or 45.7% of those arrested were allowed to remain free of custody. Altogether, the dispositions were:

• Reinstated to supervision	84	63.6%
• Returned to CRC w/o conviction	16	12.1
• Returned to CRC with conviction	21	15.9
• Discharged unfit	11	8.3

Table 3

Reason for Violation and Disposition of Outpatients
Who were Clean at 12½ Months but Not at 24½ Months

Reason for Violation		Disposition					Total	
		Rein- stated	Returned to CRC			Discharged Unfit		
			No Conv. ^a	Misd. Conv.	Felony Conv.		N	%
Other Technical		3	0	0	0	0	3	2.3
Drug Use Only		59	15	0	0	0	74	56.1
Absconded (RAL)		6	1	4	3	6	20	15.2
Arrested		16	0	7	7	5	35	26.5
Total	N	84	16	11	10	11	132	100.0
	%	63.6	12.1	8.3	7.6	8.3	100.0	

^aConv. = Convictions.

In addition to suggesting that the behavior of the majority of these cases was not viewed as extremely serious, this detailed follow-up enables the approximation of a "favorable" category and therefore allows for a tighter comparison with the felon parole results. The parole outcome category "favorable" includes (among others) violations for drug use only and other technical reasons as well as the clean cases. Adding the 77 outpatients who were violated for these reasons to the 316 who remained clean yields at least 393 who were favorable at

the end of 24½ months.³ Therefore, at least 87.7% of the outpatients who were clean at 12½ months were in favorable status at 24½ months, which is of course similar to the 85% figure used to justify the felon parole policy.

First Releases Compared to Rereleases

The final step was to repeat the month-by-month follow up for the yearly release cohorts divided into those being released from CRC for the first time and those being released for the second or more time. These results are summarized in Tables 4 and 5 and detailed in Tables 6-9. As expected from prior results (Beckett and Fowler, 1977) the first releases consistently show a higher percent clean figure at each interval compared to rereleases (Table 4). More relevant to this study, however, the rereleases show a lower percent loss from each interval to the percent clean at 24½ months. For example, for 1972 the drop in percent clean for first releases from 12½ to 24½ months is 4.8% compared to 2.5% of rereleases (Table 4). The respective figures for the 1974 releases are 5.0% and 2.8%. However, this difference may not be of practical significance because the percent clean at each follow up interval who remained clean through 24½ months is similar for first compared to rereleases (Table 5). For 12½ months the figures for 1972 first releases and second releases were 73.5% and 79.5%, respectively; and for 1974 were 66.7% and 74.8%.

³This procedure, of course, ignores the fact that 15 of these cases were in actuality returned to CRC (although for drug use only) and that some of the others may have violated again before reaching 24½ months.

Table 4

First Releases Compared to Rereleases: Percent Clean
at Three Month Intervals after Release

Months After Release	All Releases		1st Releases		Rereleases	
	1972	1974	1972	1974	1972	1974
At Release	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15 days	82.5	82.6	96.3	84.4	78.1	81.2
3½ months	42.1	37.9	49.2	42.0	33.9	34.4
6½ "	26.3	23.3	31.6	27.0	20.1	20.2
9½ "	19.2	16.7	23.2	19.7	14.6	14.3
12½ "	15.2	13.0	18.2	15.0	11.8	11.3
15½ "	13.6	11.4	16.1	13.1	10.8	9.9
18½ "	12.6	10.3	14.9	11.6	10.0	9.2
21½ "	11.8	9.6	13.8	10.6	9.5	8.7
24½ "	11.5	9.2	13.4	10.0	9.3	8.5

Table 5

First Releases Compared to Rereleases: Percent Clean
At Three Month Follow Up Intervals Who Remained Clean
through 24½ Months after Release

Months After Release	All Releases		1st Releases		2nd Releases	
	1972	1974	1972	1974	1972	1974
At Release	11.5	9.2	13.4	10.0	9.3	8.5
15 days	14.0	11.1	15.5	11.8	12.0	10.4
3½ months	27.4	24.2	27.2	23.8	27.6	24.6
6½ "	43.9	39.4	42.4	37.0	46.5	42.0
9½ "	60.0	54.8	57.9	50.8	63.9	59.3
12½ "	75.7	70.5	73.5	66.7	79.5	74.8
15½ "	84.6	80.6	83.3	76.1	86.9	85.6
18½ "	91.2	89.3	90.1	86.2	93.0	92.5
21½ "	97.5	95.5	97.1	94.0	98.1	97.0
24½ "	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The month-by-month follow up of all 7072 civil addicts released from CRC during 1972 and 1974 to outpatient status indicated that at about 12½ months after release a point of diminishing returns has been reached. Only about 14 of 100 were still clean (arrest and drug free) at the end of 12½ months, but of these 14 about 10 or 75% managed to stay clean for the next 12 months and, therefore, become eligible for an early discharge. Of the 4 who failed about half (58%) committed technical violations only, primarily for drug use, and of the 4 about 3 (or 64%) were allowed to remain free in the community. The results were slightly more favorable for rereleases over first releases, but not to the extent needed for practical application in a decision making situation. The findings for the combined releases proved to be more satisfactory than those used to justify the policy which qualifies a felon parolee for early discharge from parole after one year of clean behavior, and, as noted earlier, the subsequent evaluation of this policy confirmed that a safe decision had been made (Jaman et. al., 1974).

The potential monetary savings to be gained from reducing the early discharge requirement for civil addicts by 12 months is relatively large. The average cost to supervise an outpatient for one year is about \$1300.⁴ Therefore, discharging just the 448 of the 1974 release cohort who were clean at 12½ months amounts to \$582,400. These cases probably require

⁴Based on the 1979-80 FY budget request.

less supervision time, so the savings in time and money would in actuality be less, but the gain would still be substantial.

Another factor to be considered is the apparent impact of California's new Determinate Sentence Law (DSL) of lowering commitments to the civil addict program. Simultaneously with the implementation of this law on July 1, 1977 admissions to CRC dropped by more than 50%. During the year 1976, prior to the effective date, 1716 men were committed compared to only 883 during the year after. What seems to be happening is that a large portion of addicts eligible for civil commitment are choosing state prison instead. Their reason in doing so seems clear: substitute a longer initial period of incarceration for a much shorter parole and total commitment jurisdiction. Approximately 65% of men committed to CRC were convicted of felonies for which the DSL base sentence would be 16 months, 2 years or 3 years. According to a current study (Brewer et. al., 1978) persons sentenced to state prison for these offenses would have to serve 15.5 months (mean) before being paroled, assuming they lost no good time. They would be on parole or in the institution for a minimum of 12 months to a maximum of 18 months with the total period of state control summing up to a definite 27.5 - 33.5 months. In contrast, selecting⁵ CRC means a probable first stay of

⁵Currently, persons are rarely committed to CRC against their will, so the term "selecting" is appropriate. In a recent examination of the commitment process McGlothlin et. al. (1977) found that of 126 cases analyzed, 112 cooperated with the commitment process, and the remaining 14 successfully fought commitment.

8 months but a possible total commitment period of 84 months, which could include several returns to CRC for further incarceration. Addicts refer to this as the "seven year tail," a term which clearly describes their attitude. Addicts are also aware that CRC outpatient status is intense and stringent: the caseload size is about 35, anti-narcotic testing is twice a month, 43% of first releases are returned to CRC or discharged to state prison within one year after release (Beckett and Fowler, 1977), and only about 10% of first releases gain an early, drug-free discharge.

Conclusion

In conclusion, moving the earlier discharge up to 12½ months after release is attractive because the risks are minimal due to the relatively low number who fail after that point compared to before it; the potential saving in resources is large; the results are similar to the felon early discharge policy which proved to be safe; and the change could help make the CAP more comparable with state prison to potential civil addicts.

Recommendations

The following recommendation is supported by this study:

Initiate legislative action in order to reduce the period of time required for an early drug free discharge to one year from the two years currently required under Section 3200 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

A flat one year was selected rather than 12½ months because it is a more practical time element. (By the time the review procedures are

completed 12½ months would have elapsed anyway.) Review procedures would remain the same under this change except that they would begin twelve months sooner.

It should be noted that the NAEA is not bound strictly by law to make the early discharge inasmuch as the word "may" is used in Section 3200 of the *W&I Code*: "... (NAEA) may file...recommending to the court the discharge of the person from the program." Therefore, in the event the time requirement is advanced, the NAEA would continue to have this safeguard.

This study did not deal with those on methadone maintenance who are now required to complete three clean years before early discharge, but it would seem consistent to reduce the requirement to one and one-half or two years.

Aside from making no changes at all, there are two even more conservative alternatives which could be initiated. One would be to reduce the earlier discharge to a later interval, say 15 or 18 months after release. However, the risks wouldn't have improved that much considering the relatively small number of civil addicts involved. In addition, the longer time requirement would not have as much value in making the CAP seem to be a more viable disposition compared to state prison.

A second alternative would be to gain the legislative reduction to allow discharge to occur after 12 clean months, but to delay by NAEA policy full implementation of the reduction until further evaluation has occurred. The only evaluation which would provide information in addition to that already available would necessitate an experimental design. This might consist of reviewing all those clean at 12 months

after release and randomly assigning half to be discharged at that time. The other half would be continued under supervision until they were eligible for discharge after 24 clean months. The behavior of both groups during their second year after release from CRC would be compared in order to gain a better idea of the value of the second year of out-patient supervision. The advantage would be increased knowledge which might be a useful addition to correctional science as well as decision making. The disadvantage of this approach is that the added information probably would not appreciably increase the clarity of the decision, judging from the felon parole evaluation, and the savings to be gained from total implementation would be unnecessarily delayed.

In the final analysis the appropriate decision does not rest on the need for additional information. One must weigh the slight risks of advancing the discharge by 12 months as determined by this analysis against the gains of increased time and fiscal savings and increased viability of the Civil Addict Program.

Table 6

Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center
Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status:
First Release, 1972, N = 1969

Months After Release	Number		Percent	
	Violated ¹	Clean ²	Clean of All Released ³	Clean at 24½ mos. ⁴
At release	-	1969	100.0	13.4
.5	271	1896	96.3	15.5
1.5	305	1393	70.7	18.9
2.5	235	1158	58.8	22.8
3.5	189	969	49.2	27.2
4.5	149	820	41.6	32.2
5.5	103	717	36.4	36.8
6.5	95	622	31.6	42.4
7.5	86	536	27.2	49.2
8.5	36	500	25.4	52.8
9.5	44	456	23.2	57.9
10.5	34	422	21.4	62.6
11.5	35	387	19.7	68.2
12.5	28	359	18.2	73.5
13.5	23	336	17.1	78.6
14.5	9	327	16.6	80.7
15.5	10	317	16.1	83.3
16.5	10	307	15.6	86.0
17.5	5	302	15.3	87.4
18.5	9	293	14.9	90.1
19.5	7	286	14.5	92.3
20.5	10	276	14.0	95.6
21.5	4	272	13.8	97.1
22.5	5	267	13.6	98.9
23.5	2	265	13.5	99.6
24.5	1	264	13.4	100.0

¹Violated: A delinquent act reported to the NAEA resulting in suspension of outpatient status.

²Clean: Not violated since release.

³% Clean = Number clean/number released X 100.

⁴% Clean at 24½ months = Number clean/number clean at 24½ mos. X 100.

Table 7

Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center
Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status:
Re-Released, 1972, N = 1972

Months After Release	Number		Percent	
	Violated ¹	Clean ²	Clean of All Released ³	Clean at 24½ mos. ⁴
At release	-	1702	100.0	9.3
.5	373	1329	78.1	12.0
1.5	325	1004	59.0	15.8
2.5	238	766	45.0	28.8
3.5	189	577	33.9	27.6
4.5	106	471	27.7	33.8
5.5	69	402	23.6	39.5
6.5	60	342	20.1	46.5
7.5	35	307	18.0	51.8
8.5	27	280	16.5	56.8
9.5	31	249	14.6	63.9
10.5	25	224	13.2	71.0
11.5	13	211	12.4	75.4
12.5	11	200	11.8	79.5
13.5	8	192	11.3	82.8
14.5	5	187	11.0	85.0
15.5	4	183	10.8	86.9
16.5	5	178	10.5	89.3
17.5	3	175	10.3	90.9
18.5	4	171	10.0	93.0
19.5	4	167	9.8	95.2
20.5	2	165	9.7	96.4
21.5	3	162	9.5	98.1
22.5	3	159	9.3	100.0
23.5	0	159	9.3	100.0
24.5	0	159	9.3	100.0

¹Violated: A delinquent act reported to the NAEA resulting in suspension of outpatient status.

²Clean: Not violated since release.

³% Clean = Number clean/number released X 100.

⁴% Clean at 24½ months = Number clean/number clean at 24½ mos. X 100.

Table 8

Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center
Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status:
First Release, 1974, N = 1561

Months After Release	Number		Percent	
	Violated ¹	Clean ²	Clean of All Released ³	Clean at 24½ mos. ⁴
At release	-	1561	100.0	10.0
.5	243	1318	84.4	11.8
1.5	289	1029	65.9	15.1
2.5	209	820	52.5	19.0
3.5	164	656	42.0	23.8
4.5	97	559	35.8	27.9
5.5	84	475	30.4	32.8
6.5	53	422	27.0	37.0
7.5	36	386	24.7	40.4
8.5	39	347	22.2	45.0
9.5	40	307	19.7	50.8
10.5	25	282	18.1	55.3
11.5	24	258	16.5	60.5
12.5	24	234	15.0	66.7
13.5	10	224	14.4	69.6
14.5	9	215	13.8	72.6
15.5	10	205	13.1	76.1
16.5	8	197	12.6	79.2
17.5	8	189	12.1	82.5
18.5	8	181	11.6	86.2
19.5	8	173	11.1	90.2
20.5	3	170	10.9	91.8
21.5	4	166	10.6	94.0
22.5	3	163	10.4	95.7
23.5	2	161	10.3	96.8
24.5	5	156	10.0	100.0

¹Violated: A delinquent act reported to the NAEA resulting in suspension of outpatient status.

²Clean: Not violated since release.

³% Clean = Number clean/number released X 100.

⁴% Clean at 24½ months = Number clean/number clean at 24½ mos. X 100.

Table 9

Civil Addicts Released from California Rehabilitation Center
Who Remain Clean from Month to Month on Outpatient Status:
Re-Released, 1974, N = 1890

Months After Release	Number		Percent	
	Violated ¹	Clean ²	Clean of All Released ³	Clean at ⁴ 24½ mos.
At release	-	1890	100.0	8.5
.5	356	1534	81.2	10.4
1.5	416	1118	59.2	14.3
2.5	255	863	45.7	18.5
3.5	212	651	34.4	24.6
4.5	117	534	28.3	30.0
5.5	84	450	23.8	35.6
6.5	69	381	20.2	42.0
7.5	45	336	17.8	47.6
8.5	32	304	16.1	52.6
9.5	34	270	14.3	59.3
10.5	22	248	13.1	64.5
11.5	21	227	12.0	70.5
12.5	13	214	11.3	74.8
13.5	10	204	10.8	78.4
14.5	11	193	10.2	83.0
15.5	6	187	9.9	85.6
16.5	5	182	9.6	87.9
17.5	5	177	9.4	90.4
18.5	4	173	9.2	92.5
19.5	5	168	8.9	95.2
20.5	2	166	8.8	96.4
21.5	1	165	8.7	97.0
22.5	2	163	8.6	98.2
23.5	2	161	8.5	99.4
24.5	1	160	8.5	100.0

¹Violated: A delinquent act reported to the NAEA resulting in suspension of outpatient status.

²Clean: Not violated since release.

³% Clean = Number clean/number released X 100.

⁴% Clean at 24½ months = Number clean/number clean at 24½ mos. X 100.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Stuart. *Evaluative Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1975.
- Beckett, Gerald and Raymond Fowler. *One Year Follow-Up of Residents Released from the California Rehabilitation Center during 1975 by Outpatient Unit and Region*. Unpublished report. Chino, California: Southern California Research Group, 1977.
- Beckett, Gerald and Evelyn Thomas. Understanding Honored: Court Dispositions of Early, Drug Free Discharges from California Civil Addict Program, *Journal of Drug Issues*, 6:191-5, 1976.
- Bennett, Lawrence A. Should We Change the Offender or the System? *Crime and Delinquency*, 19:332-42, 1973.
- Brewer, David, Gerald Beckett and Norman Holt *The First Year of Determinate Sentencing in California* (in preparation). Chino, California: Southern California Research Group, 1978.
- California Department of Corrections. *Narcotic Addict Outpatient Manual*. Sacramento, California, 1971.
- Holt, Norman. Rational Risk Taking: Some Alternatives to Traditional Correctional Problems. In R. Carter and L. Wilkins (eds.), *Probation, Parole and Community Corrections*. New York, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1976.
- Jaman, Dorothy, Lawrence Bennett and John Berecochea. *Early Discharge from Parole: Policy, Practice, and Outcome*. (Research Report Number 51) Sacramento, California: California Department of Corrections Research, 1974.

McGlothlin, William, Douglas Anglin and Bruce Wilson. *An Evaluation of the California Civil Addict Program*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (No. ADM 78-558), 1977.